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INTRODUCTION

This Handbook is prepared to provide you with a summary of the major provisions of California's open meeting law for local governments – the Ralph M. Brown Act, including rules about calling and holding various types of meetings and closed sessions, as well as guidelines for how to avoid serial meetings. The second part contains the complete text of the Brown Act. This Handbook is designed for local government officials and staff and we hope you will find it useful. Should you have any questions about the information included in this Handbook, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Richards, Watson & Gershon
Summary of the Major Provisions and Requirements of the Ralph M. Brown Act
Summary of the Major Provisions and Requirements of the Ralph M. Brown Act

The Ralph M. Brown Act, more commonly known as the “Brown Act,” is California’s “sunshine” law for local government. The Brown Act is found in the California Government Code commencing with Section 54950. In a nutshell, the Brown Act requires local government business to be conducted at open and public meetings, except in certain limited situations. This paper briefly summarizes and discusses the major provisions of the Brown Act.

I. APPLICATION OF BROWN ACT TO “LEGISLATIVE BODIES”

The requirements of the Brown Act apply to “legislative bodies” of local governmental agencies. The term “legislative body” is defined to include the governing body of a local agency (e.g., the city council or the board of supervisors) and any commission, committee, board, or other body of the local agency, whether permanent or temporary, decision making or advisory, that is created by formal action of a legislative body. § 54952(a)-(b).

Standing committees of a legislative body, that have either “continuing subject matter jurisdiction” or a meeting schedule fixed by formal action of the legislative body, are also subject to the requirements of the Brown Act. Some common examples include the finance, personnel, or similar policy subcommittees of a legislative body. Standing committees exist to make routine, regular recommendations on a specific subject matter. These committees continue to exist over time and survive resolution of any one issue or matter. They are also a regular part of the governmental structure.

The Brown Act does not apply to “ad hoc” committees comprised solely of members of the legislative body that are less than a quorum of the body, provided these committees do not have a “continuing subject matter jurisdiction,” or a meeting schedule fixed by formal action of the legislative body. Such ad hoc committees are purely advisory; they generally serve only a limited or single purpose, are not perpetual, and are dissolved when their specific task is completed.

Advisory and standing committees, but not ad hoc committees, are required to have agendas, and to have their agendas posted at least 72 hours in advance of their meetings. If this is done, the meeting is considered to be a regular meeting for all purposes. If the agenda is not posted at least 72 hours in advance, the meeting must be treated as a special meeting, and all of the limitations and requirements for special meetings apply, as discussed later.
The governing boards of some private corporations, limited liability companies, and private entities may be subject to the Brown Act under certain circumstances. A private entity’s governing board constitutes a legislative body within the meaning of the Brown Act if either of the following applies: (i) the private entity is created by an elected legislative body to exercise lawfully delegated authority of the legislative body; or (ii) the private entity receives funds from a local agency and its governing board includes a member of the legislative body of the local agency who was appointed by the legislative body to the governing board as a full voting member. § 54952(c).

The Brown Act also applies to persons who are elected to serve as members of a legislative body of a local agency even before they assume the duties of office. § 54952.1. Under this provision, the statute is applicable to newly elected, but not-yet-sworn-in, city council members and members of county boards of supervisors.

II. DEFINITION OF “MEETING”

The central provision of the Brown Act requires that all “meetings” of a legislative body be open and public. The Brown Act defines the term “meeting” very broadly, § 54952.2, and encompasses almost every gathering of a majority of legislative body members, including:

Any congregation of a majority of the members of a legislative body at the same time and location . . . to hear, discuss, deliberate, or take action on any item that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body.

In plain English, this definition means that a meeting is any gathering of a majority of council members, board of directors, or other applicable legislative body, to hear, discuss or deliberate any item of local agency business or potential local agency business.

III. EXCEPTIONS TO MEETING REQUIREMENT

There are six types of gatherings that are not subject to the Brown Act. We commonly refer to these exceptions as: (1) the individual contact exception; (2) the seminar or conference exception; (3) the community meeting exception; (4) the other legislative body exception; (5) the social or ceremonial occasion exception; and (6) the standing committee exception. Unless a gathering of a majority of the members of a legislative body falls within one of the exceptions discussed below, if a majority of members are in the same room and merely listen to a discussion of local agency business, they will be participating in a meeting within the meaning of the Brown Act that requires notice, an agenda, and a period for public comment.
A. The Individual Contact Exception

Conversations, whether in person, by telephone or other means, between a member of a legislative body and any other person do not constitute a meeting under the Brown Act. § 54952.2(c)(1). However, such contacts may constitute a “serial meeting” (discussed below) in violation of the Brown Act, if the individual also makes a series of individual contacts with other members of the legislative body, and communications with these other members are used to “discuss, deliberate, or take action on any item of business that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body.”

B. The Seminar or Conference Exception

Attendance by a majority of the legislative body at a seminar, conference, or similar educational gathering is generally exempted from Brown Act requirements. § 54952.2(c)(2). However, in order to qualify under this exception, the seminar or conference must be open to the public and must involve issues of general interest to the public or to local agencies. Attendance at a California League of Cities or California Contract Cities seminar is an example of an educational gathering that fulfills these requirements. However, this exception will not apply to a conference or seminar if a majority of legislative body members discuss among themselves items of specific business relating to their own local agency other than as part of the scheduled program.

C. The Community Meeting Exception

The community meeting exception allows a majority of legislative body members to attend privately sponsored neighborhood meetings, town hall forums, chamber of commerce lunches or other community meetings at which issues of local interest are discussed. § 54952.2(c)(3). In order to fall within this exception, however, members of the legislative body must observe several rules that limit this exception. First, the community meeting must be “open and publicized.” Therefore, attendance by a majority of the legislative body at a homeowners association meeting that is limited to the residents of a particular development and only publicized among members of that development would not qualify for this exemption. Also, as with the other exceptions, a majority of legislative body members cannot discuss among themselves items of business of their own local agency other than as part of the scheduled program.

D. The Other Legislative Body Exception

This exception allows a majority of members of any legislative body to attend open and noticed meetings of other legislative bodies of their local agency, or of another local agency, without treating such attendance as a meeting of the body. § 54952.2(c)(4). Of course, as with other meeting exceptions, the legislative body members are prohibited from discussing items of business of their local agency among themselves other than as part of the scheduled meeting.
E. The Social or Ceremonial Occasion Exception

As has always been the case, the Brown Act does not apply to attendance by a majority of the legislative body members at purely social or ceremonial occasions. § 54952.2(c)(5). This exception only applies if a majority of legislative body members do not discuss among themselves items of business of their local agency.

F. The Standing Committee Exception

The standing committee exception allows members of a legislative body, who are not members of a standing committee of that body, to attend an open and noticed meeting of the committee without making the gathering a meeting of the full legislative body itself. § 54952.2(c)(6). The exception applies only in the situation where the attendance at a standing committee meeting by legislative body members who are not standing committee members would create a gathering of a majority of the legislative body (and therefore, a “meeting” of the legislative body); otherwise, there is no “meeting” under the Brown Act. In order to fall within the standing committee exception, the legislative body members who are not members of the standing committee may attend only as “observers.” This means that the noncommittee members of the legislative body should not speak at the standing committee’s meeting, sit in their usual seat on the dais, or otherwise participate in the meeting. To avoid this awkward situation, it is generally recommended that, if a standing committee meeting is likely to be attended by other legislative body members, then the meeting should be agendized as a meeting of the whole legislative body. This will allow full participation by all members of the legislative body.

IV. PERMITTED LOCATIONS OF MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCING

The Brown Act generally requires all meetings of a legislative body to occur within the boundaries of the local agency. § 54954(b). There are exceptions to this rule, however, such as allowing meetings with a legislative body of another local agency in that agency’s jurisdiction. Meetings held outside of a local agency’s boundaries pursuant to an exception still must comply with agenda and notice requirements, which are discussed below.

“Teleconferencing” may be used as a method for conducting meetings whereby members of a legislative body may be counted towards a quorum and participate fully in the meeting from remote locations. § 54953(b). If a member participates in a meeting via teleconferencing, the following requirements apply: (1) the remote locations must be connected to the main meeting location by telephone, video or both; (2) the notice and agenda of the meeting must identify the remote locations; (3) the remote locations must be posted and accessible to the public; (4) all votes must be by roll call; and (5) the meeting must in all respects comply with the Brown Act, including participation by members of the public present in remote locations. A
quorum of the legislative body must participate from locations within the jurisdiction, but other members may participate from outside the jurisdiction. The teleconferencing rules only apply to members of the legislative body. Staff members, attorneys, or consultants may participate remotely without following the posting and public access requirements of the teleconferencing rules.

V. ADA COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to Section 54953.2, all meetings of a legislative body, other than closed session meetings or parts of meetings involving a closed session, are required to be held in a location and conducted in a manner that complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. In addition, if requested, the agenda and documents in the agenda packet shall be made available in alternative formats to persons with a disability. § 54954.1. The agenda shall include information regarding how, to whom, and when a request for disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, may be made by a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in the meeting. § 54954.2.

VI. SIMULTANEOUS OR SUCCESSIVE MEETINGS

A legislative body that has convened a meeting and whose membership constitutes a quorum of any other legislative body may convene a meeting of that other legislative body, simultaneously or successively, only if a clerk or a member of the convened legislative body makes a verbal announcement prior to convening any simultaneous or successive meeting. The clerk or member of the legislative body must announce the subsequent legislative body, the amount of compensation or stipend, if any, that each member will be entitled to receive as a result of convening the simultaneous or successive meeting of the subsequent legislative body and the form in which the compensation or stipend shall be provided as a result of convening a meeting for which each member is entitled to collect compensation or a stipend. The compensation and stipend is not required to be announced if it is listed in a statute without additional compensation authorized by the local agency, and in any case, the announced compensation must not include amounts reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses incurred by a member in the performance of his or her official duties. § 54952.3.

VII. SERIAL MEETINGS

In addition to regulating all gatherings of a majority of the members of a legislative body, the Brown Act also addresses certain contacts between individual members of the legislative body. On the one hand, the Brown Act specifically provides that nothing in the Act is intended to impose requirements on individual contacts or conversations between a member of a legislative body and any other person. § 54952.2(c)(1). This
provision even applies to individual contacts between two members of the legislative body (the individual contact exception to the “meeting” described above). Despite this exception, however, the Brown Act prohibits ‘serial meetings.’ § 54952.2(b)(1).

A serial meeting is a series of meetings or communications between individual members of the legislative body in which ideas are exchanged among a majority of a legislative body through either one or more persons acting as intermediaries or through use of telephone, telephone answering machine, e-mail, or voice mail. A serial meeting can occur even though a majority of legislative body members never gather in a room at the same time, and it typically occurs in one of two ways. The first is when a staff member, a legislative body member, or some other person individually contacts a majority of legislative body members and shares ideas among the majority (“I’ve talked to members A and B and they will vote ‘yes,’ Will you?”). Alternatively, member A calls member B, who then calls member C, and so on, until a majority of the legislative body has discussed or deliberated or has taken action on the item of business.

The prohibition against serial meetings does not, however, prohibit communications between staff and legislative body members for the purpose of answering questions or providing information regarding a matter that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the local agency, as long as the staff person does not communicate, with other members of the legislative body, the comments or positions of any other member of the legislative body. § 54952.2(b)(2). Observing the following guidelines can avoid inadvertent violation of the serial meeting rule. These rules of conduct apply only when a majority of a legislative body is involved in a series of individual contacts or communications outside of a noticed “meeting,” whether with local agency staff members, constituents, developers, lobbyists, or other members of the legislative body.

A. Contacts with Staff

Staff can inadvertently become a conduit among a majority of a legislative body in the course of providing briefings on items of local agency business. The Attorney General previously took the position that, when local agency staff individually briefs a majority of legislative body members, such briefing necessarily constitutes an illegal serial meeting. This position was rejected by the California Court of Appeal, which clarified that staff briefings of individual city council members do not constitute an illegal serial meeting under the Brown Act without additional evidence that: (1) staff acted as a personal intermediary for other members of the legislative body; and (2) the meetings led to a collective concurrence among members of the legislative body. The state legislature amended Government Code Section 54952.2 in 2008, effective in 2009, to further clarify that staff briefings of individual city council members do not constitute an illegal serial meeting under the Brown Act as long as a staff person does not communicate the comments or positions of a member of the legislative body to other members. Staff briefings must therefore be handled carefully. To avoid having a staff briefing become a serial meeting:

- Staff briefings of members of the legislative body should be “unidirectional” when done on an individual basis for a majority of the
legislative body. This means that information should flow from staff to the member, and the member’s participation should be limited to asking questions and acquiring information. Otherwise, if multiple members separately give staff direction thereby causing staff to shape or modify their ultimate recommendations in order to reconcile the views of a majority of the members, a violation might occur.

- A legislative body member should not ask staff to describe the views of any other members of the legislative body, and staff should not volunteer those views if known.

- Staff may present their views to a legislative body member during an individual contact, but staff should not ask for that member’s views unless it is absolutely clear that staff is not discussing the matter with a majority of the legislative body.

B. Contacts with Constituents, Developers and Lobbyists

A constituent, developer, or lobbyist can also inadvertently become an intermediary among a majority of members of a legislative body thereby creating an illegal serial meeting in violation of the Brown Act. Such persons’ unfamiliarity with the requirements of the Brown Act aggravate this potential problem because they may expect a legislative body member to be willing to commit to a position in a private conversation in advance of a meeting. To avoid violations arising from contacts with constituents, developers and lobbyists:

- State the ground rules “up front.” Ask if the person has talked, or intends to talk, with other members of the legislative body about the same subject. If the answer is “yes,” then make it clear that the person should not disclose the views of other legislative body member(s) during the conversation.

- Explain to the person that you will not make a final decision on a matter prior to the meeting. For example: “State law prevents me from giving you a commitment outside a noticed meeting. I will listen to what you have to say and give it consideration as I make up my mind.”

- Do more listening and asking questions than expressing opinions. If you disclose your thoughts about a matter, counsel the person not to share them with other members of the legislative body.

C. Contacts with Fellow Members of the Same Legislative Body

Direct contacts concerning local agency business with fellow members of the same legislative body – whether through face-to-face or telephonic conversations, notes, letters, e-mail with or to staff members – are the most obvious means by which an illegal
serial meeting can occur. This is not to say that a member of a legislative body is precluded from discussing items of local agency business with another member of that legislative body outside of a meeting; as long as the communication does not involve a majority of the legislative body, no “meeting” has occurred. There is, however, always the risk that one participant in the communication will disclose the views of the other participant to a third or fourth legislative body member, creating the possibility of a discussion of an item of business outside a noticed public meeting. Therefore, avoid discussing city business with a majority of the members of your legislative body, and communicating the views of other legislative body members outside a meeting.

These suggested rules of conduct may seem unduly restrictive and impractical, and may make acquisition of important information more difficult or time-consuming. Nevertheless, following them will help assure that your conduct comports with the Brown Act’s goal of achieving open government. If you have questions about compliance with the Act in any given situation, you should seek advice from your city attorney. Adherence to the foregoing guidelines is not a substitute for securing advice from your legal counsel.

VIII. NOTICE, AGENDA AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

A. Time of Notice and Content of Agenda

Two key provisions of the Brown Act which ensure the public’s business is conducted openly are the requirements that legislative bodies publicly post agendas prior to their meetings, (§§ 54954.2, 54955, 54956, and 54957.5) and that no action or discussion may occur on items or subjects not listed on the posted agenda (§ 54954.2). Limited exceptions to the rule against discussing or taking action not on a posted agenda are included in the Brown Act and are discussed further below.

Legislative bodies, except advisory committees and standing committees, are required to establish a time and place for holding regular meetings. § 54954(a). A “regular” meeting is a meeting that occurs on the legislative body’s established meeting day. Agendas for a regular meeting must be publicly posted 72 hours in advance of the meeting in a place that is freely accessible to the public. Agendas must contain a brief general description of each item of business to be transacted or discussed at the meeting. § 54954.2(a). The description should inform the public of the “essential nature” of the matter, but need not exceed 20 words. San Diegans for Open Government v. City of Oceanside, 209 Cal. Rptr. 3d 305, 310 (Ct. App. 2016), as modified (Nov. 7, 2016).

Courts will uphold a challenge to the sufficiency of an agenda item description when the description provides fair notice of what the agency will consider. The San Diegans for Open Government case provides an example of a sufficient agenda description that provides fair notice. In San Diegans for Open Government, the Oceanside City
Council approved a subsidy agreement with a hotel developer using the following agenda item description:

“Adoption of a resolution to approve: 1. An Agreement Regarding Real Property (Use Restrictions) between the City of Oceanside and SD Malkin Properties Inc. to guarantee development and use of the property as a full service resort consistent with the entitlements for the project; 2. An Agreement Regarding Real Property to provide a mechanism to share Transit Occupancy Tax (TOT) generated by the Project; 3. A Grant of Easement to permit construction of a subterranean parking garage under Mission Avenue; 4. A report required by AB 562 prepared by Paul Marra of Keyser Marston and Associates documenting the amount of subsidy provided to the developer, the proposed start and end date of the subsidy, the public purpose of the subsidy, the amount of the tax revenue and jobs generated by the project; and 5. A License Agreement to permit construction staging for the project on a portion of Lot 26.”

The court ruled that this agenda description complied with the requirements of Government Code Section 54954.2 because the agenda description expressly gave the public notice that the council would consider a fairly substantial development of publicly owned property as a hotel, that the City would share the transient occupancy tax generated by the project, and that the transaction would involve a subsidy by the City. Additional information, while helpful, was not necessary to provide fair notice of the essential nature of the action under state law. The Court found that the language of the agenda, considered as a whole, provided more than a "clue" that the City planned to provide the developer with a substantial and ongoing financial subsidy in exchange for the project.

In contrast, in Hernandez v. Town of Apple Valley, No. E063721, 2017 WL 56338 (Cal. Ct. App. Jan. 5, 2017), the court held that the Apple Valley Town Council’s agenda description was insufficient. In the Hernandez case, the Apple Valley Town Council adopted three resolutions that called for a special election related to an initiative to adopt a commercial specific plan and that provided for the filing of arguments and rebuttal arguments for and against the initiative. In addition, the Town Council adopted a Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”) that authorized the acceptance of a gift from an interested party, Wal-Mart, to pay for the special election. The agenda description for the matter read “Wal-Mart Initiative Measure” and included a recommendation for action that read “[p]rovide direction to staff.”

The court reiterated that the Brown Act requires that each item of business be placed on the agenda. With respect to the MOU, the court highlighted that nothing in the agenda description, or even in the agenda packet, indicated that the Town Council was going to consider an MOU to accept a gift from Wal-Mart to pay for a special election to pass the initiative. The court concluded that the City violated the Brown Act by omitting the MOU from the agenda description, as this omission meant that the plaintiff was given no notice of this item of business.

Agendas must also be posted on the local agency’s Internet Web site, if one exists, for City Council meetings, and meetings of any other legislative body where some members are City Council members and are compensated for their appearance.
While the language of the 72 hour posting requirement appears absolute, the California Attorney General recently opined that technical difficulties, such as a power failure, cyber attack, or other third-party interference that prevents a local agency from posting its agenda on its website for the full 72 hours will not necessarily preclude the legislative body from lawfully holding its meeting. 16 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 937 (Jan. 19, 2016). Whether a public meeting may continue as scheduled will require a fact specific analysis, that will depend on whether the local agency has otherwise “substantially complied” with the Brown Act’s agenda posting requirements by properly posting a physical agenda and making other “reasonably effective efforts” (such as making the agenda available on social media or some other alternative website) to notify the public of the meeting.

Please note that the adoption of a CEQA document, such as an environmental impact report or a negative declaration, by a Planning Commission or a City Council is a distinct item of business separate from the item approving the project and must be expressly described in an agenda.

A “special” meeting is a meeting that is held at a time or place other than the time and place established for regular meetings. For special meetings, the “call and notice” of the meeting and the agenda must be posted, including in some cases on the local agency’s Internet Web site, at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. § 54956. Additionally, each member of the legislative body must personally receive written notice of the special meeting either by personal delivery or by “any other means” (such as facsimile, e-mail or U.S. mail) at least 24 hours before the time of the special meeting, unless they have previously waived receipt of written notice. Members of the press (including radio and television stations) and other members of the public can also request written notice of special meetings and, if they have, then that notice must be given at the same time notice is provided to members of the legislative body.

An “emergency” meeting may be called to address certain emergencies, such as a terrorist act or crippling disaster, without complying with the 24-hour notice requirement. Certain requirements apply for notifying the press and for conducting closed sessions as part of those meetings, and except as specified, all other rules governing special meetings apply. § 54956.5.

Both regular and special meetings may be adjourned to another time. Notices of adjourned meetings must be posted on the door of the meeting chambers where the meeting occurred within 24 hours after the meeting is adjourned. § 54955. If the adjourned meeting occurs more than five days after the prior meeting, a new agenda for that adjourned meeting must be posted 72 hours in advance of the adjourned meeting. § 54954.2(b)(3).

The Brown Act requires local agencies to mail the agenda or the full agenda packet to any person making a written request no later than the time the agenda is posted or is delivered to the members of the body, whichever is earlier. A local agency may charge a fee to recover its costs of copying and mailing. Any person may make a standing request to receive these materials, in which event the request must be
renewed annually. Failure by any requestor to receive the agenda does not constitute grounds to invalidate any action taken at a meeting. § 54954.1.

B. Action and Discussion on Non-agenda Items

The Brown Act also ensures the public’s business is conducted openly by restricting a legislative body’s ability to deviate from posted agendas. The statute affords a legislative body limited authority to act on or discuss non-agenda items at regular meetings, but forbids doing so at special meetings.

As a general rule, a legislative body may not act on or discuss any item that does not appear on the agenda posted for a regular meeting. § 54954.2. This rule does not, however, preclude a legislative body from acting on a non-agenda item that comes to the local agency’s attention subsequent to the agenda posting which requires immediate action. In order to utilize this exception, the legislative body must make findings of both components of the exception by a two-thirds vote of those present (by unanimous vote if less than two-thirds of the body is present). This means that if four members of a five-member body are present, three votes are required to add the item; if only three are present, a unanimous vote is required. In addition, an item not appearing on an agenda may be added if the legislative body determines by a majority vote that an emergency situation exists. For purposes of this exception, the term “emergency situation” refers to work stoppages or crippling disasters that severely impair public health, safety, or both.

Notwithstanding the two general exceptions set forth above, a legislative body may also discuss non-agenda items at a regular meeting under the following five additional exceptions:

- Members of the legislative body or staff may briefly respond to statements made or questions posed by persons during public comment periods;
- Members of the legislative body or staff may ask a question for clarification, make a brief announcement or make a brief report on their own activities;
- Members of the legislative body may, subject to the procedural rules of the body, provide a reference to staff or other resources for factual information;
- Members of the legislative body may, subject to the procedural rules of the body, request staff to report back to the legislative body at a subsequent meeting concerning any matter; and
- Members of the legislative body may, subject to the procedural rules of the body, take action to direct staff to place a matter of business on a future agenda.
Therefore, spending a few minutes to discuss whether a matter should be placed on a future agenda or asking staff procedural questions is permissible. Cruz v. City of Culver City, 2 Cal.App.5th 239 (2016). The legislative body may not, however, discuss non-agenda items to any significant degree. This means there should not be long or wide-ranging question and answer sessions on non-agenda items between the legislative body and the public, or between the legislative body and staff. It is important to follow these exceptions carefully and construe them narrowly to avoid tainting an important and complex action by a non-agendized discussion of the item.

The Brown Act contains even more stringent regulations to restrict action on and discussion of non-agenda items at special meetings. In particular, the statute mandates that only business that is specified in the “call and notice” of the special meeting may be considered by the legislative body. § 54956. Notwithstanding, a special meeting may not be called to discuss compensation of a local agency executive. § 54956(b).

C. Reporting of Actions

The Brown Act mandates the public reporting of individual votes or abstentions by members of legislative bodies on any given motion or action. This requirement may be satisfied in most situations by reporting the individual vote or abstention of each member in the minutes of a meeting. § 54953. As of January 1, 2017, the Brown Act also requires that the legislative body orally report a summary of recommendations made with respect to the salary, salary schedule, or compensation paid to a local agency executive. The legislative body must issue the report at the same meeting in which the final action on compensation is being considered. § 54953(c).

IX. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A. Regular Meetings

The Brown Act mandates that every agenda for a regular meeting provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any matter that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body. § 54954.3(a). In addition, the Brown Act requires the legislative body to allow members of the public to comment on any item on the agenda either before or during the body’s consideration of that item. § 54954.3(a).

Some local agencies accomplish both requirements by placing a general audience comment period at the beginning of the agenda where the public can comment on both agenda and non-agenda items. Others provide public comment periods as each item or group of items comes up on the agenda, and then leaves the general public comment period to the end of the agenda. Either method is permissible, though public comment on public hearing items must be taken during the hearing.
The Brown Act allows a legislative body to preclude public comments on an agenda item in one situation – where the item was considered by a committee, composed solely of members of the body, that held a meeting where public comments on that item were allowed. So, if the legislative body has standing committees (which are required to have agendized and open meetings with an opportunity for the public to comment on agenda items), and the committee has previously considered an item, then at the time the item comes before the full legislative body, the body may choose not to take additional public comments on that item. However, if the version presented to the full legislative body is different from the version presented to, and considered by, the committee, then the public must be given another opportunity to speak on that item at the meeting of the full body. § 54954.3.

**B. Public Comments at Special Meetings**

The Brown Act requires that agendas for special meetings provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the legislative body concerning any item listed on the agenda before or during the body’s consideration of that item. § 54954.3(a). Unlike regular meetings, though, the legislative body does not have to allow public comment on non-agenda matters at a special meeting.

**C. Limitations on the Length and Content of Public Comments**

A legislative body may adopt reasonable regulations limiting the total amount of time allocated to each person for public testimony. Typical time limits restrict speakers to three or five minutes. If an individual utilizes a translator to give testimony and simultaneous translation equipment is not used, the legislative body must allot at least twice the standard amount of time to the speaker. A legislative body may also adopt reasonable regulations limiting the total amount of time allocated for public testimony on legislative matters, such as a zoning ordinance or other regulatory ordinance. § 54954.3(b). However, we do not recommend setting total time limits per item for any quasi-judicial matter, such as a conditional use permit application, because such a restriction could result in a violation of the due process rights of those who were not able to speak to the body during the time allotted.

The Brown Act precludes a legislative body from prohibiting public criticism of the policies, procedures, programs, or services of the local agency or the acts or omissions of the body. § 54954.3(c). This prohibition does not mean that a member of the public may say anything during public testimony. If the topic of the public’s comments falls outside the subject matter jurisdiction of the local agency, the legislative body may stop a speaker’s comments.

A legislative body also may adopt reasonable rules of decorum that preclude a speaker from disrupting, disturbing or otherwise impeding the orderly conduct of its meetings. § 54954.3(b). The right to publicly criticize a public official does not include the right to slander that official, though the line between criticism and slander is often difficult to determine in the heat of the moment. Care must be given to avoid violating...
the free speech rights of speakers by suppressing opinions relevant to the business of the legislative body.

Finally, in some circumstances, the use of profanity may serve as a basis for stopping a speaker. It will depend, however, upon what profane words or comments are made and the context of those comments. Therefore, no one should be ruled out of order for profanity unless the language both is truly objectionable and causes a disturbance or disruption in the proceeding.

D. Additional Rights of the Public

The Brown Act grants the public the right to videotape or broadcast a public meeting, as well as the right to make a motion picture or still camera record of such meeting. § 54953.5(a). A legislative body may prohibit or limit recording of a meeting, however, if the body finds that the recording cannot continue without noise, illumination, or view obstruction that constitutes, or would constitute, a disruption of the proceedings. § 54953.6.

Any audio or videotape record of an open and public meeting that is made, for whatever purpose, by or at the direction of the local agency is a public record and is subject to inspection by the public consistent with the requirements of the Public Records Act. § 54953.5(b). The local agency must not destroy the tape or film record for at least 30 days following the date of the taping or recording. Inspection of the audiotape or videotape must be made available to the public for free on equipment provided by the local agency.

The Brown Act requires written material distributed to a majority of the body by any person to be provided to the public without delay. This rule is inapplicable, to attorney-client memoranda, the confidentiality of which was affirmed by the California Supreme Court in Roberts v. City of Palmdale, 5 Cal. 4th 363 (1993). However, if non-privileged material is distributed during the meeting and prepared by the local agency, it must be available for public inspection at the meeting. If it is distributed during the meeting by a member of the public, it must be made available for public inspection after the meeting. § 54957.5(c).

If material related to an agenda item is distributed to a majority of the body less than 72 hours prior to an open session of a regular meeting, the writing must be made available at the same time for public inspection at a public office or location that has been designated in advance for such purpose. Each local agency must list the address of the designated office or location on the agendas for all meetings of the legislative body of that agency. § 54957.5(b). Although this Brown Act provision technically requires an agency to list the designated office address on closed session meeting agendas, it does not require an agency to make such closed session documents and materials available for public inspection.

A local agency may also post all documents made available for public inspection pursuant to Section 54957.5(b) on the agency’s Internet Web site. However, a local
agency may not post the writings to its Web site in lieu of designating a public office or location for inspection of physical copies of the documents.

We recommended that local agencies implement the following procedures to comply with Section 54957.5(b):

- Place a binder at the agency’s principal place of business next to the public counter agenda packet that identifies the contents as follows: “Disclosable public documents related to an open session agenda item on the _____ Agenda Packet distributed by the [AGENCY] to a majority of the [LEGISLATIVE BODY] less than 72 hours prior to the meeting.”

- On the agenda template for all meetings, there should be a standard footer or statement that indicates the following: Any disclosable public writings related to an open session item on a regular meeting agenda and distributed by the [AGENCY] to at least a majority of the [LEGISLATIVE BODY] less than 72 hours prior to that meeting are available for public inspection at the _____ Counter at [AGENCY’S PLACE OF BUSINESS] located at [ADDRESS] and [optional] the _____ Counter at the _____ Library located at [LIBRARY ADDRESS] during normal business hours. [Optional] In addition, the Agency may also post such documents on the Agency’s Web site at [WEB SITE ADDRESS].

- On the [AGENCY’S] Web site, create a subfolder under the agenda packet folder that identifies the contents of the subfolder as follows: “Disclosable public documents related to an open session agenda item on the _____ Agenda Packet distributed by the [AGENCY] to a majority of the [LEGISLATIVE BODY] less than 72 hours prior to the meeting.”

- On all documents made available for public inspection pursuant to Section 54957.5(b), make a notation of the date when distributed to at least a majority of the legislative body and placed in the binder at agency’s place of business, [optional] the Library, or [optional] on the agency’s Web site.

- Charge customary photocopying charges for copies of such documents.

One problem left unaddressed by Section 54957.5(b) is what to do when written materials are distributed directly to a majority of the legislative body without knowledge of staff, or even without the legislative body members knowing that a majority has received it. The law still requires these materials to be treated as public records. Thus, it is a good idea for at least one member of the legislative body to ensure that staff gets a copy of any document distributed to members of the legislative body so that copies can be made for the local agency’s records and for members of the public who request a copy.
X. CLOSED SESSIONS

The Brown Act allows a legislative body to convene a “closed session” during a meeting in order to meet privately with its advisors on specifically enumerated topics. Sometimes people refer to closed sessions as “executive sessions,” which is a holdover term from the statute’s early days. Examples of business that may be conducted in closed session include personnel evaluations, threats to public safety, labor negotiations, pending litigation, real estate negotiations, and consideration of a response to an audit report. §§ 54956.8, 54956.9, 54957, 54957.6, 54957.75. Political sensitivity of an item is not a lawful reason for a closed session discussion.

