

**CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS
DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING
455 North Rexford Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210
City Council Chambers
Commission Meeting Room 280-A**

**Thursday, April 1, 2010
2:00 p.m.**

MINUTES

Bus Tour: No Bus Tour
Formal Meeting: 2:00 p.m.

OPEN MEETING

ROLL CALL AT 2:05 PM

Commissioners Present: M. Weiss, H. Gabbay, Vice Chair G. Gilbar, and
Chair S. Strauss.

Commissioners Absent: H. Szabo (Excused)

Staff Present: D. Jerex, I. Nguyen, S. Rojemann and C. Bond
(Community Development).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Members of the public may address the Commission

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE COMMISSION:

Chair's Report from Mayor's Cabinet Meeting

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES:

1. Consideration of the minutes of the March 4, 2010 meeting.

ACTION:

Moved by Vice Chair Gilbar and seconded by Commissioner Weiss.

That the minutes of the March 4, 2010 meeting be approved as amended.

AYES: Commissioners Gabbay, Weiss, Vice Chair Gilbar and Chair Strauss.

NOES: None.

ABSENT: Commissioner Szabo

CARRIED.

NEW BUSINESS

Cabinet meeting was said to take place April 14, 2010.

CONTINUED CASES

2. 265 South Wetherly Drive (PL 100 0935)

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, south of Santa Monica Boulevard at **265 South Wetherly Drive**. *(Continued from the meeting of March 4, 2010.)*

Assistant Planner Rojemann presented the staff report and noted that the Applicant had revised the design and made the following changes:

1. Exterior lighting was reduced to two sconces adjacent to front entryway;
2. French doors at ground floor were replaced with two picture windows;
3. Entry pediment and columns were redesigned;
4. Keystone was removed;
5. More simple wrought iron entry door is proposed;
6. Balconies were changed from rounded to squared; and
7. No changes were made to the window over the entry.

Owners Dr. and Mrs. Afsaneh Ghalehi-Khazan were present and represented by Shahriar Yadegari. Mr. Yadegari addressed the commission stating they had done what they had been asked to do.

Chair Strauss was pleased with the changes made as was Commissioner Gabbay.

Commissioner Weiss asked about the front windows. The Applicant responded that the 2 foot spacing was to allow the balconies to extend as much as possible. He pushed the building back a couple of feet to achieve that. He further stated that the owner wanted to keep the space clear of vegetation which in turn would help the integrity of the windows during rain or while the sprinklers were on. She asked about simplifying the front door and asked for a drawing or photo of the exact door to be used.

Commissioner Weiss then questioned the use of gold accents stating that the accents were too fussy and did not meet a specific design style. She asked where the gold accents would be located and received a response that they would be placed in the middle of the medallions. Chair Strauss then inquired if the Applicant would consider eliminating the gold.

Vice Chair Gilbar wanted some sense of the wall thickness to ensure it is not all on the same plane. He suggested that 3 windows and 2 French doors need to be recessed due to the flat facade; thicken the front wall; 2 windows on the ground floor and above the front door need horizontal mullions to break them up; corbels need to either be done on a more regular basis all the way across, or if fewer, make them larger, thicker or more significant (increase from 6 to 9 inches); raise the apex of the roof above the front door and move it up closer to the window so you will see more of the roof and the member along the bottom should be deeper. The Applicant said he preferred to raise the pitch of the roof at the entry and agreed with the Commission. He agreed to raise the apex and wanted to use the space inside for a light or chandelier. Commissioner Gabbay clarified to the Applicant that the pitch would go from 4 to 12 and be made 5 to 12.

Chair Strauss asked to study the landscape plan and said the trees were drought resistant.

Senior Planner Jerex suggested that a resolution could be drafted. During the meantime the Applicant could then meet the above listed conditions and bring samples and photos of the gold accents to the next meeting. The final approved version needs to be scanned onto the approved plans.

It was clarified to the Applicant that all of the items below were conditions of approval of the project.

The plans were approved with the following conditions:

1. Corbels under the roof eaves need to be enlarged from 6" to 9" or thicker;
2. Two French doors and three windows be recessed at front elevation a minimum of one foot;
3. Change the pitch above the entry, raising the apex of the roof above the front door
4. Recess and thicken the front wall to one foot;
5. All 3 windows, on ground floor and above the front door are to be broken up with horizontal mullions.

Commissioner Weiss wanted to go on the record as stating to the Applicant she would not approve the iron with gold accents as it made no sense to the design unless it was simplified. She felt it was too fussy and to do her job correctly, she would not approve it unless it fit an easily identifiable "true design style".

