



PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

STAFF REPORT

DATE: JUNE 22, 2021

TO: DESIGN COMMISSION

FROM: DAVID M. REYES, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT: APPLICATION FOR CONCEPT DESIGN REVIEW
NEW ONE-TO-FOUR-STORY, 58-UNIT RESIDENTIAL PROJECT
1870-1890 E. WALNUT STREET, 175 N. GREENWOOD AVENUE & 170 N. PARKWOOD AVENUE

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Design Commission:

Environmental Determination

Find that the application for Concept Design Review was subject to environmental review in the Categorical Exemption adopted by the Hearing Officer for Conditional Use Permit #6846 on April 21, 2021, and that there are no changed circumstances or new information which would require further environmental review.

Findings for Compliance with the Tree Protection Ordinance

Acknowledge that no protected trees are proposed to be removed in conjunction with the proposed project.

Findings for Concept Design Approval

1. Find that the project, upon implementation of the conditions of approval, will comply with the purposes of design review, the design-related goals and policies of the Land Use Element of the General Plan and the Design Guidelines for Neighborhood Commercial and Multi-Family Residential Districts; and
2. Based on these findings, approve the application for Concept Design Review subject to the following conditions to be further reviewed during Final Design Review:

Conditions

1. Depict all window and door openings on the floor plans and ensure that the locations of openings are consistent with the floor plans and elevations.
2. Further study improvements to the pedestrian character of the project, which may include such measures as, refining and providing details of the proposed ground-level canopy and frame structures at unit entrances, and providing a street-accessible entrance to unit 102. Additional measures could include, enlarging the community room arcade openings, further softening patio and stairwell walls along the street, providing additional detail and integration of the courtyard openings, and/or other measures that may be proposed by the design team.
3. Provide community room entries in close proximity to the courtyards to enhance the physical connections between these communal-use spaces within the project.
4. Provide additional means of articulation to break up the blank wall condition at the east end of the south elevation and ensure it is compatible with the building overall. In addition, provide for Final Design Review the elevations of the setback upper floors on the south, east and west elevations. Ensure that these walls are articulated in a manner consistent with the overall design and to avoid blank wall conditions that would be visible from the public realm.
5. Further study the pyramidal tower and angular elements proposed to ensure that they are consistent with the overall design and follow a clear design logic. In addition, further study the gable-roof forms shown on the south elevation to ensure consistency with the primary roof forms proposed.
6. The seating element shown within the public right-of-way along Walnut Street is not approved and requires separate review and approval by the Department of Public Works. The matching seating element within the property along Walnut Street shall be further studied to better integrate it into the design and to avoid potential conflicts with pedestrian travel and views into the courtyard, such as providing integrated seat walls into nearby proposed planters.
7. Provide dimensions of the widths and depths of the courtyard openings along Walnut Street to determine whether the proposed design complies with Zoning Code Section 17.50.350.G.3. In addition, provide details of the proposed gates within these openings and a calculation of the percentage of their openness to determine whether they comply with Zoning Code Section 17.50.350.G.6. If a modification to either of these requirements is requested, provide specific reasoning for the Design Commission to consider in its deliberations during Final Design Review.
8. A tree protection plan prepared by a Certified Arborist shall be incorporated into the plans submitted for Final Design Review and shall include the City of Pasadena Tree Protection Guidelines dated 5/13/19 (see Attachment D), to ensure that the design of the building and parking structure will allow for the protection of tree #793.

BACKGROUND:

