



AGENDA REPORT

Meeting Date: October 21, 2014

Item Number: E-1

To: Honorable Mayor & City Council

From: Susan Healy Keene, AICP, Director of Community Development

Subject: AN ORDINANCE OF THE OF THE CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS
AMENDING THE BEVERLY HILLS MUNICIPAL CODE
DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR SINGLE FAMILY PROPERTIES
IN THE CENTRAL AREA OF THE CITY TO ADDRESS ISSUES
RELATED TO BUILDING SCALE AND MASS, AND PARKING

Attachments:

1. Proposed Ordinance
2. Planning Commission Resolution No. 1728
3. Project History and Outreach
4. Map of Central Area
5. Single Family Mass and Bulk Recommendations Report
6. Summary of Recommendations Report
7. August 6, 2013 Project Status Report to City Council
8. Planning Commission Considerations
9. Public Comments – October 2013 Public Workshop
10. Height Standards

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council move to waive the full reading of the ordinance and that the ordinance entitled "An Ordinance of the City of Beverly Hills Amending the Beverly Hills Municipal Code Development Standards for Single Family Properties in the Central Area of the City to Address Issues Related to Building Scale and Mass, and Parking" be introduced and read by title only.

INTRODUCTION

This report presents an ordinance developed by the Planning Commission, with input from the Design Review Commission and community stakeholders, in response to City Council direction to consider discrete amendments to the Central Area single family development standards to address concerns related to building scale and mass and parking requirements. The proposed ordinance is Attachment 1 to this report.

The proposed code amendments are the result of a two-year process that began with a City Council/Planning Commission Liaison meeting in October, 2012, in which Design Review commissioners also participated. The City hired consultants, Dyett & Bhatia Urban and Regional planners, with John Kaliski Architects, to assist in the effort and the proposed ordinance is based in part on a Single Family Mass and Bulk Recommendations Report that was presented to the community in a Workshop in October, 2013. The Workshop was followed by Planning Commission Task Force meetings, Planning Commission Study Sessions including discussion with the Design Review Commission, and finally, public hearings on the draft ordinance which took place in August and September, 2014. The Planning Commission resolution recommending the ordinance to the City Council was adopted 4-0 on September 29, 2014. The Resolution is Attachment 2 to this report and includes a copy of the proposed ordinance indicating the areas of change from the current Code. A more detailed history of the project, including outreach to stakeholders, is included as Attachment 3 to this report.

The proposed amendments to the Zoning Code are summarized below. The amendments apply only to the Central Area of the City (See map, Attachment 4).

Proposed Amendments to the Central Area Single Family Development Standards:

- 1) Revise the standards for maximum height and maximum roof plate height in the principal building area for houses north and south of Santa Monica Boulevard;
- 2) For houses north of Santa Monica Boulevard, allow greater roof plate height in exchange for deeper front setbacks;
- 3) Prohibit light wells from being located in front or side setback areas except for street side setbacks where light wells may be located if screened;
- 4) Require porte cocheres to be set back a minimum of four feet (4') from the front façade of a house;
- 5) For properties located south of Santa Monica Boulevard, extend the nine-foot (9') wide side setback required on one side of the house the entire length of the property (currently this setback is only required for the first thirty eight feet behind the front setback line);
- 6) Require walls or fences over eighteen inches (18") high in the front setback to be set back a minimum of three feet (3') from the front lot line and require landscaping in this area;

- 7) Require the following landscape standards: a) a two-foot (2') wide area of landscaping along the entire length of each side yard with certain exceptions; b) mature trees in front yards with restrictions on the types of trees permitted to meet this requirement;
- 8) Require additional parking spaces for new homes and for additional bedrooms in existing homes.
- 9) Allow mechanical equipment to be located in required side yard setbacks if the equipment meets certain requirements, particularly the City's noise regulations set forth in the Code.
- 10) Clarify that paved parking spaces in front yards must lead to driveways or garages.
- 11) Allow decks located at grade to cover portions of driveway ramps in side setbacks that lead directly to subterranean parking for residences.