The Brown Act requires that closed session business be described on the public agenda. Moreover, there is a “bonus” of sorts for using prescribed language to describe closed sessions in that legal challenges to the adequacy of the description are precluded when such language is used. § 54954.5. This so-called “safe harbor” encourages many local agencies to use a very similar agenda format, especially in light of a California Court of Appeal ruling that a local agency substantially complied with the Brown Act’s requirement to describe closed session agenda items even though the notice referred to the wrong subsection of Section 54956.9. Castaic Lake Water Agency v. Newhall County Water District, 238 Cal.App. 4th 1196 (2015). Audio recording of closed sessions is not required unless a court orders such recording after finding a closed session violation. § 54960.

Closed sessions may be started in a location different from the usual meeting place as long as the location is noted on the agenda and the public can be present when the meeting first begins. Moreover, public comment on closed session items must be allowed before convening the closed session.

After a closed session, the legislative body must reconvene the public meeting and publicly report certain types of actions if they were taken, and the vote on those actions. § 54957.1. There are limited exceptions for specified litigation decisions, and to protect the victims of sexual misconduct or child abuse. Contracts, settlement agreements or other documents that are finally approved or adopted in closed session must be provided at the time the closed session ends to any person who has made a standing request for all documentation in connection with a request for notice of meetings (typically members of the media) and to any person who makes a request within 24 hours of the posting of the agenda, if the requestor is present when the closed session ends. § 54957.1.

One perennial area of confusion is whether a legislative body may discuss the salary and benefits of an individual employee (such as a city manager) as part of a performance evaluation session under Section 54957. It may not. However, the body may designate a negotiator or negotiators, such as two members of a five-member legislative body, to negotiate with that employee, and then meet with the negotiator(s) in closed session under Section 54957.6 to provide directions on salary and compensation issues. The employee in question may not be present in such a closed session. The Brown Act prohibits attendees from disclosing confidential information
XI. ENFORCEMENT

There are both civil remedies and criminal misdemeanor penalties for Brown Act violations. The civil remedies include injunctions against further violations, orders nullifying any unlawful action, orders determining that an alleged act violated the Brown Act, orders determining the validity of any rule to penalize or discourage the expression of a member of the legislative body, and remedies for breaching closed session confidences. §§ 54960, 54960.1, 54960.2, 54963.

The procedures for claiming there was a Brown Act violation vary depending upon what the complaining party is seeking. If the complaining party is seeking to invalidate an action based on a violation of the Brown Act, the procedures for doing so are set forth in Section 54960.1, as summarized below. If the complaining party is merely seeking a determination that a Brown Act violation occurred or desires the court to impose an order preventing further violations, the procedures for doing so are set forth in Section 54960.2, also as summarized below.

Under Section 54960.1, prior to filing suit to obtain a judicial determination that an action is null and void because of an alleged Brown Act violation, the complaining party must make a written demand on the legislative body to cure or correct the alleged violation. The written demand must be made within 90 days after the challenged action was taken. However, if the challenged action was taken in open session and involves a violation of the agenda requirements of Section 54954.2, then the written demand must be made within 30 days. The legislative body is required to cure or correct the challenged action and inform the party who filed the demand of its correcting actions, or its decision not to cure or correct, within 30 days. The complaining party must file suit within 15 days after receipt of the written notice from the legislative body, or if there is no written response, within 15 days after the 30-day cure period expires. § 54960.1(b). Under Section 54960.2, prior to filing suit to obtain a judicial determination that an alleged Brown Act violation occurred after January 1, 2013, the district attorney or interested person must submit a cease and desist letter to the legislative body clearly describing the legislative body’s past action and the nature of the alleged violation within nine months of the alleged violation. Second, the legislative body may respond within 30 days, including responding with an unconditional commitment to cease, desist from, and not repeat the past action that is alleged to violate the Brown Act. If the legislative agency responds with an unconditional commitment, that commitment must be approved by the legislative body in open session at a regular or special meeting as a separate item of business not on the consent calendar, and must be in substantially the form set forth in Section 54960.2(c)(1). Also, a legislative body may resolve to rescind an unconditional commitment with proper notice to the public and to each person to whom the unconditional commitment was made. Upon rescission, the district attorney or any interested person may file an action pursuant to Section 54960(a). Finally,
Section 54960.2 provides further deadlines and requirements that must be met when filing an action in connection with an unconditional commitment. § 54960.2.

A member of a legislative body will not be criminally liable for a violation of the Brown Act unless the member intends to deprive the public of information which the member knows or has reason to know the public is entitled to under the Brown Act. § 54959. This standard became effective in 1994 and is a different standard from most criminal standards. Until it is applied and interpreted by a court, it is not clear what type of evidence will be necessary to prosecute a Brown Act violation.

**XII. CONCLUSION**

The Brown Act can be confusing, and compliance with it can be difficult, due to the statute’s many rules and ambiguities. Nonetheless, noncompliance with the Act is not an option. In the event that you have any questions regarding any provision of the law, you should contact your legal counsel for advice.
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Section 54950. Declaration of public policy

In enacting this chapter, the Legislature finds and declares that the public commissions, boards and councils and the other public agencies in this State exist to aid in the conduct of the people’s business. It is the intent of the law that their actions be taken openly and that their deliberations be conducted openly.

The people of this State do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies which serve them. The people, in delegating authority, do not give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know. The people insist on remaining informed so that they may retain control over the instruments they have created.

Section 54950.5. Title of act

This chapter shall be known as the Ralph M. Brown Act.

Section 54951. “Local agency”

As used in this chapter, “local agency” means a county, city, whether general law or chartered, city and county, town, school district, municipal corporation, district, political subdivision, or any board, commission or agency thereof, or other local public agency.

Section 54952. “Legislative body”

As used in this chapter, “legislative body” means:

(a) The governing body of a local agency or any other local body created by state or federal statute.

(b) A commission, committee, board, or other body of a local agency, whether permanent or temporary, decisionmaking or advisory, created by charter, ordinance, resolution, or formal action of a legislative body. However, advisory committees, composed solely of the members of the legislative body that are less than a quorum of the legislative body are not legislative bodies, except that standing committees of a legislative body, irrespective of their composition, which have a continuing subject matter jurisdiction, or a meeting schedule fixed by charter, ordinance, resolution, or formal action of a legislative body are legislative bodies for purposes of this chapter.

(c) (1) A board, commission, committee, or other multimember body that governs a private corporation, limited liability company, or other entity that either:
(A) Is created by the elected legislative body in order to exercise authority that may lawfully be delegated by the elected governing body to a private corporation, limited liability company, or other entity.

(B) Receives funds from a local agency and the membership of whose governing body includes a member of the legislative body of the local agency appointed to that governing body as a full voting member by the legislative body of the local agency.

(2) Notwithstanding subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1), no board, commission, committee, or other multimember body that governs a private corporation, limited liability company, or other entity that receives funds from a local agency and, as of February 9, 1996, has a member of the legislative body of the local agency as a full voting member of the governing body of that private corporation, limited liability company, or other entity shall be relieved from the public meeting requirements of this chapter by virtue of a change in status of the full voting member to a nonvoting member.

(d) The lessee of any hospital the whole or part of which is first leased pursuant to subdivision (p) of Section 32121 of the Health and Safety Code after January 1, 1994, where the lessee exercises any material authority of a legislative body of a local agency delegated to it by that legislative body whether the lessee is organized and operated by the local agency or by a delegated authority.

**Section 54952.1. Conduct and treatment of electee**

Any person elected to serve as a member of a legislative body who has not yet assumed the duties of office shall conform his or her conduct to the requirements of this chapter and shall be treated for purposes of enforcement of this chapter as if he or she has already assumed office.

**Section 54952.2. Specified communications of legislative body of local agency prohibited outside meeting thereof**

(a) As used in this chapter, “meeting” means any congregation of a majority of the members of a legislative body at the same time and location, including teleconference location as permitted by Section 54953, to hear, discuss, deliberate, or take action on any item that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body.

(b) (1) A majority of the members of a legislative body shall not, outside a meeting authorized by this chapter, use a series of communications of any kind, directly or through intermediaries, to discuss, deliberate, or take action on any item of business that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not be construed as preventing an employee or official of a local agency, from engaging in separate conversations or communications outside of a meeting authorized by this chapter with members of a legislative body in order to answer questions or provide information regarding a matter that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the local agency, if that person does not communicate to
members of the legislative body the comments or position of any other member or members of the legislative body.

(c) Nothing in this section shall impose the requirements of this chapter upon any of the following:

(1) Individual contacts or conversations between a member of a legislative body and any other person that do not violate subdivision (b).

(2) The attendance of a majority of the members of a legislative body at a conference or similar gathering open to the public that involves a discussion of issues of general interest to the public or to public agencies of the type represented by the legislative body, provided that a majority of the members do not discuss among themselves, other than as part of the scheduled program, business of a specified nature that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the local agency. Nothing in this paragraph is intended to allow members of the public free admission to a conference or similar gathering at which the organizers have required other participants or registrants to pay fees or charges as a condition of attendance.

(3) The attendance of a majority of the members of a legislative body at an open and publicized meeting organized to address a topic of local community concern by a person or organization other than the local agency, provided that a majority of the members do not discuss among themselves, other than as part of the scheduled program, business of a specific nature that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body of the local agency.

(4) The attendance of a majority of the members of a legislative body at an open and noticed meeting of another body of the local agency, or at an open and noticed meeting of a legislative body of another local agency, provided that a majority of the members do not discuss among themselves, other than as part of the scheduled meeting, business of a specific nature that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body of the local agency.

(5) The attendance of a majority of the members of a legislative body at a purely social or ceremonial occasion, provided that a majority of the members do not discuss among themselves business of a specific nature that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body of the local agency.

(6) The attendance of a majority of the members of a legislative body at an open and noticed meeting of a standing committee of that body, provided that the members of the legislative body who are not members of the standing committee attend only as observers.

Section 54952.3. Simultaneous or serial order meetings authorized; Requirements; Compensation or stipend

(a) A legislative body that has convened a meeting and whose membership constitutes a quorum of any other legislative body may convene a meeting of that other legislative body, simultaneously or in serial order, only if a clerk or a member of the
convened legislative body verbally announces, prior to convening any simultaneous or serial order meeting of that subsequent legislative body, the amount of compensation or stipend, if any, that each member will be entitled to receive as a result of convening the simultaneous or serial meeting of the subsequent legislative body and identifies that the compensation or stipend shall be provided as a result of convening a meeting for which each member is entitled to collect compensation or a stipend. However, the clerk or member of the legislative body shall not be required to announce the amount of compensation if the amount of compensation is prescribed in statute and no additional compensation has been authorized by a local agency.

(b) For purposes of this section, compensation and stipend shall not include amounts reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses incurred by a member in the performance of the member's official duties, including, but not limited to, reimbursement of expenses relating to travel, meals, and lodging.

Section 54952.6. “Action taken”

As used in this chapter, “action taken” means a collective decision made by a majority of the members of a legislative body, a collective commitment or promise by a majority of the members of a legislative body to make a positive or a negative decision, or an actual vote by a majority of the members of a legislative body when sitting as a body or entity, upon a motion, proposal, resolution, order or ordinance.

Section 54952.7. Copy of chapter

A legislative body of a local agency may require that a copy of this chapter be given to each member of the legislative body and any person elected to serve as a member of the legislative body who has not assumed the duties of office. An elected legislative body of a local agency may require that a copy of this chapter be given to each member of each legislative body all or a majority of whose members are appointed by or under the authority of the elected legislative body.

Section 54953. Requirement that meetings be open and public; Teleconferencing; Teleconference meetings by health authority

(a) All meetings of the legislative body of a local agency shall be open and public, and all persons shall be permitted to attend any meeting of the legislative body of a local agency, except as otherwise provided in this chapter.

(b) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the legislative body of a local agency may use teleconferencing for the benefit of the public and the legislative body of a local agency in connection with any meeting or proceeding authorized by law. The teleconferenced meeting or proceeding shall comply with all requirements of this chapter and all otherwise applicable provisions of law relating to a specific type of meeting or proceeding.

(2) Teleconferencing, as authorized by this section, may be used for all purposes in connection with any meeting within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body. All votes taken during a teleconferenced meeting shall be by rollcall.
(3) If the legislative body of a local agency elects to use teleconferencing, it shall post agendas at all teleconference locations and conduct teleconference meetings in a manner that protects the statutory and constitutional rights of the parties or the public appearing before the legislative body of a local agency. Each teleconference location shall be identified in the notice and agenda of the meeting or proceeding, and each teleconference location shall be accessible to the public. During the teleconference, at least a quorum of the members of the legislative body shall participate from locations within the boundaries of the territory over which the local agency exercises jurisdiction, except as provided in subdivision (d). The agenda shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the legislative body directly pursuant to Section 54954.3 at each teleconference location.

(4) For the purposes of this section, “teleconference” means a meeting of a legislative body, the members of which are in different locations, connected by electronic means, through either audio or video, or both. Nothing in this section shall prohibit a local agency from providing the public with additional teleconference locations.

(c) (1) No legislative body shall take action by secret ballot, whether preliminary or final.

(2) The legislative body of a local agency shall publicly report any action taken and the vote or abstention on that action of each member present for the action.

(3) Prior to taking final action, the legislative body shall orally report a summary of a recommendation for a final action on the salaries, salary schedules, or compensation paid in the form of fringe benefits of a local agency executive, as defined in subdivision (d) of Section 3511.1, during the open meeting in which the final action is to be taken. This paragraph shall not affect the public’s right under the California Public Records Act (Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 6250) of Division 7 of Title 1) to inspect or copy records created or received in the process of developing the recommendation.

(d) (1) Notwithstanding the provisions relating to a quorum in paragraph (3) of subdivision (b), when a health authority conducts a teleconference meeting, members who are outside the jurisdiction of the authority may be counted toward the establishment of a quorum when participating in the teleconference if at least 50 percent of the number of members that would establish a quorum are present within the boundaries of the territory over which the authority exercises jurisdiction, and the health authority provides a teleconference number, and associated access codes, if any, that allows any person to call in to participate in the meeting and that number and access codes are identified in the notice and agenda of the meeting.

(2) Nothing in this subdivision shall be construed as discouraging health authority members from regularly meeting at a common physical site within the jurisdiction of the authority or from using teleconference locations within or near the jurisdiction of the authority. A teleconference meeting for which a quorum is
established pursuant to this subdivision shall be subject to all other requirements of this section.

(3) For purposes of this subdivision, a health authority means any entity created pursuant to Sections 14018.7, 14087.31, 14087.35, 14087.36, 14087.38, and 14087.9605 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, any joint powers authority created pursuant to Article 1 (commencing with Section 6500) of Chapter 5 of Division 7 for the purpose of contracting pursuant to Section 14087.3 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, and any advisory committee to a county sponsored health plan licensed pursuant to Chapter 2.2 (commencing with Section 1340) of Division 2 of the Health and Safety Code if the advisory committee has 12 or more members.

(4) This subdivision shall remain in effect only until January 1, 2018.

Section 54953.1. Grand jury testimony

The provisions of this chapter shall not be construed to prohibit the members of the legislative body of a local agency from giving testimony in private before a grand jury, either as individuals or as a body.

Section 54953.2. Meetings to conform to Americans with Disabilities Act

All meetings of a legislative body of a local agency that are open and public shall meet the protections and prohibitions contained in Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12132), and the federal rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof.

Section 54953.3. Registration of attendance

A member of the public shall not be required, as a condition to attendance at a meeting of a legislative body of a local agency, to register his or her name, to provide other information, to complete a questionnaire, or otherwise to fulfill any condition precedent to his or her attendance.

If an attendance list, register, questionnaire, or other similar document is posted at or near the entrance to the room where the meeting is to be held, or is circulated to the persons present during the meeting, it shall state clearly that the signing, registering, or completion of the document is voluntary, and that all persons may attend the meeting regardless of whether a person signs, registers, or completes the document.

Section 54953.5. Recording proceedings

(a) Any person attending an open and public meeting of a legislative body of a local agency shall have the right to record the proceedings with an audio or video recorder or a still or motion picture camera in the absence of a reasonable finding by the legislative body of the local agency that the recording cannot continue without noise, illumination, or obstruction of view that constitutes, or would constitute, a persistent disruption of the proceedings.
(b) Any audio or video recording of an open and public meeting made for whatever purpose by or at the direction of the local agency shall be subject to inspection pursuant to the California Public Records Act (Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 6250) of Division 7 of Title 1), but, notwithstanding Section 34090, may be erased or destroyed 30 days after the recording. Any inspection of an audio or video recording shall be provided without charge on equipment made available by the local agency.

Section 54953.6. Restrictions on broadcasts of proceedings

No legislative body of a local agency shall prohibit or otherwise restrict the broadcast of its open and public meetings in the absence of a reasonable finding that the broadcast cannot be accomplished without noise, illumination, or obstruction of view that would constitute a persistent disruption of the proceedings.

Section 54953.7. Access to meetings beyond minimal standards

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, legislative bodies of local agencies may impose requirements upon themselves which allow greater access to their meetings than prescribed by the minimal standards set forth in this chapter. In addition thereto, an elected legislative body of a local agency may impose such requirements on those appointed legislative bodies of the local agency of which all or a majority of the members are appointed by or under the authority of the elected legislative body.

Section 54954. Rules for conduct of business; Time and place of meetings

(a) Each legislative body of a local agency, except for advisory committees or standing committees, shall provide, by ordinance, resolution, bylaws, or by whatever other rule is required for the conduct of business by that body, the time and place for holding regular meetings. Meetings of advisory committees or standing committees, for which an agenda is posted at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 54954.2, shall be considered for purposes of this chapter as regular meetings of the legislative body.

(b) Regular and special meetings of the legislative body shall be held within the boundaries of the territory over which the local agency exercises jurisdiction, except to do any of the following:

(1) Comply with state or federal law or court order, or attend a judicial or administrative proceeding to which the local agency is a party.

(2) Inspect real or personal property which cannot be conveniently brought within the boundaries of the territory over which the local agency exercises jurisdiction provided that the topic of the meeting is limited to items directly related to the real or personal property.

(3) Participate in meetings or discussions of multiagency significance that are outside the boundaries of a local agency’s jurisdiction. However, any meeting or discussion held pursuant to this subdivision shall take place within the jurisdiction of one
of the participating local agencies and be noticed by all participating agencies as provided for in this chapter.

(4) Meet in the closest meeting facility if the local agency has no meeting facility within the boundaries of the territory over which the local agency exercises jurisdiction, or at the principal office of the local agency if that office is located outside the territory over which the agency exercises jurisdiction.

(5) Meet outside their immediate jurisdiction with elected or appointed officials of the United States or the State of California when a local meeting would be impractical, solely to discuss a legislative or regulatory issue affecting the local agency and over which the federal or state officials have jurisdiction.

(6) Meet outside their immediate jurisdiction if the meeting takes place in or nearby a facility owned by the agency, provided that the topic of the meeting is limited to items directly related to the facility.

(7) Visit the office of the local agency’s legal counsel for a closed session on pending litigation held pursuant to Section 54956.9, when to do so would reduce legal fees or costs.

(c) Meetings of the governing board of a school district shall be held within the district, except under the circumstances enumerated in subdivision (b), or to do any of the following:

(1) Attend a conference on nonadversarial collective bargaining techniques.

(2) Interview members of the public residing in another district with reference to the trustees’ potential employment of an applicant for the position of the superintendent of the district.

(3) Interview a potential employee from another district.

(d) Meetings of a joint powers authority shall occur within the territory of at least one of its member agencies, or as provided in subdivision (b). However, a joint powers authority which has members throughout the state may meet at any facility in the state which complies with the requirements of Section 54961.

(e) If, by reason of fire, flood, earthquake, or other emergency, it shall be unsafe to meet in the place designated, the meetings shall be held for the duration of the emergency at the place designated by the presiding officer of the legislative body or his or her designee in a notice to the local media that have requested notice pursuant to Section 54956, by the most rapid means of communication available at the time.

Section 54954.1. Request for notice; Renewal; Fee

Any person may request that a copy of the agenda, or a copy of all the documents constituting the agenda packet, of any meeting of a legislative body be mailed to that person. If requested, the agenda and documents in the agenda packet shall be
made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12132), and the federal rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof. Upon receipt of the written request, the legislative body or its designee shall cause the requested materials to be mailed at the time the agenda is posted pursuant to Section 54954.2 and 54956 or upon distribution to all, or a majority of all, of the members of a legislative body, whichever occurs first. Any request for mailed copies of agendas or agenda packets shall be valid for the calendar year in which it is filed, and must be renewed following January 1 of each year. The legislative body may establish a fee for mailing the agenda or agenda packet, which fee shall not exceed the cost of providing the service. Failure of the requesting person to receive the agenda or agenda packet pursuant to this section shall not constitute grounds for invalidation of the actions of the legislative body taken at the meeting for which the agenda or agenda packet was not received.

Section 54954.2. Posting of agenda; Actions not on agenda

(a) (1) At least 72 hours before a regular meeting, the legislative body of the local agency, or its designee, shall post an agenda containing a brief general description of each item of business to be transacted or discussed at the meeting, including items to be discussed in closed session. A brief general description of an item generally need not exceed 20 words. The agenda shall specify the time and location of the regular meeting and shall be posted in a location that is freely accessible to members of the public and on the local agency's Internet Web site, if the local agency has one. If requested, the agenda shall be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12132), and the federal rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof. The agenda shall include information regarding how, to whom, and when a request for disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, may be made by a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting.

(2) For a meeting occurring on and after January 1, 2019, of a legislative body of a city, county, city and county, special district, school district, or political subdivision established by the state that has an Internet Web site, the following provisions shall apply:

(A) An online posting of an agenda shall be posted on the primary Internet Web site homepage of a city, county, city and county, special district, school district, or political subdivision established by the state that has an Internet Web site, the following provisions shall apply:

(B) An online posting of an agenda including, but not limited to, an agenda posted in an integrated agenda management platform, shall be posted in an open format that meets all of the following requirements:
(i) Retrievable, downloadable, indexable, and electronically searchable by commonly used Internet search applications.

(ii) Platform independent and machine readable.

(iii) Available to the public free of charge and without any restriction that would impede the reuse or redistribution of the agenda.

(C) A legislative body of a city, county, city and county, special district, school district, or political subdivision established by the state that has an Internet Web site and an integrated agenda management platform shall not be required to comply with subparagraph (A) if all of the following are met:

(i) A direct link to the integrated agenda management platform shall be posted on the primary Internet Web site homepage of a city, county, city and county, special district, school district, or political subdivision established by the state. The direct link to the integrated agenda management platform shall not be in a contextual menu. When a person clicks on the direct link to the integrated agenda management platform, the direct link shall take the person directly to an Internet Web site with the agendas of the legislative body of a city, county, city and county, special district, school district, or political subdivision established by the state.

(ii) The integrated agenda management platform may contain the prior agendas of a legislative body of a city, county, city and county, special district, school district, or political subdivision established by the state for all meetings occurring on or after January 1, 2019.

(iii) The current agenda of the legislative body of a city, county, city and county, special district, school district, or political subdivision established by the state shall be the first agenda available at the top of the integrated agenda management platform.

(iv) All agendas posted in the integrated agenda management platform shall comply with the requirements in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (B).

(D) For the purposes of this paragraph, both of the following definitions shall apply:

(i) “Integrated agenda management platform” means an Internet Web site of a city, county, city and county, special district, school district, or political subdivision established by the state dedicated to providing the entirety of the agenda information for the legislative body of the city, county, city and county, special district, school district, or political subdivision established by the state to the public.

(ii) “Legislative body” has the same meaning as that term is used in subdivision (a) of Section 54952.
(E) The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to a political subdivision of a local agency that was established by the legislative body of the city, county, city and county, special district, school district, or political subdivision established by the state.

(3) No action or discussion shall be undertaken on any item not appearing on the posted agenda, except that members of a legislative body or its staff may briefly respond to statements made or questions posed by persons exercising their public testimony rights under Section 54954.3. In addition, on their own initiative or in response to questions posed by the public, a member of a legislative body or its staff may ask a question for clarification, make a brief announcement, or make a brief report on his or her own activities. Furthermore, a member of a legislative body, or the body itself, subject to rules or procedures of the legislative body, may provide a reference to staff or other resources for factual information, request staff to report back to the body at a subsequent meeting concerning any matter, or take action to direct staff to place a matter of business on a future agenda.

(b) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), the legislative body may take action on items of business not appearing on the posted agenda under any of the conditions stated below. Prior to discussing any item pursuant to this subdivision, the legislative body shall publicly identify the item.

(1) Upon a determination by a majority vote of the legislative body that an emergency situation exists, as defined in Section 54956.5.

(2) Upon a determination by a two-thirds vote of the members of the legislative body present at the meeting, or, if less than two-thirds of the members are present, a unanimous vote of those members present, that there is a need to take immediate action and that the need for action came to the attention of the local agency subsequent to the agenda being posted as specified in subdivision (a).

(3) The item was posted pursuant to subdivision (a) for a prior meeting of the legislative body occurring not more than five calendar days prior to the date action is taken on the item, and at the prior meeting the item was continued to the meeting at which action is being taken.

(c) This section is necessary to implement and reasonably within the scope of paragraph (1) of subdivision (b) of Section 3 of Article I of the California Constitution.

(d) For purposes of subdivision (a), the requirement that the agenda be posted on the local agency’s Internet Web site, if the local agency has one, shall only apply to a legislative body that meets either of the following standards:

(1) A legislative body as that term is defined by subdivision (a) of Section 54952.

(2) A legislative body as that term is defined by subdivision (b) of Section 54952, if the members of the legislative body are compensated for their appearance, and if one or more of the members of the legislative body are also
members of a legislative body as that term is defined by subdivision (a) of Section 54952.

**Section 54954.3. Public testimony at regular meetings**

(a) Every agenda for regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public, before or during the legislative body’s consideration of the item, that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body, provided that no action shall be taken on any item not appearing on the agenda unless the action is otherwise authorized by subdivision (b) of Section 54954.2. However, the agenda need not provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the legislative body on any item that has already been considered by a committee, composed exclusively of members of the legislative body, at a public meeting wherein all interested members of the public were afforded the opportunity to address the committee on the item, before or during the committee’s consideration of the item, unless the item has been substantially changed since the committee heard the item, as determined by the legislative body. Every notice for a special meeting shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body concerning any item that has been described in the notice for the meeting before or during consideration of that item.

(b) (1) The legislative body of a local agency may adopt reasonable regulations to ensure that the intent of subdivision (a) is carried out, including, but not limited to, regulations limiting the total amount of time allocated for public testimony on particular issues and for each individual speaker.

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), when the legislative body of a local agency limits time for public comment, the legislative body of a local agency shall provide at least twice the allotted time to a member of the public who utilizes a translator to ensure that non-English speakers receive the same opportunity to directly address the legislative body of a local agency.

(3) Paragraph (2) shall not apply if the legislative body of a local agency utilizes simultaneous translation equipment in a manner that allows the legislative body of a local agency to hear the translated public testimony simultaneously.

(c) The legislative body of a local agency shall not prohibit public criticism of the policies, procedures, programs, or services of the agency, or of the acts or omissions of the legislative body. Nothing in this subdivision shall confer any privilege or protection for expression beyond that otherwise provided by law.

**Section 54954.4. Legislative findings and declarations relating to reimbursements; Legislative intent; Review of claims**

(a) The Legislature hereby finds and declares that Section 12 of Chapter 641 of the Statutes of 1986, authorizing reimbursement to local agencies and school districts for costs mandated by the state pursuant to that act, shall be interpreted strictly. The intent of the Legislature is to provide reimbursement for only those costs which are
clearly and unequivocally incurred as the direct and necessary result of compliance with Chapter 641 of the Statutes of 1986.

(b) In this regard, the Legislature directs all state employees and officials involved in reviewing or authorizing claims for reimbursement, or otherwise participating in the reimbursement process, to rigorously review each claim and authorize only those claims, or parts thereof, which represent costs which are clearly and unequivocally incurred as the direct and necessary result of compliance with Chapter 641 of the Statutes of 1986 and for which complete documentation exists. For purposes of Section 54954.2, costs eligible for reimbursement shall only include the actual cost to post a single agenda for any one meeting.

(c) The Legislature hereby finds and declares that complete, faithful, and uninterrupted compliance with the Ralph M. Brown Act (Chapter 9 (commencing with Section 54950) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 of the Government Code) is a matter of overriding public importance. Unless specifically stated, no future Budget Act, or related budget enactments, shall, in any manner, be interpreted to suspend, eliminate, or otherwise modify the legal obligation and duty of local agencies to fully comply with Chapter 641 of the Statutes of 1986 in a complete, faithful, and uninterrupted manner.

Section 54954.5. Description of closed session items

For purposes of describing closed session items pursuant to Section 54954.2, the agenda may describe closed sessions as provided below. No legislative body or elected official shall be in violation of Section 54954.2 or 54956 if the closed session items were described in substantial compliance with this section. Substantial compliance is satisfied by including the information provided below, irrespective of its format.

(a) With respect to a closed session held pursuant to Section 54956.7:

LICENSE/PERMIT DETERMINATION

Applicant(s): (Specify number of applicants)

(b) With respect to every item of business to be discussed in closed session pursuant to Section 54956.8:

CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS

Property: (Specify street address, or if no street address, the parcel number or other unique reference, of the real property under negotiation)

Agency negotiator: (Specify names of negotiators attending the closed session) (If circumstances necessitate the absence of a specified negotiator, an agent or designee may participate in place of the absent negotiator so long as the name of the agent or designee is announced at an open session held prior to the closed session.)

Negotiating parties: (Specify name of party (not agent))
Under negotiation: (Specify whether instruction to negotiator will concern price, terms of payment, or both)

(c) With respect to every item of business to be discussed in closed session pursuant to Section 54956.9:

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL--EXISTING LITIGATION
(Paragraph (1) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9)

Name of case: (Specify by reference to claimant’s name, names of parties, case or claim numbers)

or

Case name unspecified: (Specify whether disclosure would jeopardize service of process or existing settlement negotiations)

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - ANTICIPATED LITIGATION

Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to paragraph (2) or (3) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9: (Specify number of potential cases)

(In addition to the information noticed above, the agency may be required to provide additional information on the agenda or in an oral statement prior to the closed session pursuant to paragraphs (2) to (5), inclusive, of subdivision (e) of Section 54956.9)

Initiation of litigation pursuant to paragraph (4) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9: (Specify number of potential cases)

(d) With respect to every item of business to be discussed in closed session pursuant to Section 54956.95:

LIABILITY CLAIMS

Claimant: (Specify name unless unspecified pursuant to Section 54961)

Agency claimed against: (Specify name)

(e) With respect to every item of business to be discussed in closed session pursuant to Section 54957:

THREAT TO PUBLIC SERVICES OR FACILITIES

Consultation with: (Specify name of law enforcement agency and title of officer, or name of applicable agency representative and title)

PUBLIC EMPLOYEE APPOINTMENT

Title: (Specify description of position to be filled)
PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT
Title: (Specify description of position to be filled)

PUBLIC EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
Title: (Specify position title of employee being reviewed)

PUBLIC EMPLOYEE DISCIPLINE/DISMISSAL/RELEASE
(No additional information is required in connection with a closed session to consider discipline, dismissal, or release of a public employee. Discipline includes potential reduction of compensation.)

