



---

---

# Architectural Review Board Report

---

---

Architectural Review Board Meeting: May 18, 2020

Agenda Item: 7.2

To: Architectural Review Board  
From: James Combs, Associate Planner  
Cc: Stephanie Reich, AIA, LEED AP, Design & Historic Preservation Planner  
Subject: 19ARB-0426 to review building design, colors, and materials for two new detached two-story dwelling units on a single lot.  
Address: 2001 Cloverfield Avenue  
Applicant: Javier Perez

## Recommended Action

It is recommended that the Architectural Review Board approve application 19ARB-0426 based upon the findings and subject to the conditions contained within this report.

## Executive Summary

Proposed are two detached units measuring 2,656 SF and 2,548 SF each with attached two-car garages and private roof decks.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed design, colors, materials, and landscape for the new buildings with conditions and findings contained in this report.

## Background

The parcel was originally developed with a single unit in 1936, an accessory building was converted to a unit in 1986 and a third two-story unit built in 1990. The two most recent improvements were approved by the Board as shown below. The property is not listed on the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI).

ARB 89-286 On February 5, 1989 the Board approved building plans, colors, materials, and landscape plans for a new two-story unit.

ARB-3148 On February 4, 1987 the Board approved modifications to an existing accessory building to allow its conversion into a livable unit.

## Project / Site Information

The property is located within the R2 zoning district at the corner of Virginia Avenue and Cloverfield Boulevard just north of Pico Boulevard. The parcel is surrounded primarily with one and two-story multi-unit dwellings.

The following table provides a brief summary of project data:

Zoning District / Design Guidelines:	R2 (Low Density Residential) District
Parcel Area (SF):	7,500 SF
Parcel Dimensions:	150' x 50'
Existing On-Site Improvements (Year Built):	Unit 1 (1936) Unit 2 (1987) Unit 3 (1989)
Historic Resources Inventory Status	The existing buildings are not listed on the HRI
CEQA	Exempt pursuant to Section 15061 (b)(3)
Adjacent Zoning & Use:	<b>North:</b> R2 – Low Density Residential <b>South:</b> R2 – Low Density Residential <b>East:</b> R2 – Low Density Residential <b>West:</b> R2 – Low Density Residential

## Analysis

### Building Design/Architectural Concept

The proposed concept is to create two freestanding Revival Style influenced units organized to include a shared outdoor space and private patios. Due to the corner location private outdoor space is largely limited to the proposed roof decks. A pool is proposed at the rear of unit “F”.

### Site Design

The existing three units are proposed to be demolished. Vehicular access will continue to be off Virginia Avenue by a relocated driveway apron. One garage faces Virginia Avenue and is set back approximately 20 feet from the side property line. The other garage is perpendicular to Virginia Avenue. Together the units create a courtyard around the shared driveway. The front unit, “O”, has its front door on Cloverfield Boulevard while the rear unit, “F”, is oriented towards Virginia Avenue.

### Landscape Design

The proposed landscape plan for the site uses Berkeley Sedge and Star Jasmine as the primary ground covers along the street elevations and side yard. The front yard is as a symmetrical garden mirrored across the walkway. Squares of artificial turf surrounding *Roystonea regia* (Royal Palm) on either side of the walkway and a central water feature. A condition of approval requires that an alternative ground cover, or lower water use turf, be used in-lieu of the proposed artificial turf. Zoning code will limit the height of the water feature to 42 inches. Hedges are proposed along the entire perimeter; within the front yard where there is a 42-inch height limit *Olea europaea* (Dwarf Olive) is proposed, while *Ficus nitida* (Fig) is proposed elsewhere.

The driveway is flanked by two more Royal Palms with a numerous shrubs and

groundcovers of varied heights in a range of colors. The proposed landscape provides varied heights, colors, and textures and appropriately complements the proposed buildings.

