STAFF REPORT

CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS

For the Design Review Commission
Meeting of January 6, 2011

TO: Design Review Commission

FROM: Shena Rojemann, Associate Planner

SUBJECT: A request for an R-1 Design Review Permit to allow a new two-story single-family residence located in the Central Area of the City, north of Santa Monica Boulevard at **631 North Crescent Drive.** (PL 101 7464)

Continued from the December 2, 2010 Design Review Commission meeting.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Albert Michaelian, on behalf of the property owner, has filed an application for Track 2 design review to allow a new single-family residence at **631 North Crescent Drive.**

This item was reviewed by the Commission at its August 5, 2010 meeting, its October 7, 2010 meeting and its December 2, 2010 meeting. At the December 2, 2010 meeting, the Commission expressed concerns with the massing and scale of the revised design and directed the applicant to further refine the design and return for further review.

The applicant has submitted a revised design for the Design Review Commission's consideration. The revised design contains elements commonly found in the Italian Renaissance Revival style of architecture. The applicant has addressed the Commission's concerns by making the following changes:

Continued on the next page.

Design Review Commission Requests December 2, 2010 Meeting	Applicant's Response
1. The Commission stated that the façade was too busy and contained too many elements, which were a mix of multiple architectural styles. The design needs fewer, stronger elements and needs to exhibit an internal compatibility.	1. The applicant has removed elements from the façade in an effort to create a simplified design that contains elements consistent with one style of architecture, opposed to multiple.
2. The entry (3 arches, the columns and the pediment) is not consistent with the Italian Renaissance Revival style of architecture and should be restudied.	2. The applicant has removed the 3 arches and the pediment feature from the entry. The entry now contains one solitary archway with small, simplified columns flanking the archway. The roof design is no longer a pediment, but is now flat, with a shallow sloping roofline. Above the shallow sloping roof the applicant has incorporated 3 small square windows.
3. The columns at the second story along both sides of the entry pediment look out of place.	3. The applicant has removed the second story columns along both sides of the entry pediment.
4. There are too many columns throughout the facades.	4. The applicant as reduced the number of columns.
5. There are too many styles of balconies and too many styles of railings.	5. The applicant has reduced the number of balconies and is now proposing only one style of railing.
6. The precast pediments above the second story windows are too heavy and feel out of place.	6. The applicant has removed the pediments above the second story windows.
7. The quoins are heavy.	7. The applicant has reduced the quoins from the design.
8. The precast moldings around the windows are too heavy and should be refined.	8. The applicant has redesigned some of the window moldings.
9. The central portion of the northern elevation needs more modulation.	9. The applicant has redesigned this section of the northern elevation. The central portion has been broken up into two planes of modulation (not one) and the balcony along this section has been redesigned.
10. Larger trees should be planted, 15 gallon is to small.	10. The applicant is now proposing a combination of 15 gallon trees, 30 gallon trees, 24 inch box trees and 36 inch box trees.
11. There should be a hierarchy of the façade elements. Not every element should be designed at the same level of importance. The design should contain foreground elements and background elements.	11. The applicant has removed elements from the façade and has redesigned some of the remaining elements so as to create a more appropriate hierarchy of design elements.

The applicant has also submitted a letter for the Commission's review which addresses how the applicant believes the revised design satisfies the findings required to be made by the Design Review Commission (see Exhibit A).

Revised material boards and rendering boards will be presented at the meeting.

DESIGN ANALYSIS

Pursuant to BHMC Section 10-3.4415, the Design Review Commission may approve, approve with conditions, or disapprove the issuance of a building permit in any matter subject to its jurisdiction after considering whether the proposed development complies with the following criteria.

If the Commission chooses to approve the design, the findings contained in Exhibit B (attached) must be made verbally at the meeting.

Upon consideration of criteria set forth in BHMC 10-3.4415, The Commission has the following options:

1. Approve the plans as presented;
2. Approve the plans subject to the following and /or other conditions, to bring the plans into conformance with criteria set forth in BHMC 10-3.4415;
3. Disapprove the plans upon detailed findings that certain criteria set forth in BHMC 10-3.4415 are not met; or
4. Return the plans for restudy and resubmittal.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the foregoing analysis and pending the information and conclusions that may result from testimony received at the public hearing, if the Commission chooses to approve the project, all findings must be made by the Commission and staff directed to prepare a Resolution.

