Beverly Hills City Council Liaison / Next Beverly Hills Committee will conduct a Special Meeting, at the following time and place, and will address the agenda listed below:

CITY HALL
Municipal Gallery
455 North Rexford Drive
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Tuesday, October 31, 2017
8:30 AM

AGENDA

1) Public Comment
   a. Members of the public will be given the opportunity to directly address the Committee on any item listed on the agenda.

2) Welcome
   a. Guest and New Member Introductions
      1. Full name, occupation, connection to Beverly Hills, interest in Committee
   b. Opening Announcements

3) Current Business
   a. ICMA Learning Lounge Presentation Recap
   b. Committee Chair and Vice Chair Nominations and Election
   c. Initiatives Updates:
      1. Community Liaisons
      2. Next Night Recap
      3. Next Gen Housing
   d. Subcommittees Updates:
      1. Marketing

4) New Business
   a. 2017 Priorities and New Initiative Proposals
   b. Pitch (New initiative proposals)
   c. Tell (Sharing of interesting and relevant next gen-related info and events)
   d. Upcoming Meetings
      1. November 28 at 8:30-10:00am

5) Adjournment

Byron Pope, City Clerk

Posted: October 27, 2017

Next Beverly Hills is a committee of talented young leaders chartered by the Mayor and the City of Beverly Hills to engage residents between the ages of 25 and 45 through innovative initiatives that address their lifestyle, economic and civic needs, and to inspire them to make Beverly Hills a better place for all.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Municipal Gallery is wheelchair accessible and is equipped with audio equipment for the hearing impaired. If you need special assistance to attend this meeting, please call the City Manager's Office at (310) 285-1014 or TTY (310) 285-6881. Please notify the City Manager's Office at least twenty-four (24) hours prior to the meeting if you require captioning service so that reasonable arrangements can be made.
MEETINGS

Meeting Date: October 31, 2017
To: Next Beverly Hills Committee
From: Timothy Hou, Assistant to the City Manager
       Michael George, Management Analyst
       Next Beverly Hills Housing Subcommittee
Subject: Presentation of Findings by the Next Beverly Hills Housing Subcommittee
Attachments: 1. Draft Position Paper
               2. Initial Visioning Survey Results
               3. Follow Up Visioning Survey Results
               4. Copy of Multiple Choice Pilot Survey

INTRODUCTION

Over the course of the last two years, the Next Beverly Hills Housing Subcommittee has spearheaded an initiative that explores the housing needs of young adults. The research includes a draft position paper, an initial visioning survey, a follow-up visioning survey, and a multiple choice pilot survey. The purpose of this initial research is to gain insight into the housing preferences of young adults and to understand why housing options that meet these preferences may not be widely available in the City of Beverly Hills.

This report is provided for information only and offers an update regarding the Next Beverly Hills Housing Subcommittee's research efforts.

DISCUSSION

Background

Today’s young adults or “Millennials” (birthdate of early 1980s to early 2000s) comprise one-third of the total population in the United States, are the largest generation in the nation today, and will continue to be a driving force in the nation's economy. In recognition of Millennials' growing influence, the Next Beverly Hills Committee (Committee) was established in May of 2015 by then-Mayor Gold to engage the age 25-45 demographic in the City. The objective of the Committee is to engage this audience through a variety of platforms and initiatives that address the lifestyle, economic and civic needs of the City’s next generation. One of the Committee’s key priorities for this year is Next Gen Housing and understanding why housing that appeals to Millennials may not be widely available in Beverly Hills. In support of this objective, the Next Beverly Hills Housing Subcommittee began researching demographic, housing, and income trends with regards to young adults, both locally and nationally. The initial findings of the
research are summarized in the draft research paper (Attachment 1). Key highlights from the research paper include:

- College educated young adults prefer to live in cities: 73 percent of 25 to 34 year-olds with a college education were living in large or mid-sized cities in 2011, compared to 67 percent in 1980.

- As of September 2014, the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim Metropolitan Statistical Area was the #2 most popular housing market with affluent young adults (Households of 18-35 year olds with incomes over $75,000). It had 254,929 of these households, ranking only behind New York-Newark-Jersey City Metropolitan Statistical Area.

- Living in urban areas, young adults are less likely to own cars, as vehicle ownership rates are declining. In 2011, 66% of those under age 25 owned a car, contrasted with 73% in 2007. A large majority of young adults want access to better transit options and less reliance on a vehicle. The National Association of Realtors finds that more than half of young adults would consider moving to another city if it had better public transportation options and 66% of those surveyed listed public transportation as one of their top three criteria in deciding where to live.

- The two largest population groups in the United States are Millennials and Baby Boomers. These two groups share many commonalities when it comes to housing preferences including desires for walkability, convenient transportation alternatives to cars, and easy access to amenities.

- According to U.S. Census data, Beverly Hills has experienced a decrease in the young adult population (25-44 years). Both the proportion and total number of young adults declined during the past two decades, decreasing from 30% to 25% between 1990 and 2010 (a total decline of 1,100 residents). During that same time, the population of middle aged adults (45-64 years) has grown with an increase of approximately 2,000 residents. The senior adult population has stayed relatively stable in Beverly Hills but is more concentrated in the City than in Los Angeles County as a whole (19% of the City's population vs 11% for the County).

- The housing stock in the City of Beverly Hills has remained relatively constant over time with a slight increase. The 2010 Census documented 16,394 housing units in the City, which represents a total of 539 new units since 2000 or about 3% growth. During the 1990s the housing stock in the City grew by less than one percent, which is a similar level of growth to that of the other Westside cities. This limited growth is due in part to the limited supply of land for new residential developments in the region. Additionally, 60% of housing in the City is more than 50 years old.

- The vast majority of individuals (95% of workers) who work in the City commute from outside City limits.

**Initial Visioning Survey**
The first research instrument was a visioning survey. The purpose of this survey was to determine which components of residential buildings are most appealing to the Committee members. The preferences measured by the survey include the amenities of
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the building, the qualities of the units, and location. A total of thirteen Committee Members provided comments. The primary results are summarized below and detailed responses are included in Attachment 2.

Amenities
The top three amenities preferred by the Committee members were gym, pool, and available parking (in descending order).

Building Unit and Qualities
The most preferred quality of a building was the style/design. Pet friendliness, and energy efficiency was also important. Additionally, members reported that a better-quality building with better amenities may be preferred to larger sized units with fewer amenities.

Location
The most preferred aspects of a building's location were being in a walkable neighborhood, proximity to amenities, and proximity to public transit (in descending order).

Other
The other top three preferred qualities of a residential building were prestige/luxury/cool factor, affordability, and safety/security. Additionally, members reported that a welcoming/friendly community is preferred.

Follow Up Visioning Survey
Nine follow-up questions were asked to Committee members based on the results of the initial visioning survey to provide additional context. The primary results of the follow-up survey are summarized below and detailed responses are included in Attachment 3.

Question 1: Parking
Respondents prefer that buildings have at least one parking space per unit, which could be bundled or unbundled with the rent; and additional parking spaces could be purchased if desired by tenants. Additionally, members reported that residents who don't use their parking spaces should potentially receive a rebate for their space.

Question 2: Unit Size
Members reported that smaller unit size would be acceptable if the building had attractive amenities such as shared outdoor spaces and/or a good quality gym. Members reported that affordability is important for the young adult housing market. Specifically, if regulations were modified to potentially allow for smaller units to be built in Beverly Hills such that the units could be more affordable, members would support regulations allowing smaller units.

Question 3: Location and Walkability
Members reported that they would prefer to live in mixed use buildings in walkable areas with access to shops, restaurants, schools, parks, and transportation. Current areas within Beverly Hills that could be described as walkable include the Southeast section of the City near Robertson Blvd., South Beverly Drive, and the Golden Triangle. One area that could be made more walkable is Olympic Blvd.
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**Question 4: Amenities**
Members reported that the most important amenities include (in no particular order) dry cleaners, grocery stores, gyms, restaurants and coffee shops. Some members reported that they would prefer not to live near a bar.