(f) With respect to every item of business to be discussed in closed session pursuant to Section 54957.6:

CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS
Agency designated representatives: (Specify names of designated representatives attending the closed session) (If circumstances necessitate the absence of a specified designated representative, an agent or designee may participate in place of the absent representative so long as the name of the agent or designee is announced at an open session held prior to the closed session)

Employee organization: (Specify name of organization representing employee or employees in question)

or

Unrepresented employee: (Specify position title of unrepresented employee who is the subject of the negotiations)

(g) With respect to closed sessions called pursuant to Section 54957.8:

CASE REVIEW/PLANNING
(No additional information is required in connection with a closed session to consider case review or planning.)

(h) With respect to every item of business to be discussed in closed session pursuant to Sections 1461, 32106, and 32155 of the Health and Safety Code or Sections 37606 and 37624.3 of the Government Code:

REPORT INVOLVING TRADE SECRET
Discussion will concern: (Specify whether discussion will concern proposed new service, program, or facility)
Estimated date of public disclosure: (Specify month and year)

HEARINGS

Subject matter: (Specify whether testimony/deliberation will concern staff privileges, report of medical audit committee, or report of quality assurance committee)

(i) With respect to every item of business to be discussed in closed session pursuant to Section 54956.86:

CHARGE OR COMPLAINT INVOLVING INFORMATION PROTECTED BY FEDERAL LAW

(No additional information is required in connection with a closed session to discuss a charge or complaint pursuant to Section 54956.86.)

(j) With respect to every item of business to be discussed in closed session pursuant to Section 54956.96:

CONFERENCE INVOLVING A JOINT POWERS AGENCY (Specify by name)

Discussion will concern: (Specify closed session description used by the joint powers agency)

Name of local agency representative on joint powers agency board: (Specify name)

(Additional information listing the names of agencies or titles of representatives attending the closed session as consultants or other representatives.)

(k) With respect to every item of business to be discussed in closed session pursuant to Section 54956.75:

AUDIT BY CALIFORNIA STATE AUDITOR'S OFFICE

Section 54954.6. Public meeting on general tax or assessment; Notice

(a) (1) Before adopting any new or increased general tax or any new or increased assessment, the legislative body of a local agency shall conduct at least one public meeting at which local officials shall allow public testimony regarding the proposed new or increased general tax or new or increased assessment in addition to the noticed public hearing at which the legislative body proposes to enact or increase the general tax or assessment.

For purposes of this section, the term “new or increased assessment” does not include any of the following:

(A) A fee that does not exceed the reasonable cost of providing the services, facilities, or regulatory activity for which the fee is charged.
(B) A service charge, rate, or charge, unless a special district's principal act requires the service charge, rate, or charge to conform to the requirements of this section.

(C) An ongoing annual assessment if it is imposed at the same or lower amount as any previous year.

(D) An assessment that does not exceed an assessment formula or range of assessments previously specified in the notice given to the public pursuant to subparagraph (G) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) and that was previously adopted by the agency or approved by the voters in the area where the assessment is imposed.

(E) Standby or immediate availability charges.

(2) The legislative body shall provide at least 45 days' public notice of the public hearing at which the legislative body proposes to enact or increase the general tax or assessment. The legislative body shall provide notice for the public meeting at the same time and in the same document as the notice for the public hearing, but the meeting shall occur prior to the hearing.

(b) (1) The joint notice of both the public meeting and the public hearing required by subdivision (a) with respect to a proposal for a new or increased general tax shall be accomplished by placing a display advertisement of at least one-eighth page in a newspaper of general circulation for three weeks pursuant to Section 6063 and by a first-class mailing to those interested parties who have filed a written request with the local agency for mailed notice of public meetings or hearings on new or increased general taxes. The public meeting pursuant to subdivision (a) shall take place no earlier than 10 days after the first publication of the joint notice pursuant to this subdivision. The public hearing shall take place no earlier than seven days after the public meeting pursuant to this subdivision. Notwithstanding paragraph (2) of subdivision (a), the joint notice need not include notice of the public meeting after the meeting has taken place. The public hearing pursuant to subdivision (a) shall take place no earlier than 45 days after the first publication of the joint notice pursuant to this subdivision. Any written request for mailed notices shall be effective for one year from the date on which it is filed unless a renewal request is filed. Renewal requests for mailed notices shall be filed on or before April 1 of each year. The legislative body may establish a reasonable annual charge for sending notices based on the estimated cost of providing the service.

(2) The notice required by paragraph (1) of this subdivision shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

(A) The amount or rate of the tax. If the tax is proposed to be increased from any previous year, the joint notice shall separately state both the existing tax rate and the proposed tax rate increase.

(B) The activity to be taxed.

(C) The estimated amount of revenue to be raised by the tax annually.
(D) The method and frequency for collecting the tax.

(E) The dates, times, and locations of the public meeting and hearing described in subdivision (a).

(F) The telephone number and address of an individual, office, or organization that interested persons may contact to receive additional information about the tax.

(c) (1) The joint notice of both the public meeting and the public hearing required by subdivision (a) with respect to a proposal for a new or increased assessment on real property or businesses shall be accomplished through a mailing, postage prepaid, in the United States mail and shall be deemed given when so deposited. The public meeting pursuant to subdivision (a) shall take place no earlier than 10 days after the joint mailing pursuant to this subdivision. The public hearing shall take place no earlier than seven days after the public meeting pursuant to this subdivision. The envelope or the cover of the mailing shall include the name of the local agency and the return address of the sender. This mailed notice shall be in at least 10-point type and shall be given to all property owners or business owners proposed to be subject to the new or increased assessment by a mailing by name to those persons whose names and addresses appear on the last equalized county assessment roll, the State Board of Equalization assessment roll, or the local agency’s records pertaining to business ownership, as the case may be.

(2) The joint notice required by paragraph (1) of this subdivision shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

(A) In the case of an assessment proposed to be levied on property, the estimated amount of the assessment per parcel. In the case of an assessment proposed to be levied on businesses, the proposed method and basis of levying the assessment in sufficient detail to allow each business owner to calculate the amount of assessment to be levied against each business. If the assessment is proposed to be increased from any previous year, the joint notice shall separately state both the amount of the existing assessment and the proposed assessment increase.

(B) A general description of the purpose or improvements that the assessment will fund.

(C) The address to which property owners may mail a protest against the assessment.

(D) The telephone number and address of an individual, office, or organization that interested persons may contact to receive additional information about the assessment.

(E) A statement that a majority protest will cause the assessment to be abandoned if the assessment act used to levy the assessment so provides. Notice shall also state the percentage of protests required to trigger an election, if applicable.
(F) The dates, times, and locations of the public meeting and hearing described in subdivision (a).

(G) A proposed assessment formula or range as described in subparagraph (D) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) if applicable and that is noticed pursuant to this section.

(3) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), in the case of an assessment that is proposed exclusively for operation and maintenance expenses imposed throughout the entire local agency, or exclusively for operation and maintenance assessments proposed to be levied on 50,000 parcels or more, notice may be provided pursuant to this subdivision or pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (b) and shall include the estimated amount of the assessment of various types, amounts, or uses of property and the information required by subparagraphs (B) to (G), inclusive, of paragraph (2) of subdivision (c).

(4) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), in the case of an assessment proposed to be levied pursuant to Part 2 (commencing with Section 22500) of Division 2 of the Streets and Highways Code by a regional park district, regional park and open-space district, or regional open-space district formed pursuant to Article 3 (commencing with Section 5500) of Chapter 3 of Division 5 of, or pursuant to Division 26 (commencing with Section 35100) of, the Public Resources Code, notice may be provided pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (b).

(d) The notice requirements imposed by this section shall be construed as additional to, and not to supersede, existing provisions of law, and shall be applied concurrently with the existing provisions so as to not delay or prolong the governmental decisionmaking process.

(e) This section shall not apply to any new or increased general tax or any new or increased assessment that requires an election of either of the following:

(1) The property owners subject to the assessment.

(2) The voters within the local agency imposing the tax or assessment.

(f) Nothing in this section shall prohibit a local agency from holding a consolidated meeting or hearing at which the legislative body discusses multiple tax or assessment proposals.

(g) The local agency may recover the reasonable costs of public meetings, public hearings, and notice required by this section from the proceeds of the tax or assessment. The costs recovered for these purposes, whether recovered pursuant to this subdivision or any other provision of law, shall not exceed the reasonable costs of the public meetings, public hearings, and notice.

(h) Any new or increased assessment that is subject to the notice and hearing provisions of Article XIII C or XIII D of the California Constitution is not subject to the notice and hearing requirements of this section.
Section 54955. Adjournment of meetings

The legislative body of a local agency may adjourn any regular, adjourned regular, special or adjourned special meeting to a time and place specified in the order of adjournment. Less than a quorum may so adjourn from time to time. If all members are absent from any regular or adjourned regular meeting the clerk or secretary of the legislative body may declare the meeting adjourned to a stated time and place and he shall cause a written notice of the adjournment to be given in the same manner as provided in Section 54956 for special meetings, unless such notice is waived as provided for special meetings. A copy of the order or notice of adjournment shall be conspicuously posted on or near the door of the place where the regular, adjourned regular, special or adjourned special meeting was held within 24 hours after the time of the adjournment. When a regular or adjourned regular meeting is adjourned as provided in this section, the resulting adjourned regular meeting is a regular meeting for all purposes. When an order of adjournment of any meeting fails to state the hour at which the adjourned meeting is to be held, it shall be held at the hour specified for regular meetings by ordinance, resolution, bylaw, or other rule.

Section 54955.1. Continuance of hearing

Any hearing being held, or noticed or ordered to be held, by a legislative body of a local agency at any meeting may by order or notice of continuance be continued or recontinued to any subsequent meeting of the legislative body in the same manner and to the same extent set forth in Section 54955 for the adjournment of meetings; provided, that if the hearing is continued to a time less than 24 hours after the time specified in the order or notice of hearing, a copy of the order or notice of continuance of hearing shall be posted immediately following the meeting at which the order or declaration of continuance was adopted or made.

Section 54956. Special meetings; call; notice; meetings regarding local agency executive salaries, salary schedules, or compensation in form of fringe benefits; posting on Internet Web site

(a) A special meeting may be called at any time by the presiding officer of the legislative body of a local agency, or by a majority of the members of the legislative body, by delivering written notice to each member of the legislative body and to each local newspaper of general circulation and radio or television station requesting notice in writing and posting a notice on the local agency's Internet Web site, if the local agency has one. The notice shall be delivered personally or by any other means and shall be received at least 24 hours before the time of the meeting as specified in the notice. The call and notice shall specify the time and place of the special meeting and the business to be transacted or discussed. No other business shall be considered at these meetings by the legislative body. The written notice may be dispensed with as to any member who at or prior to the time the meeting convenes files with the clerk or secretary of the legislative body a written waiver of notice. The waiver may be given by telegram. The written notice may also be dispensed with as to any member who is actually present at the meeting at the time it convenes.
The call and notice shall be posted at least 24 hours prior to the special meeting in a location that is freely accessible to members of the public.

(b) Notwithstanding any other law, a legislative body shall not call a special meeting regarding the salaries, salary schedules, or compensation paid in the form of fringe benefits, of a local agency executive, as defined in subdivision (d) of Section 3511.1. However, this subdivision does not apply to a local agency calling a special meeting to discuss the local agency’s budget.

(c) For purposes of subdivision (a), the requirement that the agenda be posted on the local agency’s Internet Web site, if the local agency has one, shall only apply to a legislative body that meets either of the following standards:

(1) A legislative body as that term is defined by subdivision (a) of Section 54952.

(2) A legislative body as that term is defined by subdivision (b) of Section 54952, if the members of the legislative body are compensated for their appearance, and if one or more of the members of the legislative body are also members of a legislative body as that term is defined by subdivision (a) of Section 54952.

Section 54956.5. Emergency meetings; Notice

(a) For purposes of this section, “emergency situation” means both of the following:

(1) An emergency, which shall be defined as a work stoppage, crippling activity, or other activity that severely impairs public health, safety, or both, as determined by a majority of the members of the legislative body.

(2) A dire emergency, which shall be defined as a crippling disaster, mass destruction, terrorist act, or threatened terrorist activity that poses peril so immediate and significant that requiring a legislative body to provide one-hour notice before holding an emergency meeting under this section may endanger the public health, safety, or both, as determined by a majority of the members of the legislative body.

(b) (1) Subject to paragraph (2), in the case of an emergency situation involving matters upon which prompt action is necessary due to the disruption or threatened disruption of public facilities, a legislative body may hold an emergency meeting without complying with either the 24-hour notice requirement or the 24-hour posting requirement of Section 54956 or both of the notice and posting requirements.

(2) Each local newspaper of general circulation and radio or television station that has requested notice of special meetings pursuant to Section 54956 shall be notified by the presiding officer of the legislative body, or designee thereof, one hour prior to the emergency meeting, or, in the case of a dire emergency, at or near the time that the presiding officer or designee notifies the members of the legislative body of the emergency meeting. This notice shall be given by telephone and all telephone numbers provided in the most recent request of a newspaper or station for notification.
of special meetings shall be exhausted. In the event that telephone services are not functioning, the notice requirements of this Section shall be deemed waived, and the legislative body, or designee of the legislative body, shall notify those newspapers, radio stations, or television stations of the fact of the holding of the emergency meeting, the purpose of the meeting, and any action taken at the meeting as soon after the meeting as possible.

(c) During a meeting held pursuant to this section, the legislative body may meet in closed session pursuant to Section 54957 if agreed to by a two-thirds vote of the members of the legislative body present, or, if less than two-thirds of the members are present, by a unanimous vote of the members present.

(d) All special meeting requirements, as prescribed in Section 54956 shall be applicable to a meeting called pursuant to this section, with the exception of the 24-hour notice requirement.

(e) The minutes of a meeting called pursuant to this section, a list of persons who the presiding officer of the legislative body, or designee of the legislative body, notified or attempted to notify, a copy of the rollcall vote, and any actions taken at the meeting shall be posted for a minimum of 10 days in a public place as soon after the meeting as possible.

Section 54956.6. Fees

No fees may be charged by the legislative body of a local agency for carrying out any provision of this chapter, except as specifically authorized by this chapter.

Section 54956.7. Closed sessions regarding application from person with criminal record

Whenever a legislative body of a local agency determines that it is necessary to discuss and determine whether an applicant for a license or license renewal, who has a criminal record, is sufficiently rehabilitated to obtain the license, the legislative body may hold a closed session with the applicant and the applicant’s attorney, if any, for the purpose of holding the discussion and making the determination. If the legislative body determines, as a result of the closed session, that the issuance or renewal of the license should be denied, the applicant shall be offered the opportunity to withdraw the application. If the applicant withdraws the application, no record shall be kept of the discussions or decisions made at the closed session and all matters relating to the closed session shall be confidential. If the applicant does not withdraw the application, the legislative body shall take action at the public meeting during which the closed session is held or at its next public meeting denying the application for the license but all matters relating to the closed session are confidential and shall not be disclosed without the consent of the applicant, except in an action by an applicant who has been denied a license challenging the denial of the license.
Section 54956.75. Closed session for response to final draft audit report

(a) Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed to prevent the legislative body of a local agency that has received a confidential final draft audit report from the Bureau of State Audits from holding closed sessions to discuss its response to that report.

(b) After the public release of an audit report by the Bureau of State Audits, if a legislative body of a local agency meets to discuss the audit report, it shall do so in an open session unless exempted from that requirement by some other provision of law.

Section 54956.8. Closed sessions regarding real property negotiations

Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a legislative body of a local agency may hold a closed session with its negotiator prior to the purchase, sale, exchange, or lease of real property by or for the local agency to grant authority to its negotiator regarding the price and terms of payment for the purchase, sale, exchange, or lease. However, prior to the closed session, the legislative body of the local agency shall hold an open and public session in which it identifies its negotiators, the real property or real properties which the negotiations may concern, and the person or persons with whom its negotiators may negotiate.

For purposes of this section, negotiators may be members of the legislative body of the local agency.

For purposes of this section, “lease” includes renewal or renegotiation of a lease.

Nothing in this section shall preclude a local agency from holding a closed session for discussions regarding eminent domain proceedings pursuant to Section 54956.9.

Section 54956.81. Closed sessions regarding purchase or sale of pension fund investments

Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a legislative body of a local agency that invests pension funds may hold a closed session to consider the purchase or sale of particular, specific pension fund investments. All investment transaction decisions made during the closed session shall be made by rollick vote entered into the minutes of the closed session as provided in subdivision (a) of Section 54957.2.

Section 54956.86. Closed session for health plan member

Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a legislative body of a local agency which provides services pursuant to Section 14087.3 of the Welfare and Institutions Code may hold a closed session to hear a charge or complaint from a member enrolled in its health plan if the member does not wish to have his or her name, medical status, or other information that is protected by federal law publicly disclosed. Prior to holding a closed session pursuant to this section, the legislative body shall inform the member, in writing, of his or her right to have the charge or complaint heard in an open session rather than a closed session.
Section 54956.87. Disclosure of records and information; Meetings in closed session

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, the records of a health plan that is licensed pursuant to the Knox-Keene Health Care Service Plan Act of 1975 (Chapter 2.2 (commencing with Section 1340) of Division 2 of the Health and Safety Code) and that is governed by a county board of supervisors, whether paper records, records maintained in the management information system, or records in any other form, that relate to provider rate or payment determinations, allocation or distribution methodologies for provider payments, formulas or calculations for these payments, and contract negotiations with providers of health care for alternative rates are exempt from disclosure for a period of three years after the contract is fully executed. The transmission of the records, or the information contained therein in an alternative form, to the board of supervisors shall not constitute a waiver of exemption from disclosure, and the records and information once transmitted to the board of supervisors shall be subject to this same exemption.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the governing board of a health plan that is licensed pursuant to the Knox-Keene Health Care Service Plan Act of 1975 (Chapter 2.2 (commencing with Section 1340) of Division 2 of the Health and Safety Code) and that is governed by a county board of supervisors may order that a meeting held solely for the purpose of discussion or taking action on health plan trade secrets, as defined in subdivision (f), shall be held in closed session. The requirements of making a public report of action taken in closed session, and the vote or abstention of every member present, may be limited to a brief general description without the information constituting the trade secret.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the governing board of a health plan may meet in closed session to consider and take action on matters pertaining to contracts and contract negotiations by the health plan with providers of health care services concerning all matters related to rates of payment. The governing board may delete the portion or portions containing trade secrets from any documents that were finally approved in the closed session held pursuant to subdivision (b) that are provided to persons who have made the timely or standing request.

(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed as preventing the governing board from meeting in closed session as otherwise provided by law.

(e) The provisions of this section shall not prevent access to any records by the Joint Legislative Audit Committee in the exercise of its powers pursuant to Article 1 (commencing with Section 10500) of Chapter 4 of Part 2 of Division 2 of Title 2. The provisions of this section also shall not prevent access to any records by the Department of Corporations in the exercise of its powers pursuant to Article 1 (commencing with Section 1340) of Chapter 2.2 of Division 2 of the Health and Safety Code.

(f) For purposes of this section, “health plan trade secret” means a trade secret, as defined in subdivision (d) of Section 3426.1 of the Civil Code, that also meets both of the following criteria:
(1) The secrecy of the information is necessary for the health plan to initiate a new service, program, marketing strategy, business plan, or technology, or to add a benefit or product.

(2) Premature disclosure of the trade secret would create a substantial probability of depriving the health plan of a substantial economic benefit or opportunity.

Section 54956.9. Closed sessions concerning pending litigation; Lawyer-client privilege

(a) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prevent a legislative body of a local agency, based on advice of its legal counsel, from holding a closed session to confer with, or receive advice from, its legal counsel regarding pending litigation when discussion in open session concerning those matters would prejudice the position of the local agency in the litigation.

(b) For purposes of this chapter, all expressions of the lawyer-client privilege other than those provided in this Section are hereby abrogated. This Section is the exclusive expression of the lawyer-client privilege for purposes of conducting closed-session meetings pursuant to this chapter.

(c) For purposes of this section, “litigation” includes any adjudicatory proceeding, including eminent domain, before a court, administrative body exercising its adjudicatory authority, hearing officer, or arbitrator.

(d) For purposes of this section, litigation shall be considered pending when any of the following circumstances exist:

(1) Litigation, to which the local agency is a party, has been initiated formally.

(2) A point has been reached where, in the opinion of the legislative body of the local agency on the advice of its legal counsel, based on existing facts and circumstances, there is a significant exposure to litigation against the local agency.

(3) Based on existing facts and circumstances, the legislative body of the local agency is meeting only to decide whether a closed session is authorized pursuant to paragraph (2).

(4) Based on existing facts and circumstances, the legislative body of the local agency has decided to initiate or is deciding whether to initiate litigation.

(e) For purposes of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subdivision (d), “existing facts and circumstances” shall consist only of one of the following:

(1) Facts and circumstances that might result in litigation against the local agency but which the local agency believes are not yet known to a potential plaintiff or plaintiffs, which facts and circumstances need not be disclosed.
(2) Facts and circumstances, including, but not limited to, an accident, disaster, incident, or transactional occurrence that might result in litigation against the agency and that are known to a potential plaintiff or plaintiffs, which facts or circumstances shall be publicly stated on the agenda or announced.

(3) The receipt of a claim pursuant to the Government Claims Act (Division 3.6 (commencing with Section 810) of Title 1 of the Government Code) or some other written communication from a potential plaintiff threatening litigation, which claim or communication shall be available for public inspection pursuant to Section 54957.5.

(4) A statement made by a person in an open and public meeting threatening litigation on a specific matter within the responsibility of the legislative body.

(5) A statement threatening litigation made by a person outside an open and public meeting on a specific matter within the responsibility of the legislative body so long as the official or employee of the local agency receiving knowledge of the threat makes a contemporaneous or other record of the statement prior to the meeting, which record shall be available for public inspection pursuant to Section 54957.5. The records so created need not identify the alleged victim of unlawful or tortious sexual conduct or anyone making the threat on their behalf, or identify a public employee who is the alleged perpetrator of any unlawful or tortious conduct upon which a threat of litigation is based, unless the identity of the person has been publicly disclosed.

(f) Nothing in this Section shall require disclosure of written communications that are privileged and not subject to disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act (Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 6250) of Division 7 of Title 1).

(g) Prior to holding a closed session pursuant to this section, the legislative body of the local agency shall state on the agenda or publicly announce the paragraph of subdivision (d) that authorizes the closed session. If the session is closed pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (d), the body shall state the title of or otherwise specifically identify the litigation to be discussed, unless the body states that to do so would jeopardize the agency’s ability to effectuate service of process upon one or more unserved parties, or that to do so would jeopardize its ability to conclude existing settlement negotiations to its advantage.

(h) A local agency shall be considered to be a “party” or to have a “significant exposure to litigation” if an officer or employee of the local agency is a party or has significant exposure to litigation concerning prior or prospective activities or alleged activities during the course and scope of that office or employment, including litigation in which it is an issue whether an activity is outside the course and scope of the office or employment.
Section 54956.95. Closed sessions regarding liability

(a) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prevent a joint powers agency formed pursuant to Article 1 (commencing with Section 6500) of Chapter 5 of Division 7 of Title 1, for purposes of insurance pooling, or a local agency member of the joint powers agency, from holding a closed session to discuss a claim for the payment of tort liability losses, public liability losses, or workers’ compensation liability incurred by the joint powers agency or a local agency member of the joint powers agency.

(b) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prevent the Local Agency Self-Insurance Authority formed pursuant to Chapter 5.5 (commencing with Section 6599.01) of Division 7 of Title 1, or a local agency member of the authority, from holding a closed session to discuss a claim for the payment of tort liability losses, public liability losses, or workers’ compensation liability incurred by the authority or a local agency member of the authority.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect Section 54956.9 with respect to any other local agency.

Section 54956.96. Disclosure of specified information in closed session of joint powers agency; Authorization of designated alternate to attend closed session; Closed session of legislative body of local agency member

(a) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prevent the legislative body of a joint powers agency formed pursuant to Article 1 (commencing with Section 6500) of Chapter 5 of Division 7 of Title 1, from adopting a policy or a bylaw or including in its joint powers agreement provisions that authorize either or both of the following:

(1) All information received by the legislative body of the local agency member in a closed session related to the information presented to the joint powers agency in closed session shall be confidential. However, a member of the legislative body of a member local agency may disclose information obtained in a closed session that has direct financial or liability implications for that local agency to the following individuals:

(A) Legal counsel of that member local agency for purposes of obtaining advice on whether the matter has direct financial or liability implications for that member local agency.

(B) Other members of the legislative body of the local agency present in a closed session of that member local agency.

(2) Any designated alternate member of the legislative body of the joint powers agency who is also a member of the legislative body of a local agency member and who is attending a properly noticed meeting of the joint powers agency in lieu of a local agency member’s regularly appointed member to attend closed sessions of the joint powers agency.
(b) If the legislative body of a joint powers agency adopts a policy or a bylaw or includes provisions in its joint powers agreement pursuant to subdivision (a), then the legislative body of the local agency member, upon the advice of its legal counsel, may conduct a closed session in order to receive, discuss, and take action concerning information obtained in a closed session of the joint powers agency pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (a).

Section 54957.  Closed session regarding public security, facilities, employees, examination of witness

(a) This chapter shall not be construed to prevent the legislative body of a local agency from holding closed sessions with the Governor, Attorney General, district attorney, agency counsel, sheriff, or chief of police, or their respective deputies, or a security consultant or a security operations manager, on matters posing a threat to the security of public buildings, a threat to the security of essential public services, including water, drinking water, wastewater treatment, natural gas service, and electric service, or a threat to the public’s right of access to public services or public facilities.

(b) (1) Subject to paragraph (2), this chapter shall not be construed to prevent the legislative body of a local agency from holding closed sessions during a regular or special meeting to consider the appointment, employment, evaluation of performance, discipline, or dismissal of a public employee or to hear complaints or charges brought against the employee by another person or employee unless the employee requests a public session.

(2) As a condition to holding a closed session on specific complaints or charges brought against an employee by another person or employee, the employee shall be given written notice of his or her right to have the complaints or charges heard in an open session rather than a closed session, which notice shall be delivered to the employee personally or by mail at least 24 hours before the time for holding the session. If notice is not given, any disciplinary or other action taken by the legislative body against the employee based on the specific complaints or charges in the closed session shall be null and void.

(3) The legislative body also may exclude from the public or closed meeting, during the examination of a witness, any or all other witnesses in the matter being investigated by the legislative body.

(4) For the purposes of this subdivision, the term “employee” shall include an officer or an independent contractor who functions as an officer or an employee but shall not include any elected official, member of a legislative body or other independent contractors. This subdivision shall not limit local officials’ ability to hold closed session meetings pursuant to Sections 1461, 32106, and 32155 of the Health and Safety Code or Sections 37606 and 37624.3 of the Government Code. Closed sessions held pursuant to this subdivision shall not include discussion or action on proposed compensation except for a reduction of compensation that results from the imposition of discipline.
Section 54957.1. Public report of action taken in closed session; Form; Availability; Actions for injury to interests

(a) The legislative body of any local agency shall publicly report any action taken in closed session and the vote or abstention on that action of every member present, as follows:

(1) Approval of an agreement concluding real estate negotiations pursuant to Section 54956.8 shall be reported after the agreement is final, as follows:

(A) If its own approval renders the agreement final, the body shall report that approval and the substance of the agreement in open session at the public meeting during which the closed session is held.

(B) If final approval rests with the other party to the negotiations, the local agency shall disclose the fact of that approval and the substance of the agreement upon inquiry by any person, as soon as the other party or its agent has informed the local agency of its approval.

(2) Approval given to its legal counsel to defend, or seek or refrain from seeking appellate review or relief, or to enter as an amicus curiae in any form of litigation as the result of a consultation under Section 54956.9 shall be reported in open session at the public meeting during which the closed session is held. The report shall identify, if known, the adverse party or parties and the substance of the litigation. In the case of approval given to initiate or intervene in an action, the announcement need not identify the action, the defendants, or other particulars, but shall specify that the direction to initiate or intervene in an action has been given and that the action, the defendants, and the other particulars shall, once formally commenced, be disclosed to any person upon inquiry, unless to do so would jeopardize the agency's ability to effectuate service of process on one or more unserved parties, or that to do so would jeopardize its ability to conclude existing settlement negotiations to its advantage.

(3) Approval given to its legal counsel of a settlement of pending litigation, as defined in Section 54956.9, at any stage prior to or during a judicial or quasi-judicial proceeding shall be reported after the settlement is final, as follows:

(A) If the legislative body accepts a settlement offer signed by the opposing party, the body shall report its acceptance and identify the substance of the agreement in open session at the public meeting during which the closed session is held.

(B) If final approval rests with some other party to the litigation or with the court, then as soon as the settlement becomes final, and upon inquiry by any person, the local agency shall disclose the fact of that approval, and identify the substance of the agreement.

(4) Disposition reached as to claims discussed in closed session pursuant to Section 54956.95 shall be reported as soon as reached in a manner that identifies the name of the claimant, the name of the local agency claimed against, the substance
of the claim, and any monetary amount approved for payment and agreed upon by
the claimant.

(5) Action taken to appoint, employ, dismiss, accept the resignation of, or
otherwise affect the employment status of a public employee in closed session
pursuant to Section 54957 shall be reported at the public meeting during which the
closed session is held. Any report required by this paragraph shall identify the title of the
position. The general requirement of this paragraph notwithstanding, the report of a
dismissal or of the nonrenewal of an employment contract shall be deferred until the
first public meeting following the exhaustion of administrative remedies, if any.

(6) Approval of an agreement concluding labor negotiations with
represented employees pursuant to Section 54957.6 shall be reported after the
agreement is final and has been accepted or ratified by the other party. The report
shall identify the item approved and the other party or parties to the negotiation.

(7) Pension fund investment transaction decisions made pursuant to
Section 54956.81 shall be disclosed at the first open meeting of the legislative body held
after the earlier of the close of the investment transaction or the transfer of pension
fund assets for the investment transaction.

(b) Reports that are required to be made pursuant to this Section may be made
orally or in writing. The legislative body shall provide to any person who has submitted a
written request to the legislative body within 24 hours of the posting of the agenda, or
to any person who has made a standing request for all documentation as part of a
request for notice of meetings pursuant to Section 54954.1 or 54956, if the requester is
present at the time the closed session ends, copies of any contracts, settlement
agreements, or other documents that were finally approved or adopted in the closed
session. If the action taken results in one or more substantive amendments to the
related documents requiring retyping, the documents need not be released until the
retyping is completed during normal business hours, provided that the presiding officer
of the legislative body or his or her designee orally summarizes the substance of the
amendments for the benefit of the document requester or any other person present
and requesting the information.

(c) The documentation referred to in subdivision (b) shall be available to any person
on the next business day following the meeting in which the action referred to is taken
or, in the case of substantial amendments, when any necessary retyping is complete.

(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require that the legislative body
approve actions not otherwise subject to legislative body approval.

(e) No action for injury to a reputational, liberty, or other personal interest may be
commenced by or on behalf of any employee or former employee with respect to
whom a disclosure is made by a legislative body in an effort to comply with this section.

