



CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS
455. N. Rexford Drive
Beverly Hills, California 90210

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
August 15, 2012
1:00 PM

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Date / Time: August 15, 2012 / 1:11 PM

ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Gardner-Apatow, Bernstein, Meyer, Vice Chair Blakeley, and Chair Rubins
Commissioners Absent: None
Staff Present: William Crouch, Shena Rojemann, Cindy Gordon and Virgia Randall (Community Development Department)

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Action: Motion by Chair Rubins; seconded by Commissioner Bernstein to approve the agenda as amended (Tab 7 moved before Tab 3). (5-0).

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Speakers: None.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE COMMISSION

Speakers: Chair Rubins introduced and welcomed the new Urban Designer, Bill Crouch.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

1. Minutes from the Architectural Review Commission Meeting on July 18, 2012.

Motion: Motion by Order of the Chair Rubins (5-0).
Action: Approved as amended.

CONTINUED ITEMS – PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. Crescent Hotel – 403 North Crescent Drive

Request for approval of a façade remodel and a sign accommodation to allow a non-conforming use in a multi-family zone to have signage permitted in a commercial zone (PL1210212).

Planner: Cindy Gordan, Assistant Planner
Applicant: Greg Peck and Frank Weeks
Public Input: None.

Motion: Motion by Commissioner Gardner-Apatow; seconded by Commissioner Bernstein to approve the resolution (5-0).

Action: **The resolution was approved with the following conditions:**

- 1) The address number sign located on the Crescent Drive elevation shall be reduced in size, subject to staff approval.
- 2) Architectural 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.
- 3) 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.
- 4) 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.
- 5) 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. 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.
- 6) 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.
- 7) 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 Architectural Commission.

- 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.

(Taken out of Order)

NEW BUSINESS – PUBLIC HEARINGS

7. 121 Spalding Drive

Request for approval of a new commercial building (PL121983).

Planner: Shena Rojemann, Associate Planner
Applicant: Cory Taylor, Hal Balzberg, and Tom Levyn
Public Input: None.

Motion: Motion by Chair Rubins; seconded by Commissioner Gardner-Apatow to approve the resolution (5-0).

Action: **The resolution was approved with the following standard conditions.**

- 1) **Architectural 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. 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 Architectural Commission.
- 7) **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.

(Returned to Order)

3. Playboy – 9346 Civic Center Drive

Request for approval of a building identification sign (PL1211888).

Planner: Shena Rojemann, Associate Planner
Applicant: Paul Salgado
Public Input: None.

Motion: Motion by Chair Rubins; seconded by Commissioner Meyer to approve the resolution (5-0; Meyer absent).

Action: **The resolution was approved with the following conditions:**

- 1) The signage shall be reduced in scale and returned for final approval by a subcommittee composed of Commissioners Blakeley and Gardner-Apatow.
- 2) **Architectural 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.
- 3) **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.
- 4) **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.
- 5) **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. 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.

- 6) **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.
- 7) **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 Architectural Commission.
- 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.

4. Beverly Hills Visitor Center – 9400 South Santa Monica Boulevard

Request for approval of a sign accommodation to allow a building identification sign and business identification sign facing private property (PL1211967).

Planner: Shena Rojemann, Associate Planner
Applicant: Steve Hoover
Public Input: None.

Motion: Motion by Chair Rubins; seconded by Commissioner Gardner-Apatow to return for restudy (5-0).

Action: **The resolution was approved with the following conditions:**

- 1) The proposed sign material shall be verified and the final signage shall be provided for final review and approved by a subcommittee composed of Commissioners Bernstein and Blakeley.
- 2) **Architectural 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.
- 3) **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.
- 4) **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.

- 5) **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. 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.
- 6) **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.
- 7) **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 Architectural Commission.
- 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.

5. Flemings Steakhouse– 252 South Beverly Drive

Request for approval of a sign accommodation to allow multiple business identification signs (PL1211645).

Planner: Shena Rojemann, Associate Planner
Applicant: Carol Sedensky
Public Input: None.

Motion: Motion by Chair Rubins; seconded by Commissioner Gardner-Apatow to deny the project (4-1, Bernstein).

Action: **The resolution was denied with the following findings:**

- 1) The plan for the proposed building or structure is not 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. Specifically, the project does not incorporate an appropriate balance of color, high quality materials or appropriate architectural design principles that reinforce that city's urban form and promote the image of Beverly Hills.
- 2) The plan for the proposed building or structure does not indicate the manner in which the structure is reasonably protected against external and internal noise, vibrations, and other factors which may tend to make the environmental less

desirable. The applicant has not demonstrated the manner in which the proposed project would reasonable protect persons from external and internal noise, vibration or other factors.

