STAFF REPORT

CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS

For the Architectural Commission
Meeting of May 18, 2011

TO: Architectural Commission

FROM: Shena Rojemann, Associate Planner

SUBJECT: **Park Hamilton Condominiums**
225 South Hamilton Drive
Request for approval of modifications to the entry and landscape design of a previously approved condominium project
PL 100 5705

Continued from Meeting of April 27, 2011.

PROJECT INFORMATION

Applicant	Don Holtz
Address	225 South Hamilton Drive
Project Name	Park Hamilton Condominiums
Project Type	Architectural Revisions to a 25-Unit Condominium Project

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project is located at the southwest corner of South Hamilton Drive and Gregory Way. The project is a 25-unit condominium project that was reviewed and approved by both the Planning Commission and Architectural Commission in 2006. The project is currently under construction and has recently changed ownership. As a result, the new owner desires to make several modifications to the original approval. The Commission previously reviewed modifications related to window material, building entry design, and landscaping. The Commission approved changes in window material, but asked that the entry gate and landscaping be returned for restudy to provide a design that is more consistent with the building's architecture. The Commission has reviewed the changes to the entry gate and landscaping at its meetings on October 20, 2010, December 15, 2010, February 16, 2011 and April 27, 2011. At the April 27, 2011 meeting, the Commission had the following comments:

Continued on the next page.

Architectural Commission Requests April 27, 2011	Applicant's Response
1. Riser lights should be added in the stairs. Show this in the landscape lighting plan.	1. The applicant has included riser lights in the stairs and has shown this on the landscape plan.
2. Provide a material sample of the stairs and paving material.	2. The applicant will be providing material samples of the stairs and paving materials at the meeting.
3. A material board should be provided that includes paving samples (stamped concrete), paint color chips, wood samples, stucco samples, information about the intercom, address number/name samples, etc.	3. The applicant will be providing samples of all the materials at the meeting.
4. Provide as built drawing of the wall/entry.	4. The applicant has provided an as built drawing of the wall and entry.
5. Detail drawings should be provided. Show connection and structural details.	5. The applicant has provided connection and structural details of the wall/entry trellis.
6. Provide elevations which show how the wrought iron in the door is consistent with other elements on the buildings.	6. The applicant has provided a full building elevation.
7. The drawings must be to scale and dimensioned.	7. The applicant has provided scaled and dimensioned drawings.
8. The vertical elements over the columns are not in good proportions to the columns.	8. The applicant has designed the trellis and columns to be consistent with the trellis and column design found on the adjacent buildings.
9. Provide details of the intercom box.	9. Cut sheets have been provided of the intercom box.
10. Provide clear accurate details of the address numbers and property name location	10. Details have been provided of the address numbers and the property name locations.
11. The rendering is inconsistent with the architectural drawings and the as built photos. All must be consistent.	11. The applicant has provided only the as built drawings. No renderings are proposed.
12. Provide photos of any existing signage on the site.	12. Photos of the existing signage will be provided at the meeting for the Commission's review.
13. Make a note on the landscape plan as to where the rain guard is located.	13. The applicant has made the requested note on the landscape plan.
14. Consider alternative plant materials to add contrast within the plants proposed ground floor planters.	14. Alternative plan materials have been added.

A material board will be presented at the meeting.

ANALYSIS

The massing and design of the project remains consistent with the original project approval granted by the Architectural Commission in 2006, and the number of units has not changed. The proposed revisions are as follows:

1. **Building Entry:** The project consists of two buildings that are separated by a courtyard, and the original approval called for an entry to each building to be located along South Hamilton Drive. The revised proposal maintains the South Hamilton Drive entry on the southernmost building, but eliminates the South Hamilton Drive entry from the northernmost building. To replace the entry on the northernmost building, the applicant proposes to install a gated entry with signage at the courtyard between the two buildings. The courtyard entry would then lead to a building entrance located within the courtyard. The entry is constructed of wrought iron, smooth trowel stucco, and includes a trellis structure. The overall height of the entry is approximately 10 feet. The entry design includes 6" tall cast metal signage located to the left of the entry gate, as well as an intercom system and lighting.

   Removal of the previously approved entry does not appear to materially change the appearance of the northernmost building. Historically, the Commission's desire has been to maintain a prominent entry to multi-family developments. Although the proposed building entry is no longer located at the front of the building, the gated courtyard design appears to create a prominent entry point that is readily visible from the street. Additionally, the gated entry provides security for the courtyard and condominium units. Because the proposed design creates an easily identifiable entry and is compatible with the building design staff supports this change.