SHENA ROJEMANN
Associate Planner

Attachment(s)
Exhibit A – Applicant's Response to Required Findings
Exhibit B - DRC Findings
Exhibit C – Standard Conditions of Approval
Exhibit D – Resolution for the Commission's consideration

Exhibit A

Applicant's Response to Required Findings

City of Beverly Hills Design Review Criteria

1. The proposed development's design exhibits an internally compatible design scheme;

   a) The columns at front and side façade were too many and don't match the proposed style:

      1) The lower front columns were removed. There are now fewer columns thru out the building.

      2) All columns have been changed to a Tuscan style.

      3) All pre cast pediments have been removed.

   b) One of the comments of the last design presentation was that the front entry element did not match the proposed style.

      1) The roof has been change to better fit the proposed style.

      2) Windows have been added above the entry

      3) All pre cast pediments have been removed and is now limestone clad.

      4) The niches have been removed.

   c) There are too many style railings

      1) The Juliet balconies have been removed thus eliminating the wrought iron railings.

      2) All pre cast railings have been re-designed to a more simple design. This gives a more subdued and continuous design thru out.

   d) There is no hierarchy thru out facade:

      1) The arrangement of Architectural elements has been changed. The columns and Juliet balconies removed. All pre cast coins and stone also have been removed thus simplifying the front façade for a more cohesive design. This also allows the front entry to stand out on its own with out competing against other elements in the front facade

      2) The reduction of modulations at the corner element have also been reduced and better articulated for a smoother transition to the side elevation.

2. The side elevation needs to flow within the proposed architectural style;

      1) We added an architectural roof element over family room balcony. This adds a continuous flow from front to side.

We feel the new design satisfies all criteria of the proposed Architectural style.

Exhibit B
DRC Findings

If the Commission finds that the project meets the criteria set forth below, the Commission shall make findings to approve the application. When the proposed development does not comply with the criteria, the Commission may impose such conditions it deems necessary to bring the proposed development into conformity with the provisions of this article.

1. ***The proposed development's design exhibits an internally compatible design scheme.***

2. ***Appropriately minimizes the appearance of scale and mass, enhances the garden like quality of the city, and appropriately maximizes the use of required open space within the proposed architectural style.***

3. ***The development will enhance the appearance of the neighborhood.***

4. ***The proposed development is designed to balance the reasonable expectation of development for the owner with the reasonable expectation of privacy of neighbors.***

5. ***The proposed development respects prevailing site design pattern, carefully analyzing the characteristics of the surrounding group of homes, and integrates appropriate features that will ensure harmony between old and new.***

Exhibit C
Standard Conditions of Approval

1. Any approval by the Commission is for design only; the project is subject to all applicable City zoning regulations.

2. Any future modifications to this approval shall be presented to staff for a determination as to whether the change may be approved by staff (minor) or to the Commission for review. Changes made without City approval may be required to be restored to match the City approved plans.

3. Final plans shall include spec sheets for windows to include manufacturer, size and shape.

4. Colored elevations for all construction visible from the street shall be provided with call-outs for each material proposed for verification in the field during construction.

5. A copy of the final conditions of approval per the approved Resolution shall be scanned onto the cover sheet of the final building plans.

6. The proposed landscape plan shall comply with the City's Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance.

Exhibit D

Approval Resolution for
the Commission's consideration

RESOLUTION NO. DR

RESOLUTION OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS CONDITIONALLY APPROVING AN R-1 DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO ALLOW A NEW SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE AT THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 631 NORTH CRESCENT DRIVE

Albert Michaelian, applicant on behalf of the property owner, has applied for an R-1 Design Review Permit to allow a new single-family residence on a single-family property located in the Central Area of the City. As conditioned, the Project meets all required zoning standards, including height, setbacks, parking, and floor area.

The Design Review Commission of the City of Beverly Hills hereby finds, resolves, and determines as follows:

Section 1. Reviewing Authority.

