Attached D:
Project Application

SECTION 1 – AUTHORIZATION & APPLICANT TEAM

A Property Information

Project Address: 625. N. Elm dr.

Legal Description: Lot 20 / Tract Beverly Hills

B Property Owner Information[1]

Name(s): M J 26 Trust

Address: 625 N. Elm dr

City: Beverly Hills State & Zip Code: Ca 90210

Phone: 213 - 944 9000 Fax: 818 - 274 2499

E-Mail 625elmdr@gmail.com

C Applicant Information *[individual(s) or entity benefiting from the entitlement]*

Name(s): Bita and Behnam Pertieli

Address: 625 N. lm dr

City: Beverly Hills State & Zip Code: Ca 90210

Phone: 213 - 944 9000 Fax: 818 - 274 2499

E-Mail 625 elmdr@gmail.com

D Architect / Designer Information *[Employed or hired by Applicant]*

Name(s): Omrani Group Registered Architect? Yes ☐ No ☒

Address: 9244 Wilshire dr. #202

City: Beverly Hills State & Zip Code: Ca 90212

Phone: 310 - 560 6161 Fax:

E-Mail omranihamid@aol.com

E Landscape Designer Information *[Employed or hired by Applicant]*

Name(s): Steve Hug

Address: 19162-1 Index street

City: Northridge State & Zip Code: Ca 91326

Phone: 818- 360 7206 Fax:

E-Mail

F Agent *[Individual acting on behalf of the Applicant]* **NOTE**: All communication is made through the Agent.

Name(s): Hamid Omrani

Address: 9244 Wilshire Blvd. #202

City: Beverly Hills State & Zip Code: Ca 90212

Phone: 310 - 560 6161 Fax:

E-Mail omranihamid@aol.com

G I hereby certify that I am the owner of the subject property, that the information provided is accurate to the best of my knowledge and the Agent is authorize to make decisions on my behalf[2]

M J 26 Trust / Bita and Behnam Partieli — Property Owner's Name (PRINT)

Property Owner's Signature & Date 9/21/11

[1] If the owner is a corporate entity, signatures from two corporate officers are required from each of the following Groups: Group A – chairperson or president of the board; Group B – board secretary or chief financial officer.

[2] A signed and dated authorization letter from the property owner is also acceptable.

SECTION 2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION / ZONING INFORMATION

A **Indicate Requested Application:**

☐ Track 1 Application (Administrative Review)

- Project must adhere to a pure architectural style identified in the City's Residential Design Style Catalogue. The Catalogue is available online at: http://www.beverlyhills.org/civica/filebank/blobdload.asp?BlobID=3435.
- Plans must be prepared and stamped by an architect licensed in the State of California.
- Three (3) sets of plans required (see Section 6 for plan size requirements).

☒ Track 2 Application (Commission Review)

- Eight (8) sets of plans required (see Section 6 for plan size requirements).
- Public Notice materials required (see Section 5 for public notice requirements).

B **Briefly describe the architectural style(s) that you are proposing and how the proposed materials, finishes and proportions aid in achieving the style(s):**

Italianate style / Tow story / Arched entry door /Low pitch roof / Flat facade / Front door pair / Rectangular windows / Beige color / Diffrent front set back / Central tower / Widely overhangs/ Single story poarch with supporting square post /

C **Identify the Project Zoning** - City Zoning Map available online at http://gis.beverlyhills.org/UNITEGIS/.

☐ R-1 ☐ R-1.5X2 ☒ R-1.8X
☒ R-1X ☒ R-1.6X
☐ R-1.5X ☐ R-1.7X

D **Site & Area Characteristics**

Lot Dimensions: 84'/ 161' Lot Area (square feet): 13942

Adjacent Streets: Elevado ave. / Carmelita ave.

E **Lot is currently developed with (check all that apply):**

☐ Single-Story Residence ☒ Two-Story Residence
☒ Guest House ☒ Accessory Structure(s)
☒ Vacant ☒ Other: _____

F **Are any protected trees located on the property?** (See Beverly Hills Municipal Code Section 10-3-2900)?

