



## Design Review Commission Report

**Meeting Date:** Thursday, August 7, 2014

**Subject:** **917 North Crescent Drive (PL1411540)**

A request for an R-1 Design Review Permit to allow a façade remodel to an existing two-story single-family residence located in the Central Area of the City north of Santa Monica Boulevard. The Commission will also consider adoption of a Categorical Exemption, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

**Project Applicant:** Jason Somers

**Recommendation:** Conduct public hearing and provide the applicant with design guidance.

---

### REPORT SUMMARY

The applicant is requesting approval of a façade remodel to an existing two-story single-family residence located in the Central Area of the City north of Santa Monica Boulevard. The proposed style is identified by the applicant as a French Classical style; however, since the project does not adhere to a pure architectural style, the project is before the Commission for review.

### URBAN DESIGN ANALYSIS

Based on a review conducted by the Urban Design Team, the design introduces a new material palate which is inconsistent with the design elements retained from the existing façade. The resulting design lacks internal compatibility and is neither contemporary or traditional. Staff feels that the design needs further refinement and is recommending that the Commission hold the public hearing and provide the Applicant with design guidance for the project.

### ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

The subject project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA – Public Resources Code §§21000 – 21178), 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. Since the property has not been designed by an architect listed on the City’s Master Architect List nor has it been listed on the City’s Historic Resource Survey, it does not warrant further review as a potential historical resource. It can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the subject activity could result in a significant effect on the environment.

### PUBLIC OUTREACH AND NOTIFICATION

The project requires mailed public notice within 100 feet and the block face of the subject property be mailed, and an on-site notice at the subject property be posted, ten (10) days prior to the hearing. The public notice for this project was mailed on July 28, 2014; the site was posted on July 28, 2014. To date staff has not received comments in regards to the submitted project.

#### Attachment(s):

- A. Detailed Design Description and Materials (Applicant Prepared)
- B. Project Design Plans
- C. DRAFT Approval Resolution

#### Report Author and Contact Information:

Georgana Millican, Associate Planner  
(310) 285-1121

[gmillican@beverlyhills.org](mailto:gmillican@beverlyhills.org)



**Design Review Commission Report**

455 North Rexford Drive

August 7, 2014

**Attachment A**

Detailed Design Description  
and Materials (applicant prepared)

**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/cbhfiles/storage/files/filebank/3435--Residential%20Design%20Catalog%20May%202008.pdf>
  - 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):**

The existing architectural style of the house can be best described as simplified value-engineered French classical. We are improving the facade by resurfacing with stucco of the existing color and texture, as well as replacing the existing metal guardrails with clear glass guardrails.

**C Identify the Project Zoning** (City Zoning Map available online at <http://gis.beverlyhills.org/>)

- |                                      |                               |                              |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> R-1 | <input type="radio"/> R-1.5X2 | <input type="radio"/> R-1.8X |
| <input type="radio"/> R-1X           | <input type="radio"/> R-1.6X  |                              |
| <input type="radio"/> R-1.5X         | <input type="radio"/> R-1.7X  |                              |

**D Site & Area Characteristics**

Lot Dimensions: 231' x 100' Lot Area (square feet): 23,138 SF  
 Adjacent Streets: Crescent Dr & Lexington Rd

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Single-Story Residence | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two-Story Residence    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Guest House | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accessory Structure(s) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vacant                 | <input type="checkbox"/> 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:

	<u>Quantity</u>	<u>Sizes</u>	<u>Reason for Removal</u>
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/citygovernment/departments/communitydevelopment/planning/historicpreservation/historicresources>)

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:**  
 None

**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:		33' - 0"	
Roof Plate Height:			
Floor Area:		10,525 SF	10,525 SF
Rear Setbacks:			
Side Setbacks:	S/E FYSB = 40'-0"	S/E FYSB = 40'-0"	S/E FYSB = 40'-0"
	N/W N/A	N/W N/A	N/W N/A
Parking Spaces:		6	6

**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:* Existing pre-cast quoin cladding  
*Texture /Finish:* New stucco (smooth finish)  
*Color / Transparency:* New 2-tone (taupe sand & caramel tan)