Additionally, the Planning Commission resolution recommending the ordinance to the City Council includes recommendations to the Council to consider future work items including a review of the City's Design Review program and Residential Style Guide.

BACKGROUND

The issue of houses that appear too large and bulky for their sites, often called "mansionization," is not new to Beverly Hills or to other cities with high land values. Such cities, like Beverly Hills, have experienced a high rate of teardowns, with new houses built to the maximum building envelope allowed by local codes. Larger homes in turn give rise to concerns about the provision of adequate parking for residents and guests of these larger homes.

Cities trying to achieve more appropriate scale and better design in single family home development have employed one or more of the following tools, sometimes in combination:

- Reduce the maximum amount of floor area allowed on a site;
- Reduce the maximum amount of floor area allowed and then allow additional floor area if certain design criteria are met (City of LA Baseline Mansionization Ordinance);
- Reduce permitted lot coverage; usually expressed as a percentage of lot size;
- Require a certain amount of modulation and/or step-backs;
- Develop design guidelines;
- Institute a design review process.

Since the 1980s, Beverly Hills has addressed the issue of mansionization by employing several of these tools including amendments to the Zoning Code (e.g. limiting maximum height and floor area, revising the definition of floor area to capture spaces with two-story dimensions, limiting parking/garage location, requiring greater side setbacks for greater height, etc.); and, by adopting a Design Review program and a Residential Design Style Catalogue in 2004 for single family homes in the Central Area. The City's measures have helped reduce the development

of residential designs considered particularly massive and out of scale with their neighborhoods; however, despite improvement in single family home design and construction in Beverly Hills, many feel additional measures are needed to protect residential neighborhoods and to maintain the City's character.

DISCUSSION

The Consultant's recommendations in the report entitled, "Reducing Single-Family Mass and Bulk Recommendations Report (Attachment 5),"¹ formed the framework for discussion by the public and the Planning Commission regarding changes to the Central Area development standards. Based on the consultant's analysis of the character of existing homes, along with Planning Commissioner input and information gathered at stakeholder meetings, the consultant provided a list of 13 recommendations that focus on front façade modulation, reduction of height (particularly roof plate height), limiting encroachments in setback areas, reducing the area of second floors, and landscape and parking standards. A summary of the consultant's 13 recommendations is Attachment 6 to this report. The consultant's two key goals and five guiding principles supporting the recommendations in the Report are listed below:

Guiding Goals

1. Reduce the perceived and actual mass and bulk of single-family homes as experienced from the street, to ensure adequate separation between residential structures, and conserve the traditional garden quality of Central Area residential neighborhoods.
2. Ensure the provision of adequate residential parking and reduce the impact of this parking on residential streetscapes to ensure the endurance of the character of Central Area residential neighborhoods.

Guiding Design Principles

1. Reinforce the existing character-defining garden-quality identity of Central Area residential streets and neighborhoods.
2. Ensure new residential construction is compatible with and enhances existing Central Area neighborhood character and quality.
3. Preserve the opportunity to realize present residential floor area allowances in the Central Area.
4. Develop recommendations that could be required standards or could incentivize single-family residential bulk and mass reductions and additional on-site residential parking that is not visible from the street.
5. Consider means to relate the construction of basement area to reductions of residential bulk and mass in Central Area neighborhoods.

¹ Prepared by John Kaliski Architects, October 22, 2013.

Public Comment

The October 2013 Public Workshop on the Single Family Mass and Bulk Recommendations Report was well attended (approximately 35 community members) and the main concerns expressed during the Workshop included:

- Concern that prescribed standards will result in “cookie-cutter style;”
- Limiting encroachment of architectural projections in setbacks will reduce or eliminate features such as roof eaves that are desirable in alleviating the appearance of bulk and mass;
- Landscaping is a critical factor;
- Concern about reduction in allowed basement area;
- Interest in strengthening the City’s Style Guidelines; consider tying specific modulation/design standards to specific architectural styles;
- Interest in exploring a variety of parking solutions.

