



Gateway
to the
San Gabriel Valley

ALHAMBRA DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

January 28, 2020

AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING - 7:30 P.M.

Civic Center Library, Ruth Reese Hall

101 South First Street

CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

ROLL CALL:

CHRISTINE OLSON, President

RICHARD SANCHEZ, Vice President

STEVEN CHEN, Member

KATIE CHIU, Member

ANKIT UDANI, Member

RICHARD ABE, Secretary

CONSENT CALENDAR (Items 1-2):

All items listed under Consent Calendar are considered by the Design Review Board to be routine and will be enacted by one motion unless a citizen or Board Member requests otherwise; in which case, the item will be removed for separate consideration. Items placed under Consent Calendar include smaller scale projects with no or minor design issues and ministerial matters (minutes).

1. MINUTES: January 14, 2020

Recommended Action: Design Review Board review and approve as submitted the minutes of the January 14, 2020 regular meeting of the Design Review Board.

2. 1132 South Chapel Avenue

This is an application for exterior alterations and the legalization of window replacements to an existing single-family residence.

Applicant: Cheng Cheng

Recommended Action: APPROVAL - Recommendation is for approval as submitted.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

3. 813 West Mission Road

This is an application for exterior alterations and window replacements to an existing

single-family residence.

Applicant: David Ko

Recommended Action: APPROVAL - Recommendation is for approval with the following conditions: 1. The window schedule and elevations shall be updated to show consistent window types; 2. The bedroom window on the front elevation shall use horizontal grilles to mimic a single hung design; and 3. Any revised drawings shall be reviewed and approved by DRB staff prior to permit issuance.

4. 302 South Raymond Avenue

This is an application for alterations and extensions to an existing wireless facility.

Applicant: Tina Enamorado, Crown Castle, Verizon

Recommended Action: APPROVAL - Recommendation is for approval with the following conditions: 1. The color of the monopole extension shall match existing; 2. The wrought iron fence shall be repainted a black color; 3. New landscape shall be added along the addition to match existing; and 4. Revised drawings shall be reviewed and approved by DRB staff prior to Building Plan Check.

5. 1620 South Date Avenue

This is an application for a second story addition to an existing single-family residence.

Applicant: Alejandro Jimenez

Recommended Action: APPROVAL - Recommendation is for approval with the following conditions: 1. Details shall be restudied to present a more authentic architectural style; 2. The Air Handling Unit shall be relocated to a more discreet location not visible from the street; and 3. Revised drawings shall be reviewed and approved by DRB staff prior to Planning Commission hearing.

6. 220 La Paloma Avenue

This is an application for a new accessory dwelling unit (ADU) attached to an existing detached garage of a single-family residence.

Applicant: Anna Yang

Recommended Action: APPROVAL - Recommendation is for approval with the following conditions: 1. Roof tiles shall be used along the roof parapet to match the existing conditions of the garage; 2. Window details shall be used to match the front house conditions; 3. Drawings shall be revised to accurately reflect all changes; and 4. Revised drawings shall be reviewed and approved by DRB staff prior to Building Plan Check.

7. 1301 West Valley Boulevard

This is an application for a new car wash building.

Applicant: Adam Rix

Recommended Action: APPROVAL - Recommendation is for approval approval with the following conditions: 1. Revised drawings shall include calls out for all materials on exterior elevations; and 2. Revised drawings shall be reviewed and approved by DRB staff prior to the Planning Commission hearing.

8. 1000 South Fremont Avenue

This is an application for master development standards for four (4) separate parcels with proposed uses of condominiums, apartments and a parking structure.

Applicant: Megan Moloughney, Elite TRC Alhambra Community LLC

Recommended Action: APPROVAL - Recommendation is for approval of the application with the following conditions: 1. That the applicant work with staff on design related narratives to ensure permeability between Plan Areas and consistency of architectural quality; and 2. That final architectural designs for each individual building shall be subject to Design Review Board review and approval. The timing of these reviews shall occur when the applicant is prepared to carry out the respective phases.

PUBLIC COMMENTS/ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Citizens wishing to address the Alhambra Design Review Board on any matter within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Alhambra Design Review Board not on the Agenda may do so at this time. Please STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS CLEARLY for the record.