**Question 5: Affordability**
Members reported several different amounts for what constitutes an affordable cost for a one-bedroom unit, ranging from $1000 to $3500 per month. For affordable one-bedroom condo ownership, members reported amounts ranging from $100k to $1M.

**Question 6: Ranking of Amenities**
In descending order, Members ranked on-site laundry, gym, and rooftop areas as being the most important. Following these three, the pool area was also reported to be important.

**Question 7: Ideal Unit Size for One-Bedroom**
Members reported 13 different amounts for what constitutes the ideal one-bedroom unit size. These estimates range from 700 to 1300 square feet.

**Question 8: Preference for prestigious/cool/luxury housing**
Members reported that smaller and stylish buildings are preferred. Luxurious or prestigious housing may not be important to young people; more important concerns for young people are affordability, cleanliness, and functionality.

**Question 9: Additional comments**
Members reported that multi-model urban design is important, and that given rising costs of living in the area, retaining the current renter population may be an important short-term goal. Tougher minimum standards for landlords to update buildings and a policy regarding short term rentals (such as Airbnb) may be potential mechanisms to improve affordability. Additionally, buildings with views and high floors may be desirable to newcomers.

**Multiple Choice Pilot Survey**
A 16-question multiple choice and fill-in pilot survey was distributed at a local next generation mixer event on June 23, 2016, and 15 responses were obtained from attendees. Eight respondents reported to live in Beverly Hills, and the rest reported to live in areas such as West Hollywood, Downtown Los Angeles and Westwood. The primary results are summarized below and a copy of the survey is included as Attachment 4.

**Whom do you live with?**
Out of (15) respondents (6) reported to live alone, (6) live with a spouse, and the rest either live with their family/children or a roommate.

**What is your household income?**
Out of (14) respondents, (9) report to earn more than $150k annually, while (5) cut of (14) earn between $50k and $100k annually.

**What is your current age?**
Out of (15) respondents, (12) are within the 26-45 age demographic.
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Do you think smaller or larger units are preferable for younger residents?
Out of (15) respondents, (11) believe smaller units are preferable for younger residents while (4) believe larger units are preferable for younger residents.

Would you be interested in smaller units if the community amenities in a housing complex were more expansive?
Out of (15) respondents, (12) would be interested in smaller units if the community amenities were more expansive.

Please rank the following amenities/building attributes in order of importance:
When asked to rank 13 amenities based on order of importance, respondents chose walkability, views, and unit layout as the most important (in descending order). In total (14) responses were collected.

For a one bedroom unit, what do you feel is the ideal unit size?
Out of (13) respondents, (11) believe that 700-1000 square feet is the ideal size for a one-bedroom unit.

What do you consider to be an affordable monthly rent for one bedroom unit?
Out of (15) respondents, (7) consider $1500 - $1999 to be affordable monthly rent for a one-bedroom, and (4) consider $2000-$3499 to be affordable.

What do you consider to be an affordable sale price for a one bedroom condo?
Out of (15) respondents, (8) consider an affordable 1-bedroom condo to be less than $750k, while (6) consider an affordable 1-bedroom condo to range between $750k and $999k.

How important is living in a walkable neighborhood with amenities nearby?
Out of (14) respondents, (10) believe that living in a walkable neighborhood with amenities is “very important,” while (4) report that walkability is “somewhat important.”

Which of the following locations do you believe is the most desirable for your demographic in Beverly Hills?
Out of (15) respondents, (12) believe that proximity to S. Beverly Drive and the Golden Triangle is the most desirable locations for their demographic while (3) believe proximity to E. Wilshire/La Cienega Metro station is most desirable for their demographic.

How important is having onsite parking in residential housing projects?
Out of (15) respondents, (14) believe that having onsite parking in residential housing projects is very important.

If onsite parking is important, what options should be available?
Out of (15) respondents, (6) believe that one parking spot should be designated for each unit; (5) believe street parking must be available; (11) believe guest spots are needed; (7) believe at least one parking space per bedroom must be available; and (2) believe buildings should have unbundled parking.

What is your desired future mode of transportation to get to work on a daily basis?
Out of (15) respondents, (8) desire a car as their future daily mode of transportation to work; (3) desire uber/lyft; (2) desire walking by foot; and (1) desires the subway. One respondent selected both car and uber/lyft as desired future mode of transportation.
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Additional free-response comments gathered from this survey indicate a preference for updated windows, new appliances, in-unit laundry, and updates (if the building is older), and availability of overnight parking for guests.

Conclusions and Recommendations
Based on the Subcommittee’s analysis there are opportunities to develop or reposition Beverly Hills’ housing stock to target Millennials / Young Professionals. The recommendations are listed below.

- Expanded survey – the limited pilot surveys that were conducted as part of this preliminary research can be expanded to get more significant and conclusive results regarding the needs and desires of young adults.

- Housing suitability study - additional research could be conducted to explore the suitability of various housing types to meet the needs of various groups. The study could address where in the City this housing would be most appropriate.

- Zoning Code analysis and recommendations to be completed after meeting with Planning Department.

FISCAL IMPACT
There is no fiscal impact associated with this report.

RECOMMENDATION
Staff and the Next Beverly Hills Housing Subcommittee recommend that the Next Beverly Hills Committee discuss the research presented and provide input on the future direction of the project if desired.

Once the Committee's input has been taken into account, the Memorandum will be submitted to City Council as a study session review item.
Attachment 1
# NEXT BEVERLY HILLS

**NEXT GENERATION HOUSING NEEDS**

## CH. 1: INTRODUCTION – MILLENNIALS & HOUSING NEEDS

### 1: THE FOUR LIVING GENERATIONS IN AMERICA

Millennials, also known as Generation Y, represent the demographic cohort that follows Generation X.

**Figure 1.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditionalists</th>
<th>Baby Boomers</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Millennials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Age</strong></td>
<td>71-100</td>
<td>52-70</td>
<td>36-51</td>
<td>16-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Names</strong></td>
<td>Veterans, Silent, Radio Babies, GIs</td>
<td>“Me” Generation, Moral Authority</td>
<td>Gen X, Xers, Post Boomers</td>
<td>Generation Y, Gen Y, 24/7s, Echo Boomers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influences</strong></td>
<td>WWII, Korean War, Great Depression, New Deal Raised by parents that just survived the Great Depression. Hard times growing up followed by prosperity.</td>
<td>Civil Rights, Vietnam War, Sexual Revolution, Cold War/Russia, Space travel Highest divorce rate and 2nd marriages. Grew up to be radicals of the 70s and yuppies of the 80s.</td>
<td>Watergate, Energy Crisis, Dual Income Families, Y2K, increased divorce rate Came of age when USA was losing its status as the most powerful nation in the world. Had to take care of themselves early on and watch their politicians lie and parents get laid off.</td>
<td>Digital Media, child focused world, school shootings, terrorist attacks, AIDS, 9/11 Many grew up as children of divorce They hope to be the next great generation and to turn around all the “wrong” they see in the world Kept busy as kids and were the first kids with schedules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Values</strong></td>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Anti-war</td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>Anti-government</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Avid consumers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sacrifice</td>
<td>Equal rights</td>
<td>Highly Educated</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Informality</td>
<td>Extreme fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delayed Reward</td>
<td>Loyal to children</td>
<td>Pragmatism</td>
<td>Highly tolerant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Focus</td>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>Seek life balance</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hard Work</td>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>Self-reliance</td>
<td>Like attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patriotism</td>
<td>Trust in government</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sociability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respect Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely tech savvy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust in Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOW!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>A dream</td>
<td>A birthright</td>
<td>A way to get there</td>
<td>Expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Ethic</strong></td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
<td>Driven</td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay your dues</td>
<td>Workaholics</td>
<td>Work smarter</td>
<td>Multitasking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work hard</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Eliminate the task</td>
<td>Tenacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>View on Work/Life Balance</strong></td>
<td>Work hard to maintain job security</td>
<td>Hesitant to take too much time off work for fear of losing their place</td>
<td>Focus on clearer balance between work and family.</td>
<td>Balance between work, life, community involvement and fun!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are some varying opinions on the exact range of Millennial births*

Millennials are the largest generation in the U.S. living today, representing one-third of the total U.S. population and growing. With the first of the Millennials in their mid-30s, most members of this generation are at the start of their careers and have very ambitious goals for their future. It goes without saying that Millennials will be a driving force of the U.S. economy in the coming decades and have already begun reshaping the offerings of many industries to suit their needs.