See Attachment 9 for public comments submitted at the Workshop².

An overarching concern expressed by members of the public during this review process, is avoiding standards that would limit architectural freedom and flexibility. This concern speaks to the City’s development largely with custom homes resulting in diverse architectural styles that set Beverly Hills apart from cities with large tract housing developments. Concern was expressed that strict step-back or modulation requirements can result in a uniform appearance and may preclude certain architectural styles.

Other than general public support for increased landscaping requirements, the recommendation that elicited the most public comment was the consultant’s recommendation to connect allowance of the maximum basement area to the provision of modulation in the design of a house. Many stakeholders expressed the view that basement area does not impact the appearance of scale and mass and should be encouraged; others asserted that limiting basement area would be a reduction from current allowed square footage. Some noted that large basements may intensify the use of the land, resulting in the need for more parking; alternatively, parking can be provided in basement structures.

Additional information about the Planning Commission’s deliberations regarding floor area, basements and covered parking is included as Attachment 8 to this report.

Ordinance Provisions

As discussed above, the Planning Commission decided to recommend a variety of development standards that, in combination, could have a noticeable impact on the design of single family homes in the Central Area.

² The link to the Central R-1 Study webpage follows and a video of the October 24 Workshop may be found there: <http://www.beverlyhills.org/citygovernment/departments/communitydevelopment/planning/centralareasinglefamilyhomebulkandmassstudy/>

The most significant are proposed changes in height standards, which may also affect some front setback requirements; side setback standards south of Santa Monica Boulevard; permissible encroachments in side setbacks; landscape standards; and parking standards.

Height

Proposed Code Amendments

The proposed ordinance establishes a standard for maximum plate height³ north of Santa Monica Boulevard of 22 feet to 25 feet (depending on the front setback depth), new definitions for roof types, and revised standards for total maximum height north and south of Santa Monica Boulevard based on roof types.

Discussion

After determining that it did not wish to constrain design and architectural style by requiring specific modulation or limiting second floor residential volumes, the Planning Commission reviewed the relationship of building height to plate height and setbacks in an effort to identify code changes that could improve the relationship of new homes to existing homes.

Plate Height

The Planning Commission agreed with the consultant's conclusion that plate height is a key factor in determining whether a new home is compatible with existing homes. As homes have grown larger with greater ceiling height, the average plate height has increased, contributing to the perception that new homes are massive and bulky as compared to existing or older homes. This is not a new perception; According to the National Association of Building Owners, sometime between 1995 and 2004, the nine-foot ceiling replaced the eight foot ceiling as the most common ceiling height for single-story homes and for the first floor of multi-story homes. Many builders now consider ten-foot ceilings to be standard, with specialty rooms rising to a 12 or 14 foot ceiling height, particularly for homes in the luxury category.

Building Height and Roof Types

The consultant proposed adjusting total maximum building height based on three roof types: flat, sloped and sloped with ridgeline. The three roof types are defined in the ordinance. This addresses the longstanding issue that the definition of "sloped roof" in the City's current Code allows fairly flat, mansard-style roofs to be considered sloped roofs, qualifying such structures for greater maximum height (30 feet) in areas south of Santa Monica Boulevard. The new "sloped with ridgeline" roof type is intended to define true, sloped roofs and the revised maximum building height limits will reserve the maximum roof height for buildings that have sloped roofs with ridgelines.

Requiring true ridge lines could create difficulty in placing mechanical equipment on roofs as is the current practice. The outside condensing units of air conditioning systems are required to have wide clearances to work efficiently. The proposed ordinance would allow mechanical equipment, with noise reduction measures, to be located in side yard setbacks to provide property owners with additional flexibility in locating such equipment.