Please note that while the Alhambra Design Review Board values your comments, pursuant to January 1, 1987 amendments of the Brown Act, the Commission cannot respond nor take any action until such time as the matter may appear as an item on a forthcoming agenda.

ADJOURNMENT:

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Alhambra Design Review Board will be held on Tuesday, February 11, 2020 at 7:30 p.m., in Alhambra City Hall Conference Room A, 111 South First Street, Alhambra, California.

NOTICE:

AGENDA ITEMS: Copies of the staff reports or other written documentation relating to each item of business described hereinabove are on file in the offices of the Community Development Department in City Hall, 111 South First Street, Alhambra, California, and are available for public inspection during regular office hours, which are 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Monday through Thursday. Should any person have a question concerning any of the above agenda items prior to the meeting described herein, he or she may contact the Community Development Director either in person at the Department offices, or by telephone at (626) 570-5034 during regular office hours.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT: If you require special assistance to participate in any

City meeting (including assisted listening devices) please contact the Community Development Department at (626) 570-5034. Notification of at least 72 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

APPEALS: Any person wishing to appeal any decision of the Design Review Board to the Planning Commission may do so by filing an appeal in writing along with the appropriate appeal fee to the Community Development Department in City Hall within 10 calendar days of the Design Review Board decision. The appeal period for items on this agenda expires at the close of business on February 10, 2020.

MINUTES
CITY OF ALHAMBRA
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING

January 14, 2020, 7:30 p.m. Alhambra City Hall, Conference Room A

Call to Order: At 7:30 p.m. on January 14, 2020, the Design Review Board convened in Conference Room A of the Alhambra City Hall.

Roll Call/Introductions

PRESENT: CHEN, CHIU, OLSON, SANCHEZ, UDANI

ABSENT: NONE

OFFICIALS PRESENT: RICHARD ABE, Secretary

CONSENT AGENDA (ITEMS 1-4)

All items listed under Consent Agenda were considered by the Design Review Board to be routine and, therefore, were enacted by one motion.

ITEM 1: MINUTES: December 10, 2019

ITEM 2: 1100 East Main Street

Request:

The applicant John Hwang, on behalf of, Flora + Clay, Business Tenant, proposes new signage to an existing commercial building for the business known as "FLORA+CLAY." The property is located on a corner lot at East Main Street and South El Molino Street. The proposed signs are located on the two street elevations and are identical. The signs consist of two lines of copy and a logo. All signage will be non-illuminated aluminum faced foam letters. Sizes and design are acceptable.

ITEM 3: 425 North Olive Avenue

Request:

The applicant David Huang, on behalf of, Ming Ton Chen, Property Owner, proposes a new accessory dwelling unit (ADU) to be attached to the garage on a lot with an existing single-family residence. The original home built in 1926 was most likely an English Tudor but has been compromised over the decades due to modifications. Due to the height restriction for ADUs, using a consistent roof pitch is not possible however, the stucco finish and roof material do match the existing house and are acceptable.

ITEM 4: 1219 Chapel Avenue

Request:

The applicant Timothy Roosevelt, on behalf of, Heng Zhang, Property Owner, proposes to convert and expand an existing two-car garage into an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) on a lot with an existing single-family residence. The main house was built in 1928 in a Spanish-style architecture with details that include roof tile, arched windows, smooth stucco walls and clay pipe attic vent details. Also included in the proposal, the applicant will be removing the existing unpermitted trellis that is attached to the rear of the main house. The new ADU uses details and finishes that match the existing home and the design is acceptable.

ACTION

Board Member Sanchez moved to approve Consent Agenda Items 1-4. Board Member Chen seconded and the motion carried.