Millennials are a particularly interesting generation; in so far as they stand out and differ from other, there are severe overlaps with their predecessors. Millennials are the first generation to have had access to the Internet during their formative years, granting them an entitlement to quick information that previous generations do not share. Additionally, Millennials stand out as the most diverse (due to mass immigration) and educated generation to date: 42-percent identify with an ethnicity other than non-Hispanic white, doubling that statistic in the Baby Boomer generation. 61% of Millennials have attended college, starkly contrasting the 46% of Baby Boomers to have done so.

Figure 1.2

Millennials are also more likely to attend graduate school than previous generations. Among 18 to 34 year-olds, college enrollment stood at 19 percent in 2010, up from 15 percent in 1995. Graduate school enrollment for the same age group has increased at an even faster rate, jumping from 2.8 percent in 1995 to 3.8 percent in 2010 – a 35 percent increase. And although this education is proving to be quite expensive for Millennials, they have the highest earning potential of any generation previous straight out of school, and are relying on their education to find well-paying jobs.

2. Census Bureau – 2013 Census
3. Decennial Census and American Community Survey. NEED SOURCE INFO
4. 15 ECONOMIC FACTS ABOUT MILLENNIALS – The Council of Economic Advisers October 2014
Technology has shaped the playing field in which Millennial entrepreneurs compete. More connected to technology than any previous generations, a quarter of Millennials believe that their relationship to technology is what makes their generation unique. With the cost of computational power and storage, as well as the cost of distributing digital content exponentially diminished even over just the past thirty years, Millennials have come of age in a world where the possibilities of technology are endless. Although several well-known Millennials as Zuckerberg (Facebook) and Spiegel (Snapchat) found huge success in their 20s, this generation is just beginning to reach their peak in terms of entrepreneurship. More significant than entrepreneurial opportunities offered by processing power are the opportunities in communication. Millennials sleep next to their phones, constantly connected to one another (and even some tech savvy Gen Xers) through social media, text message and other media.

In summary, Millennials represent a highly educated, highly connected and fast moving group of ambitious, social, and entitled individuals who like to work hard and play hard. Having seen significantly less crisis in their own backyards than did previous generations, Millennials have a certain lightheartedness about them. With information at their fingertips and the ability to Skype with someone across the world with only their internet speed as a barrier, it is not surprising that this newly evolved cohort of our population would have some unique needs and demands. This rings true we see in what Millennials find appealing in the housing market.

3: HOUSING – WHAT MILLENNIALS WANT

3.1 RENT NOW, BUY LATER

U.S. Millennial housing desires tend to vary based on geographic location and landscapes (city, suburban, coastal, mountainous, desert, etc.) Nevertheless, there are certain patterns in Millennial life cycles that appear universal and are significant in helping to understand “What Millennials Want.” Most noticeably Millennials, having the longest life expectancy of any living generation, are experiencing life cycle events later. Buying houses and forming families have become delayed priorities for a plethora of reasons:

Delayed Marriage: Since 1950, the median age at which both men and women have married has steadily increased. In 1950, men and women married at 22.8 and 20.3 years of age respectively. By 2013 those numbers have increased to 29 and 26.6 years of age.7

Education & Career Priorities: In a similar trend, more Millennials are pursuing post graduate degrees than ever before, resulting in many having to take student loans as the cost of education has increased drastically. This drives Millennials to find more financially rewarding careers and lower their expenses.7

Labor Market Decline & Recession: Entering adulthood during the Great Recession and a depressed labor market. Housing decisions are often linked with job prospects, so Millennials will remain renters to maintain flexibility to take opportunities that may come their way in the future.7

Money Borrowing Difficulties: Millennials are likely to face challenges obtaining mortgage credit considering approximately 67% of the population has a credit score under 680.

7. 15 ECONOMIC FACTS ABOUT MILLENNIALS – The Council of Economic Advisers October 2014
Nevertheless, growing up in an ever-connected technological world, a Millennial would be hard-pressed to become reclusive and give up sociability on account of saving money. Thus we understand the preference amongst Millennials to stay renters longer and find buildings offering smaller more affordable units and great common area amenities.

### 3.2 Millennial Housing Preferences

**Urban Living:** Urban living in the United States has seen a resurgence during Millennials’ lifetimes. In keeping with this trend, Millennials are more likely to live in urban areas than earlier generations. The move toward cities has been greater among the college educated, who have increased their likelihood of living in both large and mid-sized cities. Overall, 73 percent of 25 to 34 year-olds with a college education were living in large or mid-sized cities in 2011, compared to 67 percent in 1980. College graduate Millennials are also more likely to live in a coastal city than their counterparts.\(^8\)

Figure 1.3\(^9\)

As of September 2014, Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim Metropolitan Statistical Area was the #2 most popular market with affluent Millennials (Households of 18-35 year olds with incomes over $75,000). It had 254,929 of these households. It ranked only behind New York-Newark-Jersey City MSA (487,858 households).\(^9\)

---

8. The Millennial Generation’s Influence on Real Estate Demand RCLCO September 29, 2014 Gregg Logan
Walkability: Living in urban areas, Millennials are less likely to own cars-vehicle ownership rates are declining. In 2011, 66% of those under age 25 owned a car, contrasted with 73% in 2007. A large majority of Millennials want access to better transit options and less reliance on a vehicle as cars can be expensive and burdensome to maintain and park. More than half of Millennials surveyed say they would consider moving to another city if it had better public transportation options and 66% listed public transportation as one of their top three criteria in deciding where to live.

Figure 1.10

Some preferences vary by generation

Millennials are more interested in being within easy walking distance of places and having public transit nearby. Both Millennials and Gen Xers are more interested in sidewalks and bike lanes and paths.


10 The Rockefeller Foundation. Access to Public Transportation a Top Criterion for Millennials When Deciding Where to Live, New Survey Shows. April 22, 2014


Millennials from different areas of the country show variance in their preference and priorities in choosing new living locations; despite this difficult in pinpointing all-encompassing preferences, the below listed represent the large majority of Millennials.
3.3 OVERLAP WITH BABY BOOMERS

The American Planning Association report titled “Investing in Place” compiled results from a survey including 1,040 Americans, half Millennials and half Baby Boomers. Part of the objective was to show that the two groups have similar desires when it comes to housing.

Whether the community is a small town, suburban or an urban center, 49% of respondents said they would prefer to live in a walkable community while only 7% indicated that they preferred to drive most places. Over 75% noted the importance of affordable and convenient transportation options and the desire to have local entertainment and shopping options.

One of the most striking findings of this survey is the sharp decline across demographic groups of interest in traditional, auto-dependent suburban living. Fewer than 10 percent of Millennials, Gen Xers, or Active Boomers see themselves in this type of community in the future despite 40 percent of them living there today.