Yes ☐ No ☒

If YES, provide the following information:

	Quantity	Sizes	Reason for Removal
Heritage:			
Native:			
Urban Grove:			

G **Has the existing residence been designed by a notable architect or is it identified on any historic resource inventory, including the City of Beverly Residential Survey?** (available online at: http://www.beverlyhills.org/services/planning_division/advance_planning/default.asp)

Yes ☐ No ☒ If yes , please list Architect's name: _____

SECTION 3 – PROJECT DETAILS AND MATERIALS (continues on next page)

A Describe your public outreach efforts to adjacent neighbors and property owners:

B Indicate the project zoning details pursuant to Beverly Hills Municipal Code Section 10-3-2400:

Code Regulation	Allowed By Code	Existing Condition	Proposed Condition
Height:	28	25'	27'
Roof Plate Height:		19'	19'
Floor Area:	6897 S.F.	4641S.F.	5421S.F.
Rear Setbacks:	39'	54'	54'
Side Setbacks:	S/E 7'-6" N/W 7'-6"	S/E 15' N/W 4'-2"	S/E 15' N/W 7'-6"
Parking Spaces:	4		

C List the specific materials and finishes for all the architectural features of the project (Be Specific):

FAÇADE (List all material for all portions visible from the street)

Material: Stucco
Texture /Finish: Smooth
Color / Transparency: Light Beige

WINDOWS (Include frame, trim, glass, metal, etc)

Material: Clad
Texture /Finish: Matte
Color / Transparency: Dark Brown

DOORS (Include frame, trim, glass, metal, etc)

Material: Metal
Texture /Finish: Matte
Color / Transparency: Black

PEDIMENTS

Material:
Texture /Finish:
Color / Transparency:

ROOF

Material: (E) And (N) Class "A" asphalt shingle
Texture /Finish:
Color / Transparency: Dark Gray

CORBELS

Material: Wood
Texture /Finish: Matte paint
Color / Transparency: Dark Brown

CHIMNEY(S)

Material: Stucco
Texture /Finish: Smooth
Color / Transparency: Light Beige

SECTION 3 – PROJECT DETAILS AND MATERIALS (continued from previous page)

COLUMNS

Material:
Texture /Finish:
Color / Transparency:

BALCONIES & RAILINGS

Material: Metal
Texture /Finish: Matte paint
Color / Transparency: Black

TRELLIS, AWNINGS, CANOPIES

Material:
Texture /Finish:
Color / Transparency:

DOWNSPOUTS / GUTTERS

Material: Metall
Texture /Finish: Matte paint
Color / Transparency: Dark Brown

EXTERIOR LIGHTING

Material: Leaf trim
Texture /Finish: Rust
Color / Transparency: Black

PAVED SURFACES

Material: Concrete
Texture /Finish:
Color / Transparency: Dark Beige

FREESTANDING WALLS AND FENCES

Material: Block wall/Stucco
Texture /Finish: Smooth
Color / Transparency: Light Beige

OTHER DESIGN ELEMENTS

Material: Concrete Moulding
Texture /Finish: Smooth
Color / Transparency: Dark Beige

D **Describe the proposed landscape theme. Explain how the proposed landscaping complements the proposed style of architecture:**

Combination of group of houses's landscape theme. Proposed coloring complements the architectural style.

SECTION 4 – DESIGN ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

A Clearly identify how your project adheres to each of the required findings of the Design Review Commission:

1. ***Describe*** **how the proposed development's design exhibits an internally compatible design scheme.**

Same as before remodeling (No change)

2. ***Describe*** **how the proposed development's design appropriately minimizes the appearance of scale and mass, how the design enhances the garden like quality of the City and appropriately maximizes the use of required open space within the proposed architectural style.**

Various height of building (One story at south side- tower-tow story at north side) / Moulding line / various set backs /

3. ***Describe*** **how the proposed development will enhance the appearance of the neighborhood.**

proposed Italianate style will enhance the appearance of the neighborhood.