- 3) Proposed building or structure is, 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. Specifically, the commission has determined that the project lacks an appropriate design or includes materials that are of inadequate quality or unknown durability that may have the potential to adversely affect surrounding properties or the general vicinity.
- 4) The proposed building or structure is not 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 proposed project does not comply with the applicable goals and policies set forth in the general plan or local ordinances, and cannot be conditioned or made to comply as part of the architectural commission's review process. Accordingly, the commission is unable to find the project in harmony with other improvements in the general area.
- 5) The proposed development is not 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 proposed project does not comply with the applicable and cannot be conditioned or made to comply as part of the architectural commission's review process.

6. Sugarfish – 212 North Canon Drive

Request for approval of a façade remodel and sign accommodation to allow an awning sign to exceed seven inches in height. (PL1211537).

Planner: Shena Rojemann, Associate Planner
Applicant: Glenn Bell
Public Input: None.

Motion: Motion by Chair Rubins; seconded by Commissioner Blakeley to return for restudy (5-0).

Action: **The project was returned for restudy. The Commission provided the following comments:**

- The proposed façade remodel needs to be considerate of the architecture of the building. The integrity of the building should not be compromised. Taking away half the columns doesn't work.
- Provide additional information for the proposed bench.

- Provide sheathing/lining in the planter boxes and drip irrigation details.
- The proposed business identification sign should not block other tenants signs. Consider relocating it.

8. 9955 Durant Drive

Request for approval of a façade remodel of an existing multi-family residential building (PL1211633).

Planner: Cindy Gordon, Assistant Planner
Applicant: Karen Lilegren and Nicole Stubblefield
Public Input: None.

Motion: Motion by Chair Rubins; seconded by Commissioner Gardner-Apatow to return the project for restudy (4-0; Meyer absent).

Action: **The project was returned for restudy. The Commission provided the following comments:**

- There needs to be more movement between the modular boxes and the balconies. The current rhythm between these two elements is off.
- Additional room should be provided between the windows and the plaster surrounds. The proposed spacing is very smashed.
- The modular boxes need to be refined further as far as how the boxes stack and relate to each other and the façade. Consider making the framing even stronger.
- The concept brings the building to life but needs to have a secondary statement. The opportunity may be in the balconies.
- The inserted panels should read separately from the cement plaster.

9. 361 South Robertson Boulevard

Request for approval of a façade remodel (PL1211866).

Planner: Shena Rojemann, Associate Planner
Applicant: John Poindexter and Cameron Rye
Public Input: None.

Motion: Motion by Chair Rubins; seconded by Commissioner Meyer to return the project for restudy (5-0).

Action: **The project was returned for restudy. The Commission provided the following comments:**

- The proposed design feels disjointed and unconnected. There are many components (marque, copper band, glass system, etc.) which don't blend well

with each other. The overall design needs to be unified. The design needs to be simplified.

- The address sign is too large and should be more elegant.

10. EastWest Bank– 9378 Wilshire Boulevard

Request for approval of a new business identification sign and two window signs (PL1211806).

Planner: Shena Rojemann, Associate Planner

Applicant: Steve Therriant and Sam Moon

Public Input: None.

Motion: Motion by Chair Rubins; seconded by Commissioner Gardner-Apatow to deny the project (4-1, Bernstein).

Action: The resolution was denied with the following findings:

- 1) The plan for the proposed building or structure is not 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. Specifically, the project does not incorporate an appropriate balance of color, high quality materials or appropriate architectural design principles that reinforce that city's urban form and promote the image of Beverly Hills.
- 2) The plan for the proposed building or structure does not indicate 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 applicant has not demonstrated the manner in which the proposed project would reasonable protect persons from external and internal noise, vibration or other factors.
- 3) Proposed building or structure is, 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. Specifically, the commission has determined that the project lacks an appropriate design or includes materials that are of inadequate quality or unknown durability that may have the potential to adversely affect surrounding properties or the general vicinity.
- 4) The proposed building or structure is not 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 proposed project does not comply with the applicable goals and policies set forth in the general plan or local ordinances, and cannot be conditioned or made to comply as part of the architectural commission's review process. Accordingly, the

commission is unable to find the project in harmony with other improvements in the general area.

- 5) The proposed development is not 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 proposed project does not comply with the applicable and cannot be conditioned or made to comply as part of the architectural commission's review process.

PROJECT PREVIEW

11. 9265 Burton Way

Request for a preliminary review of a new multi-family residential project (PL1211959).

Planner: Shena Rojemann, Associate Planner
Applicant: Ed Levin
Public Input: None.

Action: No action taken on this item.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

No communication from the Commission.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

- Meeting Recap Discussion
- Architecture Day Discussion

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

12. Staff level approvals

Action: Received and filed.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Date / Time: August 15, 2012 / 5:52 PM

PASSED AND APPROVED THIS 19th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2012.

Zale Richard Rubins, Chair