---

12 The Millennial Generation’s Influence on Real Estate Demand RCLCO September 29, 2014 Gregg Logan
This doesn’t mean they are universally forsaking suburbs. Instead, the data indicate a desire for living in various types of communities — urban, suburban, rural and small town alike — but with greater mobility options, particularly walkability, and easy access to key amenities. Auto use, while continuing to be dominant, is plateauing.¹⁴

**Figure 1.12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community A: (conventional suburb) Houses with large yards and you have to drive to the places you need to go.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silent/ Greatest Generation (Born 1944 or before) 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers (Born 1945 to 1964) 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X (Born 1965 to 1980) 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial (Born 1981 or later) 42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community B: (walkable community) Houses with small yards and it is easy to walk to the places you need to go.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silent/ Greatest Generation (Born 1944 or before) 48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers (Born 1945 to 1964) 53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X (Born 1965 to 1980) 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial (Born 1981 or later) 51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These two pillar generations have strong commonalities in what they look for from their community. The American Planning Association examination of the attitudes of Millennials and Active Boomers. Of course they do not agree on everything, but this study finds them similarly eager for communities that offer key design amenities and choices. “Strikingly, both groups embrace intergenerational diversity, seek greater options for accessibility and walkability, and worry about savings and cost of living.”¹³

---

**56% of Millennials**  \**46% of Active Boomers**

**WOULD PREFER TO LIVE SOMEDAY IN A WALKABLE COMMUNITY, WHETHER AN URBAN, SUBURBAN OR SMALL TOWN LOCATION.**

**Only eight percent of Millennials and seven percent of Active Boomers** prefer living if they can afford it in a suburb that requires driving to most places.


81% of Millennials and 77% of Active Boomers say affordable and convenient transportation alternatives to the car are at least somewhat important when deciding where to live and work.

Majorities of both Millennials (59%) and Active Boomers (58%) said there are not enough transportation alternatives where they live.

These two groups represent the largest cohort of our population today, and as such represent the largest market, the most money, the greatest potential.
The following section describes the general characteristics of the City of Beverly Hills population, workforce, demographics and housing. Analyzing these current characteristics uncovers trends and provides valuable insight into the housing needs of the community. The information contained in this section was compiled from the City of Beverly Hills 2013-2021 Housing Element of the City's General Plan.

1: GENERAL POPULATION & DEMOGRAPHICS

Given that the City of Beverly Hills is a built out urban environment with very little vacant land, the population of the City of Beverly Hills tends to remain relatively stable over time. The U.S. Census documents Beverly Hills' 2010 population at 34,109, representing an increase of approximately 325 residents over the decade (2000-2010). In total, the City experienced a 6% rate of growth from 1990-2000 and a 1% growth from 2000-2010 (see table 1 for more information on general population.)

Figure 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>1990 Number</th>
<th>1990 Percent</th>
<th>2010 Number</th>
<th>2010 Percent</th>
<th>L.A. County %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preschool (&lt;5 yrs)</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Age (5-17 yrs)</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4,897</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Age (18-24 yrs)</td>
<td>2,526</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2,969</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adults (25-44 yrs)</td>
<td>9,655</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>8,540</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Age (45-64 yrs)</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9,904</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors (65+ years)</td>
<td>6,490</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6,516</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31,971</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>34,109</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: U.S. Census 1990 and 2010

Notably, the City has experienced a decrease in the young adult population (25-44 years) over the past several decades. Both the proportion and number of young adults declined during the past two decades, decreasing from 30% to 25% (a total decline of 1,100 residents). At the same time, there has been an increased population of middle adults (45-64 years) with an increase of approximately 2,000 residents. We infer from this chart that there is a limited number of new young adults moving into the city; however, some older young adults have settled in the city and had their kids here. Another important conclusion one may draw from this chart is that the City of Beverly Hills simply does not cater to the young adult demographic as this is the only age group whose population has declined in the last ten years. Finally, take note of the senior demographic concentration, comprising 19% of the city’s population, far greater than the proportion of seniors populating the county at 11%.
2: Households & Demographics

2.1 Composition

The City of Beverly Hills has within its boundaries approximately 14,896 households. According to census information similar to the above figure, the City of Beverly Hills has a lower incidence of households with children than does the rest of the Los Angeles County. 57% of households in Beverly Hills are comprised of families with children contrasted with 68% of households in Los Angeles County. Conversely the City of Beverly Hills has a much higher instance of single-person households than the county as a whole (36% vs 24%). Due to this phenomenon, the average household size in the City (2.29 persons per unit) is below that of the County (2.98 persons per unit). The Beverly Hills Housing Element contemplates that this is due in part to the large number of senior citizens living in the City of Beverly Hills.

2.2 Economics

The state and federal government classify household income into groups based on the median income at the county level. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the income level for the households in the City in 2010.

Figure 2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Income</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate Income</td>
<td>8,462</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,415</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


While the majority of the households in the City are “above moderate” income households (which means they make more than 120% of the area median income), 28% of the households in the City, nearly one third, earn less than 80% of the area median income. For a breakdown of the income limits, see Table 3.
2.3 Workforce

The United States Census information also reveals interesting trends related to the workforce in the City of Beverly Hills. For example, approximately one-third of the employment base in the City is characterized by lower paying jobs in sectors like retail, hospitality, restaurant, and service jobs. The wages for these jobs are generally much lower than would be necessary to live in the City of Beverly Hills. Accordingly, the vast majority of individuals who work in the City commute from outside City limits (95% of workers). This is indicative of the shortage of housing that is affordable to those who work in the City, and is one cause of the traffic congestion experienced in the community.

3: Current Housing Stock Profile

3.1 Overview & Character

Like the population, the housing stock in the City of Beverly Hills tends to remain relatively constant over time with a slight increase. The 2010 Census documented 16,394 housing units in the City, which represents a total of 539 new units since 2000 or about 3% growth. During the 1990s the housing stock in the City grew by less than one percent, which is a similar level of growth to that of the other Westside cities. This limited growth partially is due to the limited supply of land for new residential developments in the region.
**Size:** 36% of the housing stock in the City is classified as single family homes. The remainder (about 64%) is comprised of multi-family units, with a majority of these units (51%) in buildings with more than five units. See below for detailed characterization of the current City housing stock.

Figure 2.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type 1990-2010, Beverly Hills</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Units</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family Detached</td>
<td>5,611</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Attached and Detached</td>
<td>5,831</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family 2-4 Units</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family 5+ Units</td>
<td>8,172</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Multi-Family</td>
<td>9,815</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Homes, Trailer &amp; Other</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>15,723</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Age:** 60% of housing in the City is more than 50 years old. This can be a concern when considering the sizable portion of the population that are senior citizens. Senior citizens generally have a more difficult time maintaining space, when older units would generally need more maintenance. Not to mention the fact that since these older units were built, building and safety codes have changed immensely. See below for detailed aging report for City housing.

Figure 2.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Structure Built</th>
<th>Renter Occupied</th>
<th>Percent Renter</th>
<th>Owner Occupied</th>
<th>Percent Owner</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005 or later</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2004</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1999</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1989</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1979</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td>1409</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>1282</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 or earlier</td>
<td>2450</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2789</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,516</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** U.S. Census 2005-09 American Community Survey.
Attachment 2
Next Beverly Housing Visioning Results

When possible, input was categorized into the following categories: “Amenities”, “Building and Unit Qualities”, “Location”, and “Other”. Comments that did not fall into a specific category, or that expanded upon a category are also provided in the summary below. A total of 13 Next Beverly members provided comments.

### Amenities

A total of 25 comments were received related to building/housing amenities.

Other comments related to amenities include:

“Structured layouts that encourage socializing and meeting people within the complex(es) like recreational rooms; or organized activities around the neighborhood that allow residents to get to know one another as well as the community”

“Less important - Club type nightlife (as long as there is access to public transit they feel they would prefer to travel to it vs. have it close to home)” and “multiple parking spaces”
Building and Unit Qualities

A total of 22 comments were received relating to the qualities of housing buildings and units.