**WINDOWS** (Include frame, trim, glass, metal, etc)  
*Material:* No change to windows or trim  
*Texture /Finish:*  
*Color / Transparency:*

**DOORS** (Include frame, trim, glass, metal, etc)  
*Material:* No change  
*Texture /Finish:*  
*Color / Transparency:*

**PEDIMENTS**  
*Material:* No change  
*Texture /Finish:*  
*Color / Transparency:*

**ROOF**  
*Material:* New metal seam roof  
*Texture /Finish:* New anodized aluminum  
*Color / Transparency:* Color to match existing grey shingle roofing

**CORBELS**  
*Material:* No change  
*Texture /Finish:*  
*Color / Transparency:*

**CHIMNEY(S)**  
*Material:* No change  
*Texture /Finish:*  
*Color / Transparency:*

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

**COLUMNS**

*Material:* Existing engaged columns are clad in precast quoin block  
*Texture /Finish:* New stucco (smooth)  
*Color / Transparency:* Caramel tan to match existing color

**BALCONIES & RAILINGS**

*Material:* New tempered glass  
*Texture /Finish:* No texture  
*Color / Transparency:* Clear

**TRELLIS, AWNINGS, CANOPIES**

*Material:* No change  
*Texture /Finish:*  
*Color / Transparency:*

**DOWNSPOUTS / GUTTERS**

*Material:* No change  
*Texture /Finish:*  
*Color / Transparency:*

**EXTERIOR LIGHTING**

*Material:* No change  
*Texture /Finish:*  
*Color / Transparency:*

**PAVED SURFACES**

*Material:* No change  
*Texture /Finish:*  
*Color / Transparency:*

**FREESTANDING WALLS AND FENCES**

*Material:* No change  
*Texture /Finish:*  
*Color / Transparency:*

**OTHER DESIGN ELEMENTS**

*Material:* No change  
*Texture /Finish:*  
*Color / Transparency:*

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

No change to existing landscape

**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.**

There is no change to the design scheme or color palette. The house will remain contextually compatible

**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.**

We are simplifying the stucco face, therefore removing the distracting visual breaks in the prefabricated block cladding. This will provide a calmer aesthetic and therefore enhance the surrounding landscape.

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

The resurfaced facade will simplify the appearance by making the architectural elements become more visible

**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.**

No proposed work impacts privacy

**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.**

The proposed work is consistent with pattern development and will preserve the historic nature of the original architectural style.



**Design Review Commission Report**

455 North Rexford Drive

August 7, 2014

**Attachment B**  
Project Design Plans

# 917 CRESCENT

917 CRESCENT DR, BEVERLY HILLS, CA

EXISTING ELEVATION

DATE: 07/16/14



# 917 CRESCENT

917 CRESCENT DR, BEVERLY HILLS, CA

PROPOSED ELEVATION

DATE: 07/16/14





**Design Review Commission Report**

455 North Rexford Drive

August 7, 2014

**Attachment C**  
DRAFT Approval Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. DR XX-14

RESOLUTION OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS CONDITIONALLY APPROVING AN R-1 DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO ALLOW A FAÇADE REMODEL TO AN EXISTING TWO-STORY SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE AT THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 917 NORTH CRESCENT DRIVE (PL1411540).

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

Section 1. Jason Somers, agent, on behalf of Nile Niemi, property owner, (Collectively the “Applicant”), has applied for an R-1 Design Review Permit for design approval of a façade remodel to an existing two-story single-family residence for the property located at 917 North Crescent Drive which 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. Since the property has not been

designed by an architect listed on the City's Master Architect List nor has it been listed on the City's Historic Resource Survey, it does not warrant further review as a potential historical resource. 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 August 7, 2014 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:

Project-Specific Conditions

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

Standard Conditions

2. **Revised Plan Submittal.** For all projects that are approved with project-specific conditions, a revised plan set that has fully incorporated all such conditions shall be submitted to the project planner, both in hard copy format and in electronic format, prior to submitting for the building permit plan check process.
3. **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.
4. **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.
5. **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.

6. **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.
7. **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.
8. **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.
9. **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.
10. **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.

**11. 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.

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: August 7, 2014

---

William Crouch, Commission Secretary  
Community Development Department

---

John Wyka, Chairperson  
Design Review Commission