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

Limited window at north and south sides / No balcony or deck in middle of the building at sides

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

Design as others/Remodeling only

Attached E:
Draft Approval Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. DR-17-11

RESOLUTION OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS CONDITIONALLY APPROVING A R-1 DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO ALLOW A FAÇADE REMODEL OF AN EXISTING TWO-STORY SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE AT THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 625 NORTH ELM DRIVE

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

Section 1. Hamid Omrani, applicant on behalf of the property owners, Bita and Behnam Pertieli (Collectively the "Applicant"), has applied for a R-1 Design Review Permit for design approval of a façade remodel of an existing two-story single-family residence for the property located at 625 North Elm Drive, and is located in the city's Central R-1 Zone.

Section 2. Beverly Hills Municipal Code Article 44, Chapter 3 of Title 10, authorizes the Design Review Commission the authority to approve, approve with conditions or deny design-related aspects of projects located in the city's Central R-1 zone, subject to findings set forth in Beverly Municipal Code Section 10-3-4415.

Section 3. The subject project has been reviewed pursuant to the provisions set forth in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA – Public Resource Code Sections 21000, *et seq.*), the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 15000 *et seq.*), and the city's local CEQA Guidelines. The subject project is exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines in that the project includes the review of building design, colors and materials to the façade of the building, front yard landscaping or minor low-scaled accessory

structures, such as fences or walls. It can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the subject activity could result in a significant effect on the environment.

Section 4. The Design Review Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on December 1, 2011 at which time oral and documentary evidence was received concerning the application.

Section 5. Based upon the evidence presented at the hearings, including the staff report(s), oral and written testimony, the Design Review Commission hereby finds as follows with respect to the R-1 Design Review Permit:

A. The proposed development's design exhibits an internally compatible design scheme in that the project's proportions, form, fenestration, scale, mass, color and materials are representative of the architectural style and design scheme chosen for the building. These design elements, including existing or proposed landscaping, paving, or perimeter fencing or walls are internally compatible and consistent with the overall design.

B. The proposed development's design appropriately minimizes the appearance of scale and mass and enhances the garden like quality of the city and appropriately maximizes the use of required open space within the proposed architectural style. Specifically, the project, as conditioned, complies with applicable provisions of the municipal code that regulate overall building size, height, scale and mass. Additionally, the building provides appropriate building modulation and uses window and other design components that minimize the visual bulk and mass. The garden quality of the city is maintained through appropriately proportioned paving in the required front yard and with the

incorporation of existing or proposed plant material of appropriate sizes that complement the architectural style and help reduce overall mass and scale.

C. The proposed development will enhance the appearance of the neighborhood in that the new construction has been designed in context to the appearance, mass and scale of adjacent properties and other properties in the neighborhood. The project includes the use of high quality building materials and appropriately uses colors and design ornamentation that is appropriate to the neighborhood. Existing or new planting will promote the garden quality image and appearance of the city, consistent with city goals and existing mature landscaping in the neighborhood.

D. The proposed development is designed to balance the reasonable expectation of development for the owner with the reasonable expectation of privacy of neighbors. The City's zoning regulations set forth maximum building height and mass standards with which this project, as conditioned, conforms. The project is being constructed in an urbanized environment and has other adjacent and nearby residences. To provide a reasonable expectation of privacy, the Design Review Commission, reviewed the placement of windows on the subject and adjacent properties, considered the location of private outdoor areas and evaluated the projects proposed and neighbors existing landscaping. Accordingly, based on this review, and as conditioned by this resolution, the project balances reasonable expectations for privacy and development.