(f) This Section is necessary to implement, and reasonably within the scope of,
paragraph (1) of subdivision (b) of Section 3 of Article I of the California Constitution.
Section 54957.2.  Minute book for closed sessions

(a) The legislative body of a local agency may, by ordinance or resolution, designate a clerk or other officer or employee of the local agency who shall then attend each closed session of the legislative body and keep and enter in a minute book a record of topics discussed and decisions made at the meeting. The minute book made pursuant to this section is not a public record subject to inspection pursuant to the California Public Records Act (Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 6250) of Division 7 of Title 1), and shall be kept confidential. The minute book shall be available only to members of the legislative body or, if a violation of this chapter is alleged to have occurred at a closed session, to a court of general jurisdiction wherein the local agency lies. Such minute book may, but need not, consist of a recording of the closed session.

(b) An elected legislative body of a local agency may require that each legislative body all or a majority of whose members are appointed by or under the authority of the elected legislative body keep a minute book as prescribed under subdivision (a).

Section 54957.5.  Agendas and other writings as public records

(a) Notwithstanding Section 6255 or any other law, agendas of public meetings and any other writings, when distributed to all, or a majority of all, of the members of a legislative body of a local agency by any person in connection with a matter subject to discussion or consideration at an open meeting of the body, are disclosable public records under the California Public Records Act (Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 6250) of Division 7 of Title 1), and shall be made available upon request without delay. However, this section shall not include any writing exempt from public disclosure under Section 6253.5, 6254, 6254.3, 6254.7, 6254.15, 6254.16, 6254.22, or 6254.26.

(b) (1) If a writing that is a public record under subdivision (a), and that relates to an agenda item for an open session of a regular meeting of the legislative body of a local agency, is distributed less than 72 hours prior to that meeting, the writing shall be made available for public inspection pursuant to paragraph (2) at the time the writing is distributed to all, or a majority of all, of the members of the body.

(2) A local agency shall make any writing described in paragraph (1) available for public inspection at a public office or location that the agency shall designate for this purpose. Each local agency shall list the address of this office or location on the agendas for all meetings of the legislative body of that agency. The local agency also may post the writing on the local agency’s Internet Web site in a position and manner that makes it clear that the writing relates to an agenda item for an upcoming meeting.

(3) This subdivision shall become operative on July 1, 2008.

(c) Writings that are public records under subdivision (a) and that are distributed during a public meeting shall be made available for public inspection at the meeting if prepared by the local agency or a member of its legislative body, or after the meeting
if prepared by some other person. These writings shall be made available in appropriate alternative formats upon request by a person with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12132), and the federal rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof.

(d) This chapter shall not be construed to prevent the legislative body of a local agency from charging a fee or deposit for a copy of a public record pursuant to Section 6253, except that a surcharge shall not be imposed on persons with disabilities in violation of Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12132), and the federal rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof.

(e) This section shall not be construed to limit or delay the public’s right to inspect or obtain a copy of any record required to be disclosed under the requirements of the California Public Records Act (Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 6250) of Division 7 of Title 1). This chapter shall not be construed to require a legislative body of a local agency to place any paid advertisement or any other paid notice in any publication.

Section 54957.6. Closed sessions regarding employee matters

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a legislative body of a local agency may hold closed sessions with the local agency’s designated representatives regarding the salaries, salary schedules, or compensation paid in the form of fringe benefits of its represented and unrepresented employees, and, for represented employees, any other matter within the statutorily provided scope of representation.

However, prior to the closed session, the legislative body of the local agency shall hold an open and public session in which it identifies its designated representatives.

Closed sessions of a legislative body of a local agency, as permitted in this section, shall be for the purpose of reviewing its position and instructing the local agency’s designated representatives.

Closed sessions, as permitted in this section, may take place prior to and during consultations and discussions with representatives of employee organizations and unrepresented employees.

Closed sessions with the local agency’s designated representative regarding the salaries, salary schedules, or compensation paid in the form of fringe benefits may include discussion of an agency’s available funds and funding priorities, but only insofar as these discussions relate to providing instructions to the local agency’s designated representative.

Closed sessions held pursuant to this section shall not include final action on the proposed compensation of one or more unrepresented employees.

For the purposes enumerated in this section, a legislative body of a local agency may also meet with a state conciliator who has intervened in the proceedings.
(b) For the purposes of this section, the term “employee” shall include an officer or an independent contractor who functions as an officer or an employee, but shall not include any elected official, member of a legislative body, or other independent contractors.

Section 54957.7. Disclosure of items to be discussed at closed session

(a) Prior to holding any closed session, the legislative body of the local agency shall disclose, in an open meeting, the item or items to be discussed in the closed session. The disclosure may take the form of a reference to the item or items as they are listed by number or letter on the agenda. In the closed session, the legislative body may consider only those matters covered in its statement. Nothing in this section shall require or authorize a disclosure of information prohibited by state or federal law.

(b) After any closed session, the legislative body shall reconvene into open session prior to adjournment and shall make any disclosures required by Section 54957.1 of action taken in the closed session.

(c) The announcements required to be made in open session pursuant to this section may be made at the location announced in the agenda for the closed session, as long as the public is allowed to be present at that location for the purpose of hearing the announcements.

Section 54957.8. Closed sessions of multijurisdictional drug law enforcement agencies

(a) For purposes of this section, “multijurisdictional law enforcement agency” means a joint powers entity formed pursuant to Article 1 (commencing with Section 6500) of Chapter 5 of Division 7 of Title 1 that provides law enforcement services for the parties to the joint powers agreement for the purpose of investigating criminal activity involving drugs; gangs; sex crimes; firearms trafficking or felony possession of a firearm; high technology, computer, or identity theft; human trafficking; or vehicle theft.

(b) Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed to prevent the legislative body of a multijurisdictional law enforcement agency, or an advisory body of a multijurisdictional law enforcement agency, from holding closed sessions to discuss the case records of any ongoing criminal investigation of the multijurisdictional law enforcement agency or of any party to the joint powers agreement, to hear testimony from persons involved in the investigation, and to discuss courses of action in particular cases.

Section 54957.9. Authorization to clear room where meeting willfully interrupted; Readmission

In the event that any meeting is willfully interrupted by a group or groups of persons so as to render the orderly conduct of such meeting unfeasible and order cannot be restored by the removal of individuals who are willfully interrupting the meeting, the members of the legislative body conducting the meeting may order the meeting room cleared and continue in session. Only matters appearing on the agenda may be
considered in such a session. Representatives of the press or other news media, except those participating in the disturbance, shall be allowed to attend any session held pursuant to this section. Nothing in this section shall prohibit the legislative body from establishing a procedure for readmitting an individual or individuals not responsible for willfully disturbing the orderly conduct of the meeting.

Section 54957.10. Closed sessions regarding application for early withdrawal of deferred compensation plan funds

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a legislative body of a local agency may hold closed sessions to discuss a local agency employee’s application for early withdrawal of funds in a deferred compensation plan when the application is based on financial hardship arising from an unforeseeable emergency due to illness, accident, casualty, or other extraordinary event, as specified in the deferred compensation plan.

Section 54958. Application of chapter

The provisions of this chapter shall apply to the legislative body of every local agency notwithstanding the conflicting provisions of any other state law.

Section 54959. Criminal penalty for violation of chapter

Each member of a legislative body who attends a meeting of that legislative body where action is taken in violation of any provision of this chapter, and where the member intends to deprive the public of information to which the member knows or has reason to know the public is entitled under this chapter, is guilty of a misdemeanor.

Section 54960. Proceeding to prevent violation of chapter; Recording closed sessions; Procedure for discovery of tapes

(a) The district attorney or any interested person may commence an action by mandamus, injunction, or declaratory relief for the purpose of stopping or preventing violations or threatened violations of this chapter by members of the legislative body of a local agency or to determine the applicability of this chapter to ongoing actions or threatened future actions of the legislative body, or to determine the applicability of this chapter to past actions of the legislative body, subject to Section 54960.2, or to determine whether any rule or action by the legislative body to penalize or otherwise discourage the expression of one or more of its members is valid or invalid under the laws of this state or of the United States, or to compel the legislative body to audio record its closed sessions as hereinafter provided.

(b) The court in its discretion may, upon a judgment of a violation of Section 54956.7, 54956.8, 54956.9, 54956.95, 54957, or 54957.6, order the legislative body to audio record its closed sessions and preserve the audio recordings for the period and under the terms of security and confidentiality the court deems appropriate.

(c) Each recording so kept shall be immediately labeled with the date of the closed session recorded and the title of the clerk or other officer who shall be custodian of the recording.
(2) The audio recordings shall be subject to the following discovery procedures:

(A) In any case in which discovery or disclosure of the audio recording is sought by either the district attorney or the plaintiff in a civil action pursuant to Section 54959, 54960, or 54960.1 alleging that a violation of this chapter has occurred in a closed session that has been recorded pursuant to this section, the party seeking discovery or disclosure shall file a written notice of motion with the appropriate court with notice to the governmental agency that has custody and control of the audio recording. The notice shall be given pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 1005 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

(B) The notice shall include, in addition to the items required by Section 1010 of the Code of Civil Procedure, all of the following:

(i) Identification of the proceeding in which discovery or disclosure is sought, the party seeking discovery or disclosure, the date and time of the meeting recorded, and the governmental agency that has custody and control of the recording.

(ii) An affidavit that contains specific facts indicating that a violation of the act occurred in the closed session.

(3) If the court, following a review of the motion, finds that there is good cause to believe that a violation has occurred, the court may review, in camera, the recording of that portion of the closed session alleged to have violated the act.

(4) If, following the in camera review, the court concludes that disclosure of a portion of the recording would be likely to materially assist in the resolution of the litigation alleging violation of this chapter, the court shall, in its discretion, make a certified transcript of the portion of the recording a public exhibit in the proceeding.

(5) This Section shall not permit discovery of communications that are protected by the attorney-client privilege.

Section 54960.1. Proceeding to determine validity of action; Demand for correction

(a) The district attorney or any interested person may commence an action by mandamus or injunction for the purpose of obtaining a judicial determination that an action taken by a legislative body of a local agency in violation of Section 54953, 54954.2, 54954.5, 54954.6, 54956, or 54956.5 is null and void under this section. Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prevent a legislative body from curing or correcting an action challenged pursuant to this section.

(b) Prior to any action being commenced pursuant to subdivision (a), the district attorney or interested person shall make a demand of the legislative body to cure or correct the action alleged to have been taken in violation of Section 54953, 54954.2, 54954.5, 54954.6, 54956, or 54956.5. The demand shall be in writing and clearly describe the challenged action of the legislative body and nature of the alleged violation.
(c) (1) The written demand shall be made within 90 days from the date the action was taken unless the action was taken in an open session but in violation of Section 54954.2, in which case the written demand shall be made within 30 days from the date the action was taken.

(2) Within 30 days of receipt of the demand, the legislative body shall cure or correct the challenged action and inform the demanding party in writing of its actions to cure or correct or inform the demanding party in writing of its decision not to cure or correct the challenged action.

(3) If the legislative body takes no action within the 30-day period, the inaction shall be deemed a decision not to cure or correct the challenged action, and the 15-day period to commence the action described in subdivision (a) shall commence to run the day after the 30-day period to cure or correct expires.

(4) Within 15 days of receipt of the written notice of the legislative body's decision to cure or correct, or not to cure or correct, or within 15 days of the expiration of the 30-day period to cure or correct, whichever is earlier, the demanding party shall be required to commence the action pursuant to subdivision (a) or thereafter be barred from commencing the action.

(d) An action taken that is alleged to have been taken in violation of Section 54953, 54954.2, 54954.5, 54954.6, 54956, or 54956.5 shall not be determined to be null and void if any of the following conditions exist:

(1) The action taken was in substantial compliance with Sections 54953, 54954.2, 54954.5, 54954.6, 54956, and 54956.5.

(2) The action taken was in connection with the sale or issuance of notes, bonds, or other evidences of indebtedness or any contract, instrument, or agreement thereto.

(3) The action taken gave rise to a contractual obligation, including a contract let by competitive bid other than compensation for services in the form of salary or fees for professional services, upon which a party has, in good faith and without notice of a challenge to the validity of the action, detrimentally relied.

(4) The action taken was in connection with the collection of any tax.

(5) Any person, city, city and county, county, district, or any agency or subdivision of the state alleging noncompliance with subdivision (a) of Section 54954.2, Section 54956, or Section 54956.5, because of any defect, error, irregularity, or omission in the notice given pursuant to those provisions, had actual notice of the item of business at least 72 hours prior to the meeting at which the action was taken, if the meeting was noticed pursuant to Section 54954.2, or 24 hours prior to the meeting at which the action was taken if the meeting was noticed pursuant to Section 54956, or prior to the meeting at which the action was taken if the meeting is held pursuant to Section 54956.5.
(e) During any action seeking a judicial determination pursuant to subdivision (a) if the court determines, pursuant to a showing by the legislative body that an action alleged to have been taken in violation of Section 54953, 54954.2, 54954.5, 54954.6, 54956, or 54956.5 has been cured or corrected by a subsequent action of the legislative body, the action filed pursuant to subdivision (a) shall be dismissed with prejudice.

(f) The fact that a legislative body takes a subsequent action to cure or correct an action taken pursuant to this section shall not be construed or admissible as evidence of a violation of this chapter.

Section 54960.2 Proceeding to determine the applicability of chapter to past actions of legislative body; Conditions; Cease and desist letter

(a) The district attorney or any interested person may file an action to determine the applicability of this chapter to past actions of the legislative body pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 54960 only if all of the following conditions are met:

(1) The district attorney or interested person alleging a violation of this chapter first submits a cease and desist letter by postal mail or facsimile transmission to the clerk or secretary of the legislative body being accused of the violation, as designated in the statement pertaining to that public agency on file pursuant to Section 53051, or if the agency does not have a statement on file designating a clerk or a secretary, to the chief executive officer of that agency, clearly describing the past action of the legislative body and nature of the alleged violation.

(2) The cease and desist letter required under paragraph (1) is submitted to the legislative body within nine months of the alleged violation.

(3) The time during which the legislative body may respond to the cease and desist letter pursuant to subdivision (b) has expired and the legislative body has not provided an unconditional commitment pursuant to subdivision (c).

(4) Within 60 days of receipt of the legislative body's response to the cease and desist letter, other than an unconditional commitment pursuant to subdivision (c), or within 60 days of the expiration of the time during which the legislative body may respond to the cease and desist letter pursuant to subdivision (b), whichever is earlier, the party submitting the cease and desist letter shall commence the action pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 54960 or thereafter be barred from commencing the action.

(b) The legislative body may respond to a cease and desist letter submitted pursuant to subdivision (a) within 30 days of receiving the letter. This subdivision shall not be construed to prevent the legislative body from providing an unconditional commitment pursuant to subdivision (c) at any time after the 30-day period has expired, except that in that event the court shall award court costs and reasonable attorney fees to the plaintiff in an action brought pursuant to this section, in accordance with Section 54960.5.

(c) (1) If the legislative body elects to respond to the cease and desist letter with an unconditional commitment to cease, desist from, and not repeat the past action
that is alleged to violate this chapter, that response shall be in substantially the following form:

To ______________________:

The [name of legislative body] has received your cease and desist letter dated [date] alleging that the following described past action of the legislative body violates the Ralph M. Brown Act:

[Describe alleged past action, as set forth in the cease and desist letter submitted pursuant to subdivision (a)]

In order to avoid unnecessary litigation and without admitting any violation of the Ralph M. Brown Act, the [name of legislative body] hereby unconditionally commits that it will cease, desist from, and not repeat the challenged past action as described above.

The [name of legislative body] may rescind this commitment only by a majority vote of its membership taken in open session at a regular meeting and noticed on its posted agenda as "Rescission of Brown Act Commitment." You will be provided with written notice, sent by any means or media you provide in response to this message, to whatever address or addresses you specify, of any intention to consider rescinding this commitment at least 30 days before any such regular meeting. In the event that this commitment is rescinded, you will have the right to commence legal action pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 54960 of the Government Code. That notice will be delivered to you by the same means as this commitment, or may be mailed to an address that you have designated in writing.

Very truly yours,

[Chairperson or acting chairperson of the legislative body]

(2) An unconditional commitment pursuant to this subdivision shall be approved by the legislative body in open session at a regular or special meeting as a separate item of business, and not on its consent agenda.

(3) An action shall not be commenced to determine the applicability of this chapter to any past action of the legislative body for which the legislative body has provided an unconditional commitment pursuant to this subdivision. During any action seeking a judicial determination regarding the applicability of this chapter to any past action of the legislative body pursuant to subdivision (a), if the court determines that the legislative body has provided an unconditional commitment pursuant to this subdivision, the action shall be dismissed with prejudice. Nothing in this subdivision shall be construed to modify or limit the existing ability of the district attorney or any interested person to commence an action to determine the applicability of this chapter to ongoing actions or threatened future actions of the legislative body.
(4) Except as provided in subdivision (d), the fact that a legislative body provides an unconditional commitment shall not be construed or admissible as evidence of a violation of this chapter.

(d) If the legislative body provides an unconditional commitment as set forth in subdivision (c), the legislative body shall not thereafter take or engage in the challenged action described in the cease and desist letter, except as provided in subdivision (e). Violation of this subdivision shall constitute an independent violation of this chapter, without regard to whether the challenged action would otherwise violate this chapter. An action alleging past violation or threatened future violation of this subdivision may be brought pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 54960, without regard to the procedural requirements of this section.

(e) The legislative body may resolve to rescind an unconditional commitment made pursuant to subdivision (c) by a majority vote of its membership taken in open session at a regular meeting as a separate item of business not on its consent agenda, and noticed on its posted agenda as “Rescission of Brown Act Commitment,” provided that not less than 30 days prior to such regular meeting, the legislative body provides written notice of its intent to consider the rescission to each person to whom the unconditional commitment was made, and to the district attorney. Upon rescission, the district attorney or any interested person may commence an action pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 54960. An action under this subdivision may be brought pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 54960, without regard to the procedural requirements of this section.

Section 54960.5. Costs and attorney fees

A court may award court costs and reasonable attorney fees to the plaintiff in an action brought pursuant to Section 54960, 54960.1 or 54960.2 where it is found that a legislative body of the local agency has violated this chapter. Additionally, when an action brought pursuant to Section 54960.2 is dismissed with prejudice because a legislative body has provided an unconditional commitment pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (c) of that Section at any time after the 30-day period for making such a commitment has expired, the court shall award court costs and reasonable attorney fees to the plaintiff if the filing of that action caused the legislative body to issue the unconditional commitment. The costs and fees shall be paid by the local agency and shall not become a personal liability of any public officer or employee of the local agency.

A court may award court costs and reasonable attorney fees to a defendant in any action brought pursuant to Section 54960 or 54960.1 where the defendant has prevailed in a final determination of such action and the court finds that the action was clearly frivolous and totally lacking in merit.
Section 54961. Meeting place with discriminatory admission policies; Identification of victim of sexual or child abuse

(a) No legislative body of a local agency shall conduct any meeting in any facility that prohibits the admittance of any person, or persons, on the basis of ancestry or any characteristic listed or defined in Section 11135, or which is inaccessible to disabled persons, or where members of the public may not be present without making a payment or purchase. This section shall apply to every local agency as defined in Section 54951.

(b) No notice, agenda, announcement, or report required under this chapter need identify any victim or alleged victim of tortious sexual conduct or child abuse unless the identity of the person has been publicly disclosed.

Section 54962. Prohibition against closed sessions except as expressly authorized

Except as expressly authorized by this chapter, or by Sections 1461, 1462, 32106, and 32155 of the Health and Safety Code, or by Sections 37606, 37606.1, and 37624.3 of the Government Code as they apply to hospitals, or by any provision of the Education Code pertaining to school districts and community college districts, no closed session may be held by any legislative body of any local agency.

Section 54963. Disclosure of confidential information acquired in closed session prohibited; Disciplinary action for violation

(a) A person may not disclose confidential information that has been acquired by being present in a closed session authorized by Section 54956.7, 54956.8, 54956.86, 54956.87, 54956.9, 54957, 54957.6, 54957.8, or 54957.10 to a person not entitled to receive it, unless the legislative body authorizes disclosure of that confidential information.

(b) For purposes of this section, “confidential information” means a communication made in a closed session that is specifically related to the basis for the legislative body of a local agency to meet lawfully in closed session under this chapter.

(c) Violation of this section may be addressed by the use of such remedies as are currently available by law, including, but not limited to:

   (1) Injunctive relief to prevent the disclosure of confidential information prohibited by this section.

   (2) Disciplinary action against an employee who has willfully disclosed confidential information in violation of this section.

   (3) Referral of a member of a legislative body who has willfully disclosed confidential information in violation of this section to the grand jury.
(d) Disciplinary action pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) shall require that the employee in question has either received training as to the requirements of this Section or otherwise has been given notice of the requirements of this section.

(e) A local agency may not take any action authorized by subdivision (c) against a person, nor shall it be deemed a violation of this section, for doing any of the following:

(1) Making a confidential inquiry or complaint to a district attorney or grand jury concerning a perceived violation of law, including disclosing facts to a district attorney or grand jury that are necessary to establish the illegality of an action taken by a legislative body of a local agency or the potential illegality of an action that has been the subject of deliberation at a closed session if that action were to be taken by a legislative body of a local agency.

(2) Expressing an opinion concerning the propriety or legality of actions taken by a legislative body of a local agency in closed session, including disclosure of the nature and extent of the illegal or potentially illegal action.

(3) Disclosing information acquired by being present in a closed session under this chapter that is not confidential information.

(f) Nothing in this Section shall be construed to prohibit disclosures under the whistleblower statutes contained in Section 1102.5 of the Labor Code or Article 4.5 (commencing with Section 53296) of Chapter 2 of this code.
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The above content is a structured outline of a report on the Commercial Standards Committee's work, including an executive summary, introduction, committee charge, work plan, educational process, community outreach, recommendations, glossary, and appendices. The appendices include agendas and meeting notes, community outreach materials, educational materials, and lists of articles and publications consulted as well as data from the City of Beverly Hills.
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

City Council Charge

The City Council's charge to the Commercial Standards Committee provides direction to consider the character, role and function of areas zoned for commercial uses as they exist today as well as for the future. The Commercial Standards Committee's ("CSC") full report includes detailed recommendations for each commercial type/area of the City. This Executive Summary highlights the major overall issues addressed by the CSC.

Committee Vision

The Commercial Standards Committee's vision for the City's future development seeks to capitalize on the existing successes and to guide further growth in a manner that balances residential quality of life with the necessities and realities of maintaining a successful business climate to support that quality of life. The Committee felt that much of the activity in the City "works well" but that minor improvements could be made. In making its recommendations, the Committee felt that the following issues should be prioritized:

• The business triangle is an area where more density is appropriate due to its relative isolation from residential areas. More night time activities and a more integrated synergy between uses should be encouraged to promote a more vibrant atmosphere to serve the community.

• Development scenarios for the Robinsons-May/Hilton Hotel site and Parcels 1 and 2 were evaluated and recommendations made for their future redevelopment. For the Robinsons-May/Hilton Hotel site, these include housing and commercial potential at increased densities as this site does not directly abut residential uses. For Parcels 1 and 2, the CSC recommended that the site be developed in accordance with the currently allowable development standards. The CSC also recognized that these "Gateway" sites are underutilized and could be developed with significant architecture.

• The balance between the commercial areas and abutting residential zones was carefully considered. Better coordination (such as a 55-foot height limit in the commercial zones that abut 55-foot height limits in the R-4 zones) should be provided so that the residential areas are buffered and protected from negative impacts resulting from businesses.

• Development potential for key "gateway" locations (e.g., larger intersections) should be identified. These locations should be targeted for additional height and
density and should be highlighted as areas where signature architectural buildings should be developed.

- Allow Mixed-Use Development in all City commercial zones, including the area commonly referred to as the "industrial area." Development standards should be consistent with the scale and character of the existing development surrounding the future project sites.

- Architectural diversity, creativity, and style were felt to be extremely important. To encourage diversity in building designs, developers should be offered flexibility for height and modulation without changing existing limitations on density.
Beverly Hills has a strong sense of community, offers good schools, parks and pleasing aesthetic qualities. This combination of factors draws both residents and businesses alike to make up the fabric of the community. The CSC’s vision for commercial corridors is to revitalize, sustain, and enhance the community’s viability while ensuring that this development is balanced and compatible with goals to maintain an excellent residential quality of life. The Committee recognized the importance of maintaining the City’s cachet as a prestigious business location. This cachet goes hand-in-hand with the revenue generated by the business community. Bearing these factors in mind, the CSC attempted to create a long-term vision to maintain the City’s attractive and prestigious business image, while at the same time protecting its residential component by balancing the positive aspects of business revenue with the benefits to the residential aspects of the community.

The City is located in the center of an extremely competitive Los Angeles business market, yet its consistently high property values as well as excellent city and school services also make it a desirable place to live. While the City enjoys a reputation for financial success, some businesses do struggle, and vacant storefronts exist even in the most prestigious areas. Like other cities, Beverly Hills must continue to attract new business while supporting its current business and property owner base.

In general, the Commercial Standards Committee (“CSC”) felt that “fine tuning” rather than major changes was needed to project and maintain the City’s successful image. Major areas of discussion were grouped into five basic categories as follows:

- Coordination of height limits between commercial uses and adjacent residential neighborhoods
- Allowing additional height without increasing density for architectural enhancement of new buildings
- Maximizing Parking opportunities
- Development of “Gateway” locations throughout the City
- Mixed-Use Development
This fine tuning would involve two primary aspects: 1) minor changes to existing development standards to encourage local and regional serving uses in the community (e.g., shoe repair shops, pharmacies, supermarkets, legitimate theater, corporate headquarters, bookstores, congregate housing, etc.) and to nurture unique businesses such as talent agencies, auto sales, stockbrokers, banks and hotels to maintain the City's prosperity; and 2) focus on the few remaining development opportunities (Robinson's May/Hilton and the area known as "Parcels 1 and 2" at the western end of the City) and establish standards that would promote the best possible development for those sites while ensuring that such development would not significantly alter the City's character.

III. COMMITTEE CHARGE

The City Council's charge to the Commercial Standards Committee provides specific direction to consider the character, role and function of areas of the City zoned for commercial uses in the present context as well as the future. At a minimum, the Committee was directed to include the following issues in its discussions:

- The character, role and function for the community of the range of commercial uses currently permitted (e.g., retail and non-retail, hotels, service uses, local entertainment opportunities, retail character, mixed residential/commercial use, etc.).
- Commercial "areas" that are not characterized by single commercial streets surrounded by residential uses, including the Business Triangle, C-5 zone (old Industrial Area), and Robinson's/Hilton area.
- Parking management (in lieu, municipal parking).
- Development opportunities that will benefit the community.
- Older, less economically competitive commercial buildings.
- Former railroad right-of-way (westerly, Parcels 1 and 2).

IV. WORKPLAN

The CSC began its analysis by brainstorming about factors that affect the City's commercial vitality. One of the goals was to create a path for accomplishing feasible commercial projects. Considerations included discussions of successful projects in other areas; issues that drive development or cause obstacles to development; how local traffic versus through traffic affects commercial corridors; the relationship between uses and areas, and how development standards such as height and density might be modified to better suit their location in district areas such as the Business Triangle, Industrial Area, and commercial corridors such as Wilshire
Boulevard, Olympic Boulevard, South Beverly Drive, La Cienega Boulevard and Robertson Boulevard.

To address its charge, the CSC divided the City's commercial areas into small geographic regions and studied them one region at a time. Wilshire Boulevard was broken down into smaller areas (West: Santa Monica West to Beverly Drive; Mid: Beverly Drive to Robertson Boulevard; and East: Robertson Boulevard to the Eastern City Limit). South Beverly Drive, Robertson Boulevard, La Cienega Boulevard, Olympic Boulevard, the Business Triangle, and the Industrial Area were also reviewed as distinct areas.

The group then approached its charge and recommendations based on the following major areas of concern:

**Workplan Issue 1:**
Character, Role and Function of Commercial Uses, Development Opportunities, and Parking Management and Supply.

a) Wilshire Boulevard (West, Mid and East)  
b) South Beverly Drive  
c) Robertson Boulevard  
d) La Cienega Boulevard  
e) Business Triangle  
f) Olympic Boulevard  
g) Industrial Area

**Workplan Issue 2:**
Reconstruction of older, less economically competitive buildings in all commercial areas of the City.

**Workplan Issue 3:**
Development opportunities (uses and development standards) for the following sites:

a) Beverly Hilton Hotel/Robinson's May Site  
b) Former railroad right-of-way (westerly, Parcels 1 and 2)

**Workplan Issue 4**
Mixed-Use Development
V. EDUCATIONAL PROCESS

The CSC participated in the three all-Committee briefing sessions that kicked off the General Plan Topic Committee project. Briefing documents provided to the CSC to inform and assist them in their recommendation included:

a. Maps with summaries of permitted uses in commercial districts.
b. Building data (height, square footage, floor area ratio) for each of the study areas.
c. Two comprehensive bus tours of the study areas.
d. Memorandum and presentation by Chief Financial Officer Don Oblander regarding City general fund sources.
e. A presentation of mixed-use projects by local architect and university lecturer Johannes Van Tilburg.
f. A presentation on mixed-use development experiences of other cities by Paul Silvern (land use, real estate and financial strategist with Hamilton, Rabinovitz and Altschuler) and Bill Trimble (Senior Planner, City of Pasadena).

Educational materials provided to the Committee members are included in the attached Appendices.

VI. COMMUNITY OUTREACH

The CSC participated in the following three efforts to gauge the community’s reaction to progress the committee was making with respect to its charge. Support documents for these efforts are provided under the Community Outreach Appendix.

April 2003: All-Committee Session at which each topic committee shared preliminary recommendations. This session helped committees to identify issues of overlap and conflict between the various groups.

May 2003: Farmers’ Market Outreach with the Community Character, Commercial Standards, and Commercial-Residential Interface Committees. Along with a series of questions, residents were provided with photographs to assist them in selecting the types of standards they felt were appropriate for their community.

September 2003: An outreach survey was sent to every residential address in the City (over 15,000 households), with a response rate of 9.8% (1,435 responses). Responses to the survey varied widely and demonstrated issues where there exists a great deal of debate within the community. The results indicated to the Committee that the survey might not have been consistently interpreted by all respondents, as the questions appear to have been
received and understood in differing ways. Some felt the questions were leading or were constructed in such a manner to elicit a specific response. Since the survey was developed by group members and staff (as opposed to a professional marketing firm), the Committee felt it was more accurate to state that the survey drew attention to the areas of conflict but was not necessarily a scientific method of testing the community’s viewpoints. The survey and compilation of results is included under the Community Outreach Appendix. Generally, there was a strong consensus around the following areas:

- Office buildings on Wilshire Boulevard that exceed the City’s current 3-story height limit could be rebuilt at their existing heights and sizes if the full amount of required parking is provided.
- Mixed-use development is appropriate for most commercial areas.
- The area located on the north side of Little Santa Monica Boulevard, west of Wilshire and east of Moreno Drive (Parcels 1 and 2) should not be developed at a higher density than 3 stories and 2:1 FAR.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Workplan Issue #1: Character, Role and Function of Commercial Uses, Development Opportunities, and Parking Management and Supply.

a) Wilshire Boulevard:

Due to the variation in uses and overall length of Wilshire Boulevard, this street was separated into sub-areas. Some of these areas were broken down further into north and south sides of the streets as warranted by their differing characteristics including uses, traffic flow, heights of existing buildings, proximity to both single and multi-family residential areas, changing market places, differing degrees of building maintenance and care, and the potential for increased density to attract reinvestment and new development. The recommendations were then consolidated within the following primary sections of the corridor.

1) Wilshire Boulevard West: (Santa Monica Blvd. – Beverly Drive)
In this area, buildings are taller and more dense than those to the east and consist of major commercial "high-rise" businesses and department stores, located at the southern edge of the business triangle. The area transitions to residential on the south side of Wilshire Boulevard.