![Bar chart showing the distribution of comments on different building and unit qualities.]

Other Comments related to building and unit qualities:

“I think something that matters less is unit size, people are willing to live in smaller units to be in a desirable location in an amenity rich building”

“reasonable rent in quality space (light & thoughtful design)”

“passive energy: design elements that allow easier heating and cooling function for the interiors, also lowering utilities and less maintenance for the landlords”

“Open space- If we are looking at smaller units, I believe keeping it as open as possible might make it seem bigger or a more efficient use of space”

Location

A total of 19 comments were received relating to location of housing.

![Bar chart showing the distribution of comments on different location factors.]

Location
Other comments received related to location include:

“Cool X-factor for residence AND neighborhood”

“luxury apartments within a major shopping & entertainment center like Rick Caruso’s The Americana at Brand or the Grove”

“dog-friendly places like parks or walking paths (the Wilshire / La Cienega is perfect for this because of the proximity to the La Cienega Park)”

“public and city transportation (again, ideal because of the subway station that will be at the corner) but additionally, a city bike station would be useful since some young professionals who move to Beverly Hills / West Hollywood may not own a vehicle”

“Proximity- As the greater LA area grows, the neighborhoods shrink. If we put these buildings near Wilshire and La Cienega with a carless tenant in mind, where will they be able to walk? The closest grocery store requires transportation, restaurants on restaurant row are expensive and more family oriented. Entertainment (nightlife, etc.) is not very close. I understand many of these concerns may be solved by the mixed use part of the development, but how many need to be built to make it sustainable/attractive?”

Other

A total of 19 comments were received that are classified as “other”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>community feel/friendly/welcoming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other young people</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prestige/“cool”/luxury</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safety/security</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affordable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landlord attentiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nice weather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other

Other comments received in the “other” category include:

“Rent increase annually is too high (10%)”

“I think the most important aspect for young people is affordability as it pertains to housing”
Other General Comments and Ideas expressed include:

1. Luxury apartments within a major shopping & entertainment center like Rick Caruso's *The Americana at Brand* and *The Grove* (see: [http://apartments.americanaatbrand.com](http://apartments.americanaatbrand.com)).

2. Turning the planned Metro station in Beverly Hills into an entertainment center similar to the Hollywood/Highland Metro station (see: [http://hollywoodandhighland.com](http://hollywoodandhighland.com) and [https://www.caesars.com/la/thingsto-do](https://www.caesars.com/la/thingsto-do)) with housing within or surrounding (see: [http://www.thepalazzocommunities.com](http://www.thepalazzocommunities.com)) the center.

3. Developing residences within hotels and attracting new developments combining hotel and residential spaces (see: [https://www.montagehotels.com/beverlyhills/residences/residential-ownership/](https://www.montagehotels.com/beverlyhills/residences/residential-ownership/)).

4. Beautifying, remodeling and redesigning the La Cienega and Wilshire area to match the style and feel of the Golden Triangle, creating a fresh, new business and social gathering spot in town. People don’t tend to frequent this area and its surroundings as it is right now; it is old, unattractive and needs revitalization.

5. Creating a new district where hip clubs, dining and shopping are open late night, like in West Hollywood. Young professionals like to go out at night.

6. Upscale housing appealing to recent college graduates, similar to luxury apartments by USC (see: [http://www.tuscanyfig.com](http://www.tuscanyfig.com), [http://www.thelorenzo.com](http://www.thelorenzo.com), [http://www.theorsini.com](http://www.theorsini.com)).

7. A town center neighborhood/village (see: [https://village.usc.edu](https://village.usc.edu), [http://la.curbed.com/archives/2015/07/ivy_station_culver_city_expo_line.php#more](http://la.curbed.com/archives/2015/07/ivy_station_culver_city_expo_line.php#more) and [http://runyongroup.com/project/platform](http://runyongroup.com/project/platform)).

8. Shuttle service within the city, self-driving or otherwise (see: [http://www.labusinessjournal.com/news/2015/jun/01/taking-wheel-transit/](http://www.labusinessjournal.com/news/2015/jun/01/taking-wheel-transit/)). One of the reasons of the lack of activity in the Southeast portion of the city is the issue of parking. A regular shuttle service would help solve this issue and draw people into living a development in this area."

“I believe that any housing initiative we pursue maintain as little government involvement as possible. Developers should be the one making decisions and not the city. The city should not partner with a developer and the city should not be involved in the development process, with the exception of issuing permits and making sure things are up to code. Furthermore, any plan issued by the city must ensure that eminent domain will not be used in an effort to jumpstart any project.

Like most residents I believe that housing in our city should stick with and maintain our city's integrity. We should not be constructing micro apartments that stifle individual’s ability to have space. We should maintain the city’s family friendly atmosphere by maintaining the need for housing that has parking for residents.”
Attachment 3
Next Beverly Survey Results

2nd housing survey

Q1. Participants indicated that parking is an important aspect of housing for the Next Beverly members. Please elaborate on the importance of parking in housing developments. Some things to think about: Is it important to you to have multiple parking spaces per unit? One parking spot per unit? Un-bundled parking (where renting a parking spot is optional and the cost of parking is separate from cost of monthly rent)? Should there be more/less guest spots? Should there be lower parking requirements, or higher parking requirements?

- Very important. One parking spot per unit at least. Option to pay for two. Tandem not preferable. Guest spots are important. I wouldn't live somewhere where there was the possibility my guests could not park in the building or on the street with ease.

- It depends on the available street parking options in the area. Permitted street parking or no? I don't believe it necessary to have multiple, but probably one spot per unit.

- More guest spots or easy guest permit process (possibly online?) Parking separate from rent.

- First off, I HIGHLY recommend reading Donald Shoup's book The High Cost of Free Parking. It lays out such a perfect dissection of how cities offer and price parking. There is a great article on Medium (https://medium.com/@scottforman/autonomous-cars-and-the-end-of-parking-2610202f8dc#.om5ibapao) recently that discusses autonomous cars and the end of parking. Shoup has the answer: charge the right price for on-street parking, dedicate at least some of the revenue generated to local improvements, and eliminate minimum parking requirements everywhere. It's better for businesses, it's better for the environment, it's better for housing affordability, it's better in every way you can imagine. And there are real-world examples. Old Town Pasadena, for instance, is an astounding success story for exactly these policies—utterly transformed in 10 years by an enlightened stance on parking. We are within a 10-year window where the cost of owning a car just won't make sense any more for most people. When my lease is up in 18 months I might actually opt for that world. When we reduce private car ownership we effectively end the need for parking, especially if we get smart about development and laying out our city in a more multimodal manner. I think guest spaces should be provided, but not more and not without a charge. And I LOVE the idea of bundling parking from the cost of a unit, especially for new developments near the subway stop. I recognize that many long time Angelinos can't get their head around valet stand after valet stand, but it's not only "Next", it's practically already here. We need to plan for this.

- One parking space is a necessity. Two would be nice as I really don't know anyone personally that just uses public transportation. We love our cars in this town.

- I think parking is very important because personal transportation is going to be here for quite a while in the foreseeable future, regardless of new technologies or new public transportation projects. Depending on the number of occupants in a unit, there should be one to two parking spaces allotted per unit with the option to receive discounted rates for not using the allotted parking spaces. Entertaining guests is a big part of life, so great consideration should be placed on guest spots, especially since there is currently a lack of parking structures in the proposed Southeast area of Beverly Hills we are looking into. That being said, parking requirements could be a barrier to housing development, so we should lower parking requirements and be very flexible. We want to help spur economic development in Southeast Beverly Hills. In addition, we should also look into ways on how to make street parking in Beverly Hills easier and convenient for residents and visitors.