### Mass and Scale

Designed as two independent structures on a standard sized lot in a neighborhood zoned for four units per lot, the proposal has less apparent massing than most new buildings in R2 zone. Along Virginia Avenue, much of the façade is set back 1'-6" to 5'-0" further than the minimum 20'-0" front yard setback. Along Virginia Avenue the 30'-0" wide courtyard greatly reduces the building's street presence. The south elevation, facing the neighboring property, is also set back more than required with a minimum 9'-8" side yard setback across the entire elevation where 8'-0" is the minimum. Further, a 10'-0" gap between the buildings on the south elevation allows views and air circulation from the neighboring lot to the south all the way through onto Virginia Avenue. As designed the overall massing of the proposed buildings appears sensitive to surrounding uses. However, the monumental entry of Building "O" (fronting Cloverfield Avenue) is out of scale with the building and the neighborhood. A condition of approval to modify the entry has been included.

### Design, Details and Materials

The proposed detached single units inspired by Revival Style designs feature a variety of finishes including wood windows, steel troweled stucco, "S" shaped roof tile, and wrought iron railings. Detailing and finish of the proposed architectural elements is important to ensure high quality design of the proposed style, a condition of approval has been included to require additional details for elements such as windows, corbels, and stucco pattern prior to building permit submittal. A further condition of approval requires that the roof tiles be a "barrel shaped" and that the decorative molding and corbels be a solid material and not a thin layer of stucco over foam. Sheet ARB-500 shows a proposed textured hand troweled stucco, a condition of approval has been included to ensure this, or a comparable style of hand troweled stucco will be used. The proposed windows are a mix of hung and sliding windows; staff has included a condition that all windows be change to a hung type operation. Many of the doors are proposed with lintels above them which slightly overhang the openings by a few inches. In order to maintain detailing of the proposed style a condition of approval has been included that the lintel shall be no wider than the proposed door opening.

Each building shares similar design elements such as wood corbels, precast stone columns and travertine tiles. Both units feature rooftop decks recessed into the roof so that the guardrail/parapet are partially hidden by the hipped roof. Access to the roof decks will be from internal stairs rising above the roofline for both units. Although the buildings exhibit the same style and share many characteristics, each is unique. In addition to a different site layout, the two building are further defined by a grand entry (noted above) on Building F and a circular stair tower on Building O.

The existing site wall is proposed to remain along the north (Virginia Avenue) and east property lines. New walls will be constructed to match existing walls along the west (Cloverfield Avenue) and south property lines. A condition of approval has been included to confirm that walls along Virginia Avenue and Cloverfield Boulevard are finished to

match the proposed building and walls on shared property lines be a decorative material not requiring after-installation treatment. Walls within the front yard setback may not exceed 42” per code while those elsewhere on the property are proposed to be 6’-0” tall. Pedestrian and vehicular gates on the property are proposed to be redwood planks stained to match the windows and corbels surrounded with 2x2 metal framing.

The material palette and color scheme as proposed and conditioned are high quality and complement the building design. Roof drainage and downspout locations are unclear, a condition has been added to ensure the downspouts are integrated into the design.

<b>DESIGN ELEMENTS</b>	<b>PROPOSED EXTERIOR MATERIAL, FINISH AND COLOR</b>
Façade	Steel troweled white plaster stucco Travertine tile
Windows	Brown wood windows (sliding and hung)
Doors	Wood and glass doors.
Roof	Mission style clay tiles (S-shaped)
Mechanical Screening	NA - no rooftop equipment proposed.
Refuse Screening	NA – existing.
Lighting	Wall Sconces.
Fencing	NA – existing.

Impact on Historic Resources

The subject property is not listed on the City’s Historic Resources Inventory (HRI).

**Code Compliance**

This application has only been preliminarily reviewed for compliance with the base district’s development standards which address aspects of the plan that could result in significant changes to the project’s design. A complete code-compliance review will not occur until the application is submitted for plan check. Any significant changes to the design subsequent to any ARB approval will require Board approval.

**CEQA Status**

The project is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15061 (b)(3) in that it can be seen with certainty that the proposed project does not have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment in that the project involves the review of design-related issues associated with the proposed structure(s) in terms of general architectural design, proposed materials, colors, mechanical screening and/or landscape plans.

**Summary**

The proposed project creates two new units in traditional style that relate to one another in plan and character. The independent buildings achieve a sensible mass and scale with varied materials and significant setbacks and open space along the street and the neighboring properties. The proposed design has a three-dimensional quality that will fit

in with this location. The proposed landscape is attractive and emphasizes the formal qualities of the homes.