The Committee felt that additional height and density should be considered at certain anchor locations, as is suggested in the current General Plan since this type of development lends more architectural diversity and interest. The edge of this area is also being considered for a major hotel and public plaza project (the T-Lot, which consists of 14 lots between Canon and Beverly Drives just north of the lots fronting on Wilshire Boulevard). This project is also discussed in the next section of this report. Generally speaking, this area along the southern edge of the Business Triangle should be "enlivened". This could be accomplished by encouraging pedestrian and mixed-use development.

Uses/Opportunities:

- Office uses should continue to predominate on the north side of the street, even at the ground floor level.
- Pedestrian-type uses such as retail should be allowed, but not required.
- Mixed-use development consisting of retail on the ground floor and residential above should be allowed on the south side where the use is compatible with adjacent multi-family residential uses.
- The existing Department Store Overlay Zone on the south side of the street should be expanded two blocks westward to the Wilshire/Santa Monica Boulevard intersection.

While a majority of members agreed with this recommendation, some members felt this proposed change would be in conflict with the previously set cap on developable floor area in the Department Store Overlay Zone.
Note: The existing Department Store Overlay Zones extend from Camden to McCarty Drives to Peck Drive on the south side of Wilshire Blvd. (Camden/Peck/Bedford Drives for the CRPD Zone and Bedford/Roxbury/McCarty Drives for the CR Zone.)

Note: The CRPD and CR zones are overlay zones which allow additional height and density for the construction of department stores. If the department store incentive is not exercised and general commercial office space is developed, the underlying provisions of the C3 Zone (3 stories, 45-foot height limit, 2:1 FAR) remain in effect.

Development Potential/Standards:

- To create architectural diversity and character, the existing development standards of 45 feet and 2:1 floor area ratio (FAR) should be modified for the triangular-shaped parcel at the Bedford Drive, Roxbury Drive and Brighton Way intersections to allow 75 feet in height with a 3:1 FAR.

  While the majority of members agreed to this recommendation, a minority felt that the development standards should not be intensified due to concerns about potential increased traffic impacts.

- For the triangular-shaped parcel on the north side of the street at Rodeo Drive and Dayton Way, maintain the existing code allowances (45-foot height and 2:1 FAR).

- Allow the replacement of non-conforming buildings to existing FAR even if this exceeds the current code allowances provided that current code parking is provided. This would promote retention of the majority of the City's office space and provide a more architecturally interesting streetscape.

- Consider allowing increases in height while maintaining a 2:1 FAR so that properties can be developed with setbacks, plazas, and more interesting architecture.

- The height limit should be increased from 45 to 55 feet on the south side of Wilshire Boulevard for mixed-use development to be compatible with the height of the abutting R4 zone to the south.
For the Commercial Retail Planned Development Overlay Zone (C-R-PD Zone aka Department Store Overlay Zone located on the Barney’s site), continue to allow an 85-foot height limit with a 5:1 FAR.

Parking Supply:

- Because parking is an essential resource, and in order to maximize availability, the City should retain the existing code-required parking standards and the in-lieu parking program for retail uses only.

Resources Required to Implement:

- Zoning incentives for mixed-use development might be required, as well as amendments to the Municipal Code for added height and/or density and design requirements. Staff and consultant time for design, cost of environmental and other studies would also be required.
- For the triangular parcel at Bedford Drive, Roxbury Drive and Brighton Way, accommodations for allowing a parking encroachment underneath the sidewalk would be necessary.

2) **Mid-Wilshire Boulevard: Beverly Drive – Robertson Boulevard**
Current and proposed uses in this area include the hotel approved between Palm and Maple Drives (currently a vacant blockface on the south side of the street); and the mixed commercial and residential “Crescent” project under construction at the northwest corner of Wilshire Boulevard and Crescent Drive (the project’s frontage is on Wilshire Boulevard). The Crescent project would be 54 feet in height, which is taller than the current 45-foot height limit along Wilshire Boulevard.

Moving eastward, Doheny Drive is one of the few designated north-south traffic arterials in the City. This area has a mix of building heights and types. Some older buildings are considered obsolete and/or in need of rehabilitation. This presents opportunities for conversion from office to residential uses. Many are legal and non-conforming with regard to height and density; yet remodels can be more costly than new construction. This can lead to poorly maintained buildings and result in difficulties leasing less-than-quality space.

In general, this stretch along Wilshire could be enhanced by more pedestrian-friendly businesses including mixed-use. Mixed-use developments would create fewer impacts to the surrounding neighborhood than commercial projects developed to current code allowed height and density.

**Uses/Opportunities:**

- Maintain existing mix of commercial uses.
- In addition to existing commercial uses, promote pedestrian activities as these would spur property owners to upgrade buildings and attract retail and other pedestrian-friendly ground floor uses.
- Encourage mixed-use development on the south side as it would be compatible with adjacent multi-family residential uses to the south.
- Due to the proximity to a single-family residential zone, mixed-use should also be allowed on the north side of the street, provided that it is built within the current code allowances (45 feet, 3 stories, 2:1 FAR).
- Continue to allow automobile dealer uses (for new vehicles) with enclosed showrooms (currently allowed by Conditional Use Permit).

**Development Potential/Standards:**

- Allow additional height and density at the corners of major intersections (with the exception of the Wilshire/Doheny intersection due to its lower density as compared to other intersections) and anchor locations through transfers of development rights from lower-density buildings. This would allow for development of more distinctive architecture and uses. Concentrating height along intersecting commercial corridors would shift the taller buildings to commercial areas at the end of the block that do not abut and impact residential zones. Transfers of development rights for height or density would need to be reviewed on a block-by-block basis. (Any transfers of such rights should only occur within the same block).

- Allow a height increase from 45 feet to 55 feet on the south side of the street to match the higher adjacent residential development to the south, but retain the 2:1 FAR.
- Maintain current standard of 45 foot height and 2:1 FAR on the north side because of its adjacency to the single-family residential zone.
- Allow additional height and density for projects that involve multiple lots that provide other community benefits such as open or green space.

**Parking Supply:**

- Retain current code requirements.

**Resources Required to Implement:**

- Staff, consultant and decision-makers’ time would be required to implement zone changes.
3) Wilshire Boulevard East: Robertson Boulevard – Eastern City Limit

This area is characterized by older commercial and office buildings. It also includes local-serving retail businesses and a cluster of older movie theaters. Lot sizes vary, and the properties do not have alleys at the rear. The Wilshire Boulevard commercial lots abut residential zones on both the north and south sides of the street. At the easterly end, the corridor is characterized by existing large scale development on both sides of the street with strip mall development on the south side at the City’s gateway. Reinvestment in this area is encouraged to revitalize many of these older buildings.

Uses/Opportunities:

- Allow mixed-use development to increase activity that would support local-serving businesses without additional adverse traffic impacts.
- Between Stanley Drive and La Cienega Boulevard, allow residential uses on the commercially-zoned properties.
- Allow mixed residential and commercial development on both sides of the street between Robertson and La Cienega Boulevards.

Development Potential/Standards:

- Between Stanley Drive, Le Doux Road and La Cienega Boulevard, encourage cohesive, unified development and allow residential mixed uses in the commercially-zoned properties.
- Maintain current standard of 45-foot height limit and 2:1 FAR on the south side of the street where it abuts an R-1 zone.
- Increase the height allowance from 45 feet to 55 feet on the north side of the street, east of La Cienega Boulevard.
- Allow additional height and density for building significant architecture for gateway locations such as the corner of San Vicente and Wilshire Boulevards.
Parking Supply:

- Retain current code requirements with the exception of the area between Stanley Drive and La Cienega Boulevard.
- Encourage extra public parking through zoning incentives such as allowing extra height, except in areas that abut R-1 zoning.

Resources Required to Implement:

- Staff and decision-makers' time to implement zoning amendments.
- Funding for environmental and other technical studies.

b) South Beverly Drive

The character of South Beverly Drive is village-like, small-scale and local neighborhood-oriented. It has mostly local-serving businesses, smaller-scale buildings, diagonal street parking, and restaurants with outdoor dining. It also serves as a north-south traffic corridor with a grocery store at the end of the district near Olympic. The 300 block is much less active than the 100 and 200 blocks because of the existing non-pedestrian-type development and street-level uses. Concern was expressed that the valet route often utilizes residential alleyways adjacent to this commercial area to access the parking facilities. The CSC felt the scale and uses of this area should be preserved and retained "as is" because it is very popular, attractive, walkable neighborhood for locals.
Uses/Opportunities:

- Allow residential and mixed-use development along the 400 block to foster the pedestrian activity and liveliness of this area. This type of development will be compatible with nearby residential areas.
- With the exception of the 400 block, prohibit office uses on the ground floor street level to promote pedestrian activity in this entire sub-area. (Restrictions would be similar to those effective in the Business Triangle.)
- Continue to encourage village-type, neighborhood-oriented uses.
- Protect adjacent residential properties from commercial activities by maintaining low-intensity uses.

Development Potential/Standards:

- Retain the existing height and density requirements for structures on both sides of the street.
- On the west side, the rear yard setback requirements should be increased by an additional third-floor setback of 10 feet for those commercial buildings that abut R-1 zoned lots.
- Additional vertical setbacks should be imposed on properties abutting single-family residences if multiple-parcel development occurs.

Parking Supply:

- Implement a centralized or universal valet service.
- Accommodate employee parking so that public parking availability is maximized and not used by employees.
- The business triangle's in-lieu parking program should be expanded to this area.
- Additional public parking should be provided in the 400 block.
Resources Required to Implement:

- Staff and decision-maker time to modify Zoning Code.
- Funding to acquire property for additional public parking.

c) Robertson Boulevard

Uses along Robertson are primarily small-scale retail and local-serving businesses that are mostly one or two stories in height. Most people think this area is all within the City of Beverly Hills, however many of the popular retail and restaurant businesses are actually located in Los Angeles, which makes a coordinated effort for the future of this street somewhat complicated. Although the Committee acknowledged the lack of parking on this street, it also felt that if more parking were to be built, more vehicle trips would be encouraged and this would add to the existing congestion and potentially result in a zero-sum gain in parking. Members were also concerned that if parking was added along the rear side of businesses, it would increase business activities along areas that directly abut residential zones. On the other hand, the Committee also felt that if parking was moved to structures and off the street, it would stop drivers from circling the street in search of parking and would free up traffic during rush hour.

Given the general nature of the neighborhood-serving uses and desire to maintain this small scale type of development, mixed-use or adaptive reuse within existing height restrictions in this area should be encouraged.
Uses/Opportunities:

- Maintain the existing character (local businesses serving small scale of the street).
- Mixed-use and or adaptive reuse (modifying existing commercial buildings into a mix of commercial and residential uses) projects should be allowed.

Development Potential/Standards:

- Maintain current standard of 45-foot height limit and 2:1 FAR.
- Encourage retention of the existing scale through zoning incentives.

Although this view was shared by a majority of members, a minority felt that additional height should be allowed for mixed-used development or parking; and some felt that additional height should be permitted on the first blocks north and south of Wilshire Boulevard.

Parking Supply:

- Encourage City acquisition of properties to build a City-owned, public parking facility.
- With Beverly Hills Unified School District, explore the possibility of building a parking facility under the playground at Horace Mann School.

Resources Required to Implement:

- Staff and decision-maker time to modify the Zoning Code.
- Staff, decision-maker and School District representatives' time to negotiate the construction of joint-use, public parking.
d) La Cienega Boulevard

This major north-south corridor is mostly characterized by Restaurant Row and commercial businesses. Small-scale commercial buildings and mid-scale medical office buildings are located here, as well as La Cienega Park, which has a number of uses including tennis and playing fields, and the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences Library with its large open, grassy lawn. Typical lots have a shallow depth, no alley, and abut residential neighborhoods.

Uses/Opportunities:

- Continue to allow existing uses, including the existing character of restaurant row and mid-size general and medical office uses. "Restaurant Row" should not be restricted to only restaurant uses.

- For the area north of Wilshire Boulevard, modify the transitional ordinance to allow restaurants to seat customers after 10:00 p.m.

Development Potential/Standards:

- For the area north of Wilshire Boulevard on the west side, the allowable height should be reduced from three stories to two stories to retain the existing height, density, scale and character of the adjacent single family neighborhood.
• For the area north of Wilshire Boulevard on the east side, the current 2:1 FAR allowance should be maintained, however, the maximum height should be increased from 45 feet to 55 feet to be consistent with adjacent R-4 allowable heights.

• To facilitate better access to the park and parking facilities, a pedestrian bridge should be constructed over La Cienega Boulevard to connect La Cienega Park to both sides of the street. This bridge would be considered a City gateway and should be architecturally significant.

Parking Supply:

• Retain current Code requirements.

Resources Required to Implement:

• Staff and decision-maker time to modify Zoning Code.
• City funding for public right-of-way improvements (pedestrian bridge).

e) Business Triangle

The Business Triangle is the City’s main business district. It is considered to be pedestrian-oriented with high-end retail, commercial, office, medical and financial uses. City parking structures facilitate much of the pedestrian activity in this part of town. To encourage additional world-class architecture, larger buildings (with additional height and density if necessary) could be built. The Triangle can support additional height and density (especially within the inner core) as height and density would not adversely impact residential neighborhoods. The property known as the T-Lot (8 lots just north of Wilshire between Beverly and Canon Drives) contains several surface parking lots. Although surface parking is not necessarily a desirable use for these properties, the lack of development on these lots currently provides a visual relief for the area. This “open feeling” should be retained through the use of a public park or plaza area in future redevelopment plans.
Uses/Opportunities:

- Maintain current mix of pedestrian-oriented businesses, medical offices and hotels.
- Maintain the non-retail ground floor use limitation on the urban design streets (Rodeo Drive, Beverly Drive, Canon Drive, Dayton Way and Brighton Way) to a 25-foot frontage.
- Continue to encourage outdoor dining activities.
- Promote evening entertainment-oriented (theater, etc.) uses.
- Allow mixed-use development (including adaptive reuse on all streets in the triangle with different development standards depending on surrounding development.

Development Potential/Standards:

- In general, retain current standards of 45-foot height limit and 2:1 FAR.
- Allow additional height and density toward the center of the Triangle as it would not have an adverse effect on neighboring properties.
- To maintain the existing village-like character, consider expanding the unreinforced masonry program to other older buildings.
- Maintain existing General Plan goal of allowing additional height and FAR for key corner "anchor locations" at intersections of Little Santa Monica and Wilshire Boulevards and streets that run north/south.
• Support the concept of providing amenities such as the open space plaza currently under consideration for the City's T-Lot project, which is the last remaining underdeveloped parcel in the triangle.

Parking Supply:

• Consider extending the in-lieu program to uses other than retail to help maintain and expand the commercial base of the City.
• Consider developing a shared parking program as parking might be available during the evening that would otherwise only be used by daytime workers/visitors.
• Provide development incentives for projects that include a public parking component to maximize availability of public parking.
• In areas where physical constraints preclude the development of parking, encourage encroachment below grade under the public right-of-way to gain additional parking spaces.
• Consider allowing alternative methods such as car elevators to provide the code-required number of parking spaces.
• Encourage and work with businesses to provide employee parking outside the business triangle and shuttle employees to work.

Resources Required to Implement:

• Facilitation and administration of a shuttle program (including funding, equipment and staff) to City-owned structures.
• Staff and decision-maker time to modify the Zoning Code.
• Encroachments under the public right-of-way for parking may require relocation of utilities.
Olympic Boulevard is a high-traffic corridor with a variety of uses including local-serving businesses; low-scale buildings with ground floor retail; office buildings near Beverly Drive; institutional and religious uses; mini-malls (the most in the City); auto dealerships; a grocery store; a major City park; and multi-family residences west of Beverly Drive. This area is unique to the City in that multi-family buildings on Olympic Boulevard face a high-traffic street, and many of the residential areas directly behind Olympic on both sides of the street are zoned both single and multi-family residential.

Uses/Opportunities:

- Allow mixed-use development/adaptive reuse on the commercial section between Beverly Drive and Robertson Boulevard.
- Continue to allow mini-malls subject to a Conditional Use Permit.
- Continue to allow car dealerships subject to a Conditional Use Permit. New dealerships should be located in a fully enclosed structure.
Development Potential/Standards:

- Remove CUP restriction and allow 45-foot height limit and 2:1 FAR for buildings that abut R-4 Zones. This will make the development standards for this area consistent with other commercial areas in the City that abut R-4 properties.
- Continue to restrict the FAR of 1.33:1 FAR (with an increase to 2:1 FAR by CUP) for areas abutting single family residential zones.
- Allow additional height and/or density at Beverly Drive intersection. This area could support large structures as a focal point.

Parking Supply:

- Maintain current code requirements.
- Consider development incentives such as additional height or encroachment under the public right-of-way to increase the parking supply.

Resources Required to Implement:

- Staff and decision-maker time to modify Zoning Code; and to establish policies regarding additional height at Beverly intersection.
g) **Industrial Area:**

The Industrial Area is predominantly characterized by three uses: Corporate campus and entertainment industry headquarters; City/government uses and properties; and pedestrian/retail oriented uses. Civic Center Drive includes low-rise buildings as well as some new and renovated architectural structures (the Ice House). Large lots with streetside setbacks characterize Foothill, Maple and Alden. Industrial uses such as the power plant, water treatment plant and City vehicle maintenance facility are located on Foothill and Third Street respectively. There is considerable new, modern commercial headquarter-type development, as well as older existing facilities like the power plant and City maintenance yard. A Temple was recently approved for a vacant site on Alden Drive.

In general the CSC supported the Industrial Area Plan adopted by the City in 1994, with the following exceptions.

**Uses/Opportunities:**

- Mixed-use and adaptive reuse for privately-owned property as long as the ground floor is restricted to office use.

A minority view held that residential development was not appropriate in this area because of its proximity to civic uses such as the power station and vehicle maintenance yard.
• Change the Code to allow car dealers on all streets except Maple Drive. (Car dealerships are currently prohibited.)

Not all members agreed that car dealership uses were appropriate for this area as it is close to residential and some of the activities associated with auto sales (car deliveries, test driving, etc.) are disruptive. The minority vote also did not feel that car showrooms should be allowed.

• Encourage mixed-use/community center/housing opportunities on City-owned property. A minority view held that residential development was not appropriate in this area because of its proximity to civic uses such as the power station and vehicle maintenance yard; and that City-owned property should be used for civic rather than residential purposes.

• Allow medical uses if the number of vehicle trips generated by the medical use does not exceed the number of trips that would be generated if the property was zoned for office use. A minority view held that medical uses would create too many additional vehicle trips and that the area is too close to residential for this type of use.

• If mixed-use is permitted, consider allowing expansion of the existing hotel as it would be compatible with mixed-use development. This vote was very close (6-5) because almost half of the members who voted felt that a hotel use should not encroach into City-owned property, and that the corporate headquarters theme of this area should be retained without allowing other uses to incrementally encroach onto available infill parcels in this area.

Development Potential/Standards:

• Allow additional height for additional open green space on the internal blocks. While members agreed with the overall concept of additional height and density for anchor locations, they also agreed that most of the developable property belongs to the City and that the City could increase height and density if needed. Some members expressed concern that additional height would change the character of the area and impact nearby residential areas.
• Maintain the existing code allowances for height and FAR on the external blocks because of their adjacency to residential zones.
Parking Supply:

- Encourage additional parking to support existing municipal facilities.
- Consider this area as a possible location for Business Triangle employees to park and be shuttled to work.

Resources Required to Implement:

- Staff and decision-maker time to amend Zoning Code.
- Fund and perform a traffic and parking study for the area to evaluate the potential use of City-owned properties.

Workplan Issue #2: Reconstruction of Older, Less Economically Competitive Buildings

The CSC recognized that many older buildings in the City are not well-maintained and that rehabilitation costs may even exceed costs for reconstruction. Yet many of these buildings are legal and non-conforming with regard to height, density and parking. Therefore, owners may prefer to leave the buildings as-is and defer maintenance on them rather than rebuild them at lower heights and density.

To encourage reinvestment in these buildings and to retain the City's commercial base and cachet associated with a Beverly Hills address, the CSC agreed that legal non-conforming buildings may be reconstructed to their current height and density provided the current code required parking is provided. (For example, an existing legal non-conforming 8-story building with a 3:1 existing FAR and substandard parking could be rebuilt to the same height and density, provided the parking is provided per today's Code requirements.)

Resources Required to Implement:

- Staff and decision-maker time to amend Zoning Code.
Workplan Issue #3: Development Opportunities for the Beverly Hilton Hotel/Robinson’s May Site, and the former railroad right-of-way (westerly, Parcels 1 and 2).

a) The Beverly Hilton Hotel/Robinson’s-May Site

The CSC described this property as a "Trophy Property" and as a "World Class" location and development opportunity. The Committee agreed that the preference would be to develop the site in a unified manner with uses that are compatible with the existing anchor hotel use rather than on a piecemeal basis. Quality architecture and landscaping are both critical as this location also serves as a gateway to the City.

Current Uses:

The current site conditions were described as underutilized. The hotel and retail stores, including Robinsons-May, do not generate a great deal of business activity or traffic. Most of the traffic in the immediate area is not related to on-site activities; it is cut-through or passer-by traffic. The large parking lot is not very attractive, and the hotel has a dated feel. The department store has a recently executed 25-year lease and serves as the only large mid-priced department store in the City. At the same time, the site is a critical gateway into the City, and is the largest underdeveloped parcel in Beverly Hills.

Potential Uses/Development Standards

The CSC felt that quality architecture and landscaping are critical because of the gateway location. The Santa Monica Boulevard (south) side of the parcel is currently unattractive and needs upgrading. The site will soon be affected by roadway improvements to Santa Monica Boulevard that will extend beyond the site to Moreno Drive. Other considerations include whether or not the City could impose redevelopment standards, as well as what type of revenue is generated through sales tax, and transient occupancy tax (bed tax) vs. other types of potential uses such as housing.
Suggested uses include public parking, hotel, housing and retail. An arched walkway or bridge connecting the site to the retail area south of Santa Monica Boulevard was also suggested. Support was also voiced for redeveloping the site in such a way that the proposed uses would not adversely impact the existing hotel on the site or the City's Business Triangle (particularly Rodeo Drive businesses).

A residential use on the back of the lot would be the least intrusive location to the neighboring residential properties across Wilshire Boulevard, and these new residential units would have nice views of the golf course; would not look down on the neighboring homes; and could interact with the hotel and generate tax revenue.

Additional height should be considered for portions of the site since the current 45-foot height restriction would not allow sufficient development potential. The increased height should be limited to the westerly and southerly sections of the site adjacent to the golf course and away from the nearby residential area. The increase in height should not exceed the height of the existing hotel building. As incentive for a unified development, the Committee also felt that additional density should be considered.

Future development standards will need to take into consideration the fact that the Santa Monica/Wilshire Boulevard intersection is a high traffic area and any future development needs to take into account not only the uses, but also the ingress/egress to and from the site; circulation and access within the site; parking; and traffic impacts.

**Parking Supply**

Shared parking for all users of the site (hotel, residential and retail) will be critical to make the project work. The Committee also discussed and recommended providing additional parking to support businesses to the south on Little Santa Monica Boulevard. This assumes that there would be a bridge or some other means of connecting the two sites.
(b) Former Railroad Right-of-Way (Parcels 1 and 2)

Existing allowable uses for these privately-owned, currently vacant, undeveloped parcels is limited to open space, transportation and surface parking. The property is zoned T-1, abuts a C-3 zone, and is in close proximity to two major hotels, the high school, and older buildings with small-scale local-serving retail businesses along Santa Monica Boulevard. Parking in this area is in short supply. The parcel includes lots with a very shallow 60-foot depth, which allows for limited access from both the north and south roadways. Its proximity to the City's border and future Santa Monica Boulevard roadway improvements further complicates the development opportunities.

Uses/Opportunities

- Create incentives to encourage the unified development of the parcels on Little Santa Monica Boulevard with the T-1 zoned property behind it.
- Allow mixed-use development.

Development Potential

- Provide incentives for unified development (i.e., the concurrent development of both the C-3 and T-1 zoned parcels).
- For the T-1 zone: if NOT used for transit purposes, allow development consistent with C-3 standards of 45-foot height and 2:1 FAR.
- Allow additional height as an incentive for mixed-use development that includes residential uses.
- Closely review the proposed architectural treatment for the building elevations facing both Santa Monica Boulevard roadways as this is a critical intersection with Wilshire Boulevard and serves as a gateway to the City. A minority felt that additional height and density above what is currently permissible should not be allowed in this area due to small lot sizes and visual impacts that taller buildings might create for this low-scale corner.
Parking Supply

- To maximize parking opportunities in an area with a noticeable shortage, consider allowing parking encroachments below the sidewalk.
- Initiate a parking strategy or program for additional parking in this area. The City should consider providing public parking as one of the options.

Workplan Issue #4: Mixed-Use Development

A major issue of the CSC's charge was to consider whether the City should allow a mix of residential and commercial uses in commercial areas. In general, residential uses are not permitted in commercial zones per the existing Code. There are, however, a few exceptions. The RMCP zone allows a mix of commercial and residential uses under certain conditions. A code amendment was also approved recently for an adaptive reuse district for the north side of the 8600 block of Wilshire Boulevard. This zone allows the office space to be converted to apartments with retail uses on the ground floor.

Over the past several years, a number of property owners have approached the City with mixed-use development proposals. This caused the Planning Commission and City Council to engage in deliberations regarding the implementation of a City-wide mixed-use ordinance. As this debate was coming to fruition, the General Plan committees began their process, and the City Council felt it would be appropriate for study in this comprehensive process of developing goals and a vision for the City's future, and deferred development of this ordinance until recommendations have been received from the General Plan committees.

As mentioned in the Workplan section of this report, the CSC studied mixed-use at several sessions. A presentation and Question-and-Answer session was held with a local architect who has developed a number of mixed-use projects in Southern California. Another presentation and session was hosted by Bill Trimble, Senior Planner with the City of Pasadena, and Paul Silvern, a partner with Hamilton, Rabinovitz and Altschuler (a firm specializing in land use, real estate and fiscal impact analysis). Discussions were also held on this subject as it arose during regular committee meetings over the course of the last 18 months.
Factors considered in making recommendations for mixed-use include:

- Housing Element goals for the creation of new housing for all income groups.
- Opportunities to create a concentration of different uses that would reduce vehicle trips.
- Uses and incentives that benefit the City’s tax base and revenue.
- Concerns raised by developers stating that the 45-foot height limit renders mixed-use projects economically infeasible.
- Are incentives appropriate and/or necessary for apartments and/or condominiums?

Recommendations:

General Mixed-Use Recommendations:

Most commercial zones are appropriate locations for ground floor commercial uses with residential units on upper levels. (Exceptions to this general recommendation are discussed in the individual geographic sub-area recommendations of this report.) A minority felt that there is a potential conflict between the commercial and residential use in mixed development on a site and the lack of usable outdoor living spaces. In addition, there was concern that residential uses may not be compatible with municipal service uses in some areas of the City.

- Require high quality architectural design and construction.
- Allow up to 55 feet in height for mixed-use development on commercial corridors that abut residential zones with a 55-foot height limit.
- Increased height and density may be appropriate in some areas to encourage the construction of additional housing units. Any modifications to development standards to allow for such an increase should be determined on a area-specific basis to ensure compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood character and uses.

Location-Specific Mixed-Use Recommendations:

- For Wilshire Boulevard:
  1. Do not allow incentives or trade-offs for additional height or density in commercial areas that abut R-1 zones.
  2. Allow adaptive reuse of existing older buildings provided the ground floor is retained as commercial.
  3. Consider mixed-use as potential use on a unified development on the block between Stanley Drive and Le Doux Road.
For Olympic Boulevard:
1. Allow mixed-use or adaptive reuse between Beverly Drive and Robertson Boulevard.
2. Allow mixed-use development within existing code allowances for height and density.

For the Industrial Area:
1. Allow mixed-used or adaptive reuse for privately-owned property as long as the ground floor is used for commercial office purposes.
2. Encourage mixed-use development on City-owned properties with retail uses on the ground floor.

Consider mixed-use as a potential use for Parcels 1 and 2 under a unified development plan (for the C-3 and T-1 lots).

DISCLAIMER

The members of the General Plan Commercial Standards Topic Committee include some property owners within the Commercial (C-3) Zones in the City of Beverly Hills and these areas were part of the discussions of the group. Land/property ownership was disclosed as part of the application process for all General Plan Topic Committee Members and was considered during the selection process.
**Glossary of Terms**

**Adaptive Reuse:** The conversion of an existing building to another use. (For example, an office building that is converted to apartments.)

**CUP:** Conditional Use Permit. A discretionary permit that allows certain uses defined in the Municipal Code if the City finds that the proposed location of such a use will not be detrimental to adjacent property or to the public welfare (e.g., hotels, religious institutions, vehicle sales, etc.)

**FAR:** Floor Area Ratio. The ratio of floor area to site area. (For example, a 7500 square foot lot with a 2:1 FAR would have a maximum FAR of 15,000 s.f. (2 x 7500 s.f.)

**In-Lieu Parking District:** Commercially-zoned properties that are eligible to satisfy all or part of the requirements for parking spaces through the payment of an in-lieu fee to the City.

**Legal Non-Conforming Building:** A building constructed under previous code allowances (e.g., height, setbacks, parking) which have since changed.

**Mixed-Use:** Development projects that contain more than one use such as commercial on the ground floor with residential uses above.

**Pedestrian Uses:** Commercial uses that encourage walk-in customers. A pedestrian-friendly environment is intended to create a vibrant atmosphere that stimulates economic investment and a sense of place. Safety is enhanced by activities that encourage “eyes on the street.”

**Public Right-of-Way:** Sidewalks, streets, alleys and other areas that are public property and not privately owned.

**Setbacks:** The minimum distance between the front, back or side lot line and the closest element of a building or structure on that site area.

**Transitional Ordinance:** A set of standards developed to buffer commercial uses from residential areas.
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This Executive Summary highlights the main issues addressed by the Community Character Committee through the General Plan update process. The full report outlines the Committee's educational process, community outreach efforts, and the work plan that lead to its recommendations.

City Council's Charge

The Community Character Committee's charge included direction to consider the history of the City and the economic and social forces that have shaped it; the character of the community's demographic and built environment as it exists today; and alternate scenarios describing the City’s future. At a minimum the Committee was required to include in this discussion:

- How the City is perceived by its residents, property owners and business owners, and by “others.” What ways, if any, the character of the City should change in the future and what is necessary in order to best achieve that change.
- Urban Design (Wilshire corridor and Business Triangle)
- Aesthetics of the built environment
- Historic Preservation of structures and places of cultural significance
- Gateways to the City of Beverly Hills

Organization of Workplan

The group’s approach to formulating recommendations for the City’s future growth and standards of excellence over the long term focused on three main subject areas: Character Defining Elements of Streetscapes, Historic Preservation, and Gateways.

The Committee’s overall goal was to identify issues and opportunities that reflect the fundamental objective of maintaining and enhancing the quality of the City’s built environment. While the group expressed strong concerns and placed the highest priority on the aesthetic quality of residential neighborhoods, pursuant to its charge, the group focused its main commentary on commercial corridors.