Vote: Moved: SANCHEZ Seconded: CHEN
 Ayes: CHEN, CHIU, OLSON, SANCHEZ, UDANI
 Abstain: NONE
 Noes: NONE
 Absent: NONE

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

ITEM 5: 101 South Cordova Street

Request:

The applicant Lindon Shiao, Property Owner, proposes to replace the existing balcony/front porch cover of an existing multi-family apartment building. This property was recently cited by the Building Division for the unsafe condition of the balcony/front porch cover at the front elevation and the property owner responded by immediately removing the structure prior to obtaining all necessary City approvals and permits. Due to costs, the owner proposes to replace the balcony and porch cover entirely and create a roof detail to match the existing architecture. The roof wraps to the side and terminates at a logical point. The existing sliding doors that opened to the balcony will be in-filled with a stucco wall matching in color and texture with the existing stucco wall. The applicant also proposes to similarly eliminate and in-fill some windows on the 1st and 2nd floors. These window changes are shown on the proposed floor plan but are not readily evident in the proposed elevations. Only one window will be removed on the 1st floor, occurring at the kitchen (backside) of Unit 101. On the 2nd floor, the same unit (Unit 201) that will have the existing sliding door removed, will also have two sets of windows removed on the two side elevations. One set of windows will be removed from the kitchen and in-filled. The second set of windows occurs at Existing Bedroom 1. One window will be in-filled, leaving Bedroom 1 with only one remaining window. The applicant needs to verify if the remaining window in Bedroom 1 will satisfy emergency egress requirements for bedrooms, otherwise, it

will need to be modified. Overall the design is consistent with the existing style of architecture and is acceptable.

Project discussion was as follows:

Board Member Chen moved to table the item to give the applicant time to arrive. Board Member Udani seconded the motion and was passed unanimously. The applicant arrived and the project was reviewed. The applicant stated that the building portions were removed due to safety reasons. The applicant then described the design intention of the proposal. Jennifer Ng showed prints from Google Maps and stated that at the time of the balcony removal the interior was gutted without a permit. Ms. Ng also showed photos of the house exterior in its current condition. Ms. Ng also stated that she questioned the storage of building material. The applicant stated that Ms. Ng’s comments were categorically not true. The applicant stated that the building materials were stored on the property and removed with no clandestine reason. Ms. Ng stated that the balcony was valuable in the design and should be replaced like for like. The applicant restated that he was not planning to put back the balcony and is replacing it with a small eave. Board Member Sanchez stated that the eave was not enough and suggested a porch to mimic the balcony. The Board suggested that staff confirm with the Planning Division regarding private open space requirements. The applicant asked if removing and replacing windows would be okay. Board Member Sanchez stated that the any new windows should match the original windows including all details. The applicant questioned the process that would allow construction to begin. Board Member Sanchez moved to continue the application, Board Member Chen seconded and the motion carried.

ACTION

The Design Review Board continued the application for further review.

Vote: Moved: SANCHEZ Seconded: CHEN
 Ayes: CHEN, CHIU, OLSON, SANCHEZ, UDANI
 Abstain: NONE
 Noes: NONE
 Absent: NONE

ITEM 6: 316 South Eighth Street

Request:

The applicant Young N. Kwon, Property Owner, proposes a new front yard fence to an existing single-family residence. The new fence lines the perimeter of the front yard area using concrete block posts and walls. Due to the height of the fence, consideration should be made to use a design and/or material that mitigates the long mass.

Project discussion was as follows:

The applicant was present and questioned staff comments. Ms. Ung described the discrepancy in the documentation and that the elevation difference created a

mass differential. The applicant stated that he preferred an all block wall. Board Member Chen questioned if there was a security reason but the applicant stated it was more for the issue of drainage. Board Member Sanchez clarified that the applicant started work and came to the Board due to a stop work citation. Discussion ensued regarding the aesthetics. Board Member Chen stated that setting the wall back would be another acceptable alternative. After discussion with the owner, concurrence was that the use of wrought iron would be appropriate. It was also clarified that there be a simple cap. Board Member Sanchez moved to approve the application with the following conditions: 1) Remove wall as needed to provide a retaining block wall of a maximum of 2'; 2) The fence above the retaining wall shall be wrought iron fence with an overall height not to exceed 3'; 3) The existing pillars can remain but must be code compliant in height; and 4) Design details to be provided to staff prior to construction. Board Member Chen seconded and the motion carried.

ACTION

The Design Review Board approved the application with the following conditions: 1) Remove wall as needed to provide a retaining block wall of a maximum of 2'; 2) The fence above the retaining wall shall be a wrought iron fence with an overall height not to exceed 3'; 3) The existing pillars can remain but must be code compliant in height; and 4) Design details are to be provided to staff prior to construction.