Project Overview

- General Plan Designation: Low Commercial (0 – 1.00 FAR) & Medium Density Residential (0-16 DU/Acre)
- Zoning: CG (Commercial General) & RM-16 (Multi-Family Residential, 16 units per acre)
- Design Guidelines: The applicable design guidelines are the design-related goals and policies in the Land Use Element of the General Plan, the Design Guidelines in the East Pasadena Specific Plan and the Design Guidelines for Neighborhood Commercial and Multi-Family Residential Districts.
- Site: The site is comprised of four adjoining lots totaling approximately 1 acre in size on the south side of E. Walnut Street, the entire block between N. Parkwood Avenue and N. Greenwood Avenue. It is rectangular in shape and is currently developed with one- and two-story commercial and automotive buildings as well as a non-historic single-family residence on the Parkwood Avenue property. A tree inventory provided with the application identifies eight trees on site, one of which is a protected specimen tree, as well as two street trees along the property's frontages.
- Surroundings: Surrounding properties include one- and two-story commercial and industrial buildings along Walnut Street, one- and one-and-one-half-story single-family residences along Greenwood Avenue, and one- and two-story single- and multi-family residences along Parkwood Avenue. A recently constructed four-story mixed-use building is approximately 500 feet to the east of the site's eastern boundary at the northwest corner of Walnut Street and Allen Avenue. Nearby designated historic resources include the Woodbury Well directly across Walnut Street from the project site (1930, Aubrey St. Clair), historic signs at 2114 E. Foothill Blvd. (In N Out Burger, 1952) and 1821 E. Walnut St. (Bells & Vaughn Frame & Wheel Aligning, 1946), and two houses at 116 and 119 N. Meridith Avenue (1911 and 1912, respectively).
- Project Description: The project involves construction of a new one-to-four-story, 58-unit residential project. One protected specimen tree is proposed to be retained, and seven non-protected trees are proposed to be removed to accommodate the project. Parking will be provided in one subterranean level.
- Site Design: The site plan shows the proposed new building covering most of the site with varying setbacks from its street frontages and interior property lines. A number of private patios and exterior stairs are shown along the building's frontages, creating modulation in the building walls along the perimeter. Two separate open-air courtyards are proposed within the center of the building. The vehicular ramp to the subterranean garage is shown at the southeast corner of the site. A 10'-wide utility easement is shown at the southwest portion of the site, which is proposed to be covered in lawn and used as a dog run.

- Architectural Style: Industrial
- Developer: Heritage Housing Partners
- Architects: Moule & Polyzoides, Architects and Urbanists
- Landscape Architect: Fong Hart Schneider + Partners

ANALYSIS:

Design Commission Comments from Preliminary Consultation

On October 13, 2020, the Design Commission reviewed an application for Preliminary Consultation for this project. The Commission’s comments from that meeting, with excerpts from the design team’s responses, and staff’s comments, are detailed in the chart below. The design team’s full responses are in Attachment A.

Commissioner Comments, October 13, 2020	Excerpt from Design Team Response	Staff Comments
<p>1. Further, consider the pedestrian scale of the project, including softening entrances and ensuring adequate transparency, further articulating the building massing, lowering the community room volume to better engage the street grade, improving visibility into courtyards and considering an open space/plaza element along Walnut Street.</p>	<p>a. “The proposed design engenders transparency while maintaining occupant security. A community room is situated at the ground floor of the central building volume, which is fronted by a covered porch with glazing behind. On either side of this space are zaguans providing access through to internal courtyards...</p> <p>b. Lowering the community room to the street grade would negatively impact the design as proposed. First, the move would restrict the height clearances of the subterranean garage below. Second, the community room would need internal ramps to maintain accessibility to all residents, which compromises the interior’s usability. Third, the current height maintains the community room’s connection to the courtyards on either side of it. ...”</p>	<p><i>Comment to be addressed through conditions of approval.</i></p> <p>The pedestrian scale of the project has not substantially changed since the previous review, with the exception of the private patio walls along Walnut Street, which have been softened to include an open railing component at the top. Two formerly separate, direct stairs to ground level units along the east elevation have been combined into a single stair structure, now oriented in the north-south direction. Open-frame structures are shown highlighting three of four unit entries along Walnut Street.</p> <p>While the project provides multiple unit entrances and patios along the street, staff finds that the pedestrian character of the project could continue to be improved by such measures as refining and providing details of the proposed ground-level canopy and frame structures at unit entrances, providing a street-accessible entrance to unit 102, enlarging the community room arcade openings, further softening patio and stairwell walls along the</p>