- There should be a hybrid approach of 1 space per unit as a minimum with 2 spaces for a 3 bed unit. Then place an option for renting additional spaces on a user pays basis.
• I think at least one parking spot is necessary for each unit. I think any additional spots should be un-bundled. Regarding guest spots, a small number of guest stalls is helpful but street parking is also a good option for guest parking.

• Ideal, but not required to have multiple parking spots. Would be nice for Renters to receive rebates towards parking permits.

• I think un-bundled would be a good compromise. I believe parking is very important. If the street has available parking, they can always get a permit.

• I believe parking spots are important 1 or 2 max. I think the parking spot can be optional and a separate cost from monthly. Guest parking would be good too, but not necessary.

• I think parking is incredibly important on the whole more so for the amenities that are wanted locally I would think. If the next generation is interested in having an area densely populated with bars and restaurants, there will need to be parking because those facilities won’t thrive on resident patrons alone.

• Parking should be considered for all tenants. It may be beneficial to have 1 mandatory spot with the option of purchasing additional spots based on single or double occupancy.

• Parking is definitely an important aspect of housing in Beverly Hills, since street parking tends to have limitations. Primarily there should be parking available for residents of the development. One parking spot for a single or one-bedroom and two for a two-bedroom unit seem adequate for inclusion in rental rates and any additional spaces could cost extra. Guest parking would be ideal; some developments regulate this with valet parking where a guest will be admitted based on the unit number they are visiting. Some developments have designated visitor spots with time limits. The larger the housing development, the more possibility there is for guest parking; however, monitoring its use becomes more challenging.

• It depends on whether we’re talking rent vs. own. Personally, I’d never buy a property without parking. I’d want at least 1 spot for a studio and 2 spots for 2-3BR. Unbundled is a nice option but again that depends on whether we’re talking about rent vs. own. I’d only consider that if I was renting a place. I would have a few guest spots but that really depends on the number of units in the condo/apt complex. 1 may be enough for a 30-unit complex but it’s too little for a 50-unit complex for example. I don’t know what you mean by lower/higher parking requirements.

• There should be a parking space per bedroom and guest parking.

Q2. A number of participants in the initial visioning activity indicated that unit size was an important aspect for housing. Please elaborate on this topic. Some things to think about: What does this mean to you? Do you think smaller/larger units are preferable for housing for younger residents? Why/why not? Would you be interested in smaller units if the community amenities in a housing complex were larger/more expansive? (for reference, current City regulations require the following minimum unit sizes: efficiency unit - 600 square feet, one bedroom unit - 1,000 square feet, two bedroom unit - 1,300 square feet, three or more bedroom unit - 1,500 square feet)

• I think smaller units are find for younger residents. 600 sq ft is perfect for a single young person. Amenities are a huge perk and draw, such as a gym. I would pay more if there was a clean gym with enough machines to avoid a wait.

• Minimum unit sizes could be smaller across the board if they were initially designed to use the space more efficiently.

• Smaller units are attractive if there are nice common spaces including outdoor bbq and lounge areas. Not as many young people entertain at their own homes, so large private units are not as desirable as they might have been to previous generations who entertained more.
- Smaller would be fine, but I don't like the "microapartment" trend we've seen in San Francisco and some other cities. I think there's a balance between reducing existing regulations and livability. I've been beyond happy with 900 sq feet for 12 years. It's home, but it also motivates me to leave the house and socialize in West Hollywood and Beverly Hills, usually on foot. It builds far great community and allows for more units. I've also lived in and spent considerable time in Europe, and have seen firsthand how they live over there. It's far better lifestyle IMHO--and I'm from the Midwest where everyone has a 5000 sq ft mega-mansion in the middle of nowhere.

- This is tough because I personally need space for office use. So living with my g/f, I would need a 2200 sq. ft. minimum (with our dogs).

- I would only be in favor of smaller units if they significantly brought down the cost of rental, making it easier for young adults to be able to afford living in Beverly Hills. I am not at all interested in larger, more expansive community amenities in favor of sacrificing the size of living units. Your living space is where you spend the majority of your time, and I would not sacrifice my comfort in favor of having an Olympic-size swimming pool or the like.

- Current unit sizes are based on outdated by laws and should be more aligned with trends and needs of today's market. Creating a built environment that is well thought through both as a single building and on a wider community level will enable provision of common facilities that cater better to today's market. What does this mean in terms of unit size - it means that a more attainable (not necessarily affordable) rental is able to be achieved via unit sizes as follows - 1 bed is very comfortably accommodated in 600-700 square feet and 2 bed 700-900 with 3 bed 1200 and up. This combined with well thought through common areas both in the building and in the community will provide for a very comfortable living environment.

- I think smaller units are an attractive option to be in an amenity rich building, I think the right size for one bedroom units is between 600 - 800 sf and 800 - 1000 sf for two bedroom units.

- I like things the way they currently are (1,000 sq ft units), but would appreciate greater standards for landlords to maintain building units to avoid run down buildings (as seen on South Rexford, South Elm, etc.).

- I would prefer larger. It seems the trend in housing construction is smaller units with larger price tags. This could be something that differentiates BH from other places.

- I think with open concept units, smaller unit sizes would be less of an issue and if that would make them more affordable (to build and to rent or sell) then it's a win-win for all. Seeing more mixed use buildings would also be a plus.

- Smaller housing is most definitely preferable for younger people as they generally do not have families and do not spend a whole lot of time in their apartments between work and socializing.

- For young residents of Beverly Hills, a range in unit sizing is desirable. Many young people live in singles or studios of 500-600 square feet and some choose to live with roommates in 2-4 bedroom units as this tends to be a more cost-effective situation. Having both options would be ideal for a residential development. Amenities in the housing complex are important and I think a lot of young residents would sacrifice some square footage in order to have more expansive common areas like a laundry room, gym, pool, grass for pets, movie theatre, etc. Young people tend to value amenities that promote socialization and a more convenient quality of life. In regards to City regulation, unit sizes seem appropriate and I think an efficiency unit could even go down to 500 square feet for young residents.

- These limits seem reasonable but I think it depends on what millennials typically can afford for housing. If the average millennial pays $2000 for rent and a 1300 square foot unit goes for $2000+ then maybe those limits need to be looked at. But, I'm not sure this can be answered without looking at what people are paying on average for these size units in the LA area.
- 1000-1200 for a one bedroom is adequate.

Q3. A majority of comments related to location indicated that Next Beverly participants were interested in living in a walkable neighborhood with amenities nearby. Please elaborate on what this means to you. Some things to think about: Can you think of an area in Beverly Hills that exemplifies this idea? What about an area outside of the City? Would you live in a mixed use building, why or why not?

- I think South Beverly is somewhat walkable, and the Rodeo area is extremely walkable. I look for coffee shops, places with outdoor seating, wifi, etc. Abbott Kinney is a good example, although it could stand to have more outside seating.

- The areas east and west of S. Beverly are walkable to nearly everything the city has to offer. Would for sure live in a mixed use building. Love the feeling of living in the middle of the city.

- I would love to live in a mixed use building. And I would HAVE to be near a walkable neighborhood. I’m sure you all know Walk Score (https://www.walkscore.com/). I lived in San Francisco for 8 years prior to moving to LA. My Walk Score here at 421 N Doheny Dr is 88, a better score than all 7 of my SF residences, and each of them was in a great neighborhood. It should be noted that my Bike Score is only 53 with notes that it’s “Flat as a pancake, minimal bike lanes.” That of course is another conversation... :) My Walk Score is that high because of what I have to my east in West Hollywood more than what lies west to me. I wouldn’t care if the mixed use building was inside the triangle on the outskirts, so long as it was highly walkable.