³ "Plate Height" is defined in the zoning code as: "Plate Height: The height to the topmost element of the structural support of a building's roof framing members."

Height South of Santa Monica Boulevard

Plate Height

Homes south of Santa Monica Boulevard are currently subject to a maximum plate height of 22 feet. The consultant recommended lowering the maximum plate height in areas south of Santa Monica Boulevard by two feet from 22 feet to 20 feet. During public review, the Planning Commission heard comments that a 22-foot maximum plate height barely accommodates an acceptable ceiling height, with a 25-foot plate height more desirable to many. The Planning Commission expressed its intention to allow Beverly Hills residents to enjoy commonly expected ceiling heights and the Commission therefore decided to recommend retaining the 22-foot maximum plate height in areas south of Santa Monica Boulevard.

Building Height

The Planning Commission ultimately decided to recommend reducing maximum building height from 30 feet to 28 feet for homes with sloped roofs without true ridge lines (e.g. mansard style) to address bulk and mass concerns associated with this style and to be consistent with standards north of Santa Monica which currently allow a maximum height of 28 feet. The Planning Commission further decided to allow homes with true ridgelines a maximum building height of 32 feet to incentivize these homes. The expectation is that the two feet in added height would be concentrated in the center of the roof with little impact on adjoining properties and homes with a more traditional sloped roof will be more compatible with neighborhoods.

Height North of Santa Monica Boulevard

For areas north of Santa Monica Boulevard, the Code currently sets a maximum building height of 28 feet with the ability to achieve a maximum height of 32 feet if additional side setbacks are provided. A maximum building height of 34 feet can be achieved if the project can meet certain criteria through a discretionary review process. Most owners currently choose to provide the additional side setbacks and build a 32-foot tall home with the additional side setbacks providing some relief for adjacent property owners.

Plate Height

The consultant proposed a maximum plate height in the north of 24 feet (no maximum plate height currently exists for this area) and proposed height standards based on flat and sloped roofs, similar to the current height requirements for areas south of Santa Monica Boulevard. The Planning Commission is recommending a new maximum plate height standard of 22 feet with the option to raise the plate height to 25 feet if a greater front setback is provided. Requiring homes with greater plate height to be set back from the street is intended to reduce the impact of such homes as viewed from the street, potentially resulting in a better balance between new houses and existing homes.

Requiring deeper front setbacks could also result in a more varied building pattern as viewed from the street. This could be seen as positive or negative depending on whether a strictly uniform front setback pattern is viewed as desirable. Most streets north of Santa Monica Boulevard already exhibit varied front setback patterns.

Building Height

Maximum building height would remain unchanged for flat and sloped roof houses if the minimum side setbacks are provided. For buildings with sloped roofs with ridgelines, additional height would be permitted by right up to a maximum height of 34 feet if additional side setbacks

are provided (additional height is currently permitted for all houses with a discretionary review process). See Attachment 10 for additional information about the height standards. Greater height may also be allowed for flat-roofed buildings through a discretionary Central R-1 Permit process requiring Planning Commission review.

Side Setbacks

Proposed Code Amendment

The ordinance proposes to extend the nine-foot wide setback required on one side of the lot on lots south of Santa Monica Boulevard, prohibit encroachments in that nine-foot wide area, prohibit lightwells in side yards, require porte cocheres to be set back four feet from the building face, and to allow mechanical equipment in side yards if certain criteria are met.

Side Setback Extension

Currently the Zoning Code requires the side setback for houses south of Santa Monica Boulevard to be five feet on one side and, for the other side, nine feet for the first 38 feet behind the front setback line, with the remainder at five feet. Minimum five foot wide setbacks on both sides of a property as currently allowed impede the ability to park cars in the side setback area or to access parking that could be located at the rear of a property, even if a future owner wished to do so.