Vote: Moved: SANCHEZ Seconded: CHEN
Ayes: CHEN, CHIU, OLSON, SANCHEZ, UDANI
Abstain: NONE
Noes: NONE
Absent: NONE

ITEM 7: 425 North Story Place

Request:

The applicant Ramon Gallardo, on behalf of, Marina and Jose Gomez, Property Owners, proposes to convert an existing detached two-car garage into an accessory dwelling unit (ADU). The existing home is a modified Spanish Revival home using hung windows, hip roofs and clay tile roofing. The existing structure in the rear is a two story building with the garage on the ground floor and a recreation room above. The first floor plan will be enlarged to convert the garage to the new ADU. The new addition uses a hip roof which matches the front house and is acceptable. In the documentation proposed details such as window trim, type and style appear to be different from the front house but the applicant should clarify the existing window conditions of the existing rear structure.

Project discussion was as follows:

Due to the absence of the applicants the item was continued. Board Member Sanchez moved to continue the application, Board Member Chen seconded, the motion carried.

ACTION

The Design Review Board continued the application due to the absence of the applicant.

Vote: Moved: SANCHEZ Seconded: CHEN
Ayes: CHEN, CHIU, OLSON, SANCHEZ, UDANI
Abstain: NONE
Noes: NONE
Absent: NONE

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

ADJOURNMENT:

At 8:40 p.m., as there was no further business for the Board to transact, the Design Review Board adjourned the meeting with unanimous consent to the next regularly scheduled meeting to be held in the Ruth Reese Hall, Alhambra City Public Library, on Tuesday, January 28, 2020, at 7:30 p.m.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 28th day of January, 2020.

Christine Olson, President



*Gateway
to the
San Gabriel Valley*

**ALHAMBRA DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
STAFF REPORT
January 28, 2020**

ADDRESS: 1132 South Chapel Avenue

APPLICANT: Cheng Cheng

PROPERTY OWNER: Cheng Cheng

PROJECT TYPE: This application is for exterior alterations and the legalization of window replacements to an existing single-family residence.

PROJECT STATUS: First Time Applicant

DESIGN ASSESSMENT: This application proposes exterior color alterations, as well as the legalization of window and door replacements to an existing single-family residence. The original home was built in 1924 and closely resembles Craftsman Bungalow-style architecture with details that include an extended front porch, gabled roofs and deep eaves. The windows and doors were replaced without permits and approvals, however, it was done by a previous owner which is also the justification for the lack of documentation regarding original window details. The new windows consist of both hung and sliding white vinyl windows. The most significant front elevation alteration is the double door entry which replaced the original, characteristic wide door with sidelites. Due to the width of the front elevation, the double door entry, although unfortunate, can be seen as acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION: Recommendation is for approval as submitted.



*Gateway
to the
San Gabriel Valley*

**ALHAMBRA DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
STAFF REPORT
January 28, 2020**

ADDRESS: 813 West Mission Road

APPLICANT: David Ko

PROPERTY OWNER: Lily Chan

PROJECT TYPE: This application is for exterior alterations and window replacements to an existing single-family residence.

PROJECT STATUS: Continued Applicant

DESIGN ASSESSMENT: This application was last heard at the December 10, 2019 Design Review Board meeting. It was continued to allow for a resubmittal of documents showing real or synthetic wood siding for the exterior of the home. The previous drawings proposed to replace the existing wood siding with stucco, however, the Board was concerned about the removal of such a prominent feature of the home. The original house was built in 1915 in a Craftsman-style architecture with details that include wood siding, exposed rafter tails, deep eaves, vertical slat attic vents and characteristic wood window details at the jambs and sill. The revised drawings propose Hardie plank siding to replace the existing wood siding and will wrap around all elevations. The applicant is also proposing to replace four windows with same-sized white vinyl windows. Three of the replacement windows will be changed from single hung to sliders due to egress compliance for the existing bedrooms. Consideration could be made to using a horizontal grille to simulate a single hung window to match the existing window on the front elevation. There is a discrepancy between the window schedule and the proposed south elevation regarding the single hung window. The elevation shows a single hung however the floor plan marks it as Window #5 which is specified as a slider in the window schedule.