Commissioner Comments, October 13, 2020	Excerpt from Design Team Response	Staff Comments
		street and providing additional detail and integration of the courtyard openings. Staff has recommended a condition of approval requiring further study of these and other possible measures that may be proposed by the design team to improve the project's pedestrian character.
2. Further, explore the connection between the community room and the courtyards.	"The community room has been triangulated between three amenities: the courtyards and the Walnut St. plaza. Moving it to the project interior between the two courtyards would sever its connection to the plaza element on Walnut. Community room walls along the zaguans will be fenestrated to improve the visual connection between the courtyards and the community room."	<i>Comment to be addressed through conditions of approval.</i> The location of the community room and its physical connections to the courtyards have not substantially changed in the current design. Covered, open walkways adjoin the community room on both its east and west sides and both terminate at the open courtyards. While the design team's response indicates that there will be fenestration along these walkways allowing for views between the courtyard and community room, these are not shown in the floor plans. Staff finds that the connection between the community room and the courtyards could be further enhanced by providing entries to the community room near the courtyards and also by demonstrating the size and locations of proposed fenestration in the floor plans. Staff has recommended conditions of approval to address these issues.
3. The raked roof at the southwest corner is the beginning of an idea that could be more developed and reflected on other building elevations.	"This element is echoed by roof lines appearing on the north elevation, in the courtyard elevations, and above two-story townhouses on the southern edge of the property. These are all conceived as being cast in the same material and color."	<i>Comment to be addressed through conditions of approval.</i> While it appears that no substantial changes have been made to the design in response to this comment, there are multiple locations throughout the project where sloping roofs are provided as a secondary element to the primary flat roof forms of the building. Staff finds that these secondary elements create a more dynamic roofline to the project; however, staff has recommended a

Commissioner Comments, October 13, 2020	Excerpt from Design Team Response	Staff Comments
		condition requiring two gable roof forms along the south elevation to be further studied and refined to better integrate with the other roof forms proposed.
4. Consider moving the bicycle storage room to the first floor.	“Locating bicycle parking in the garage is optimum because it provides the most storage space for the equipment, which means more tenants will be able to own and ride bicycles. The secure placement in the garage also protects the equipment from theft and exposure to the elements, and can better accommodate electric bicycle charging outlets.”	<i>Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i> While the location of the bicycle parking has not changed in response to this comment, there are no design guidelines that would stipulate that bicycle parking be provided at the ground floor and the location provided in the subterranean garage has been found to comply with the Zoning Code. As such, this comment is satisfactorily addressed.
5. Consider replacing trellises and shade sails with box-metal canopies to improve consistency with the chosen architectural style.	“Trellises will be constructed out of metal or wood that is compatible with the industrial palette of the prevailing building volume. They will be detailed in a manner that feels utilitarian as opposed to a specific revival style.”	<i>Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i> The project continues to propose a variety of pergolas, framed structures and solid canopies, the details of which will be further reviewed during Final Design Review. No shade sails are evident in the current drawings.
6. While the design incorporates height averaging to achieve much of its massing and roofline articulation, this is not authorized by the Zoning Code, which limits use of height averaging to certain areas of the Central District Specific Plan. However, additional height up to 12 feet over no more than 60% of the proposed building footprint may be allowed as a concession for providing required on-site affordable housing pursuant to Zoning Code Section 17.43.055.B. If this option is being	“The current height and massing appropriately renders an industrial style building image while respecting the adjacent mass and scale of the neighboring context.”	<i>Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i> The height proposed was approved through an Affordable Housing Concession Permit. No additional areas of additional height were proposed subsequent to the Preliminary Consultation.

Commissioner Comments, October 13, 2020	Excerpt from Design Team Response	Staff Comments
<p>pursued, and in light of the fact that only approximately 20% of the proposed building footprint is proposed to exceed the 45-foot height limit of the CG Zoning District, consider whether additional areas of increased height at the northern portion of the site would further improve the massing and roofline articulation of the project.</p>		
<p>7. The building is appropriately sited to frame and be oriented toward the public streets onto which it fronts, including appropriate fenestration and frontage elements for direct pedestrian access. However, pursuant to comments provided by staff of the Current Planning Section, the property at 170 N. Parkwood Avenue, which is within the RM-16 Zoning District, is not sited to comply with the development standards of this district (such as including a required main garden). Staff understands that the applicant may pursue Variances or an Affordable Housing Concession Permit to allow the site design as proposed; however, any changes to the design that may be made in the future may require a second Preliminary</p>	<p>“OK.”</p>	<p><i>Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i></p> <p>Staff of the Current Planning Section has reviewed the plans submitted for this review and determined them to be in compliance with the Zoning Code and the approved Affordable Housing Concession Permit, with the exception of standards related to the courtyard openings to the street. See further discussion of this issue in the body of the report below.</p>