Senior Planner Jerex suggested that a resolution be drafted for the next meeting. She advised that an amendment to the approval was to include the Applicant bringing photos and samples of the proposed front door and the location and placement of the gold on the medallions. All these items were yet to be approved by the Commission.

ACTION:

Moved by Vice Chair Gilbar and seconded by Commissioner Gabbay.

That a resolution conditionally approving the R-1 Design Review permit be drafted for consideration at a future meeting.

AYES: Commissioners Gabbay, Weiss, Vice Chair Gilbar and Chair Strauss.

NOES: None.

ABSENT: Commissioner Szabo.

CARRIED

PROJECT PREVIEW

Commissioner Gabbay recused himself from the meeting at this time.

3. 126 North Maple Drive (PL 100 3896)

A request for an R-1 Design Review Permit to allow a new, two-story single-family residence with a full basement and garage located in the central area of the city north of Santa Monica Boulevard at **126 North Maple Drive**.

Senior Planner Jerex presented the project preview. She noted that by offering informal project previews, concerns of the Commission could be relayed at the beginning of the process and potentially save applicants time and cost.

Senior Planner Jerex asked the Commission to confirm whether it would be appropriate for staff to approve this project without Commission review (Track 1). The response from the Commission was negative based upon the fact that it was not a pure design style that fit the criteria of the design style guide catalogue.

It was noted that all future submissions that did not fit an exact pure design style must go before the Commission for review. If it met all the conditions of a true style, then staff could approve the project.

Informal comments from the Commission included:

- This project seemed to fit the issue of how to fit a large house on a small lot.
- Concern was expressed that the area south of Wilshire should not look like a tract subdivision as that is not the desire of the community.
- Chocolate brown colors were suggested.
- The front section with four arches could be a bit deeper for stronger elevation.
- There should be more room between the arches and the top of the roof to provide more weight.
- Move windows lower and add horizontal mullions.
- Make fixed, stained glass window on top shorter of entry and more recessed to make it more of a focal point (a bit smaller and deeper).
- Move the vent further back and make it in green copper to match the green slate of the roof.
- Make all elements a bit stronger.
- Avoid trees in front yard. Along the walkway plant a series of Cypress trees to be in keeping with Italianate design style (i.e. a tall evergreen).
- Reconsider the concrete material and use a darker, warmer tone like brown instead of gray. It was noted that the pre-cast looked unfinished.
- The green slate roof should be reconsidered.

Chair Strauss asked the Applicant to make a note of the recommendations made by the Commission. She added to refine it further and do some work on the landscaping.

Commissioner Gabbay returned to the meeting.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

- **Director's Report / Good and Welfare**
 - City Council study session item will be on April 20th to address consolidation of the two commissions. The time was not confirmed; therefore, it was requested that an email be sent in advance with a copy of the staff report be sent to all Commissioners. Senior Planner Jerex confirmed notification and staff reports would be released the Friday before the scheduled meeting.

- **Discussion/Staff Presentation of Recent DRC Approvals**

Since July 13, 2009, some cases have been exempted for small items like windows change outs. In 2009, there were 18 approvals by the Design Review Commission. Approximately 20 projects are in the pipeline which first go through code compliance and then are determined to be Track 1 or Track 2.

- **Discussion: Policy on Preliminary Approvals**

Chair Strauss met with Senior Planner Jerex to discuss the following:

 - Proposals are first looked at for code compliance and to determine if they qualify for a Track 1 or 2 review. Sometimes the code compliance process takes 30 to 60 days or more. Possibly an informal preview could be presented to the Commission during this time to speed up the process. Staff is checking with the City Attorney to determine if this is OK.
 - Training for Commissioners was proposed on the following: 1) Familiarity with code issues which could be implemented with check lists upon submission; 2) Training on the Brown Act (e.g., how to speak to an applicant who approaches you in public); 3) As code requires a conceptual landscape plan, staff is working on getting a landscape professional on board to review plans prior to submission to the Commission. A fee currently exists that has not been taken advantage of before for landscape review.
 - Commissioner Gabbay supported the preliminary reviews. He felt it was helpful to all Applicants to save time, money and effort.
 - Commissioner Gabbay suggested a study session to review potential Code amendments that had been raised during the March 2007 retreat.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 4:08 PM

PASSED AND APPROVED THIS 6th DAY OF MAY 2010.

Susan Strauss, Chair

Submitted by Donna Jerex, Secretary