- Reeves Dr. is a great example of what’s great because it’s a quiet street, but so close to everything on Beverly Drive. A mixed use building would be cool depending on what was below. Not a restaurant due to the noise, but a store that closed at 6, absolutely.

- I think the Golden Triangle area of Beverly Hills best represents a walkable neighborhood with amenities nearby. It is a clean, attractive and vibrant area full of life and energy and is where most residents and visitors congregate. Everything you need is in the area within walking distance—restaurants, stores, parks, residential areas, etc. The idea of living in an apartment complex in the Southeast portion of Beverly Hills, especially in the area by the planned Metro station, is very unattractive to me not only because it is far-removed from the Golden Triangle, which is the center of our town, but because that area lacks appeal—it is old, dirty and run-down looking and it feels empty and far-removed from the beautiful, fresh, welcoming and elegant atmosphere of the Golden Triangle. I think building a brand new, modern apartment complex in this part of town is a step towards the direction of revitalizing the area, and I hope it leads to a movement of altering its landscape to better represent the world-class reputation of Beverly Hills. I think a mixed used apartment building would be perfect, as a start, in an area with little amenities nearby.

- It means having shops, restaurants, schools, parks and transport nearby. This can be achieved with the right zoning changes and associated initiatives by the city to enable this to form in areas such as the south east corner. I would live in a mixed use building - they have great benefits that would work very well in and add value to the south east corner.

- Walkability is important. I view walkability as the ability to accomplish errands (grocery shopping, drugstore, fast/casual dining, services ie dry cleaning, salon, etc) on foot. In addition, the presence of sidewalks and the feeling of safety also further contribute to an areas walkability. There are parts of Beverly Hills that offer walkability now, in particular the streets to the east and west of South Beverly Dr. Outside the City there are many more examples including Downtown Santa Monica, pretty much all of West Hollywood, parts of Hollywood. I would definitely live in a mixed use building. It would add convenient amenities to the building.

- Beverly Hills is now only walkable for those living near the West side of Wilshire, near Santa Monica Blvd, or those near South Robertson. Would be nice to have more community-friendly cafes and stores near the East side of Wilshire, and along W Olympic.
- The triangle is great. Coffee, restaurants, retail, nightlife (sort of), and parking. Other people are also walking so I get to run into people I know. I work in this area so having this added feature makes me feel more involved in the community... I would love in a mixed use building.

- Yes, a mixed use building would be great. It would be similar to what is seen in other cities like NYC and San Francisco. Promotes local spending, convenience for families with small children and people who like to walk instead of drive. Also, if the trend is toward less people owning cars and driving and using Uber (as mentioned in our group) then mixed use concept would need to be incorporated to make living in BH more attractive.

- It would be very cool in my opinion to have some activity based amenities, such as a color me mine or something maybe not as dated.

- Walkability is a very desirable trait in residential living for young adults and becomes more and more accessible as the City continues to develop. A walkable neighborhood means that not only do residents feel comfortable strolling outside, but that there are also amenities nearby like grocery stores, pharmacies, restaurants, shops, theatres, etc. Mixed use buildings are great for promoting walkability because residents don’t have to get in a car or other modes of transportation in order to run errands. They are also a great incentive for developers because retail space generates high income so that residential units can be more reasonably priced. Many young residents work long hours so having a market or restaurant nearby is quite convenient. The southeast of Beverly Hills as well as West Hollywood are two examples of walkable neighborhoods. Parks are also a great amenity that promote walking around and are great places for walking dogs.

- Walkable is Colorado Blvd in Pasadena or Georgetown in Washington, DC or Boston or Chicago. It means easy and safe access to the necessities (groceries, services) and easy and safe access to public transportation. Overall it means easy access to the people and places that make one’s life better.

- Mixed use yes. Close to shops is ideal

Q4. Many participants in the initial visioning activity indicated that living near amenities is important. What amenities are important to you? Do you have concerns about living near any amenities?

- Gym, trader joe’s, grocery stores, pharmacies, drugstores.

- Bars, restaurants, coffee shops, convenience/grocery stores are at the top of the list. I live near all of the amenities currently. It's great to live in the middle of the city, but parking is almost always an issue for me, despite the fact that I live on a street that’s permit parking only.

- Functional amenities like dry cleaner, grocery store, gym, but also open spaces like park/garden

- Bike lanes (that connect!), public transportation, parks, coffee shops, fitness (yoga, HIIT, etc.), restaurants and shared spaces are all very important to me.


- I see great potential in the Southeast portion of Beverly Hills and would love to see more high-end hotels, restaurants, nightclubs, gyms, social hangouts, entertainment centers, etc. A grocery store would be a great convenience. I think a vibrant, new atmosphere would be attractive, and I wouldn't have concerns living near them.

- convenience shops, restaurants, parks, school
• The amenities that are important to me are grocery store, drugstore, nail/hair salon, dry cleaner, fitness (gym, pilates, yoga, etc), fast casual restaurants, coffee shops. I don't have concerns about living near any amenities.
• Affordable but quality restaurants (similar to Walter's), proximity to grocery store, banks.
• I wouldn't want to live next to a nightclub. Good amenities are retail, grocery, entertainment (movie theater, playhouse, etc), food, coffee, gym, etc.
• grocery store, local restaurant/bar, laundry facility
• Market, Restaurants, Bank
• Restaurants
• The most important amenities in my opinion are markets, laundry room / laundromat, restaurants, shopping/retail, movie theatres, parks, pharmacies. For young professionals, living near these places promotes convenience, socialization, and cuts down on transportation.
• Parks, recreation centers, gyms.
• No concerns. Pool, gym, Wifi lounging.

Q5. What would you consider to be an "affordable" price for monthly rent for a one bedroom unit? What would you consider to be an affordable sale price for a one bedroom condo?

• $1200-$1800
• $2,000 Rent $500,000 Condo
• $1,200/month $650K/purchase
• Rent: $1500-$1800 Purchase: $600,000
• 1 bedroom rental - 1500 1 bedroom condo for sale - 300,000
• I think somewhere in the $1000 - $1500 price range would be considered affordable for a one bedroom unit monthly rent. As for an affordable sale price for a one bedroom condo, I think somewhere in the $100,000 - $300,000 price range would be considered affordable.
• One bedroom for rent: $2,000 - $3,500 One bedroom for sale: $600,000 - $1,000,000
• I don't think we are talking affordable but rather attainable. In this instance we are talking about rental of $4/sft and selling prices ranging from $600-$1000/sft
• $1,700/$1,800 for 1 bedroom rent.
• $1250.00 including utilities. Because after all this is Beverly Hills, and it should be more expensive than other rents in the city. Most people in this age range pay between $750 and $1100 for an apartment. Given that this would be new construction most likely etc, I think a bit of a premium applies and many young professionals would be willing to sacrifice an extra $150 in disposable income to live in an awesome pad.
• $1500-$1700. Condo- Under $400k
• $1500 $255,000
• For a one-bedroom unit, an "affordable" rental price would be between $1,000-$1,400. And an affordable sale price for a condo would be $300-400K.
• $2000/month for a 1BR rental and $375,000-$400,000 for one bedroom condo.
• $1800 $500k
Q6. There were a number of amenities that were mentioned in the initial visioning activity. Please rank these amenities in order of how important they are to you in housing (1 is more important).

Q7. In your opinion, what would be the ideal size (in square feet) of a one bedroom unit?

- 900
- 800
- 800 sq ft
- 1300 sq ft
- 1,000 square feet
- 700
- 700-800
- 1,000 sq ft
- 800 SF
- Don't know
- 750-1,500 square feet
- 600-700
- 1200

Q8. A number of comments received during the initial visioning activity indicated that housing that is perceived to be "prestigious" "cool" or "luxury housing" is desirable. Is that important to you? What does this mean to you?
Sure. Having an instant community, where you can meet people on your rooftop is desirable.