Pursuant to Section 10-3-4408 of the Beverly Hills Municipal Code, no single-family residence located in a Central R-1 Zone shall be erected, constructed, altered, or remodeled unless the elevations and plans for the exterior portions and areas visible from the street are reviewed and approved by the City. The Design Review Commission is the reviewing authority if it has first been determined that the design does not substantially conform to a pure architectural style, but has been designed by a licensed architect. Therefore, it has been determined that the Design Review Commission shall be the reviewing authority.

Pursuant to Section 10-3-4415 of the Beverly Hills Municipal code, the request for a Design Review Permit may be approved, provided the Design Review Commission makes certain findings as set forth in Section 4: Project Public Hearing/Approved Project Plans.

Section 2. Terms Defined.

The Following Terms	**Shall Mean:**
"Project Site"	631 North Crescent Drive
"Agent"	Albert Michaelian
"Property Owner"	Sharohk and Nazanin Shamtobi
"Applicant"	Collectively, the property owner and agent.

Section 3. Project Description.

The lot is currently developed with a with a single-story residence and accessory structure. The existing primary residence and accessory structure would be demolished and replaced by a new two-story residence and detached cabana. Surrounding development consists of one- and two-story single-family homes.

Section 4. Project Public Hearing/Approved Project Plans

The Design Review Commission held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the application. Evidence, both written and oral, was presented and architectural plans addressing the conditions of approval were presented for the Commission's consideration in conjunction with this Resolution.

- A Public Hearing for this project was held on the following date(s):
  - August 5, 2010
  - October 7, 2010
  - December 2, 2010
  - January 6, 2011
- Architectural plans were conditionally approved by the Commission on January 6, 2011.

Section 5. Environmental Assessment

The Project has been environmentally reviewed pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq, hereafter the "Guidelines"), and the City's environmental guidelines. The City has determined that the Project qualifies for a Class 2 Categorical Exemption (replacement or reconstruction of a single-family residence) in accordance with the requirements of Section 15302 of the Guidelines. Therefore, no significant impacts to the environment are anticipated.

Section 6. Findings of the Design Review Commission.

Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing, including the staff report and architectural plans, the Design Review Commission made findings to approve the project as set forth in "Exhibit 1" to this Resolution.

Section 7. Conditions of Approval

Based on the foregoing, the Design Review Commission hereby grants the R-1 Design Review Permit for the Project subject to the conditions set forth in "Exhibit 2" to this Resolution.

Section 8. Certification.

The Secretary of the Design Review Commission shall certify to the passage, approval, and adoption of this resolution, and shall cause this resolution and certification to be entered in the Book of Resolutions of the Design review Commission of the City.

Adopted: January 6, 2010

Susan Strauss
Chair of the Design Review Commission of the City of Beverly Hills, California

ATTEST:

Secretary

Approved as to content:

Jonathan Lait, AICP
City Planner

EXHIBIT 1 OF 2: FINDINGS

Based on its review of the application, documentation, and the testimony heard at the public hearing, the Design Review Commission determined that the proposed Project meets the following 5 criteria in accordance with Beverly Hills Municipal Code Section 10-3-4415:

1. The project includes high quality materials such as smooth stucco and concrete mouldings, two-piece mission roof tile, and wood windows and doors. The proposed materials and details are consistent throughout the project's design, thereby creating a uniform design scheme. Based on the project's balanced design and consistent use of materials, it appears to exhibit an internally compatible design scheme.

2. The project incorporates substantial modulation along the facades, contains recessed windows and doors, and contains a dynamic roofline. Because these elements help to reduce the appearance of mass and scale, it is therefore possible to make the required finding. The landscape plan utilizes a variety of landscaping features and mature-sized trees that will contribute to the garden quality of the city and help to soften the appearance of the project.

3. The project utilizes high quality building materials and design, which will help to enhance the appearance of the neighborhood. Additionally, the design follows a consistent, balanced theme, while maintaining an appropriate level of scale, mass, and modulation. Therefore, the project is expected to enhance the appearance of the neighborhood.

4. The project meets the City's current side setback requirements along all property lines. Additionally, the project is located on a corner property, which has only one shared property line. Because the project meets all required setbacks and has only one shared property line, the proposed project creates a balance between the reasonable expectation of development and the reasonable expectation of privacy of neighbors.