The consultant proposed extending the required nine-foot wide setback from 38 feet to 46 feet from the front setback line (an increase of 8 feet), before the setback could be reduced to a five-foot width. The Planning Commission, however, is recommending that the nine-foot wide setback be extended the entire length of the lot. The nine-foot wide setback traditionally allowed for parking adjacent to the house along a side lot line or access to a rear garage. Even though most of the streets in the Central Area have rear alleys, many homeowners have chosen to park their cars in tandem along the side lot line, rather than provide parking accessed from the alley.

In addition to providing more area to park cars, the extended nine-foot wide setback provides greater separation between buildings, reducing the sense of mass as perceived from the street and increasing neighbors' access to light, air and privacy. The proposed ordinance as currently drafted requires the nine-foot setback area to be a "flat paved area..." The City Council may wish to discuss whether the word "paved" should be removed from the ordinance language (Section 5 of the proposed ordinance) because there may be situations where parking is provided elsewhere on a site, such as in a garage, and it might be more beneficial for the nine-foot setback area to be landscaped. Landscaping in this area would not preclude future paving if a driveway or additional parking is needed in the future.

It is noted that increasing the side setback at the rear of the house from five feet to nine feet will not prevent any owner from developing to the maximum floor area permitted since there is still sufficient principal building area available to build to the maximum square footage allowed by Code.

Lightwells

Lightwells are excavated areas that allow light into a below-grade level of a building. Lightwells have been permitted by the City in residential setback areas. The consultant suggested prohibiting lightwells in all required setback areas except the rear setback and the Planning Commission concurred. Removing lightwells from required side yards will provide an opportunity for additional landscaping at grade between properties and, for those property owners who still wish to have a lightwell on the side of the house, this could encourage additional modulation in the side wall of the house because the lightwell must be located in the principal building area and must be open to the sky. It also minimizes excavations near common property lines which often result in removal of lateral support causing concern to neighboring property owners.

Porte Cocheres

The consultant proposed setback standards for porte cocheres such as landscaped side yard setbacks and a setback from the front of the house. Requiring a small landscaped setback between a porte cochere and side property line could help to create a visual break in buildings along a street but public comment has been received expressing concern that requiring any additional side setbacks will reduce the available locations to provide parking. The Planning Commission decided not to recommend an additional side setback for porte cocheres but is recommending a four foot setback from the front building façade to provide some façade modulation. The Design Review Commission often requires such a setback for porte cocheres as a condition of approval to break up building mass as viewed from the street.

Mechanical Equipment

Allowing mechanical equipment in side yards recognizes that mechanical equipment can be quieter and more efficient than in the past and provides an alternative for mechanical equipment location if such equipment cannot be located on the roof of a home, particularly homes with true ridgelines in the traditional style as encouraged by the proposed ordinance. Mechanical equipment is required to meet City noise standards pursuant to Code; however, taking into consideration the possibility that noise from mechanical equipment can impact neighbors, particularly as the equipment ages, the Council may wish to consider requiring a sound attenuating enclosure for mechanical equipment located in required side setbacks to reduce noise impacts (Section 7 of the proposed ordinance).

Landscape Standards

Proposed Code Amendments

- Require a minimum three-foot deep, landscaped front setback for walls and fences over 18 inches high;
- Require the following landscape requirements: planting a minimum of one mature, 48-inch box deciduous or evergreen tree in the front yard of sites less than or equal to 60 feet wide (mostly south of Santa Monica Boulevard), planting a minimum of two mature, deciduous or evergreen (or a combination) 48-inch box trees in the front yard of sites exceeding 60' in width (mostly north of Santa Monica Boulevard), and,

- Provide a minimum two foot wide landscaped area the length of each side yard.