Committee Vision: Issues and Opportunities

The Committee believes that the “garden quality” aspect of the vision developed by the City’s original founders is as relevant today as it was at the time the City was incorporated. As a result, identification of opportunities for additional landscaping was a theme that touched almost every aspect of the Committee’s recommendations. The following three overall goals were used to guide the Committee’s analysis throughout its review process:
Goal 1: Enhance the quality of life by creating and sustaining: attractive buildings and open spaces; walkable pedestrian districts; outstanding community facilities (including public safety) and cultural opportunities.

Goal 2: Maintain and encourage commercial development that is supportive of, compatible with and complimentary to the surrounding residential neighborhoods.

Goal 3: Maintain the highest urban design principles with respect to scale, quality materials, and uses that are consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Working from that basis, the Committee’s recommendations include:

Character-Defining Elements

- Grand Boulevard Vision for Wilshire Boulevard: The street should present an overriding sense of character that allows for different types and levels of physical development, yet ties the street together within the city’s boundaries. Distinct segments such as an entertainment/arts district could be created by capitalizing on the location of existing theaters and galleries.
- Allow mixed-use development in certain areas (e.g. east of Robertson) to revitalize buildings and generate more vibrant uses.
- Encourage the creation of business associations on a street-by-street basis to help upgrade and maintain business districts.
- Coordinated lighting and design techniques for medians and streetscapes should be considered for all major commercial corridors and districts.
- Design guidelines should be considered for commercial and residential buildings.

The report discusses similar recommendations specific to each of the City’s commercial corridors and districts.

Historic Preservation

Preservation was a major issue for the Committee, and a series of recommendations are outlined in the full report. These include:

- Update the 1985 Historic Resources Survey
- Develop a City Landmarks Ordinance to preserve its historic character
- Develop a local public repository for ownership history of buildings
Gateways

The report discusses a variety of ways to identify entrypoints to the City, such as:

- Signage, architectural statements, lighting, landscaping
- Consideration of gateway statements at major nodes that may not be entry points such as a water feature reminiscent of what once existed in Beverly Gardens Park
II. **INTRODUCTION**

A city's overall vision for community character includes many things: urban design; appearance of both new and old commercial and residential structures; entry points or "gateways;" historic and cultural activities and places; and education and activities that the community supports and values. The Community Character Committee (Committee) has created a set of goals and objectives to help the City maintain and enhance those elements of the community that contribute positively to its character and that retain the City's identity and image as an attractive, safe, and desirable place to live, work, entertain and experience cultural opportunities.

While Beverly Hills is a place where residents feel a strong sense of community and comfort, it is also renowned worldwide for its international image and prestige associated with the entertainment industry, shopping and beautiful homes. The Committee felt very strongly about protecting and enhancing this beautiful enclave's overall character and livability. Residents enjoy walking along the lovely tree-lined residential streets in a safe environment and want to protect this community's unique locale that exists within the midst of a large metropolis.

Although the Committee's charge included an overall vision of the City (vs. the Residential Issues Committee, whose charge it was to specifically make residential recommendations), the group believes that maintaining quality residential structures and beautiful streetscapes is the key starting point for developing the City's overall character. The "garden quality" of the City dates back to the vision of its original founders and continues to be a factor in planning and land use decisions made today. In this same vein, public safety and education are among the highest common values for those who live here. The moderate climate, beautiful parks and reputation for upscale aesthetic qualities render the City its unique cachet and standing as one of the most desirable cities in the world in which to live, visit or establish a prestigious business address.
III. CITY COUNCIL CHARGE

The Community Character Committee received direction to examine the City’s existing character and to identify issues and opportunities for its future.

The City Council’s Charge required that the Committee consider the history of the City and economic and social forces that have shaped it, the character of the community’s demographic and built environment as it exists today, and alternate scenarios describing the City’s future. At a minimum the Committee was required to include in this discussion:

- How the City is perceived by its residents, property owners and business owners, and by “others.” What ways, if any, the character of the City should change in the future and what is necessary in order to best achieve that change.
- Urban Design (Wilshire corridor and Business Triangle).
- Aesthetics of the built environment.
- Historic Preservation of structures and places of cultural significance.
- Gateways to the City of Beverly Hills.

To organize the recommendations for the City’s future growth and standards of excellence over the long term, the group developed three main subject areas:

a) Character Defining Elements of Streetscapes;

b) Historic Preservation; and

c) Gateways.

IV. EDUCATIONAL PROCESS

The Community Character Committee participated in three all-Committee briefing sessions at the start of the General Plan Topic Committee project. Over the course of 20 regular Committee meetings, the group received primers consisting of a bus tour of the City’s commercial and industrial areas; a presentation of the Planning Commission’s Single Family Residential Design Proposals; a panel featuring local experts/academics in the historic preservation field; and educational briefings provided by staff.

V. WORKPLAN

Early in the process, the group was asked to bring in photographs of images in the City they felt represented community values and positive aspects of existing
character. A brainstorming session followed wherein the group developed a list of qualities that come to mind when one thinks of Beverly Hills as it exists today, focusing on both its strengths and weaknesses. This list related to all sectors of the City (i.e., single and multi-family residential, commercial, industrial, and recreational areas). Qualities like a strong educational system, personal safety and City services were also factored into the mix. Categories were developed to illustrate the type of image the City would like to promote in each of these areas in a way that would make both residents and visitors feel that they had entered a unique and desirable environment.

A series of baseline existing conditions, both good and bad, was established to describe the City’s existing community character. Discussions ensued to determine how these physical conditions could be enhanced or modified to create a true physical environment that coincides with the image the City would like to project.

A series of goals, policies and objectives were drafted to guide City policymakers, residents and businesses toward a quality vision of community character for the future. The group felt that its charge could best be achieved by breaking down the process into a three-phase review process as follows:

A) **Character Defining Elements**

Discussions began by identifying the City’s physical characteristics in terms of the following categories: uses, physical form, and streetscapes (including public and private landscape areas). The City was then broken down into eleven separate physical sub-areas, and each area was evaluated using these categories. These are discussed in detail in the “Issues and Opportunities” section of this report.

B) **Historic Preservation**

The Committee felt that the preservation of historic structures, important sites, and landscapes is a key factor in retaining the City’s physical character and beauty. Preservation sustains and sets the tone for a high quality built environment and maintains a desirable level of aesthetic character. It can also contribute to the economic sustainability of the City and encourages understanding and respect for the history and culture of the City.

C) **Gateways**

Gateways to the City at entrypoints as well as within the City at key points of interest were considered. In concert with the City Council’s direction, the
group felt that gateway features are essential to making people feel like they are in a unique, recognizable environment that is separate from neighboring jurisdictions.

VI. IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES

The issues and opportunities discussed in this report attempt to define ways for the stated goals to be accomplished with the recognition that the issue of “character” is interrelated with many other policy concerns including land use, zoning and planning, development of parks and open space, and environmental sustainability, to name a few. The issues and opportunities discussed below considered this overlap and are intended to incorporate rather than conflict with similar issues presented by the other committees.

The format for the “Issues and Opportunities” section is separated into Character Defining Elements of Streetscapes, Historic Preservation, and Gateways. Existing conditions are described for each topic, followed by a series of goals and objectives for the future.

The following three overall goals were used to guide the Committee’s analysis throughout its review process:

Goal 1: Enhance the quality of life by creating and sustaining; attractive buildings and open spaces; walkable pedestrian districts; outstanding community facilities (including public safety) and cultural opportunities.
Goal 2: Maintain and encourage commercial development that is supportive of, compatible with and complimentary to the surrounding residential neighborhoods.

Goal 3: Maintain the highest urban design principles with respect to scale, quality materials, and uses that are consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Issue 1: Character Defining Elements

Residential Objectives

The Committee shares a sense of the importance of the character of the single-family residential neighborhoods of the City. The look of the residential streetscapes is a key definer of the overall character of the City. While there are many different styles that make up the current character, in the best cases those various styles work together as a community of buildings that support each other with respect to high quality materials and construction, lush landscaping and compatible scale and massing. The Committee also shares a concern that new residential buildings do not always support these characteristics. However, there is not a consensus on the best approach to address this concern.

While single-family residential design review is supported by an overwhelming majority of members, there was significant debate about the challenge of creating a fair system. Although development of proposed solutions to address this issue is outside the Committee's charge, the members commit to be active participants in
the community debate over the best way to sustain and enhance the character of the City's residential areas.

Citywide Objectives

The Committee believes that when you arrive in Beverly Hills, you should know that you are in a special place. The City needs an overall sense of recognizable design elements that let residents and visitors know they are within the boundaries of Beverly Hills. Upon entering this unique place, it becomes apparent that the City is made up of a series of distinct districts which may differ in their use, form and character; yet unified visual cues, such as high quality design in every aspect of the built environment, indicate that you are still within the City. Toward this end, the Committee recommends:

- Reinforce the City's existing character by building upon the existing strengths of commercial districts (architectural review to ensure quality buildings and materials, landscaping, etc.).

- Consider developing written design guidelines and incentives for property owners to clearly define the look of the streetscape and the architectural characteristics of individual buildings. These guidelines should not emphasize any specific architectural style; they should focus on qualities like plant materials and sizes, rooflines, modulated volumes, sufficient window areas, articulated facades, quality materials, and should consider the relationship of the building's size, neighboring properties, and location on each block.

- Develop both a community sports and recreation center, and a cultural center to enhance the importance of community activities.

- Encourage the creation of business owners' associations in commercial districts to create motivation to keep storefronts attractive and well-maintained. Suggest that plans for amenities such as hanging flower baskets (similar to those at Two Rodeo) be implemented by property owners.

- Enhance the public streetscapes with trees, landscaping and street furniture as appropriate throughout commercial districts, using both public and private initiatives to develop the character of pedestrian places.

- Streetscape designs should be of a consistent theme throughout the City. Similar elements should be used (lighting, plants, decorative features), but the scale and intensity should vary in a manner that is appropriate for each location.

- Add street lighting in commercial areas in a manner that provides safety and yet is still decorative.

- Variety should be encouraged from street to street, however, unifying elements should be used to tie the look of the City together.
Resources Required to Implement:

Each of these general objectives, as well as the objectives that follow for Wilshire Boulevard and the various sub-areas would require staff (including consultant) and decision-maker time for:

- Development and ongoing implementation of design guidelines
- Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance
- Funding for physical improvements

Potential Implications:

- While beautification of the City is a good long-term investment, funding is limited, and the City will need to find funding sources to support this type of project.
- Due to funding limitations, not all residents agree that this priority is the most important use of City money.
- A long-term plan that prioritizes the various areas in need of physical upgrades would need to be established.
- Special Assessment Districts (such as the one in the business triangle that supported the Urban Design Program) may need to be established.

"Grand Boulevard" Vision for Wilshire Boulevard

The idea of creating a "grand boulevard" is shared far beyond the Community Character Committee, and resonated in comments received throughout the public outreach process. Wilshire Boulevard is a prominent continuous commercial street through the west side of Los Angeles. Its span extends from downtown Los Angeles to the Pacific Ocean. While there are distinguished Beverly Hills landmarks along Wilshire (the department stores, Two Rodeo, the Beverly-Wilshire Hotel), there is no contiguous theme that holds the City's image together.

Even though the Committee is aware that even in the best of times the economy will not support the pinnacle of commercial businesses along the entire stretch of the boulevard, it felt that there should still be an overriding sense of character that ties the street together within the City's boundaries. Business types and uses will vary depending on the size of buildings, parking availability, surrounding neighborhoods, etc. Due to the length of the street and varied surrounding characteristics, Wilshire Boulevard was divided into sub-areas to recognize the unique development of each area.
Objectives - Wilshire’s “Grand Boulevard” Vision

Uses:

In general, the existing uses are an appropriate mix of offices and destination retail interspersed with neighborhood-serving uses. In order to enhance the existing mix:

- Encourage car dealerships to enclose showrooms where feasible. Alternatively, ensure that lots are well-maintained with discreet methods of advertising (no banners, flags, balloons, etc.).
- Encourage outdoor cafes where appropriate along Wilshire Boulevard.
- Encourage stores, restaurants and galleries to stay open later in the evening, including involvement with the Chamber of Commerce.

Physical Form:

- Consider the use of color by painting street lights, adding banners to light posts, or soliciting ideas from artist groups to provide distinctive character to the various street segments.

Streetscape:

- Trees should be well lit at both the trunks and canopies.
- Elements such as greenery, islands, and lighting are desirable and serve to attract people outdoors and encourage pedestrian activity.
- Install landscaped medians where feasible.
- Although constraints exist (cost, maintenance, physical restrictions such as short blocks and the need for left turn lanes, etc), medians are a key way of beautifying streets.
- The design and planting of medians should have a consistent theme along the length of Wilshire Boulevard so that people are aware they are within the City limits.
- Medians are also strong gateway statements

Security:

- Continue to provide a high level of personal security (lighting, police, etc.) that is consistent with the community’s values.

Sub-Area 1: Wilshire Boulevard: Western City Limit to Crescent Drive

Existing Conditions: Wilshire Boulevard has a higher density, corridor-type development characterized by major department stores and single to 12-story office development interspersed with smaller-scale development. Although this area is among
Sub-Area 1:  
*Wilshire Boulevard: Western City Limit to Crescent Drive (continued)*

the most prestigious business locations anywhere, the area lacks restaurants, pedestrians, and street activity. Recently many buildings have been upgraded and remodeled. A number of buildings were developed at a higher density than allowed under today’s Code, so it is not likely that they would be torn down and replaced. The storefronts and sidewalk areas lack sufficient landscaping.

Rationale for Future Vision:

Pedestrians need to feel more comfortable walking this area. Tree canopies that provide shade for walkers, and landscaping in front of stores would draw people to these businesses and beautify the streetscape.

Objectives:

Uses:
- Maintain the current mix of department store, retail and office uses.

Physical Form:
- Retain a mix of taller and lower building heights.
- Require vacant storefronts to be maintained, decorated or used to advertise other City businesses.

Streetscape:
- Revitalize streets and sidewalks by adding shade trees to provide shade for pedestrians, particularly on the north side of the street where it tends to become hot.
- Encourage a better relationship between retail stores and the sidewalk through landscaping (including planter boxes) and tree lighting.

Sub-Area 2:  
*Wilshire Boulevard: Crescent Drive to Robertson Boulevard*

Existing Conditions: The physical character of this area is a mix of relatively indistinct low-, mid- and high-rise buildings. Uses include car dealerships, medical offices and commercial buildings, and movie theaters/screening rooms. The perception is that there is no reason to walk to this area and that no parking is available. The area lacks
Sub-Area 2:
Wilshire Boulevard: Crescent Drive to Robertson Boulevard (continued)

A uniform sense of identity and does not have the vibrancy of the segment of Wilshire immediately west of this area.

Rationale for Future Vision: The seeds for an entertainment district exist along this stretch. There are several movie screens in this sub-area and many high-profile events are held each year that generate positive news stories and activity in the area. The City could sponsor a film festival or similar entertainment-related event to draw people and businesses in to capitalize on this unique opportunity for revitalization, as the following five theaters are located in this vicinity:

- Writers Guild Theatre at 135 S. Doheny Drive
- Cecchi Gori Fine Arts Theatre at 8556 Wilshire Boulevard
- Music Hall Theatre at 9036 Wilshire Boulevard
- Wilshire Theatre at 8840 Wilshire Boulevard
- Samuel Goldwyn Theater at 8949 Wilshire Boulevard

Uses:
- Encourage activities such as a film festival that relate to the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences and the theatres along this stretch of Wilshire.

Physical Form:
- Retain interesting buildings such as 9101 Wilshire (Kate Mantilini Restaurant) which includes a mix of three building types (one, two, and ten-stories high) as a
Sub-Area 2:
*Wilshire Boulevard: Crescent Drive to Robertson Boulevard (continued)*

building of this type could not be constructed under today’s development allowances.

Streetscape:
- Enhance the public streetscapes with trees, landscaping and street furniture as appropriate to develop the character of pedestrian places.

**Sub-Area 3:**
*Wilshire Boulevard: Robertson Boulevard to Eastern City Limit*

**Existing Conditions:** Moving eastward on Wilshire Boulevard, there is a major shift in business activity types. Vacancy levels increase and many buildings look worn and need to be upgraded. Commercial tenants in this area are more transient and the area is hard to distinguish as separate from Los Angeles. No particular theme exists (no landmarks, significant building or use patterns, etc.) that ties this area into the overall City. Improved maintenance would enhance the visual quality and, in turn, the vibrancy of the street.

**Objectives:**

**Uses:**
- Encourage variation in building heights to relieve the monotony that would be created if all new construction met today’s standards (45 feet with 3 stories).
- Encourage mixed-use development (buildings that integrate residential and commercial uses) with smaller restaurants to rejuvenate the area. Encourage a mix of small office and residential uses. Office suites should be restricted to small sizes, and allowable uses should be limited to a level of intensity that does not disrupt the neighborhood.
- Allow limited entertainment uses to support existing local businesses (e.g., supper clubs, jazz clubs, cabaret uses of an intensity that does not significantly impact the surrounding residential neighborhoods).
- Encourage pedestrian-oriented uses through incentives.
- Expedite the City approval process for areas such as this, where development is needed.
- Support enlivened street activity.
- Consider installing short-term street parking to encourage new, small businesses to locate here.
Sub-Area 3:  
*Wilshire Boulevard: Robertson Boulevard to Eastern City Limit (continued)*

**Physical Form:**
- Allow variation in building heights to relieve the monotony that would be created if all new construction met today's standards (45 feet with 3 stories).
- Consider allowing incentives for more height if developers agree to provide less expensive lease space at the ground level for small businesses.

**Streetscape:**
- Consider adding urban design elements such as streetlights, trees that are not as tall as the existing palms and flowers as you cross City borders to signify that you've left Los Angeles or West Hollywood and entered Beverly Hills.
- Increase landscape elements that are incorporated into building facades.

**Potential Implications:**
- If the City modified restrictions as an incentive to allow desired uses in this area, any new use would have to be carefully considered to determine its impacts (including noise, safety, traffic, etc.) to nearby residential neighborhoods. Conditions would have to be placed on new projects to limit any potential negative impacts. Members felt that if some new uses were allowed and the area becomes more successful, residential neighbors would realize the benefits to the neighborhood (improved vibrancy, improved access to local neighborhood uses, and improved safety that goes hand-in-hand with active streets), and see it as a positive change.
- A parking strategy would be needed so that neighborhoods are not affected by traffic.
- When considering allowing new uses, the City Council should consider the overall impacts to the entire City and not just the impacts to adjacent residents.

**Commercial Corridor Objectives**

**Sub-Area 4: Olympic Boulevard**

This area is a more "suburban style" commercial corridor. It is auto-oriented with mini-malls and very few pedestrians. Many older multi-family residential structures still exist along Olympic Boulevard. It contains a mix of uses including neighborhood services, boutique offices, car dealerships and mini-malls.
Sub-Area 4: Olympic Boulevard (continued)

Rationale for Future Vision: Improvements should be considered for this commercial corridor such as developing gateways and improving the overall design of the streetscape.

Objectives:

Uses:
- Consider mixed-use to introduce more pedestrian activity.
- Consider allowing open-air dining if adequate measures can be designed to separate the use from the street traffic.

Physical Form:
- Explore the street’s “City Gateway” architectural opportunities.
- Use the design review process to emphasize quality signage in both private and public spaces.
- To the extent possible, maintain the character of the low-scale buildings and historic fabric of existing older buildings. However, allow more height in the limited area where Olympic abuts R-4 zoning, such as those areas directly east and west of Beverly Drive.

Streetscape:
- Provide consistent street tree types.
- Implement a lighting plan that breaks up the residential and commercial areas so that it no longer has a “long corridor” feel.

Sub-Area 5: La Cienega Boulevard

Existing Conditions: This area is functionally different from other parts of the City and is mostly distinguished by Restaurant Row. It is a complex street because it is heavily trafficked, yet is lined with parks and small businesses. In addition, commercial businesses, including restaurants, directly abut a single-family residential zone (without an alley serving as a buffer) on the east side of the street. It also has some very interesting qualities such as La Cienega Park and the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences Library.

Rationale for Future Vision: Primary concerns along this area include public safety and the future of “Restaurant Row.” The park is very active and attractive, as is the Academy with its open space. Opportunities also exist for mixed-use housing along this street.
Sub-Area 5: La Cienega Boulevard (continued)

Objectives:

Uses:
- As the restaurant district in this area is not as active as it once was, it is probably appropriate to consider new uses and character-definers other than restaurant row while encouraging the stability of landmark restaurants including Lawry's and others.
- Encourage development that is more destination-oriented so that this street no longer serves as a "pass-through" to the City of Los Angeles.
- Encourage mixed-use in this area.
- Encourage small-scale uses in the mid-block areas.

Physical Form:
- Increased height should be allowed for new mixed-use structures near Olympic and La Cienega. This should be limited to the block north of the park on both sides of the street since existing building heights vary along that block and infill buildings with more density and height could be accommodated.
- Ensure that residential neighborhoods are protected from La Cienega buildings by transitioning building heights.

Streetscape:
- Provide aesthetic improvements through landscaping and lighting. As the street is not pedestrian-oriented, designs should consider the intensity of the street and the variety in uses.
- Study whether the parkway median can be extended.

Sub-Area 6: Robertson Boulevard

Existing Conditions: The northernmost portion of Robertson Boulevard between Beverly Boulevard and Burton Way is often mistaken for Beverly Hills. This area actually lies within the City of Los Angeles. The portion in Beverly Hills is south of Burton Way on the west side of the street, and begins at Clifton Way on the east side of the street. The City's portion of the street
**Sub-Area 6: Robertson Boulevard (continued)**

is not very clearly defined through streetscape elements. The City should encourage property owners in this area to strive for consistency with the design-oriented, upscale feel of neighboring properties in West Hollywood.

South of Wilshire Boulevard, the Beverly Hills portion of Robertson extends southward to Whitworth Drive on the west side of the street, and to Gregory Way on the east side. Signage along the street is varied, and the parking is difficult. The street contains a “grab bag” of uses that include a large number of nail shops and small storefronts. Drawbacks include a less than desirable mix of uses and a lack of parking. The character is affected by the narrow width of the street and the fact that it serves as a cross between an arterial street and a pedestrian walking area, which creates an inherent conflict.

**Rationale for Future Vision:** Overall, Robertson Boulevard is a difficult area to explore because there are so many conflicts with traffic and pedestrian activities. Ideally, this area could become more pedestrian-oriented and follow the trend of upscale shops and restaurants along the northern portion of the street in Los Angeles.

**Objectives:**

**Uses:**
- Encourage local destination uses where nearby residents can bring their families.
- Create a “destination” type of environment that builds on the upscale shops and restaurants farther north on the street. Work cooperatively with adjacent jurisdictions so that the uses complement each other and work well together as an area that is noted for restaurants and shopping.
- Discourage uses within the block that do not support and promote pedestrian activity.
- Develop a public parking facility, either through City funds or a developer-based incentive.
- Robertson Boulevard has wide sidewalks that support and complement pedestrian activity. Allowable uses and design requirements should capitalize on this asset and take advantage of this existing pedestrian-friendly wide sidewalk.

**Physical Form:**
- Ensure that parking is well-designed. Articulate parking façades with landscaping along the frontages so that they look like attractive buildings rather than parking structures.
- Prohibit parking on private property in front of new buildings (mini-malls).
Sub-Area 6: Robertson Boulevard (continued)

- Consider mid-block street crossings to encourage pedestrian activity. (Note: The group recognized that this would impede traffic flow; however, it is still needed to make people feel comfortable and safe as they walk this area.)
- Encourage design that includes the following criteria: small scale, charm, courtyards, village feel, storefronts with attractive window displays.
- Provide additional lighting along sidewalks for pedestrian safety and feeling of well-being.

Streetscape:
- The streetscape design should unify the area as a district.
- More lighting is needed to make the area feel safer.
- As ficus trees are eventually removed, they should be replaced with canopy trees.

Sub-Area 7: South Beverly Drive

Existing Conditions: This area has a low-rise, neighborhood feel. Businesses appear more relaxed, neighborhood and pedestrian-oriented than in the Triangle with a good parking supply. Local retailers co-exist with a lesser number of nationwide chains. The aesthetic is somewhat of a mosaic, with both good and bad examples of design. Both sides of this commercial street abut residences. The street includes diagonal parking, and locals can walk to restaurants and active commercial businesses. This area has a different look than other parts of the City -- brick buildings with smaller windows and less glass and steel. The grocery store at Olympic Boulevard breaks the rhythm of the neighborhood.

Rationale for Future Vision: The Committee felt the scale and character of this area should be maintained, with minor improvements to design and landscaping.

Objectives:

Uses:
- Maintain current allowances for neighborhood-serving uses.

Physical Form:
- Maintain the existing scale and character of the street.
- Maintain the current levels of development.
Sub-Area 7: South Beverly Drive (continued)

Note: Although higher density (3 stories and 2:1 FAR) than what exists along some of the blocks would be permitted under today’s Code, it is unlikely that this level of development would occur because of the parking requirements.

- Encourage differentiated façades while retaining the existing overall theme of the building grain as the scale of individual shops is important to the overall look of the street.
- Provide Citywide written design guidelines and incentives for property owners to clearly define how the street should look. These guidelines should not emphasize any specific architectural style; they should focus on plantings, sufficient window area, articulated facades, quality materials, and should consider the relationship of the building’s size, neighboring properties, and location on each block.

Streetscape:
- Upgrade street amenities to include trees that provide a canopy for pedestrians and planters of a consistent type.

Sub-Area 8: Business Triangle

Existing Conditions: This is the City’s prime commercial area. It has a strong identity with a mix of upscale shopping, commercial businesses, medical offices and pedestrian activity. Rodeo Drive serves as its most prestigious international retail street. To the east, Beverly Drive supports more national retailers, while Canon Drive is home to smaller scale shops with more of a neighborhood clientele, and Crescent Drive is developed with senior housing, convenience retail (including a supermarket), commercial, medical and parking uses at a relatively low scale. To the west of Rodeo Drive, medical uses and commercial offices hold the majority of tenants although retail uses and restaurants also thrive in this area. An urban design program is underway involving long-term physical improvements to five streets (Brighton, Dayton, Rodeo, Beverly and Canon). The program includes sidewalk widening, mid-block pedestrian crosswalks, landscaping, lighting and trees.

Rationale for Future Vision: Given the urban design program and its benefits, the main issue for the Business Triangle lies with drawing more night-time activity. This will likely be spurred by the pedestrian-oriented lighting in the design improvements, but additional efforts are needed.

Objectives:

Uses:
- Support existing uses, and also encourage sophisticated entertainment uses like supper/jazz clubs and restaurants.
Sub-Area 8: Business Triangle (continued)

Physical Form:
- Maintain existing variation in building heights along each blockface.
- Consider locating future parking structures in the business triangle rather than along Wilshire Boulevard, as development is more concentrated and accessible in the triangle, whereas Wilshire Boulevard is long and linear.
- Encourage architecture that is inviting from the street, as well as designs that create a welcoming, open feeling for pedestrians.

Streetscape:
- Capitalize on the Urban Design Program by maintaining the individual character of streets through urban design review and features such as landscaping and awnings.
- Encourage low-scale landscape designs such as planter beds, flowers and canopy trees.

Little Santa Monica Boulevard

Existing Conditions: The north side of the street presents a challenge for the edge of the Triangle. Historically restaurants perform well; however, other types of uses continue to struggle. As rents are lower in this area, it seems to have potential for neighborhood-serving uses. Fortunately, these uses have parking support from the double-level parking structures north of the buildings on the south side of Santa Monica Boulevard.

Objectives:

Uses:
- Encourage retention of the existing mix of uses and individually-owned local shops.
- Encourage neighborhood-serving uses.

Physical Form:
- Maintain the existing low-scale building heights and small storefronts.

Streetscape:
- Provide shade protection/tree canopies in future streetscape upgrades.

Safety:
- Evaluate traffic-slowing measures such as signalized mid-block crossings in future roadway improvements to provide a safer pedestrian environment and further
Little Santa Monica Boulevard (continued)

encourage pedestrian activity. The Committee recognizes that regional transportation concerns will be included in this consideration by necessity.

Sub-Area 9: Civic Center/Industrial Area

Existing Conditions: This area was thought to have a somewhat sterile, government-like feel. Although this location is referred to as the City's "industrial area," it is actually more of a corporate headquarters center. Buildings in this area are big, yet not too big, with a concentration of both single-story and low-rise buildings. This may be partially due to the fact that the lots in this area are much larger than typical commercial lot sizes. Although it is a business area, it still retains the sensibility of Beverly Hills because of the front setbacks, trees and shade. A sub-area exists along Civic Center Drive because of the stretch of older low-rise buildings fronting the sidewalk along several blocks which are just across the street from the vacant railroad right-of-way area.

Rationale for Future Vision: Santa Monica Boulevard buffers this area from residential neighborhoods to the north. Much of the area is also secluded from residential uses on the south, east and west sides, which gives this location a unique opportunity for uses such as light entertainment, art galleries, a sports and recreation center, and retail uses.

Objectives:

Uses:
- Consider allowing portions of this area to be zoned for a specific type of district (e.g., galleries, entertainment uses like supper clubs, shops, bookstores).
- Allow neighborhood retail/restaurant uses.
Sub-Area 9: Civic Center/Industrial Area (continued)

Physical Form:
- Development standards (height/density/setbacks) should be consistent with a small neighborhood/village-type feel.

Streetscape:
- Maintain the existing landscaping, setbacks and open space around the perimeter of the sub-area.

Sub-Area 10: Peninsula Hotel Area

Existing Conditions: This area is very linear and somewhat isolated; not an area pedestrians would casually walk. Parking is scarce. The scale is low and several charming building designs provide good pedestrian character. While the Peninsula Hotel defines the area, virtually none of the development in the area relates to the hotel. Most lots on the north side of Little Santa Monica Boulevard are shallow (40’ in depth). The former railroad right-of-way is currently zoned for transportation purposes only. If the properties were developed, vehicular access would be difficult as it would not be possible from the north roadway of Santa Monica Boulevard.

Rationale for Future Vision: This area has potential as a gallery or art district. Uses should be considered to capture business from the hotel and enliven this area. New buildings should follow the area’s small-town charm as well as the architectural sophistication of the I.M. Pei-designed Creative Artists building. At the same time, concerns were expressed about how this area will be affected by the Santa Monica Boulevard roadway improvements underway in Los Angeles since the area could become more traffic intensive and no longer appropriate for pedestrian activity.

Objectives:

Uses:
- Encourage pedestrian-oriented uses.
- Consider developing an art district on both sides of Little Santa Monica Boulevard and promote the use of public art.
- Retain the small-scale, walkable character by encouraging small cafes, bookstores and small-scale uses.

Physical Form:
- Consider ways to protect pedestrians from the traffic on Little Santa Monica Boulevard, especially as the roadway improvements may create more intense traffic patterns.
Sub-Area 10: Peninsula Hotel Area (continued)

- Consider allowing a pedestrian bridge leading from the existing Robinsons-May site to the area for pedestrian safety and better access.
- Encourage the theme of pedestrian-oriented charm and quality architecture.
- Lasky Drive: Retain and enhance the character created by uses such as Maison 140 (boutique hotel).

Streetscape:
- Maintain consistency with other streetscape plans by adding appropriate trees, landscaping and lighting.

Sub-Area 11: Robinsons-May/Beverly Hilton Triangle

Existing Conditions: This area is characterized as a destination location developed with the Robinsons-May Department Store and the Beverly Hilton Hotel.

Rationale for Future Vision: This is considered to be a signature site with a great deal of potential for redevelopment. It is 17-acres in size and serves as a City entry/gateway. Its proximity to Little Santa Monica Boulevard provides opportunities to consider shared parking and connectivity of uses.