Commissioner Comments, October 13, 2020	Excerpt from Design Team Response	Staff Comments
Consultation review.		
<p>8. Consider incorporation of additional articulation or fenestration on the rear/south façade and avoid unbalanced blank wall conditions on this façade to the greatest extent feasible in the areas that would be most visible to the public, while also ensuring adequate privacy of the adjoining existing residential properties.</p>	<p>“The design has been refined so that buildings on the southern elevation have domestic character that is responsive to the adjacent residential context. The window composition is varied, and niches have been added to break up blank wall conditions.”</p>	<p><i>Comment to be addressed through conditions of approval.</i></p> <p>The fenestration of the majority of the south elevation is appropriate and balanced; however, the niches provided at the east end of the south elevation appear unbalanced in comparison to the rest of the building design and should be further studied to identify additional means of articulating this publicly visible façade. In addition, the fenestration of the south-facing portions of the upper floors that are further set back from the southernmost elevation is not shown and should be provided for review to ensure appropriate articulation of these walls. Staff has recommended conditions of approval to address these issues.</p>
<p>9. Further, consider differentiated design/programming elements for the two courtyards to provide alternative open space areas for different purposes. Ensure that courtyards include amenities to promote their active use, such as seating, water features, shade, and outdoor cooking and eating facilities. In addition, consider reducing or eliminating private open space encroachments into the relatively small communal courtyard spaces, while providing direct pedestrian access to units that adjoin them.</p>	<p>“The courtyards are differentiated through architectural and landscape design. The building elevations are varied so that the courtyards feel related but unique. Different tree species will be the focal point of each courtyard, which will shade tables and seats below. Direct pedestrian access to adjoining units has been maintained while reducing the patio conditions in front of each entrance. Both courtyards are outfitted with a barbecue and ample seating and dining areas. Courtyard L3 has a native turf lawn.”</p>	<p><i>Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i></p> <p>The landscape drawings provided depict differentiated but compatible design elements between the two courtyard spaces, with similar uses and amenities provided in each space including seating, shade trees, lighting and outdoor cooking.</p>

Commissioner Comments, October 13, 2020	Excerpt from Design Team Response	Staff Comments
<p>10. In future submittals, ensure that the location and approximate canopy size of the protected tree proposed to be retained is shown on all floor plans and elevations to ensure adequate protection of the tree during and after construction.</p>	<p>“In all drawings where it is visible, the protected tree has been shown in red at the recorded size.”</p>	<p><i>Comment to be addressed through conditions of approval.</i></p> <p>The protected tree to remain is shown on the demolition plan, the site plan, the floor plans, the preliminary grading diagram and the west elevation. The subterranean parking structure is set back 10’ from the property line along Parkwood Avenue, which appears to be sufficient distance to ensure protection of the tree; however, this should be confirmed by the project arborist through the provision of a tree protection plan. The tree is shown outside of the grading area on the Preliminary Grading Diagram; therefore, it appears that sufficient steps have been taken to ensure its protection. A condition of approval is recommended to require submittal of a tree protection plan to ensure adequate protection of the tree is demonstrated in the drawings submitted for Final Design Review.</p>

Programming and Circulation

The project proposes placement of the proposed new residential building covering the majority of the site with varying setbacks from the street and side property lines and with two open courtyards within the building interior, each with an opening and view corridor from Walnut Street. The building program is comprised of residential units on each floor, accessed by double-loaded interior corridors, with an enclosed community room space centered along the Walnut Street frontage at the ground floor, and a second, smaller community room and communal roof deck at the southeast corner of the second floor. There are 21 units proposed on the ground floor (17 flats and four townhouses), 19 flats at the second floor and 18 units at the third floor (12 flats and six townhouses). The fourth floor consists of the second floors of the six townhouses that are accessed from the third floor below. Vehicular access to the subterranean garage is proposed at the southeast corner of the property and vertical circulation from the parking structure to the upper levels of the building is provided via a stair at the southeast corner and a second stair and elevator at the north-central portion of the building. An additional stair at the southwest corner provides vertical circulation from the ground floor to the third floor.