Discussion

Beverly Hills has a robust tree canopy and is a recognized Tree City. Trees can provide shade, screening, and can soften the appearance of a home as viewed from the street. The City's Design Review Commission often requires large trees to be planted in the front yard as a condition of approval for new or substantially remodeled homes. The Planning Commission did not choose to require mature trees in the side and rear yards because of concerns about unintended consequences such as issues with neighbors. Trees located in side and rear yards are also not as directly involved in reducing the appearance of building scale and mass as viewed from the street. It is noted that palm trees, cypress trees and ficus trees may not be used to fulfill the proposed tree requirements.

A minimum two-foot wide landscape requirement the length of each property has been proposed, except in portions of the side yard occupied by approved accessory structures, approved elevators or elevator enclosures, a permitted swimming pool or driveway. The consultant had recommended a five-foot wide landscape requirement but the Planning Commission decided this did not allow for paths in these areas such as for emergency access (there is no side setback landscape requirement today).

Parking Standards

Proposed Code Amendment

The draft ordinance would require one additional parking space for four and five bedroom houses and additional parking spaces for bedrooms in excess of six.

PARKING STANDARDS	Current Standards	Proposed Standards
Up to 4 bedrooms	2 parking spaces	3 parking spaces
5 bedrooms	3 parking spaces	4 parking spaces
6 bedrooms	4 parking spaces	4 parking spaces
7 bedrooms	4 parking spaces	5 parking spaces
8 bedrooms	4 parking spaces	6 parking spaces
9 or more bedrooms	4 parking spaces	7 parking spaces

Discussion

The City's current Code requires a maximum of four onsite parking spaces for six or more bedrooms.⁴ The consultant recommended consideration of increases to the off-street parking requirements for homes with more than six bedrooms. The Commission has supported this

⁴ An approved Second Unit would require one additional parking space.

recommendation and has proposed increasing the parking requirement for four-bedroom homes from two to three parking spaces and increasing the requirement for five-bedroom homes from three to four parking spaces. The requirement for a six-bedroom home would remain four parking spaces as it is today. The Commission has expressed concern about both the inadequacy of the number of parking spaces currently required and a desire to move cars out of the front setback area, which is not allowed to be used to satisfy the City's parking requirements but can be used for guest parking. If residents choose to park regularly on their front driveways, it is very difficult for the City to enforce parking in the approved parking spaces elsewhere on the site.

Most applicants provide their required parking along the side of the house or in the rear setback. Requiring additional parking for more bedrooms could eliminate some green space in the side or rear. Additionally, more applicants have been inquiring about automated parking. This could make below-grade parking more desirable but, as noted in the October Workshop comments, there is concern about fitting the ramping required to get cars below grade.

The Planning Commission discussed the appropriateness of covered parking requirements and decided not to propose requiring covered parking, expressing the concern that garages would not be used to park cars.

Front Yard Parking/Paving Restriction

Proposed Code Amendment

Paved parking spaces in front yards must lead to driveways or garages.

Discussion

The Code does not currently prohibit paved areas in front yards adjacent to curb cuts (i.e. parking spaces) not connected to a driveway or garage. This has resulted in floating parking spaces in front yards so long as the paving does not exceed the paving limits set out in Code. The proposed amendment clarifies that paved areas adjacent to a driveway apron shall lead directly to a carport, garage or parking area beyond the front setback area.

Allow Basement Driveway Ramps

Proposed Code Amendment

Allow decks located at grade to cover portions of driveway ramps in side setbacks that lead directly to subterranean parking for residences.

Discussion

A covered driveway ramp currently meets the Code definition of basement and is therefore not permitted as an encroachment in the side setback. The proposed amendment would allow property owners to cover such driveways, at grade, so owners may landscape this area. It is anticipated this will create a better appearance as viewed from the street and a better experience for the next-door neighbor who will no longer be directly adjacent to a deep trench

leading to the neighbor's basement. This would also be consistent with the previously described recommendation for landscaping in the side setbacks.