Yes, smaller and stylish, would be more desirable than bigger and ugly.

Not important Safe and accessible is more important.

Not at all. I couldn't hate the word "luxury" more. If you're attempting to attract the kind of person who cares about luxury, you'll never change the composition of the city and attract younger people. It'll be more of the same. Younger people care about value. They care about connecting. That's why they spend their money to go to Coachella and care about Instagram like. Ridiculously expensive handbags... notsomuch. I've always been embarrassed about my 90210 zip code. I love Beverly Hills because it's clean and central.

Not really.

Yes, very much so, especially in an upscale area as Beverly Hills. A prestigious, luxury unit to me, in general, would entail a beautiful, modern and elegant living space with the feel of living in an upscale hotel, like the Montage or the Peninsula

I think that is particularly important to young people who are moving to Los Angeles. I think it means new units in a highly amenitized building with other young people.

Yes it is important. I think that the housing we are talking about should be more "cool" "funky" rather than prestigious/luxury as it needs to be attainable and with smaller apartment sizes and the location of the SE corner, it wont be seen as at the top end of luxury. I think this positioning is important to understand.

By cool, I mean comfortable and well-maintained. Buildings should be upgraded with stronger internet, central AC, laundry units, and updated painting and landscaping on the exterior.

Nice construction & finishes. Luxury however implies expensive.

Of course it's important. I feel location is more important. "Cool" wears off. I feel people mainly want clean, easy and functional.

updated kitchen and bath and open concept is what is desirable to me as well as on-site laundry and parking.

For young residents I don't think it's important to have very luxurious or prestigious housing since the main concern seems to be affordability. However, this does not mean that the spaces shouldn't be design savvy and space efficient. There should be design sense and creativity incorporated that is not only aesthetically pleasing but also helps drive maintenance costs down.

All of those things are in the branding of the building and complex but I think related items include amenities, interior design, great finishes, high-end appeal, etc.

New is cool. Modern is ideal.

Q9. Is there anything else you would like to add? Is there any housing related topic you would like the group to discuss?

- Bike lanes and multimodal urban design - How do we move people in and throughout as efficiently as possible? 2. Wooing next generation businesses - People want to live where they work. Before I began consulting, I headed up companies in Hollywood and then Santa Monica. One of the reasons I never purchased a condo is that I hate commuting and didn't want to commit to an area until I started up my own company and new we be locked into an area for a while. The composition of workers in this city is changing drastically. Most of these new companies are anchoring on the Westside (SaMo, Venice, Playa Vista) or East (DTLA, Hollywood, Koreatown). I think it's important to recruit some of these companies to Beverly Hills.
• I think the idea of building a new housing complex is not only a long-term goal, but a finite one. It will take years, possibly decades, to see something like this come into fruition and when we finally do have an apartment complex, it only opens up space for a relatively small amount of people depending on however many units are available. I think in the meantime, we should be focusing on improving the retention of our residents, in addition to looking into plans for future development. Being that Beverly Hills is a renter-majority city, this is a very important concern. We should see how we could implement rent control to prevent the market and landlords from increasing rent so much that it forces renters out of the city. This is a scenario I’ve seen quite often. People may live here for a couple of years and love it, but when the rent increases and they can no longer afford it, they would be forced to go elsewhere. While it happens to people of all ages, this can especially be true of young professionals starting out in life. In many cases, housing in other cities is newer and more affordable and with so many people priced out of Beverly Hills, they would be more inclined to choose a newer unit in another city rather than staying in an overpriced older unit, not in the best condition, in Beverly Hills. A brief look into current rentals available in the market right now shows a very significant price difference in Beverly Hills-adjacent properties alone. A common complaint I hear among residents are problems associated with old housing—homes falling apart, plumbing issues, unattractiveness, etc.—issues sometimes so unbearable, some would consider moving to more updated/newer housing in another city. While historic homes are part of the charm of Beverly Hills, I think we should look into modernization—of updating our current housing and attracting new development.

• Importance of views/high floors

• I think the approach to this topic should be holistic and not be just housing. We should start with what place we want to create to ensure we encapsulate the context of the housing. Ideally we end up with a plan that outlines the types of facilities we are looking for (parks, transport, shops, restaurants, schools) and how the changes to by laws will facilitate implementation of these facilities through contributions from those who develop properties into the new housing types. This big picture approach will enable robust by laws to govern the re development of the SE corner for the next 10 years

• I would like to make tougher minimum standards (or tougher implementation thereof) for apartment building owners to maintain and upgrade their buildings so tenants aren’t living in squalor.

• I’m a proponent of clear rules regarding short term rentals and think allowing short term rentals is a way for people to supplement their income and increase the affordability of living in a city like Beverly Hills. (Airbnb, VRBO, etc.)
Attachment 4
Next Beverly Hills Housing White Paper Subcommittee
Housing Survey

1. Where do you currently live? Are you a Beverly Hills resident?
   a. Yes
   b. Other: ______________________

2. Whom do you live with?
   a. Myself / alone
   b. With a roommate
   c. With a spouse
   d. With my family (including children)

3. What is your household income?
   a. < than $50K
   b. $50 - $100K
   c. $101-150K
   d. +$150K

4. What is your current age?
   a. 18 – 25
   b. 26 – 35
   c. 36 – 45
   d. 46+

5. Do you think smaller or larger units are preferable for younger residents?
   a. Smaller
   b. Larger

6. Would you be interested in smaller units if the community amenities (gym, pool, lounge) in a housing complex were more expansive?
   a. Yes
   b. No
7. Please rank the following 13 amenities/building attributes in order of importance:

- Pool
- Gym
- Common Area
- Rooftop Area
- Concierge
- Ample on-site parking
- Walkability
- Views from units/rooftop
- Privacy
- Unit Layout
- Building Architecture and Design
- Age of Building/Unit
- Views

8. For a one bedroom unit, what do feel is the ideal unit size? (please choose one)
   a. Less than 700 sq ft: I prefer a small and efficient unit.
   b. 700 – 1,000 sq ft: I want a moderately sized unit
   c. 1,200+ sq ft: I am only interested in large, spacious units
9. What do you consider to be an affordable price for monthly rent for a one-bedroom unit?
   a. $5,000+
   b. $3,500 - $4,999
   c. $2,000 - $3,499
   d. $1,500 - $1,999
   e. Less than $1,500

10. What do you consider to be an affordable sale price for a one-bedroom condo?
    a. $1,500,000+
    b. $1,000,000 - $1,499,999
    c. $750,000 - $999,999
    d. Less than $750,000

11. How important is living in a walkable neighborhood with amenities (e.g. fitness, retail, nightlife) nearby?
    a. Very important
    b. Somewhat important
    c. Not important

12. Which of the following locations do you believe is the most desirable for your demographic in Beverly Hills?
    a. Close proximity to South Beverly Drive and the Golden Triangle.
    b. Close proximity to East Wilshire/La Cienega and the planned Metro station.
    c. Other: ____________________________

13. How important is having onsite parking in residential housing projects?
    a. Very important
    b. Somewhat important
    c. Not Important

14. If onsite parking is important, what options should be available? (Circle all that apply)
    a. One spot per unit
    b. Street parking must be available
    c. Guest spots needed
    d. Multiple parking spaces per unit (one per bedroom)
    e. Unbundled parking (i.e. spot is priced separately from rent)

15. What is your desired future mode of transportation to get to work on a daily basis?
    a. Bicycle
    b. Car
    c. Uber/Lyft
    d. Subway
    e. By foot
16. Anything we did not cover in this survey that you would like us to know? Some questions to consider are what walkable amenities are most important to you? Do you value new construction? Is there a residential project in Los Angeles that you think is ideal?

Thank you again for taking the time to fill out this survey!