2. **Landscaping:** The original plan included landscaping and a fountain at the entry to the courtyard between the two buildings. The landscaping received preliminary approval, but was required to be returned to the Commission for review prior to planting. The applicant never returned to the Commission for final approval, and because of this the new owner is seeking approval of a landscaping plan. The new plan eliminates the fountain, and instead provides a realigned walkway to the courtyard entry gate as outlined above.

   The revised landscape plan includes increased tree sizes and appears to be consistent with the architectural style of the project. As a result, the landscape plan will be a compatible addition to the neighborhood.

ARCHITECTURAL CRITERIA

Pursuant to Municipal Code Section 3-3010 the Architectural Commission may approve, approve with conditions, or disapprove the issuance of a building permit in any matter subject to its jurisdiction after consideration of the below criteria.

All findings were previously made in support of the condominium project located at 225 South Hamilton Drive. The proposed changes have not materially impacted the project, and all

findings can still be made in support of the project. The original findings are incorporated below:

(a) The plan for the proposed building or structure is in conformity with good taste and good design and in general contributes to the image of Beverly Hills as a place of beauty, spaciousness, balance, taste, fitness, broad vistas and high quality.

The proposal links both buildings along a central outdoor axis and combines mixed-scale massing with extensive landscaping. The building proposal introduces materials and methods applied to all of the elevations which are in conformity with those qualities that represent good taste and good design. The design is balanced and tasteful in the selection of a compatible earth-toned color palette with the architectural materials. In addition, the landscape plan proposes a variety of planting materials and greenery at varying scales. Therefore, with the recommendations given, the proposal would not compromise the image of Beverly Hills as a place of beauty, spaciousness, balance, taste, fitness, broad vistas and high quality.

(b) The plan for the proposed building or structure indicates the manner in which the structure is reasonably protected against external and internal noise, vibrations, and other factors which may tend to make the environment less desirable.

The proposed entry gate and landscaping are unrelated to the structure's ability to protect its residents against external and internal noise and vibrations, and are therefore not expected to make the environment less favorable.

(c) The proposed building is not in its exterior design and appearance of inferior quality such as to cause the nature of the local environment to materially depreciate in appearance and value.

The two proposed buildings provide more modulation and outdoor area than required by Code, with the northerly building required to provide additional modulation for large scale multiple residential developments (building width greater than 100' feet). The local environment is a mix of residential densities and architectural styles, and is established with lush gardens and well maintained institutional plantings. The landscape plan would be lushly planted with both Subtropical and Mediterranean plant material. Therefore, the proposed development would not cause the nature of the local environment to materially depreciate in appearance and value.

(d) The proposed building or structure is in harmony with the proposed developments on land in the General area, with the General Plan for Beverly Hills, and with any precise plans adopted pursuant to the General Plan.

The project is within the allowable height and density requirements for a multiple-family residential (R-4) zone, which includes a high-density, multiple-family residential (R-4) zone, and is in harmony with the proposed developments on land in the General area, and does not detract from such developments. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the General Plan for Beverly Hills, or with any precise plans adopted pursuant to the General Plan.

(e) The proposed building or structure is in conformity with the standards of this Code and other applicable laws insofar as the location and appearance of the buildings and structures are involved.

The project is in conformance with the standards of this Code and other applicable laws insofar as the location and appearance of the buildings and structure involved.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the foregoing analysis and pending the information and conclusions that may result from testimony received at the public hearing, as well as Architectural Commission deliberations, staff recommends the Architectural Commission either provide the applicant with further direction and return the item for restudy, or approve the project with any conditions the Commission may wish to add, in addition to the recommended conditions of approval (see Exhibit A).

Shena Rojemann, Associate Planner

Attachments
Exhibit A – Conditions of Approval

EXHIBIT A
Conditions of Approval

Standard Conditions:

1. Final plans shall substantially conform to the plans submitted to and reviewed by the Architectural Commission on May 18, 2011.

2. This approval by the Architectural Commission is for design only; the project is subject to all applicable City regulations for the construction of the project (including zoning, building codes and Public Works requirements.)

3. 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 requires review by the Commission. Changes made without City approval shall be required to be restored to match the City approved plans.

5. Any projections within the public-right-of way shall be reviewed and approved by the Public Works and Transportation Department.

6. A copy of the City's approval letter shall be scanned onto the final plans.