Overall, the programming of the building and site is consistent with the applicable design guidelines and as responsive as possible to the Commission’s Preliminary Consultation

comments. Ground-level residential units are shown having direct access to the perimeter streets and the primary communal area for the residents is prominently centered along Walnut Street, with direct pedestrian access from the public realm. The openings that flank the community room space allow for visual access to the courtyard open spaces provided within the center of the building. As noted above, in response to a Design Commission comment from the Preliminary Consultation, staff has recommended a condition of approval requiring continued study of the project's connection to the public realm pedestrian environment, including articulation of patio and stairwell walls, refinement of canopy and frame structure details, enlargement of community room arcade openings, refinement of courtyard openings and/or other measures that may be proposed by the design team.

Orientation

The proposed new building has windows, balconies and sun-shading devices arranged in a clear pattern on all sides, with the exception of the east end of the south elevation as noted in the table above. In addition, the orientation of upper-level facades is currently unknown and, although set back from the primary edge volumes of the building, would also likely be visible from the public realm. Staff has recommended conditions of approval to ensure appropriate orientation of these areas to the public realm. Importantly, the main community room space is placed along the street frontage with direct access from the public realm via stairs and an open arcade.

Height, Massing and Modulation

The height limit at this location is 45' within the CG-zoned portion of the site and 23' to the top plate and 32' to the highest ridgeline within the RM-16-zoned portion of the site. The project was granted an Affordable Housing Concession Permit (AHCP) to exceed the height limit to 55'4" on the CG-zoned portion of the site and 40' to the top plate and 44'4" to the highest ridgeline in the RM-16-zoned portion of the site. Staff of the Current Planning Section has reviewed the plans submitted for this review and determined the height to comply with the approved AHCP.

The elevation drawings and floor plans depict the building massing being modulated by the creation of articulated sub-volumes that appropriately gives the appearance of multiple buildings along Walnut Street. The elevations facing the side streets are similarly divided into smaller volumes with recessed, narrow areas between, as well as projecting stairs. Recessed and projecting balconies and rooftop pergolas also provide texture to the building masses. The taller volumes are appropriately placed toward the north-central portion of the site to relate to Walnut Street and avoid overwhelming adjacent lower-scaled residential development to the south. Overall, the modulation depicted in the elevation drawings is appropriate and responsive to the design guidelines and previous comments from the Commission.

Architectural Style and Detailing

The proposed new building reflects a traditional industrial design language that is found in certain areas of the City, including smaller-scaled buildings along portions of Walnut Street. It has a flat roof with some shed-roofed areas at recessed, secondary volumes as well as hipped roofs at the two-story portions along the southern edge; articulated massing creating the

appearance of multiple buildings; large, stacked openings, some with tile inlays, in a regular, repeating pattern; recessed and projecting balconies with decorative metal railings; projecting canopies and pergolas; and brick cladding with recessed volumes clad in corrugated metal panels and lower-scaled volumes to the south coated in cement plaster. The design also features a pyramidal articulated tower element at the northeast corner and angular elements including peaked arches, gates with angled forms, and canted posts at entry frame elements and pergolas.

In general, the architectural design proposed is appropriate for the site and context for a development of this scale. Staff recommends a condition of approval requiring some of the detail elements to be further studied to ensure that they are consistent with the design proposed and follow a clear design logic, including the pyramidal tower and angular elements, which appear somewhat unresolved and disconnected from the overall design. In addition, there are two gable-roof forms shown on the south elevation that also appear disconnected from the roof forms of the overall project design and should be further studied.

Compatibility

The proposed new building is generally compatible with its immediate surroundings, particularly recently completed and anticipated future development, in terms of height, massing, setbacks and architectural design. As noted previously, staff recommends further study of the project's connections to the public realm and some of the details of the proposed design for consistency with the overall design proposed.

Conceptual Landscape Design

The landscape plans provided outline a program of landscaping that would soften the existing streetscape, enhance the network of pathways and open spaces within the project site and provide usable outdoor space and amenities for the building residents. This includes the two previously described courtyards within the center of the building as well as multiple planter areas and trees proposed along the building perimeter and a small lawn area within the utility easement at the southwestern portion of the site. The level of detail provided in the drawings is appropriate to demonstrate that adequate areas for landscaping will be installed; further detail, including specific planting and hardscape materials and details of planter walls and other built-in amenities, will be required to be submitted for review during Final Design Review, as a matter of course.