Objectives:

General Vision:
- This area is a prime candidate for a "master plan" to include garden-quality aspects throughout, buffers between uses, and variation in heights (with lowered building heights as the proximity to the street increases).
- A broad vision is recommended that would take into account the fountain at the Wilshire/Santa Monica Blvd. intersection and the Budget Rental Car property.
- A landscaped "green edge" along the entire Santa Monica Boulevard is strongly encouraged.

Uses:
- Full-service luxury residential/hotel mixed-use with support functions for residential or specialty retail.
Sub-Area 11: Robinsons-May/Beverly Hilton Triangle (continued)

Physical Form:
- It is unlikely that the hotel would be completely demolished. However, a remodeled hotel could provide a signature architectural statement for this area and could incorporate new, smaller scale ancillary buildings.
- Impacts to nearby El Rodeo School should be considered along with the nearby single family residences.
- Encourage higher scale residential development for the western end and lower scale development surrounding the existing high-rise portion. A tiered approach was suggested that would keep the edges surrounded by greenery (reflecting the park across the street to the north), and an inner area adjacent to the green border with one or two stories.
- Consider building a “landmark” pedestrian bridge over Santa Monica Boulevard connecting to the former railroad property and potentially providing an opportunity for shared parking resources.

Streetscape:
- Along the Santa Monica frontage, multiple storefronts are not appropriate because of the high traffic volume.
- The gas station is at the actual gateway to the City. The southwest corner of the parcel should be park-like and address the layout of the gas station in defining the gateway.

Issue 2: Historic Preservation

A significant period of time was devoted to education and background on historic preservation. The 1985 Historic Resources Survey and preservation policies were presented and discussed. It was noted that five buildings are currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places. In June 2003, a preservation panel consisting of local architectural historians and academicians provided members with an overview of local, state and federal case studies, policies and regulations.

The Committee agreed that the City should develop an overall strategy for historic preservation. However, a minority held a slightly different view in that there was support for preservation of commercial and civic structures, but not for residential properties. The Committee
recognized that many approaches are available to the City, ranging from mandatory designations to property owner-initiated programs. Based on the experience and case studies presented by experts in the field, members felt that preservation should begin with the City's encouragement of voluntary participation in the preservation process. Toward this goal, the Committee believes that the City should encourage, support and recognize voluntary preservation efforts to generate a strong and positive momentum for preservation in the community.

Objectives:

- Update the existing 1985 Historic Resources Survey of single-family residential and commercial buildings to identify important existing resources.
- Develop a City Landmarks Ordinance to preserve the historic character of significant buildings and places.
- Review the Landmarks Advisory Board portion of the Architectural Commission's charge in order to activate this role.
- Develop historic preservation education programs (schools, architectural bus tours/trolley, etc.).
- Develop a local repository for the ownership history of all commercial and residential Beverly Hills buildings. Historical photographs should accompany the listings to provide a stronger link to the people involved in making Beverly Hills what it is.
- Consider nominating City-owned properties for the National Register of Historic Places.
- Create opportunities/incentives for preservation (adaptive reuse, tax incentives, modifications of Code standards)
- Develop an Historic Preservation Element as part of General Plan – set goals and policies.
- Create an awards program for historically significant properties.

Resources Required to Implement:

- Staff and decision-maker time to develop and implement a new ordinance and potentially a Historic Preservation Element.
- Staff to develop programs for awards, incentives, etc.
Potential Implications:

- The Architectural Commission’s role would be expanded, or another Advisory Commission specifically dealing with Historic Preservation may be required.
- The importance of historic resources may not be clearly understood by the community. The value of historic preservation should be communicated through educational programs, workshops, etc.
- The Committee recommends that the preservation program be started on a voluntary basis to gain support, rather than imposing severe restrictions that would likely not be endorsed by the community at large.
- Staff will be needed on a long-term basis to develop and implement an historic preservation program for the City.

Issue 3: Gateways

There are numerous ways to identify the gateways (significant entrypoints) to the City. These can range from architectural statements (significant buildings or sculpture) to lighting features, signage, or a unified City landscape plan. Although our unique street signs are key to the City’s unique identity, this identity should also be reinforced through gateway features at significant locations. Heavily trafficked intersections might have more significant identifiers than smaller, less used intersections, yet both types of areas are important in establishing the continuity and feeling that you are in a unique place that can be identified by its gateway features. The following potential gateways areas were identified:

Major:

- Center of Beverly Gardens Park
- La Cienega Boulevard and San Vicente Boulevard
- Wilshire Boulevard at eastern City border
- Olympic Boulevard and Beverly Drive
- Olympic Boulevard and Robertson Boulevard
- Olympic Boulevard at western City border
- Sunset Boulevard at western City border
- Sunset Boulevard at eastern City border
- Santa Monica Boulevard at eastern City border
  (Note: This gateway should be prioritized because of its key location at the border adjacent to the City of West Hollywood and the marked difference in appearance as you move from one city to the other.)
- Santa Monica Boulevard at western City border
- Santa Monica/Wilshire Boulevard Intersection
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Minor:

- Burton Way and Oakhurst Drive
- Burton Way and Robertson Boulevard
- La Cienega Boulevard at southernmost City border
- Robertson Boulevard at southernmost City border
- Whitworth Drive and Smithwood Drive at southern City border
- Benedict Canyon Drive at northern City border
- Coldwater Canyon at northern City border

Gateway Objectives:

- Priority should be given to the high profile gateway at Santa Monica Boulevard and Doheny Drive.
- Maintain the appearance and consistency of City street signs. The distinctive Beverly Hills street signs create community character by letting you know that you are in a distinctive place.
- Accelerate the refurbishment plan that is underway for the classic City shield signs.
- Consider additional Beverly Hills signage at the more prominent City entry points.
- Develop a consistent landscape plan that would accompany the signs to enhance the visibility of the entry markers.
- For smaller-scale entries and nodes: consider less intense, simpler designs with the same overall theme as the major entries.
- Consider a significant fountain/water-feature centrally positioned in Beverly Gardens Park as a major internal node marker and to recall the historic water feature in this area.

Resources Required to Implement:

- Staff and decision-maker time to develop a gateways program.
- Funding for construction/procurement of gateways and ongoing maintenance.

Potential Implications:

- In recognition of the substantial costs associated with these types of physical improvements, the City should seek creative financing solutions for this project.
VII. COMMUNITY OUTREACH

The Committee participated in the following three efforts to gauge the community’s areas of interest and reaction to progress the Committee was making with respect to its charge.

April 2003: All-Committee Session at which each topic committee shared preliminary recommendations. This session helped committees to identify issues of overlap and conflict between the various groups as well as gauge reaction to preliminary recommendations.

May 2003: Farmers’ Market Outreach with the Commercial Standards and Commercial-Residential Interface Committees. Along with a questionnaire, residents were provided with photographs to assist them in selecting the types of aesthetic qualities they felt were appropriate for their community. Exhibit materials prepared for this event were also used at the Beverly Hills Historical Society booth at the May Affaire in the Gardens. Questionnaires and responses are included with the appendices.

Sample images of desirable community qualities for Beverly Hills as identified by the survey respondents are shown below.

October 2003: Outreach Survey

A short survey was mailed in early October to each of the over 15,000 households in the City. The survey requested feedback regarding City gateways and historic preservation. Approximately 900 responses were received, which represents about 6% of total households. Survey results are attached as an appendix.

Using a scale ranging from 1 to 10 (less important to more important, respectively), residents were asked how important they felt it was for the City to devote resources to developing the City’s identity at key areas within its borders through landscaping, signage, lighting, etc. Responses were mixed, with approximately 60% responding
with a "6" or higher level of importance; and 40% with a "5" or lower level of importance.

A total of 60% of respondents “strongly agreed,” and an additional 22% “somewhat agreed” that historically significant structures and places should be protected. Respondents also favored the preservation of commercial buildings as well as single and multi-family residences.

Areas of Potential Conflict Between General Plan Topic Subcommittees:

The Traffic and Circulation Topic Committee had different views as to how Little Santa Monica Boulevard should be treated. While Community Character felt it should be more pedestrian-oriented, others felt it should be used more for transit purposes by reducing the number of traffic signals and removing the street parking.

Respectfully submitted,

The Community Character Issues Committee

Robert Anderson Judy Komaiko
Allison Balson Lynn Whitney Leipzig
Jan Block Marcia Moussa
Christopher Bonbright Vicki Reynolds
Jill Collins Richard Rosenzweig
Lya Cordova Latta Michael Rutigliano
Jelena Erceg Mel Spitz
Howard Fisher Paul Supnik
Debbie Grossman Catherine Weary
Guitta Karubian
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VIII. LIST OF APPENDICES

Agendas and Meeting Notes

Community Outreach
- April 2003
- May 2003
- October 2003

Educational Materials
- Commercial Zoning Maps
- City of Beverly Hills Industrial Area Plan (1994)
- Historic Resources Group Presentation on Preservation (June 2003)
- (Draft) Master Program for Gateways – Goals and Objectives
- Robinsons-May Site Map and Information
- Newspaper Articles on Preservation and Robertson Boulevard
- Map of City Parking Structures
- Map of Sub-Areas and Potential Gateways
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Beverly Hills is both city and concept. To its residents, Beverly Hills is lush garden parks and attractive tree-lined neighborhoods, excellent schools, ultra-responsive public services, and cultural and community activities which engender a village feel. To the world, Beverly Hills is an iconic place where movie stars stroll down Rodeo Drive carrying bags from Gucci and Cartier, where studio moguls make handshake deals at the Polo Lounge, and where palatial estates play host to elegant soirees. Though these perspectives vary widely, they share a set of common expectations of the city: aesthetic distinction, high quality surroundings, vitality, and financial strength.

Currently in the midst of updating its General Plan, the City of Beverly Hills has determined that the eastern portion of Wilshire Boulevard (“East Wilshire”), between Rexford Boulevard and San Vicente Boulevard, does not appropriately reflect the true character of Beverly Hills and is generally underutilized. In contrast to the bustling western portion of Wilshire Boulevard which includes the Golden Triangle and Department Store Row, the eastern portion of Wilshire Boulevard does not possess a recognizable identity. B and C-class office and retail uses, as well as several empty lots, give East Wilshire an appearance that is dated, lacks street life, and possesses an inconsistent urban form. In contrast to West Wilshire, one can enter the city from the east and travel for miles before realizing that one has entered Beverly Hills city boundaries.

The City of Beverly Hills engaged the Los Angeles District Council of the Urban Land Institute (ULI Los Angeles) to commission a Technical Assistant Panel (TAP) to study the issues surrounding East Wilshire and provide recommendations to the City. Specifically, the ULI Los Angeles TAP was charged with providing recommendations for creating vibrancy and vitality on East Wilshire in a physical form that is consistent with the high standards and character of Beverly Hills, enhances the City’s revenue stream, yet does not negatively impact the quality of life enjoyed by the immediately surrounding residential neighborhoods.
Constraints

In its plans to realize the true potential of East Wilshire, the City faces a number of challenges. Wilshire Boulevard, between Rexford and San Vicente, abuts single-family and multi-family uses, in some instances with no alley to serve as a buffer. Increased activity on East Wilshire must not negatively impact these abutting residential uses. Additionally, the City derives a sizable portion of its revenue base from business taxes, and new development on East Wilshire should enhance this revenue base. Rising costs to provide superior public services, such as a two-minute emergency response time, and recent high-profile business departures make this revenue-base issue especially relevant for the City.

A third challenge the City faces is a demonstrated community distaste for added height in the City. Though the Montage Hotel project provides open space, is not located near residential uses, and provides a sizable number of parking spaces, its height still proved to be a contentious issue with the community. A related challenge the City faces is the incorrect community perception that residential uses create traffic congestion, while office uses do not. Pass-through traffic, estimated at fifty percent of the City’s total traffic, is a continuous concern.

General Plan Topic Committees

The City of Beverly Hills already has taken substantive steps to elicit community involvement in its General Plan update process through the creation of General Plan Topic Committees. The committees with charges relevant to Wilshire Boulevard included the Community Character Committee, the Commercial Standards Committee, and the Commercial-Residential Interface Committee. The reports produced by each of these General Plan Topic Committees was provided to the ULI Technical Assistance Panel and provided the panel with a clear picture of community “wants and not wants.”

Current Development Projects

A number of exciting projects, in various stages of development, currently are underway in Beverly Hills. Located just north of Wilshire Boulevard, between Beverly and Canon Drives, the Montage Hotel project will consist of 214 guest rooms, 25 penthouse residences, and 34,595 square feet of retail, spa, and meeting space. Additional components of the project include 24,000 square feet of City-owned retail, restaurant and commercial space, 33,000 square feet of public gardens, and an underground parking garage for up to 1,172 cars.

A mixed-use project by Legacy Partners on 9200 Wilshire will include 54 condominium units, 14,000 square-feet of ground-floor commercial space, and 204 parking spaces. J.H. Snyder & Co is near completing The Crescent, the first rental apartment complex to be developed in Beverly Hills in the past 25 years, encompassing 40,000 square-feet of office space, 12 two-story brownstones and 76 luxury townhouse apartments, with three levels of underground parking containing 534 spaces. Another exciting project underway is the adaptive reuse of 8601 Wilshire, which will convert an existing office building into 37 apartment units with 640 square-feet of ground floor retail, and 114 parking spaces.

Though the commercial brokerage community contends that the Beverly Hills sub-market could currently absorb an additional 200,000 square feet of Class A office space, developers have expressed reservations about building such projects on the empty parcels located on East Wilshire because height and density restrictions eliminate the economic viability of such projects.
Based on briefing material provided by the City, a tour of the area, and the panelists' knowledge of the study area, the panel concluded that the appropriate urban form for East Wilshire is of tantamount importance to the City, even more so than the combination of uses that might locate there. This idea can be expressed in the simple phrase: “It has to look like Beverly Hills, and right now it simply does not.”

The panel also concluded that though a considerable amount of valuable work had been completed by the City and the community, and the panel commends this good work, there is currently a lack of unified vision for East Wilshire. Such a vision, both defined and embraced by the community, is necessary in order to affect desired changes. The panel strongly recommends continuing community engagement and consensus-building projects such as the General Plan Topic Committees.

With regard to uses, the panel recommends that the City extend the dominant uses already present in Beverly Hills—namely Class-A office, medical, and residential uses—east on Wilshire Boulevard with the goal of simultaneously spurring revenue-producing retail development. Office and residential uses drive activity and households which in turn drive demand for retail, dining, service, hospitality and cultural uses. These uses generate revenue for the City through business taxes, sales taxes, increased property taxes and parking revenue. Though it is difficult at this early stage to make definitive financial projections, the principle that activity begets revenues holds especially true for East Wilshire.

The panel recommends that the City utilize a package of form-based zoning and performance standards to achieve its goals for East Wilshire. Based on the theory that the physical form is more important than uses occurring within that form, form-based zoning seeks to regulate the form of the built environment, focusing on building shape and bulk. Performance standards will drive a certain desired architectural design and detail, as well as a building’s interaction with adjacent properties.

The identity of East Wilshire will form through a differentiation and interspersal of uses which will create a series of neighborhood villages. Combined with the interspersal of uses, the modulation of height will create for East Wilshire a Beverly Hills identity that is unique from its West Wilshire counterpart, which is characterized by taller office buildings, greater density, and big department store masses.

An important goal for East Wilshire is the creation of a “Grand Sidewalk,” a concept which entails the creation of a pedestrian-friendly environment which is shaded and has comfortable places to sit and gather. The uses and the urban form of buildings, in conjunction with enhanced placemaking on the sidewalks and building facades, will create a unique identity for East Wilshire. A Grand Sidewalk would contain unifying elements from end-to-end that create a consistent look and feel that appropriately represents the style and character of Beverly Hills.
Key Observations

The panel concluded that the notion of East Wilshire Boulevard as a continuous strip of commercial uses is a dated concept and recommended that the City look at East Wilshire not as a line, but as a matrix with a synergy of uses. The overall goal is to generate activity through attracting compatible and synergistic uses.

The identity of East Wilshire will form through a differentiation and interspersal of uses which will create a series of neighborhood villages. Gaining the support of the residences abutting the commercial uses is crucial.

Class-A Office Space

Within a twenty-year span, the commercial brokerage community anticipates demand for two million square feet of Class-A office space in the Beverly Hills sub-market. Furthermore, the next wave of office development on the Westside will encounter a severe scarcity of viable parcels to build on. The panel recommends that the City embrace these trends and design a strategy to add Class-A office product to East Wilshire in a physical form designed to attract and retain major entertainment companies. These companies have a natural affinity to Beverly Hills, their image fits well with the character and history of the City, and their presence plays a vital role in the City's revenue base.

Talent agencies and production companies want to be in Beverly Hills, but the lack of large contiguous office space suitable to their needs has made it challenging for the City to retain these businesses when they want to expand. Creative Artist Agency, the seventh largest employer in Beverly Hills in 2004, recently signed a lease to move their operations to Century City because they could not find contiguous office space that suited their needs in Beverly Hills. A wave of recent consolidations in the music, movie, and television industries will further exacerbate this trend.

Large entertainment firms, with the largest occupying between 150,000 and 200,000 square feet, will serve as anchors and will attract collateral support users, such as attorneys, accountants, and consultants. The combined activity generated by these uses will in turn attract dining, service retail, and lunch-time shopping—nearby amenities that are a necessary component of a vibrant office market.

The city must be mindful of the particular needs of large entertainment office users. These users are looking for buildings that communicate individuality and creativity. They are looking for a place rather than space, and accordingly, do not want to be in commoditized, vertically-stacked office space. Specifically, entertainment office users are looking for low-rise, environmentally-sensitive buildings with great gardens, quality exteriors, and large floor plates ranging from 25,000 to 45,000 square-feet. They are looking for creative and functional space with bay depths to lease along the corridors.

The concept of a series of office buildings along a commercial corridor, however, no longer appeals to the market, and has been replaced by a new mold of 3-4 block office clusters, which include retail, entertainment, and place making. New office development would start at Rexford Drive, where critical mass is adjacent and work eastward; simultaneously, new development would also move west from La Cienega Boulevard. The panel concluded that the current height envelope is generally acceptable, but the density envelope needs to increase to approximately 4:1.
Residential

The panel felt that residential development along East Wilshire serves as a key driver for bringing people onto the street, and thus, is a second necessary ingredient for creating vibrancy and vitality. A wonderful synergistic driver of activity, residential uses bring pedestrians who shop for their daily needs, leading to growing retail sales, which then make the surrounding office product more desirable.

Residential uses on East Wilshire create an interspersal of uses by breaking up office uses, and provide a good buffer for abutting residential users. Furthermore, an extremely robust Los Angeles housing market makes these residential and mixed-use projects economically viable.

The residential product appropriate for East Wilshire would be 3-4 story for-sale and rental housing over subterranean parking, or over parking faced with retail and dining uses. The appropriate density would be 36-50 dwelling units per acre. The panel felt that projects similar to J.H. Snyder Co.’s The Crescent and Legacy Partners’ mixed-use project would work well if transplanted onto East Wilshire.

The panel encourages both horizontal and vertical mixed-use, with a preference for vertical mixed-use. Where vertical mixed-use in not practical or economically viable, the panel recommends that the City utilize mixed-use within the commercial strip.

The panel encourages the City to have a number of different uses—such as office, residential, hotel, and automotive—within the same block.
Mixed-use developments create vibrancy, and the residential component of these projects act as a powerful driver for the street uses. The panel recommends that the City incentivize developers to have ground floor neighborhood-serving retail in their residential-dominant projects. The City should require a target percentage to be neighborhood-serving retail—60% of frontage, for example—and provide incentives to get 100% of the street-front activated.

The panel felt that senior housing would also be an appropriate use on East Wilshire, particularly on portions of East Wilshire which abut single-family residences and are not separated by an alley.

**Retail**

Retail uses on East Wilshire would be of a different nature than the luxury, fashion-oriented retail located on the Golden Triangle. The panel felt that retail uses on East Wilshire would likely be smaller-scale, neighborhood-serving uses consistent with the village concept, and that the City should encourage bleed-around from La Cienega and Robertson. The panel also felt that the City would not likely be able to attract another department store on East Wilshire, given the department stores anchored on West Wilshire, the diminishing number of department stores in the retail industry, and site constraints.

Beyond neighborhood-serving retail, the retail uses with the most economic viability for East Wilshire would be a clustering of furniture, art, and automotive. Auto dealerships continue an existing appropriate use, while furniture, art, and local-serving retail build on the increased traffic and activity generated by office and residential uses.

Urban dwellers residing on and around East Wilshire will have a variety of retail needs, and the panel suggests that the new smaller urban concepts of national big-box retailers, such as Best Buy and Bed, Bath and Beyond, would be a good fit for East Wilshire. The City should take proactive steps to consider which retailers it needs on East Wilshire, and actively invite and pursue these retailers.

The panel did not find major entertainment uses, like a multi-screen movie theater, to be viable on East Wilshire, though art house theaters, which are already present, and art galleries which may locate there organically are compatible uses.

**Automotive**

In line with the high-end character of Beverly Hills, the panel felt that automotive dealerships should be an encouraged use for East Wilshire. Auto dealerships are terrific revenue generators for the City, and these businesses are willing to make substantial investments in their buildings. The panel recommends that automotive dealership be allowed to build showcase dealerships, but in tighter multi-story formats that take vehicle storage off the street, akin to formats found in San Francisco. The City can include some operational guidelines in their development covenants to prevent these businesses from disturbing abutting residential users with respect to test drives and service queues.

**Medical**

The panel felt that medical businesses are established, positive uses on East Wilshire, and their presence should be encouraged. These businesses are stable and neighbor-friendly, and though City staff and officials expressed concern about the proliferation of surgery centers on East Wilshire, the panel felt that the market would naturally sort out
any excesses in this industry in coming years. Parking issues stemming from increased parking requirements for medical businesses need to be considered.

**Hospitality**

The panel felt that the proposed office uses along East Wilshire, as well as present and future medical uses, will drive a small number of boutique hotels. Boutique recovery hotels catering to nearby cosmetic surgery practices were thought to be an innovative and viable use. High-end spas would also be an appropriate use on East Wilshire, in line with both the Beverly Hills image and lodging industry trends.

**Cultural Activities**

Beverly Hills programs a rich slate of cultural and community activities throughout the year, such as the Farmers' Market, Plaza Sweets, the Beverly Hills Symphony, and the Beverly Hills Forum Series. These activities contribute to the excellent quality of life enjoyed by Beverly Hills residents. The panel recommends that the City use its slate of cultural and community activities as a tool to create vibrancy on East Wilshire. When practical, the City should spread these activities around to different parts of the city.

The panel considered the creation of an arts district on East Wilshire. An arts district would likely have to develop organically, but the City could provide economic incentives in the form of reduced business taxes to attract art galleries to the area.

An extremely popular activity held by other Southern California cities that could be successful on East Wilshire would be to project movies onto the sides of buildings, and encourage people to come out onto the sidewalk and watch.
Key Observations

Recommendations for urban form and design principles were driven by the panel's recognition of the importance of an appropriate physical form of East Wilshire reflecting the quality and character for which Beverly Hills has built an international reputation, as well as the panel's assessment of the proper interplay of suggested uses and existing surrounding uses.

The panel felt that a guiding principle in achieving the appropriate form is to relate and involve the surrounding residential neighborhoods to the land uses on East Wilshire.

Form-Based Zoning and Performance Standards

The panel recommends that the City utilize a package of form-based zoning and performance standards to achieve its goals for East Wilshire. Based on the theory that the physical form is more important than uses occurring within that form, form-based zoning seeks to regulate the form of the built environment, focusing on building shape and bulk. Although prescribing the form will influence the use, the form-based code would not dictate nor limit the use specifically. Form-based zoning is largely a reaction to the sterility resulting from use-restricting zoning.

Performance-based zoning limits development based largely on the impacts it may create, rather than specific zoning prescriptions. Buildings are not limited by particular setback standards, but instead are limited by compliance with a stated performance standard. For example, a new commercial building cannot cast a shadow on a residential building, or a new use cannot cause a noise decibel to exceed a prescribed level.

This approach allows the City to stay flexible in the face of shifting market forces. Building an urban box, done by form-based codes, provides flexibility for a variety of future uses. To create vitality and pedestrian-friendly uses, the City can require the ground floor to be of a certain design. In the initial years, if the demand for ground-floor retail has not developed, the space can be used for office uses. As demand for neighborhood-serving retail builds over time, the design is already in place for a smooth transition.

Performance standards will drive a certain desired architectural design and detail, as well as a building's interaction with adjacent properties. The City should identify which characteristics are appropriate for East Wilshire.

The panel recommends that the City use incentives to achieve an activated and pedestrian-friendly street-front. As an example, the City could require that a minimum of 60% of a project's ground-floor space be devoted to pedestrian-friendly uses, and any space used in excess of that earns an incentive.

When appropriate opportunities present themselves, the City should utilize the transfer of development rights (TDR) as a tool. This involves transferring density and/or height between parcels, all within the overall target envelope for the corridor. The transfer of development rights allows anchor or highlight uses at key intersections and focal points like Robertson, Doheny, San Vicente, and La Cienega.

Form-Based Segments/Villages

The panel recommends that the City create multiple form-based segments or villages for East Wilshire and create defining guidelines that are specific to each segment. The concept of form-based segments directly contrasts the conventional approach of use-based districts.
The City should encourage each segment, along with the residential users that abut each segment, to define its own character and identity. Each identity should be unique, yet should reflect the character and standards of Beverly Hills. This process encourages involvement and ownership, and works to connect the commercial and the residential uses in a way that would not be possible across the entire boulevard. Form-based segments or villages bring the residential neighborhood “out to” Wilshire Boulevard.

**Modulation of Height**

The panel envisions a modulation of height for structures along East Wilshire. Combined with the interspersal of uses, the modulation of height will create for East Wilshire a Beverly Hills identity that is unique from its West Wilshire counterpart, which is characterized by taller office buildings, greater density, and big department store masses.

The panel encourages the City to respect the community’s resistance to height, but when the opportunity exists to place an iconic building or a desired use on East Wilshire, the project’s height should not keep the city from approving the project. Rather, in those instances the City should try to obtain some form of concession from the developer, such as public space, alley dedications, or the provision of extra parking.

Between Beverly Drive and Doheny Drive, the panel recommends medium-density residential of 6-7 stories, which then scales down from Robertson Boulevard to La Cienega Boulevard to low-density residential of 4-6 stories and underground parking. Height should be concentrated on the south side of Wilshire Boulevard to avoid shading issues.

**The “Grand Sidewalk” versus the “Grand Boulevard”**

The recommendations of the General Plan Topic Committees, as well as
presentations from City officials and staff, highlighted the vision of a Grand Boulevard. Because landscaped medians are not a practical option for East Wilshire due to left-turn lane requirements, the panel felt that the vision of a Grand Boulevard could be attainable for East Wilshire through the creation of a Grand Sidewalk.

An important goal of the Grand Sidewalk concept is placemaking—the creation of a pedestrian-friendly environment which is shaded and has comfortable places to sit and gather. The uses and the urban form of buildings, in conjunction with enhanced placemaking on the sidewalks and building facades, create a unique identity for East Wilshire. This identity is more noticeable to the pedestrian than to vehicular traffic, and importantly, allows Wilshire Boulevard to maintain its primary function as a major east-west vehicular artery.

A Grand Sidewalk would contain unifying elements from end-to-end that create a consistent look and feel that appropriately represents the style and character of Beverly Hills. These elements include curb-side planters, urban trees, street furniture, differentiated street lighting, graphics, and stylized bus shelters. Planters act as effective buffers and shield the pedestrian from traffic. The panel felt that because of the City's connection with art and its history of using art pieces to highlight the built environment, art pieces should be an important unifying element along East Wilshire. Significant art pieces should serve as entry markers at each end of the city.

The panel recommends that the City utilize corners, when possible, as opportunities for public space. To make the sidewalk more pedestrian-friendly, the City should build to the urban edge, a practice that is comforting to pedestrians, though it should also encourage and create opportunities for sitting, side-walk dining and green space.

Alley Ways

To invite abutting residential users onto East Wilshire, the City should consider pedestrian alleys that perforate the uses on Wilshire, a technique used successfully by other Southern California cities. A related idea is to include entrances in the back of office campus buildings to provide neighbors access into and through the commercial projects to access retail and dining uses on Wilshire Boulevard.

Wilshire and Robertson Intersection

The panel observed that the intersection of Wilshire and Robertson, where Wilshire Boulevard bends, provides an excellent opportunity to create a terminating vista. A terminating vista is typically a building, a landscaping feature and/or art work that sits at the end of a boulevard or street, essentially giving closure to the space. It "terminates" the view (or the "vista"). The penultimate example of a terminating vista is the Eiffel Tower in Paris, which serves as the focal point that terminates the view or vistas of the boulevards that converge upon it.
Transportation Issues

Key Observation
The panel recognizes Beverly Hills has a built-out street system that is not likely to change. The prudent approach is to make sure that the street system functions properly for both buses and automobiles, understanding that if the street system does not function well, traffic will spill over to an alternative route. In the case of East Wilshire, alternative routes will likely be residential streets.

Medians
Though City officials and staff, as well the General Plan Topic Committees, discussed the desire for landscaped medians, the panel concluded that landscaped medians are not practical for East Wilshire because they would require the closing of north-south traffic on select streets. This would mean that those streets with restricted north-south traffic flow would be positively impacted, while the remaining open north-south arterials would be negatively impacted due to increased spill-over traffic. The City’s emergency response also could be negatively impacted due to reduced mobility.

Driveways
In new development projects, the panel recommends that driveways be located on side streets, to the extent that is practical. Because it allows Wilshire to function better as a vehicular arterial, driveways should be designed to encourage turns to and from the north, with the understanding that this may increase traffic on those side streets.

Alley Ways
Alley ways provide a good buffer between commercial and residential uses. Where there is new development abutting residential that does not contain an alley, the panel recommends that the
City require the dedication and construction of an alley. The City should continue to discourage the use of alleys as a parallel cut-through.

Alley ways off of East Wilshire currently serve a utilitarian function. The City should try to introduce more landscaping in the alleys where sufficient landscaping strips are already available and as new developments happen. Where commercial uses directly abut residential uses, the City should plant tall trees and plant material such as bamboo or ficus to serve as a buffer.

**Parking**

The panel believes that additional public parking currently is not necessary on East Wilshire, except to satisfy the requirements of new development. If additional public parking is added, it is important that it be well-signed, easily accessible, of sufficient quantity, and user-friendly.

Eventually all of the street parking on Wilshire should be eliminated to maximize the functional efficiency of Wilshire Boulevard as an arterial, and the City will have to look into off-street parking. The panel feels that the parking study currently underway is important and the data that it provides will be necessary to drive the discussion about parking needs, location, and means of execution on East Wilshire. Future parking requirements may need to be satisfied by requiring new projects to provide more than their required share of parking in exchange for incentives such as a density bonus.

**Public Transportation**

The City should think long term with regard to public transportation. Though far off into the future, the Metro Red Line may be coming to Beverly Hills. As such, the city should consider Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) principles, and it should consider a TOD overlay zone, perhaps something near Robertson or La Cienega.

A transit-oriented overlay zone recognizes the proximity of public transit to uses, and in that district recognizes the ability to have greater density, reduced parking requirements, and a greater proportion of mixed-use.