RECOMMENDATION: Recommendation is for approval with the following conditions:

1. The window schedule and elevations shall be updated to show consistent window types;
2. The bedroom window on the front elevation shall use horizontal grilles to mimic a single hung design; and
3. Any revised drawings shall be reviewed and approved by DRB staff prior to permit issuance.



ALHAMBRA DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
STAFF REPORT
January 28, 2020

ADDRESS: 302 South Raymond Avenue

APPLICANT: Tina Enamorado, Crown Castle

BUSINESS TENANT: Verizon

PROPERTY OWNER: Southern California Edison

PROJECT TYPE: This application is for alterations and extensions to an existing wireless facility.

PROJECT STATUS: First Time Applicant

DESIGN ASSESSMENT: This application proposes to extend the existing monopole and expand the fenced area of an existing unmanned Verizon wireless facility. Additional antennae will be added to the top of the existing monopole and will increase the total height to 14'-0". The drawings should specify that the color of the extension match the existing pole. New wrought iron fencing will extend the enclosure to accommodate new exterior equipment and utility cabinets. The style of the fence will match existing and is acceptable however, consideration should be made to repainting the fence black (or a similar dark color) and to extend the landscape as needed to soften the perimeter of the facility.

RECOMMENDATION: Recommendation is for approval with the following conditions:

1. The color of the monopole extension shall match existing;
2. The wrought iron fence shall be repainted a black color;
3. New landscape shall be added along the addition to match existing; and
4. Revised drawings shall be reviewed and approved by DRB staff prior to Building Plan Check.



*Gateway
to the
San Gabriel Valley*

**ALHAMBRA DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
STAFF REPORT
January 28, 2020**

ADDRESS: 1620 South Date Avenue

APPLICANT: Alejandro Jimenez

PROPERTY OWNER: Alejandro Jimenez

PROJECT TYPE: This application is for a second story addition to an existing single-family residence.

PROJECT STATUS: First Time Applicant

DESIGN ASSESSMENT: This application proposes a second story addition to an existing single-family residence. The house was built in 1937 in an English Cottage style of architecture. The addition is located towards the rear of the house allowing for a large setback from the street. There are several exterior alterations and new details which alter the style to resemble more of a Craftsman style. The use of features such as gable roofs, siding, decorative attic vents and wide framed window details mimic a Craftsman or Traditional home, however collectively they could be improved to create a more architecturally authentic appearance. The applicant is also proposing to place the new Air Handling Unit (AHU) on the roof with a wood screen however this should be relocated in a more discreet location that would not be visible from the street.

RECOMMENDATION: Recommendation is for approval with the following conditions:

1. Details shall be restudied to present a more authentic architectural style;
2. The Air Handling Unit shall be relocated to a more discreet location not visible from the street; and
3. Revised drawings shall be reviewed and approved by DRB staff prior to Planning Commission hearing.



*Gateway
to the
San Gabriel Valley*

**ALHAMBRA DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
STAFF REPORT
January 28, 2020**

ADDRESS: 220 La Paloma Avenue

APPLICANT: Anna Yang

PROPERTY OWNER: Anna H. Yang

PROJECT TYPE: This application is for a new accessory dwelling unit (ADU) attached to an existing detached garage of a single-family residence.

PROJECT STATUS: First Time Applicant

DESIGN ASSESSMENT: This application proposes a new accessory dwelling unit (ADU) attached to the existing detached garage of a single-family residence. The existing Spanish home was built in 1927. Overall the proposed ADU lacks detail and has no relation to the existing structures on the property. The elevation drawings of the existing front house should not be used as reference due to its inaccuracies.

RECOMMENDATION: Recommendation is for approval with the following conditions:

1. Roof tiles shall be used along the roof parapet to match the existing conditions of the garage;
2. Window details shall be used to match the front house conditions;
3. Drawings shall be revised to accurately reflect all changes; and
4. Revised drawings shall be reviewed and approved by DRB staff prior to Building Plan Check.



*Gateway
to the
San Gabriel Valley*

**ALHAMBRA DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
STAFF REPORT
January 28, 2020**

ADDRESS: 1301 West Valley Boulevard

APPLICANT: Adam Rix

BUSINESS TENANT: Cruizers Express Car Wash

PROPERTY OWNER: Guy L Tapfer

PROJECT TYPE: This application is for a new car wash.