**FINDINGS:**

- A. The plan for the proposed building or structure is expressive of good taste, good design, and in general contributes to the image of Santa Monica as a place of beauty, creativity and individuality in that the proposed Revival Style influenced buildings relate well to each other and the surrounding neighborhood.
- B. The proposed building or structure is not of inferior quality such as to cause the nature of the local neighborhood or environment to materially depreciate in appearance and value in that high quality materials such as wood windows, steel troweled stucco, and wrought iron guardrails will be incorporated into the building design as proposed in the application submittal and as presented to the Architectural Review Board. These finishes and associated color scheme support and enhance the building design and its three-dimensional quality.
- C. The proposed design of the building or structure is compatible with developments on land in the general area in that the perceived mass and scale are addressed through various design techniques, including use of colors, materials, fenestration pattern, and building form and the independent nature of the two buildings. The proposed design is compatible with surrounding developments as other contemporary buildings exist in the neighborhood. As shown, the proposed buildings will be compliant with the Zoning Ordinance in terms of setback and parcel coverage, and height and no deviation from Code is requested.
- D. The proposed development conforms to the effective guidelines and standards adopted pursuant to Chapter 9.55 – *Architectural Review Board*, and all other applicable ordinances insofar as the location and appearance of the buildings and structures are involved. Specifically, the location and appearance of the buildings and structures comply with required findings set forth in Chapter 9.55, as documented by the Architectural Review Board, and as conditioned, the plans will fully comply with all applicable regulations prior to the issuance of a building permit.

**CONDITIONS:**

- 1. Prior to plan check submittal, the entry to unit “O” shall be reduced in size and scale, to be reviewed and approved by ARB staff
- 2. Prior to plan check submittal, all details including, but not limited to, windows, doors, trellises at the roof and at the ground floor rear, existing and new mezzanines, stair, security gate and other typical and unique conditions shall be reviewed and approved by ARB staff to ensure high quality details for proper implementation.

3. Prior to plan check submittal an example of the proposed roofing tiles shall be reviewed and approved by ARB staff to ensure that it is a high-quality barrel shaped tile.
4. Prior to plan check submittal an example of the proposed precast stone trim and molding shall be reviewed and approved by ARB staff to ensure that it is a high-quality material.
5. Prior to plan check submittal the plans shall be modified so the lintel proposed above the doors does not extend past the opening and framing to be reviewed and approved by ARB staff.
6. Prior to plan check submittal the plans shall be revised to create consistency in the operational type of windows being proposed, all windows shall be a hung type reviewed and approved by ARB staff.
7. Prior to plan check submittal, provide lighting at the alley and building entrance that is a low light level sufficient for security and circulation. Plans shall be reviewed and approved by ARB staff to ensure it complements the design.
8. Prior to plan check submittal the proposed roof tiles shall be changed to a “barrel shaped” mission style roof reviewed and approved by ARB staff.
9. Aluminum or another comparable material shall be used for the windows throughout reviewed and approved by ARB staff.
10. This approval shall expire when the administrative or discretionary entitlements, not including any Subdivision Map approvals, previously granted for the project have lapsed. If no such entitlements have been granted, this approval shall expire 24 months from its effective date, or 30 months if in the Coastal Zone unless appealed.
11. Prior to plan check submittal, provide information on drainage to ensure design integration.
12. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall demonstrate that the plans comply with all applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. Significant changes to a project’s design shall require review and approval of the Architectural Review Board. Minor changes may be approved administratively pursuant to all applicable guidelines.

The Architectural Review Board’s approval, conditions of approval, or denial of this application may be appealed to the Planning Commission if the appeal is filed with the Zoning Administrator within ten consecutive days following the date of the Architectural Review Board’s determination in the manner provided in SMMC 9.61.100.

### **Attachments**

Applicant’s Submittal Material

[https://smgov365.sharepoint.com/teams/pcdsp/CityPlanning/ARB/STFRPT/SR19/2001 Cloverfield/19ARB-0426 \(2001 Cloverfield\) New Duplex.docx](https://smgov365.sharepoint.com/teams/pcdsp/CityPlanning/ARB/STFRPT/SR19/2001%20Cloverfield/19ARB-0426%20(2001%20Cloverfield)%20New%20Duplex.docx)