E. The proposed development respects prevailing site design patterns, carefully analyzing the characteristics of the surrounding group of homes, and integrates appropriate features that will ensure harmony between old and new. Specifically, the project has been designed with an internally compatible architectural theme and is modulated in a manner that respects privacy and scale of

development to adjacent properties. The project design, proportionality and landscaping is compatible with other properties in the general vicinity and the project reinforces a cohesive streetscape. In its review the Design Review Commission carefully studied the proposed project in context to adjacent properties and conducted individual site inspections or reviewed photographs of the surrounding group of homes.

Section 6. Based on the foregoing, the Design Review Commission hereby grants the request defined in this resolution subject to the following conditions:

Standard Conditions

1. **Design Approval**. Project approval is for the design-related aspects of the project only. No approval is implied or granted with regard to applicable city zoning or technical codes, which may require review and approval from other city commissions or officials.

2. **Compliance with Municipal Code**. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with all applicable provisions of the city's municipal code and applicable conditions imposed by any discretionary review approval.

3. **Compliance with Special Conditions**. Any special conditions that require approval by the director of community development, or designee, shall be submitted to the staff liaison to the commission within fourteen (14) days of approval or prior to submittal of the plan check review application, whichever is greater.

4. **Project Rendering**. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall incorporate into the building permit set of plans, an updated color rendering of all building facades that are visible from the public street. The quality and detail of the rendering shall be subject to approval from the director of community development, or designee, and shall include sufficient design information to evaluate project compliance during construction.

5. **Approval Resolution**. A copy of the signed resolution of approval shall be scanned onto the cover sheet(s) of the building permit set of plans.

6. **Substantial Compliance with Approved Plans**. The director of community development, or designee, shall determine if changes to the approved project are in substantial compliance with the commission's action. This determination shall be subject to applicable fees and charges. A substantial modification to the approved project requires approval from the Design Review Commission.

7. **Covenant Recording**. Prior to issuance of a building permit, a covenant shall be filed with the Los Angeles County Register-Recorder/City Clerk that includes a copy of this resolution as an exhibit. The Applicant may submit evidence of proper filing to the community development department or submit an application along with applicable fees to the development for covenant preparation and filing.

8. **Validity of Permits**. The rights granted by this approval shall remain valid for three (3) years from the date of approval, unless extended pursuant to Beverly Hills Municipal Code Section 10-3-207.

9. **Appeals**. Decisions of the Design Review Commission may be appealed to the Planning Commission within fourteen (14) days of the final action by filing a written appeal and paying appropriate fees with the City Clerk.

Special Conditions

10. No special conditions have been imposed for this project.

Section 7. The Secretary of the Design Review Commission shall certify to the passage, approval, and adoption of this resolution, and shall cause this resolution and its certification to be entered in the administrative record maintained by the community development department.

Section 8. Decisions of the Design Review Commission may be appealed to the Planning Commission within fourteen (14) days of the final action by filling a written appeal and paying appropriate fees with the City of Beverly Hills City Clerk.

Approved as to Form and Content:

Adopted: December 1, 2011

Shena Rojemann, Commission Secretary
Community Development Department

Howard Szabo, Chairperson
Design Review Commission

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES) SS.

CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS)

I, SHENA ROJEMANN, Secretary of the Design Review Commission and Associate Planner of the City of Beverly Hills, California, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Resolution No. DR-17-11 duly passed, approved, and adopted by the Design Review Commission of said City at a meeting of said Commission on December 1, 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: Commissioner Wyka, Commissioner Nathan, Commissioner Strauss, Vice Chair Pepp, and Chair Szabo.

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

ABSENT: None.

_____

SHENA ROJEMANN
Secretary to the Design Review
Commission/Associate Planner
City of Beverly Hills, California

Attached F:
Draft Denial Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. DR-17-11

RESOLUTION OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS DENYING A R-1 DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR A FAÇADE REMODEL OF THE EXISTING TWO-STORY RESIDENCE AT THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 625 NORTH ELM DRIVE

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

Section 1. Hamid Omrani, applicant on behalf of the property owners, Bita and Behnam Pertielli (Collectively the "Applicant"), has applied for a R-1 Design Review Permit for design approval of a façade remodel of the existing two-story residence for the property located at 625 North Elm Drive, and is located in the city's Central R-1 Zone.