PROJECT STATUS: First Time Applicant

DESIGN ASSESSMENT: This application proposes a new car wash building for the franchise "Cruizers Express Car Wash." It is located on a corner lot at West Valley Boulevard and Marguerita Avenue. The building itself is prototypical for all franchise locations. Design Review Board policy is generally accepting of national prototypes and brand related color palettes. The architectural aesthetic of the building(s) in the project is contemporary and generally acceptable. The elevation drawings are minimal and there is a need for additional clarification on materials.

RECOMMENDATION: Recommendation is for approval with the following conditions:

1. Revised drawings shall include calls out for all materials on exterior elevations; and
2. Revised drawings shall be reviewed and approved by DRB staff prior to the Planning Commission hearing.



*Gateway
to the
San Gabriel Valley*

ALHAMBRA DESIGN REVIEW BOARD STAFF REPORT January 28, 2020

ADDRESS: 1000 South Fremont Avenue

APPLICANT: Megan Moloughney, Elite TRC Alhambra Community LLC

PROPERTY OWNER: Multiple Owners

PROJECT TYPE: This application is for master development standards for four (4) separate parcels with proposed uses of condominiums, apartments and a parking structure.

PROJECT STATUS: First Time Applicant

DESIGN ASSESSMENT: This application is a document providing development standards for the future development of four plan areas on the project site bordered by the streets: Mission, Fremont, Orange and Date. Within the development area is an existing office campus (The Alhambra) totaling 912,146 square feet. Included in the scope of this mixed-use urban community are 516 condominiums, 545 apartment units and a 490 stall parking structure. This design review is not for specific buildings, it is to review and evaluate the design development guidelines that will be used in each of the four parcels. A more specific DRB evaluation of the final architectural design for an individual building will occur when the applicant is prepared to carry out the respective phases.

The applicant has met with staff and addressed several issues as it relates to both design and urban fabric. The first issue is massing at a community scale. There is an intention seen in the standards to manage the massing of the project from the edges of the subject area inward. Since Fremont and Mission are wide trafficked streets the placement of the podium building in the North Plan area is logical, these podium buildings should be able to manage a duality of scale while forming the edge of the project along Date and Orange. The wrap buildings along Mission and the existing commercial property along Fremont address these streets appropriately. The sketches provided illustrate the strategies where building mass steps down where pedestrian activity is encouraged. The diversity of building and unit types include wrap buildings, podium buildings, flats and townhouses. This diversity should allow for architectural variety.

A related second issue discussed with the applicant is how the massing and circulation of the proposed developments were integrated with the existing commercial property. The existing open spaces are well designed and well maintained providing a great amenity for the upcoming community. The aforementioned massing and the permeability of the blocks through pedestrian access and landscape should encourage interaction between the different Plan Areas including the existing open spaces. This will be a benefit that can be encouraged in the final development in each parcel creating a more open planning strategy for each parcel.

The third issue is the balance between a consistent architectural design approach for the subject area while still maintaining differences in style that allow for the perception of organic growth. A consistent quality is necessary but each block should have enough visual distinction to encourage neighborhood identity. Review of the narrative within the document that speaks to this issue can be a tool enabling better design for all Plan Areas.

In a similar fashion the fourth issue is the definition of finishes, materials and architectural detail within the written standards. It is the framework that will define the quality of each Plan Area. Since there is no hard definition of architectural style it is a diverse standards of material finish and detail that will create a quality consistency between Plan Areas. Since this building type is fairly predictable in design when positioned in the Alhambra real estate market quality materials and good design must be imbued within the written or graphic standards.

Overall, the documents presented are deep and comprehensive as it relates to the building product and general planning strategy of the subject area. There is a necessary balance in a development standard to ensure quality but encourage architectural diversity. Should there be areas of the document that the Board feels need strengthening staff is willing to work with the applicant on those narrative portions.

RECOMMENDATION: Recommendation is for approval of the application with the following conditions:

1. That the applicant work with staff on design related narratives to ensure permeability between Plan Areas and consistency of architectural quality.; and
2. That final architectural designs for each individual building shall be subject to Design Review Board review and approval. The timing of these reviews shall occur when the applicant is prepared to carry out the respective phases.