The current plans depict installation of a curvilinear seating element within the public right-of-way along Walnut Street, which is subject to review and approval by the Department of Public Works and, therefore, staff recommends a condition of approval to clarify that this review is required. There is also a second, matching seating element shown on the property near the northwest corner of the community room space, which appears disconnected from the design and could potentially impede the pedestrian path of travel and views to the courtyard space. Staff recommends further study of the location of this element to better integrate it with the design, such as incorporating seat walls into proposed planters nearby.

COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS:

Inter-departmental review was conducted in conjunction with the Conditional Use Permit for the project and conditions of approval from other City Departments were incorporated into that decision. Staff routed the Concept Design Review drawings to staff of the Current Planning Section to verify consistency with the approved Conditional Use Permit and the results of that review are in Attachment B. The review identifies the following three potential deviations that may be requested through the design review process:

- Height of courtyard opening

Pursuant to Zoning Code Section 17.50.350.G.2, urban housing structures with more than 75' of street frontage are required to have an opening that allows for visibility into the required courtyard space, which is required to have a height that is a minimum of 50% of the overall height of the building but not more than 25'. The proposed building's overall height is 54'9"; therefore, the opening is required to be 25' high. Subsection 5 of this Code section also states that this requirement may be modified through the design review process and does not specify any additional findings that would need to be made to allow for such modification.

The applicant has provided two openings into the two courtyards along the north (Walnut Street) elevation of the building, which are both proposed to be a maximum of 12' high. They are requesting a deviation from this requirement through the design review process and have provided two reasons for this request:

1. Providing the required height would "create a grossly disproportionate dimension to the façade of the building," and
2. Increasing the height "would block the second-floor hallway and prevent access to the elevator core; as a result, extra elevators would have to be provided in all three building volumes, resulting in a loss of units and increased cost of construction that negatively impacts the affordable housing project's feasibility."

Staff is in agreement with these reasons and recommends that the Commission approve the requested modification. The proposed heights of the openings are proportional to the size of the building and at a human scale that will allow for adequate visibility into the spaces.

- Width of courtyard opening

In addition to the above, the Zoning Code requires the courtyard opening to be a minimum of 10' wide and to be increased by 1' in width for every 3' of depth above 30'. The plans provided do not clearly depict the width and depth of the openings; therefore, this issue was raised for review to determine if a modification to this standard is also needed. The applicant has indicated that the depths of the openings are 32' and the widths are 14', which is compliance with this requirement. Staff recommends a condition of approval requiring these dimensions to be demonstrated in the drawings submitted for Final Design Review, to ensure compliance. With this condition in place, no modification to this standard would be necessary.

Design Commission

Concept Design Review – 1870-1890 E. Walnut St., 175 N. Greenwood Ave. & 170 N. Parkwood Ave.

June 22, 2021

Page 13 of 14

- Visibility into courtyard opening

Finally, this same Zoning Code section also requires any gates installed within the required opening(s) to the courtyard be at least 75% open. The applicant has not yet provided a specific design for proposed gates; however, this will be required to be provided for review during Final Design Review. As such, staff recommends that a condition of approval be included in this decision to require submittal of the proposed gate design in addition to a calculation of its openness and, if less than 75% openness is proposed, a request for modification of this requirement, including specific reasons for the request.


ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

On April 21, 2021, the Hearing Officer adopted a class 32 Categorical Exemption from CEQA in conjunction with the approval of Conditional Use Permit #6846. This application for Concept Design Review is consistent with this previous approval; therefore, no further environmental analysis is required.

CONCLUSION:

The project design requires some additional study to fully address the comments provided during Preliminary Consultation. The project design is generally consistent with the design-related goals and policies in the Land Use Element of the General Plan and the Design Guidelines for Neighborhood Commercial & Multi-Family Residential Districts. Staff recommends approval of the application for Concept Design Review for the project with conditions requiring further study of the project's response to the pedestrian environment, enhancement of connections between communal spaces, integration of certain architectural elements and perimeter seating, demonstration of compliance with Zoning Code requirements for courtyard openings (or request for modification during Final Design Review) and articulation of blank wall conditions.

Respectfully Submitted,



David M. Reyes
Director of Planning and
Community Development

Prepared by:



Kevin Johnson
Senior Planner

Reviewed by:



Leon E. White
Principal Planner

Attachments:

- A. Applicant's responses to Preliminary Consultation comments
- B. Current plans & elevations
- C. Comments from the Current Planning Section
- D. Tree Protection Guidelines