Section 2. Beverly Hills Municipal Code Article 44, Chapter 3 of Title 10, authorizes the Design Review Commission the authority to approve, approve with conditions or deny design-related aspects of projects located in the city's Central R-1 zone, subject to findings set forth in Beverly Municipal Code Section 10-3-4415.

Section 3. The subject project has been reviewed pursuant to the provisions set forth in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA – Public Resource Code Sections 21000, *et seq.*), the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 15000 *et seq.*), and the city's local CEQA Guidelines. The subject project is exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines in that the project includes the review of building design, colors and materials to the façade of the building, front yard landscaping or minor low-scaled accessory

structures, such as fences or walls. It can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the subject activity could result in a significant effect on the environment.

Section 4. The Design Review Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on December 1, 2011, at which time oral and documentary evidence was received concerning the application.

Section 5. Based upon the evidence presented at the hearings, including the staff report(s), oral and written testimony, the Design Review Commission hereby finds as follows with respect to the R-1 Design Review Permit:

A. The proposed development's design does not exhibit an internally compatible design scheme in that the project's proportions, form, fenestration, scale, mass, color and materials are not representative of the architectural style and design scheme chosen for the building.

B. The proposed development's design does not appropriately minimizes the appearance of scale and mass and does not enhance the garden like quality of the city and does not appropriately maximize the use of required open space within the proposed architectural style. Specifically, the project is overly boxy, lacks necessary articulation, and appears massive. The proposed design magnifies the overall scale and mass of the building with its lack of proportionality and out of scale design features. The existing or proposed landscape plan is inadequately sized or does not sufficiently complement the architectural design theme. Accordingly, the project does not minimize mass and scale and fails to respect the garden like quality of the city.

C. The proposed development will not enhance the appearance of the neighborhood in that its design does not provide internal compatibility or is not consistent with the prevailing pattern of development in the area and, more specifically, does not provide adequate transitions in scale to adjacent structure(s). The design theme is incongruent with and would detract from the appearance of the neighborhood.

D. The proposed development is not designed to balance the reasonable expectation of development for the owner with the reasonable expectation of privacy of neighbors. Specifically, the project includes design features that do not provide a reasonable measure of privacy to adjacent properties. The placement of windows, entries or other open areas unreasonably impacts the neighbor's privacy with unimpeded visual access to private rooms or outdoor areas on the neighbor's property. The impact to privacy cannot be ameliorated with conditions and would require redesign.

E. The proposed development does not respect prevailing site design patterns, does not carefully analyze the characteristics of the surrounding group of homes, and does not integrate appropriate features that will ensure harmony between old and new. Specifically, the project does not represent an internally compatible architectural theme and does not incorporate elements that would provide an appropriate transition in scale or character to the adjacent properties. Moreover, the scale, lack of appropriate design proportionality and other design features, inappropriately draw attention to this building to the detriment of the surrounding neighborhood. As opposed to creating harmony between new and old, the proposed design adversely dominates the streetscape creating disharmony between it and existing homes. In its review the Design Review Commission carefully studied the proposed project in context to adjacent properties and conducted individual site inspections or reviewed photographs of the surrounding group of homes.

Section 6. Based on the foregoing, the Design Review Commission hereby denies the request defined in this resolution.

Section 7. The Secretary of the Design Review Commission shall certify to the passage, approval, and adoption of this resolution, and shall cause this resolution and its certification to be entered in the administrative record maintained by the community development department.

Section 8. Decisions of the Design Review Commission may be appealed to the Planning Commission within fourteen (14) days of the final action by filling a written appeal and paying appropriate fees with the City of Beverly Hills City Clerk.

Approved as to Form and Content:

Shena Rojemann, Commission Secretary
Community Development Department

Adopted: December 1, 2011

Howard Szabo, Chairperson
Design Review Commission