Design Review Commission Comments

The Design Review Commission has provided input at several points in the process and has supported the proposed amendments but has also been interested in exploring additional changes to the Code. The Planning Commission resolution includes a request, supported by the Design Review Commission, that the City Council direct review of the City's Design Review Ordinance and Residential Style Guide. One of the goals of such an effort would be to strengthen the Design Review Commission's authority to require additional modulation, including substantial setbacks, when reviewing proposed single family home designs. Another goal is to improve the Style Guide's direction to the public regarding the appropriateness of certain styles for smaller lots as well as the importance of proportionality when designing homes.

The Planning Commission Resolution also includes a request to the City Council, strongly supported by the Design Review Commission, that new front yard walls and fences should be required to go through some type of design review process because of the outsized effect new walls and fences can have on a property's appearance.

Additionally, the Design Review Commission recommended the Planning Commission consider including an amendment to prohibit or discourage circular driveways in front yards. The Planning Commission considered the request and decided not to recommend such a change at this time based on public comments and a determination that circular driveways are widely supported.

Projects Affected

The proposed ordinance would apply to the development of new single family homes in the City which includes major remodels that remove more than 50% of the exterior of the existing home. This ordinance shall not apply to:

- Pending applications for single family development projects that include any type of discretionary review or design review, filed with the Community Development Department on or before the effective date of this ordinance; or,
- Ministerial projects with a valid building permit issued prior to the effective date of this ordinance.

GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY

The City's General Plan includes the following land use policies and implementation strategies that address the goals above including: "LU 1 Long-Term Stability," "LU 3 Managed Change," "LU 5 Complete, Livable and Quality Neighborhoods," "LU 10, Economically Vital Districts," "LU 11 Well-Designed and attractive Districts," "LU 12 Business Districts Adjoining Residential

Neighborhoods” and, “LU 15 Economic Sustainability.” The following goals are specifically addressed by the proposed zone text amendment:

Policy LU 2.1 City Places: Neighborhoods, Districts, and Corridors. Maintain and enhance the character, distribution, built form, scale, and aesthetic qualities of the City’s distinctive residential neighborhoods, business districts, corridors, and open spaces.

Policy LU 5.1 Neighborhood Conservation. Maintain the uses, densities, character, amenities, and quality of the City’s residential neighborhoods, recognizing their contribution to the City’s identity, economic value, and quality of life.

Policy LU 6.1 Neighborhood Identity. Maintain the characteristics that distinguish the City’s single-family neighborhoods from one another in such terms as topography, lot size, housing scale and form, and public streetscapes

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

This Ordinance has been assessed in accordance with the authority and criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the environmental regulations of the City. It can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the adoption and implementation of the Ordinance may have a significant effect on the environment. The Ordinance does not authorize construction. This Ordinance is exempt from the environmental review requirements of CEQA pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations.

PUBLIC NOTICING AND COMMENTS

This public hearing was noticed in the *Beverly Hills Courier* on October 10, 2014 and in the *Beverly Hills Weekly* on October 16, 2014. The public hearing on the draft ordinance held by the Planning Commission on September 11, 2014, and continued to September 29, 2014, was noticed in the *Beverly Hills Courier* on August 29, 2014, and in the *Beverly Hills Weekly* on September 4, 2014. Additionally, meeting agendas for both public hearings have been posted at City Hall, the Library, and Civic Center Parking Garage, in addition to the City’s website. Staff also contacted homeowners associations, community groups, the Planning Commission, the Design Review Commission, and other interested parties who have participated in the process to develop the draft ordinance.

FISCAL IMPACTS

Because the proposed amendments do not affect the amount of floor area that may be built but rather propose discreet changes to development standards for building height, setbacks, parking and landscaping, it is not expected that the proposed ordinance will have an impact on the City's tax base or a fiscal impact on individual property owners. There would be costs associated with implementing the ordinance, including community outreach and staff training regarding the new code standards.

Susan Healy Keene, AICP
Director of Community Development

Approved By

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Susan Healy Keene". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned below the printed name and title.