5. The project respects prevailing site design by following prevailing setbacks and building orientation found along the adjacent streetscape. Although the project is larger than some of the existing residences on the block, the design has been executed to ensure that scale and massing is controlled, and that the project will be consistent with the surrounding area. Based on

its design, the project maximizes floor area without appearing unduly massive and bulky and would be a harmonious addition to the existing neighborhood.

EXHIBIT 2 OF 2: CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

STANDARD CONDITIONS:

3. Design Review: Any approval by the Commission is for design only; the project is subject to all applicable City zoning regulations.

4. Final Plans: The Applicant shall submit final working drawings to the Director of Community Development for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. The Project shall be built in substantial compliance with the plans approved by the Design Review Commission on January 6, 2011 on file with the Department of Community Development.

5. Future Modifications: Any future modifications to this approval shall be presented to staff for a determination as to whether the change may be approved by staff (minor changes only) or presented to the Commission for review. Changes made without City approval may be required to be restored to match the City approved plans.

6. Windows: Final plans shall include spec sheets for windows and include the name of the manufacturer, size, shape, color and material of each window.

7. Elevations – Material Call-Outs: Colored elevations for all construction visible from the street shall be provided with the final plans. Call-outs for each material shall be provided for verification in the field during construction.

. Resolution Scanned on Plans: A copy of the approved Resolution (including the Findings and Conditions of Approval) shall be scanned onto the cover sheet of the approved building plans.

11. Water Efficient Landscaping: The proposed landscape plan shall comply with the City's Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance.

12. Construction Management Plan. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Applicant shall prepare a construction management plan for review and approval by the Department of Community Development. The plan shall include the location of construction parking, loading and hauling routes and locations, and number of construction employees anticipated on site. All construction-related parking, staging and hauling shall conform to the construction parking and hauling plan submitted to and approved by the Building Official and the City Engineer.

13. Site Maintenance and Contact Information. The Applicant shall maintain the site in an orderly condition prior to commencement of and during construction, including, but not limited to, maintenance of the orderly appearance of existing structures and landscaping on the site, dust suppression for areas cleared by demolition, maintenance of safety barriers and adjacent public sidewalks, and provision of a contact person directly accessible to the public by telephone in the event that the public has any concerns regarding maintenance of the site. The name and telephone number of the contact person shall be transmitted to the Director of Community Development and

the Building Official. In addition, the Applicant shall post the name and telephone number of the contact person on the site in a location readily visible to the general public and approved by the Director of Community Development.

14. Recordation of Covenant. These conditions of approval shall run with the land and shall remain in full force and effect for the duration of the life of this approval. This resolution approving the R-1 Design Review Permit shall not become effective until the owner of the Project site records a covenant, satisfactory in form and content to the City Attorney, accepting the conditions of approval set forth in this resolution. The covenant shall include a copy of this resolution as an exhibit. The Covenant shall be recorded prior to issuance of a building permit.

The Applicant shall deliver the executed covenant to the Department of Community Development **within 60 days** of the Design Review Commission decision. At the time that the Applicant delivers the covenant to the City, the Applicant shall also provide the City with all fees necessary to record the document with the County Recorder. If the Applicant fails to deliver the executed covenant within the required 60 days, this resolution approving the R-1 Design Review **shall be null and void** and of no further effect. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the director of Community Development may, upon a request by the Applicant, grant a waiver from the 60-day time limit if, at the time of the request, the Director determines that there have been no substantial changes to any federal, state or local law that would affect the R-1 Design Review.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES) SS.

CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS)

I, JONATHAN LAIT, Secretary of the Design Review Commission and City Planner of the City of Beverly Hills, California, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Resolution No. DR duly passed, approved, and adopted by the Design Review Commission of said City at a meeting of said Commission on January 6, 2011 and thereafter duly signed by the Secretary of the Design Review Commission, as indicated; and that the Design Review Commission of the City consists of five (5) members and said Resolution was passed by the following vote of said Commission, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

JONATHAN LAIT, AICP
Secretary to the Design Review
Commission/City Planner
City of Beverly Hills, California