**Traffic Composition**

Understanding the make-up of the traffic on Wilshire will continue to be a challenge. An alternative tool available to the City to control density is to utilize trip caps. Under the concept of trip caps, the city basically ignores uses, and moderates growth by the number of automobile trips that new projects create.
General Plan Topic Committees

The panel believes that the General Plan Topic Committees have established an excellent foundation for the City to build on in terms of community input and consensus building. The City should use the work of the Topic Committees relevant to Wilshire Boulevard to either reaffirm the recommendations of this panel or to develop alternatives that the community prefers to those suggested by the panel. From a process standpoint, the City should continue along its current path.

A Unified Vision

Defining a widely-supported, unified vision for East Boulevard is crucial. Someone needs to take the initiative to ask the right questions that will identify common ground.

The panel recommends that the City utilize any one of a number of well-tested community involvement processes to help define a vision and lead the community to adopt that vision as their own. The vision needs to widely shared and understood.

Leadership

Great streets need great champions. Leaders with energy, enthusiasm, and commitment are a necessary ingredient to a revitalized East Wilshire. People, not zoning or buildings, make great streets.

Community Involvement

The panel recommends that the City create a public-private taskforce dedicated to thinking about East Wilshire. Such a taskforce would include stakeholders—such as property and business owners, public officials, city staff, and regional transit officials—with clearly-defined roles who take on a set of clearly-defined responsibilities. The panel recommends that the task force take this TAP Report as a foundation and review it, enhance and augment it, and make it their own.

Timeline / Strategy of Activities

The panel recommends that the City create a timeline and map out a strategy of activities. Each strategy needs to be programmed over time, with steps that
can be immediately undertaken within six months or sooner, steps within a one-to-two year horizon, and steps with a three or more year horizon. This roadmap should assign responsibilities and promote accountability. Remember: change is incremental.

It is important the City understand its resources. The City should pick and focus on some key catalytic uses and locations within the overall framework and concentrate on executing those first.

The panel recommends that the City consider the use of a Property-based Business Improvement District (PBID) for East Wilshire. Additionally, the City would be well-served by deepening its understanding of the people who live, work, and shop in and around East Wilshire through psychographic and lifestyle statistical analysis.

**Attracting Developers**

The City will attract the attention of the development community through clear communication of what it is looking for in terms of form, densities, uses, and similar factors. This clarity of communication creates a sense of certainty for developers that their projects will gain approval by the City. Furthermore, when developers see the City investing in itself, they will take note and look to invest as well.

**Conclusion**

The panel concludes that the ultimate goal for East Wilshire is identity creation. Achieving this goal begins with attracting and encouraging anchor uses already predominant in the City, such as Class A office, medical, and medium-density residential. These anchor uses bring people and generate activity, and they attract neighborhood-serving retail uses which contribute to the City’s revenue base. Throughout the process, community engagement is crucial, with sensitivity to expectations of high-quality and high-end surroundings appropriately reflecting the character of Beverly Hills, as well as quality-of-life expectations of adjacent residential uses.
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How to Use this Plan

The Sustainable City Plan is a tool kit that the City may use, either in whole, or in part to help address sustainability issues. The Sustainable City Plan does not direct the implementation of any specific actions, but provides a list of potential programs and the foundation on which the City can build a unified sustainability strategy. The Sustainable City Plan is not a State requirement, but represents the aspirations of the community to become more sustainable.

In the event of a conflict, the General Plan takes precedence over the Sustainable City Plan.
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Executive Summary

Becoming sustainable is both a necessity and an opportunity. By using sustainable practices, communities can move towards a secure future where a resilient local economy, a healthy environment, and a vibrant community are possible.

This Plan establishes guiding principles and goals that the City will use to develop and implement programs that focus on sustainability. This Plan also provides an implementation framework and suggests a means of prioritization to assure that the most effective policies and programs are implemented first.

Sustainability for Beverly Hills

Sustainability in simple terms is the capacity to maintain a certain process or state indefinitely. For Beverly Hills, this means that the City has the capacity to provide the desired levels of service to all residents, resources are used in an efficient and effective manner and the local environment is preserved as both an ecological asset and as a benefit.

Guiding Principles, Goals, Objectives and Policies

The guiding principles for sustainability express the City’s commitment toward sustainability. The sustainability goals, objectives and policies apply the guiding principles and are based on the factors affecting sustainability in the City as identified by the General Plan Sustainability Topic Committee.

Implementation Strategy

The Plan provides a framework for implementing the sustainability goals and guiding principles. The framework proposes a method that includes developing and initiating programs, and at a later date, evaluating the programs for success at meeting the goals and making modifications as necessary.

Next Steps

The Plan establishes guiding principles and goals for sustainability and provides a methodical approach to implementing sustainability actions and programs. The implementation strategy provided in this document is a framework. Once the Plan is adopted, it will be necessary to develop the implementation strategy into a working process that is integrated into City decision-making and is thereby made a seamless part of City processes.
Once the Plan is adopted the next steps will include:

- **Development of an implementation and monitoring program** – This puts the Plan into action and is based on the goals, objectives, policies and framework provided.

- **Compilation of baseline information on City operations** – This provides information on how the City is currently performing and identifies areas of improvement.

- **Standardization of reporting** – This establishes a systematic means of providing information on program results.

- **Identification of Measures** – This provides a means of assessing success at reaching the sustainability goals.

- **Modification of City activities, operations and programs** – This facilitates a move in current City processes towards more sustainable options.

- **Initiation of new activities, operations and programs** – This allows the City to introduce new activities, operations and programs to further the sustainability goals.

- **Monitoring, periodically reporting and modifying City activities, operations and programs** – This provides a means of periodically ensuring that the City is progressing towards reaching the sustainability goals.

**Prioritizing New Sustainability Programs**

To assure that moving towards sustainability is realizable, it will be important to select programs that will have the greatest effect for the lowest cost. A means of prioritizing programs is provided that compares the overall effectiveness of each program against its estimated costs. This allows the City to select programs that will have the greatest effect with the lowest estimated cost.

Additionally, as sustainable practices are integrated into City actions, operations and programs, instances may arise when implementation of sustainable alternatives will need to be weighed against other City interests. This may require the City to evaluate the sustainability goals and policies against other City goals and policies to determine how potentially conflicting priorities can be accommodated.

**Policies and Programs to Consider When Implementing the Plan**

Several potential policies and programs have been provided in Appendix B. Further work is necessary in order to compare the overall effectiveness of these programs against their estimated costs. By including these programs in the Plan, it is intended that many of them will be initiated by the City in the future.
Chapter 1  INTRODUCTION

Becoming more sustainable is both a necessity and an opportunity. The impacts of current, unsustainable practices are global and are best illustrated by erratic climate patterns, unstable energy supplies, and an unstable global market place. Sustainability is currently being addressed by public agencies, communities, businesses, organizations and individuals. By utilizing more sustainable methods, communities can move towards a future where resources, energy, fuels, and goods and services are utilized to their best extent making it possible to sustain a resilient local economy, a healthy environment, and a vibrant community.

Purpose of this Plan

The purpose of the Beverly Hills Sustainable City Plan is to provide the framework for implementing and evaluating policies and programs in terms of the City’s sustainability guiding principles and goals. The Plan provides an implementation framework along with a means of prioritizing the order in which policies and programs should be advanced in order to meet the goals. For this plan to be successful, however, the community must be engaged and sustainable options must be considered in decision-making processes whenever it is relevant to do so.

As a major regulator, landowner, employer, building manager, fleet operator, utility owner, goods consumer, and service provider, the City of Beverly Hills has both the opportunity and the capacity to advance policies and programs that would benefit City residents, workers and visitors.

California is a leader in addressing sustainability issues. The State is particularly known for the adoption of AB 32, the Climate Change Solutions Act, in 2006, the first state commitment to reducing the greenhouse gases that contribute to climate change.1

Beverly Hills has been in the process of addressing sustainability, having adopted a number of innovative initiatives including water conservation programs, environmentally friendly procurement policies, a waste recycling program that accepts food waste and a mandatory green building ordinance. The City, through the advancement of this Plan, has an opportunity to build on this existing foundation.

The Sustainable City Plan is not a State requirement, but represents the aspirations of the community to become more sustainable. In the event of a conflict, the General Plan takes precedence over the Sustainable City Plan.

---

Definition of Sustainability

Sustainability in simple terms is the capacity to maintain a certain process or state indefinitely. Sustainability, as defined by the United Nations in 1987\(^2\), means “meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs,” in other words, living today in a way that does not reduce the ability of future generations to have access to the same opportunities and resources. Sustainability is not just about the environment; it also incorporates economic and social equity issues. These three areas are sometimes stated as “people, planet and profit,” and are often referred to as the “triple bottom line.” To achieve full sustainability, all three topics must be addressed.

The Three Aspects of Sustainability

![Diagram of the Three Aspects of Sustainability: Environmentally Sensitive, Socially Equitable, Economically Sound]

Sustainability is often described as the intersection of environmental sensitivity, economic soundness and social equity.

It is generally understood that in order for policies, programs and actions to be considered sustainable, they must be environmentally sensitive, economically sound and socially equitable. It is also understood that these three criteria are not mutually exclusive and that each of the three affects and is affected by the others.

For public agencies, sustainability provides a comprehensive, integrated approach to environmental, economic and equity issues. It allows previously isolated issues and single-purpose agencies to work together under unified principles and goals.

\(^2\) WECD, 1987
What does Sustainability Mean to Beverly Hills?

In the long-term, sustainability for Beverly Hills means that the City has the capacity to provide the desired levels of service to all residents, the City and business community use ecologically sensitive business practices, resources are used in an efficient and effective manner and the local environment is preserved as both an ecological asset and as a benefit to the City.

It is important that sustainability be considered in the decision-making process whenever it is relevant to do so. This has implications both at the policy level and at the programmatic level. Although the City will bring forward policies and programs specifically focused at sustainability, it is important to consider the sustainability implications of all policies and programs holistically.

Meeting the needs of present and future generations in a sustainable manner involves taking actions that are: 1.) Ecologically Sensitive, 2.) Economically Sound, and 3.) Socially Equitable. Although individual City programs and operations may be weighted more towards one of the three components, in order for programs to be considered as sustainable they would need to in some way address all three.

**Economically Sound**

In an economic context, sustainability suggests that there is resilience in the business community, the local economy is able to weather downturns in the marketplace and, businesses have adapted practices to utilize renewable resources and are accountable for environmental impacts from their activities.

**Social Equity**

In a social context, sustainability means providing the opportunity to all members of the community to meet their present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Sustainability in this sense also means maintaining the character of the City’s neighborhoods in a form and sense that is desirable to those who live, work and play there.

**Environmentally Sensitive**

In an environmental context, sustainability is the ability of the environment to maintain natural processes, functions, biodiversity and productivity into the future. This includes water quality in local streams and water bodies, natural recharge of local ground water resources, dissipation of storm water from major storm events and maintenance of slope stability in the hillside areas.
Chapter 2 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Guiding Principles

These guiding principles define the values that the City sees as important in moving towards sustainability. The City will, to the best means possible, incorporate these principles into decision-making on all levels and into the development of new policies and programs.

1. **City policy will be guided by a long-term vision of sustainability.**
   The City is committed to meeting today’s needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The City will ensure that its policy and program decisions are interconnected through the common bond of sustainability as expressed in these guiding principles.

2. **The City will lead by example.**
   The City is committed to making decisions that minimize negative environmental, economic, and social impacts, and to setting an example for others. To assure transparency, the City will establish goals and objectives for City operations and facilities, as well as for citywide programs, and will regularly evaluate, measure and report outcomes. The City will develop and abide by an environmentally and socially responsible procurement policy that emphasizes long-term values and serves as a model for others.

3. **Protection, preservation and restoration of the natural environment are City priorities.**
   The City is committed to protecting, preserving and restoring the natural environment. City decision-making will be guided by the goal of maximizing environmental benefits and reducing or eliminating negative environmental impacts.

4. **The City recognizes that environmental, economic-, and social equity are mutually dependent.**
   A healthy environment is integral to the City’s long-term economic and social interests. All geographic and socioeconomic sectors of the population must have access to the benefits of a sustainable community.

5. **Economic, environmental and social impacts will be key considerations in City policy and actions.**
   The City’s financial and human resources are limited. The City and community will, therefore, regularly reevaluate their priorities, programs and policies to ensure that the best possible investments in the future are being made. The evaluation of each program’s cost-effectiveness will be based on a complete, lifecycle costing analysis of the associated environmental, economic, and social costs, and benefits.

---

**What is lifecycle costing?**

Lifecycle costing is the total cost of owning, operating, maintaining, and eventually disposing of an asset over its expected life.
6. The City will inform and inspire all community members to take action.
   The City will be a leader in educating and inspiring all community
   stakeholders to become active in the Plan and to take personal
   responsibility for their own actions.

7. The City recognizes that partnerships are essential to achieving a
   sustainable community.
   Partnerships among the City government, School District, businesses,
   residents, and all other community stakeholders are necessary to achieve
   a sustainable community.

8. The City recognizes its linkage with the regional, national, and global
   community.
   Local sustainability issues cannot be separated from their broader
   context. This relationship between local, regional, national and global
   issues will be recognized and reflected in the City’s programs and policies.
Chapter 3  SUSTAINABILITY GOALS

Goals and Policies

The City’s goals for sustainability are provided in this chapter. Moving towards sustainability will require changes on many different levels; therefore, nine factors that impact sustainability have been identified. For each topic area a single goal has been identified. Additionally, each of these goals is further defined with an objective and three to four policy statements.

In 2002, the City Council created the Environmental Sustainability Committee, which was one of several General Plan Topic Committees established to maximize public involvement in the General Plan Update process. The task of this committee was to identify issues and opportunities important to the community in regards to sustainability. The Environmental Sustainability Committee’s final report to Council identified factors that impact sustainability in Beverly Hills. The elements identified were: water (potable, wastewater, and storm water), solid waste, energy, telecommunications and infrastructure. For the purposes of this Plan, this list was expanded to include additional factors that also affect sustainability, such as air quality, land-use, public health, local business practices and social equity. The final list of factors affecting sustainability in Beverly Hills follows:

Factors Affecting Sustainability in Beverly Hills
- Community Participation & Civic Duty
- Climate Protection & Air Quality
- Energy
- Water
- Land-use, Transportation & Open Space
- Materials & Waste
- Environmental & Public Health
- Sustainable Local Economy
- Social Equity

Each factor is addressed individually in the remainder of this chapter. For each factor, the following is provided:

Goal – Statement of what the City would like to achieve in the long-term. Each goal is based on the City’s guiding principles for sustainability.

Objective – Statement on how the City will reach the goals.

Policies – Statements of how the City will implement the objectives to meet the goals.
1. Community Participation & Civic Duty

Community participation is an essential part of forwarding the City’s sustainability goals. Although the City can be a leader in progressing towards sustainability, for the City as a whole to truly become more sustainable, all businesses and residents must be inspired to change the way they conduct business and change the way they live their lives.

Through a wide variety of programs offered in schools, parks, community centers, neighborhoods and commercial districts, and a broad-based network of partner organizations, the City can promote an ethic of resource efficiency, stewardship of the earth, and encourage and empower citizens to take actions that improve environmental, economic, and social sustainability in their lives and in the community.

Goal

Nurture an engaged, educated and actively participating community.

Objective

Increase opportunities for community participation and civic duty.

Policies

1. Ensure that all those who live, work and play in the City understand the basic principles of sustainability and use them to guide their decisions and actions.
2. Facilitate communication, public outreach, community engagement and civic duty in regards to sustainability.
3. Enable all community members to participate actively and effectively in the development and implementation of sustainability strategies and in meeting the City’s sustainability goals.
4. Retain transparency in all aspects of planning, implementation and reporting on sustainability.
5. Provide ample opportunities for all those who live, work and play in the City to take part in becoming more sustainable.

Simple Things That You Can Do to Participate

- Stay informed regarding sustainability issues
- Take action to address sustainability in your personal life
- Talk to your family and friends about sustainability
2. Climate Change and Air Quality

Climate change will likely be a defining issue of the twenty-first century. To address climate change and global warming, the State of California passed into law AB 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 requires that carbon emissions be reduced to the levels present in 1990 by the year 2020.

While Beverly Hills is a small City that contributes a modest percentage of global greenhouse gas and regional air emissions, the City exists within the greater Los Angeles region and every citizen and community in the region must consider the long-term environmental implications of their decisions on the local, regional and global level.

Goal

Combat climate change and improve air quality.

Objective

Reduce and encourage the reduction of air emissions in City operations and Citywide.

Policies

1. Minimize greenhouse gas and other emissions from City facilities and operations.
3. Minimize stationary source air emissions.
4. Minimize particulate matter, both airborne photochemical precipitates and windborne dust.

Why is poor air quality a concern?

Poor air quality damages health and quality of life, particularly affecting the most vulnerable in society: the very young, older people, and those with heart or lung problems.

How are Greenhouse Gas Emissions Generated?

Five economic sectors contribute to approximately 96 percent of California’s greenhouse gas emissions:

- 38 percent = Transportation
- 23 percent = Electrical Production
- 20 percent = Industrial Uses
- 9 percent = Commercial and Residential
- 6 percent = Agriculture

Simple Things That You Can Do for Climate Change and Air Quality

- Walk or ride a bicycle whenever possible
- Limit the number of trips taken in your car
- Select a low-emissions auto the next time you purchase a vehicle
3. Energy

The production, transportation and consumption of energy are key contributors to climate change, economic stress, energy security challenges, poor local air quality, increasing trade deficits, and a variety of other sustainability challenges.

California has a stringent energy efficiency code for new buildings and modernization projects, known as Title 24. Currently, the City’s new Green Building Ordinance goes beyond Title 24 by requiring that all qualifying projects both be 15 percent more efficient than required by Title 24 and incorporate photovoltaic (solar electric) systems.

**Goal**

Encourage the use of energy in a clean and efficient manner and the use of renewable energy sources.

**Objective**

Reduce the use of non-renewable fuels through efficiency and an increase in use of renewable energy.

**Policies**

1. Maximize energy efficiency in both City operations and Citywide.
2. Maximize the use of renewable energy generating systems and other energy efficiency technologies on City, other agency, residential, and commercial buildings.
3. Minimize the use of nonrenewable, polluting transportation fuels.
4. Strive for energy independence as a City.

**Simple Things That You Can Do to Save Energy**

- Plant appropriate trees to shade your home and reduce the need for air conditioning
- Install solar panels
- Use florescent light bulbs
4. Water

Water is a precious and scarce resource in California. There are numerous related water issues, including water efficiency, alternative sources of water, storm water, ground water and wastewater.

Water use and energy use are closely linked. Approximately 19 percent of the electricity consumed in California is used to move, process and heat water.

Maintaining and improving the quality of storm water runoff is important to maintaining and improving water quality in local water bodies. In the Los Angeles region, a majority of all storm water and irrigation water drains into storm drains and eventually into Santa Monica Bay; it is estimated that less than 10 percent of this runoff is filtered through the groundwater table.

Wastewater is another concern. Much of the City’s current storm water and wastewater infrastructure is aging and requires regular maintenance and upgrades to ensure efficient operation.

Goal

Reduce water use while maintaining a garden-like quality in the City.

Objective

Use water efficiently and effectively while managing storm and waste water in a beneficial manner.

Policies

1. Minimize water consumption, particularly for landscaping through efficient irrigation and drought-tolerant landscaping.
2. Maximize the availability and use of alternative water sources to provide adequate water supplies for present uses and future growth.
3. Replenish groundwater to ensure its future availability and to filter storm water before entering local water bodies.
4. Maintain and improve dry and wet weather storm water runoff quality to protect local water bodies such as Ballona Creek and Santa Monica Bay.
5. Reduce the amount of dry and wet weather storm water runoff directly entering the storm water drainage system.
6. Minimize the adverse effects to water quality from the sanitary sewer system.

---


4 Ibid, p.6

---

Simple Things That You Can Do to Save Water

- Install a smart sprinkler controller
- Water landscaping before 8 am
- Wash only full loads of laundry
- Fix leaky faucets & irrigation lines
- Take shorter showers

Where does Beverly Hills get its drinking water?

Beverly Hills provides approximately 10 percent of its water from local ground water wells and 90 percent from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). The MWD imports its water from the California State Water Project and the Colorado River.

How is water used in the city?

The City has its own water agency that services both Beverly Hills and a portion of the City of West Hollywood. 65 percent of all the water consumed in the City is used to irrigate landscaping and lawns. All of the water used in the City is treated to potable standards, it is estimated that only 2 percent of the water is used by resident for drinking.
5. Land-Use, Transportation and Open Space

Beverly Hills is a built out City with a diversity of land-uses, buildings, infrastructure, parks and open space. Currently, many of City residents are highly dependent on vehicles to access goods and services that they require. As the City redevelops, it is important to consider the long-term land-use and transportation implications of existing development patterns, and to encourage development that limits or reduces energy consumption, construction waste, air pollution and the amount of time people spend in vehicles. It is also important to consider the benefits of additional parks and open space. Parks and open space provide many environmental, social and economic benefits, including improved air quality, cooler temperatures and a variety of recreational opportunities. Enhancing existing, and adding additional, parks and open space can also improve quality of life.

**Goal**

Foster an energy efficient, walk-able community that provides ample goods, services and benefits to all residents while respecting the local environment.

**Objective**

Encourage buildings, infrastructure, parks and open space that better the quality of life for all who live, work and play in the City.

**Policies**

1. Implement land-use and transportation programs that encourage new buildings, re-use of buildings, infrastructure, parks and open space that improve the quality of life for all who live, work and play in the City.
2. Promote a diversity of buildings, infrastructure, parks, open space and uses to support a variety of businesses and improve the quality-of-life for residents at all income levels.
3. Reduce traffic congestion while improving the pedestrian experience on roadways and encourage alternative forms of travel, especially to parks.
4. Encourage the preservation, enhancement and utilization of parks and other open spaces that are accessible to members of the community and that provide wildlife habitat and environmental functions.
6. Materials and Waste

Waste can be viewed as both an expensive problem and as a resource. It is a problem in part because the landfills used by the City are rapidly running out of space and a number of key local landfills are expected to close in the near future. These closures will require Beverly Hills to find alternative means of disposing of waste or to ship it much further than the City does currently. Costs associated with disposing of waste will most likely increase, as will the cost to the environment. Although waste is a local issue, waste has regional and global ramifications due to the gases it emits, including carbon dioxide and methane.

Goal

Encourage a reduction in waste and an increase in the amount of materials recycled.

Objective

Reduce waste and use of products resulting from non-renewable sources while increasing recycling beyond State requirements.

Policies

1. Minimize the amount of solid waste deposited in landfills through reducing, reusing and recycling both natural and manmade materials.
2. Establish Citywide recycling goals that continue to exceed the State requirements while also increasing the amount of recycled material over time.
3. Ensure that the City’s procurement decisions emphasize long-term values to protect against unnecessary impacts and serve as a model for others to follow. These decisions should minimize negative environmental and social impacts, protect public health and save City resources and money.

How does reducing waste relate to sustainability?

Waste reduction helps conserve resources for future generations and contributes to a cleaner environment.

According to the California Integrated Waste Management Board, waste reduction (or prevention) is the preferred approach to waste management, because waste that is never created does not have any associated waste management costs.

What are the current State requirements for recycling?

Under California law, Beverly Hills must recycle at least 50 percent of its waste. In 2007, the City of Beverly Hills generated 91,300 tons of commercial and residential waste, including recyclables, street sweeping debris, construction debris and green waste. Sixty percent of this waste was recycled.

Simple Things That You Can Do to Reduce Waste

- Choose products that are made of recycled materials
- Avoid items that are over-packaged
- When shopping, bring your own bag
7. Environmental and Public Health

The health of the environment and of all citizens is closely linked. Modern society produces and utilizes many products with unhealthy short-term and long-term consequences. Many commercial activities are also undertaken in ways that negatively impact individuals and the environment. Achieving sustainability, therefore, must include programs that provide access to healthy goods and lifestyles, regulate the use of unhealthy products and activities, and encourage individuals to undertake activities to improve their health. Additionally, a healthy environment is not a privilege. Access to a healthy environment must be provided to all citizens, regardless of means.

The City should consider the effect on public health of certain land-use patterns. For example, if neighborhoods are pedestrian friendly and if services are close by, people will walk more. If there are safe bicycle routes and if secure bicycle parking is available then people will bicycle more. The mix of goods and services offered by local stores and restaurants has an impact on health. For example, the types of eating places near schools and other dense land-uses may affect the types and quality of foods readily available.

**Goal**

Provide a healthy environment for wildlife, and for all who live, work and play in the City.

**Objective**

Increase accessibility to healthy lifestyle opportunities while reducing the amount of pollutants entering the environment.

**Policies**

1. Adopt policies that improve the general health and well-being of the community.
2. Improve the health of residents through access to a diverse mix of wellness activities and fresh, locally produced organic food.
3. Ensure that residents in the City are equally protected from environmental pollution.
4. Minimize the amounts of pollutants entering the air, soil, and water and, whenever possible, eliminate the use of hazardous or toxic materials.
5. Encourage fire-resistant plants and landscaping in fire-prone areas.

---

**Simple Things That You Can Do to Improve Environmental and Public Health**

- Use products that are environmentally sensitive
- Avoid products with excessive dyes, perfumes and chemicals
- Dispose of household cleaners and chemicals responsibly
8. Sustainable Local Economy

Beverly Hills is recognized as a world-class and pre-eminent center of retailing, entertainment, hotels, finance, real estate, professional services and, increasingly, information technology. The revenue generated from the past success of the Beverly Hills business community has allowed the City to provide high levels of service to the entire community. Developing a sustainable local economy ensures long-term economic viability by attracting and retaining businesses that contribute to the City’s sustainability goals.

A sustainable local economy has the ability to feed, house and provide for the needs of the City’s residents, while, observing business practices that are sensitive to the environment. It reduces the City’s carbon footprint by encouraging businesses offering a wide variety of goods and services to locate throughout the City’s commercial areas, thereby reducing long-distance shopping trips and encouraging alternative modes of transportation.

A sustainable local economy nurtures a diverse, stable-, and vibrant business community that promotes consumer support of local businesses, encourages re-investment in the local economy, and facilitates trade among local businesses and consumers. Such an economy will help ensure stability in anticipated City revenue streams, thereby making it possible for the City to provide constant levels of service to the community regardless of economic fluctuations.

Goal

Support a stable, diversified business community.

Objective

Encourage a diversity of businesses while reducing business practices that are harmful to the environment.

Policies

1. Nurture a diverse and stable local economy that supports a wide variety of goods and services, including the provision of basic needs and services for all segments of the community.
2. Encourage the efficient and sustainable use of all resources in a manner that can maximize the retention of dollars in the local economy.
3. Encourage businesses, organizations and government agencies to adopt sustainable business practices and encourage businesses with products and services that increase sustainability.

Why is a sustainable local economy important?

A sustainable local economy ensures long-term economic viability by attracting and retaining businesses that contribute to the City’s environmental, economic and social sustainability goals.

How would a sustainable local economy benefit the community?

A healthy local economy consists of businesses that use sustainable practices and provide a stable economic base which allows a City to provide consistent, high-levels of service that in turn lead to a high quality of life.

A high quality of life is usually beneficial for businesses. Many companies looking for a place to locate seek communities with good schools, clean air and water, and safe and quiet neighborhoods in order to attract and retain in-demand employees.

Simple Things That You Can Do to Support Local Businesses

- Shop locally as much as possible
- Bring your own shopping bags
- Encourage businesses to carry environmentally sensitive products
9. Social Equity

Beverly Hills consists of a diverse population representing many backgrounds and having a variety of needs and goals. For the City to be sustainable, the aspirations of all members of the community must be fairly and fully addressed. Fundamental rights must be protected and a “level playing field” must be provided so that all citizens have the ability to prosper.

Elements of social equity ensure public safety, equitable access to basic needs and the fair treatment of all community members. In a larger sense, social equity also addresses quality of life. Beverly Hills currently has policies and programs that address and improve the quality of life. These policies and programs address social equity by providing a diversity of social programs, community activities and publicly accessible visual and aesthetic amenities such as public art and high quality architecture.

Goal

Maintain and increase the quality of life for all those who live, work and play in the City.

Objective

Promote fair and equitable access to goods, services, benefits and amenities.

Policies

1. Promote equitable opportunity for all members of the Beverly Hills community to meet their basic needs and to empower them to enhance the quality of their lives.
2. Encourage equitable and fair access to City services and facilities for all members of the community.
3. Encourage a mix of housing types within the community for people of all socio-economic groups including seniors, families, singles and the disabled.
4. Ensure respect for, and appreciation of, the value added by all community members without discrimination by race, religion, gender, age, economic status, sexual orientation, disabilities or nation of origin.

Simple Things That You Can Do for Social Equity

- Participate in City activities and events
- Treat everyone with courtesy and respect
Chapter 4  IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

Sustainability should be seen as a process that will be achieved in incremental steps and actions. The goals, objectives and policies outlined in this Plan define how the City will work towards a more sustainable future. However, to reach this future, this document will need to be translated into programs and actions.

This section outlines steps the City can take to implement sustainability programs in a systematic way. Once the Sustainable City Plan is adopted, the City would develop a comprehensive implementation strategy. The Implementation Strategy establishes a framework by which the City identifies and develops programs and initiatives that work towards meeting the City’s sustainability goals, objectives and policies established in the Plan. The implementation strategy also allows the City to evaluate each program in order to assure that the goals are being met. If the City’s goals are not being met, the implementation strategy provides a means for modifying the programs in order to better meet the City’s goals.

Forming a Strategy

When implementing sustainability, the discussion is better framed by the term “moving towards sustainability.” This term acknowledges that sustainability will not occur immediately, but is a process by which City operations and the day-to-day actions of the community in general will become increasingly sustainable as a result of the outcomes from various City actions and programs.

It is important that the many sustainability programs that the City funds are tied together in such a way that their outcomes build off of one another and that each subsequent program increases the effectiveness of the others. This requires a unifying strategy. The strategy could also be seen as the “glue” that unites the City’s sustainability programs into a cohesive force, each program to build off of the other’s successes and accomplishments.

Becoming Sustainable is an Iterative Process

Moving towards sustainability is an iterative process that requires regular and periodic evaluation at all levels. In this process, goals are set and existing policies, programs and actions are evaluated, modified and implemented. At an established future date, the programs and actions are then re-evaluated based on how well they have met the established goals. If the programs and actions are not meeting the City’s goals, they can be modified or enhanced and re-implemented. This process is then repeated until the City’s goals have been met.
How Does the Plan Work?

The Plan works through methodical and repeated implementation and evaluation of various programs.

Implementation is done by first evaluating current City programs based on the sustainability goals, objectives and policies. The current programs are either modified or new programs are developed based on meeting the goals. These programs are then implemented based on the City’s guiding principles.

Figure 2 – Moving towards sustainability is an iterative process. In this process existing programs and initiatives are modified based on the City’s sustainability goals. These new programs are implemented and then at a future date are re-evaluated based on their success and modified as necessary to better meet the goals.

At a designated time after initiation, each program is then evaluated based on how successful it was in reaching the goals. Measurable objectives are used in order to quantify or qualify the amount of success each program has had. The programs are then either re-instated or modified based on how well they met the sustainability goals and then are reinitiated.
A Step-Wise Process

The implementation strategy establishes a systematic process through which programs and initiatives are implemented and their outcomes are evaluated. In this way, the City’s efforts in moving towards sustainability are coordinated and the outcomes are evaluated and used to influence future sustainability efforts.

1. **Set Goals and Guiding Principles**
   Identify City goals and objectives for sustainability.

2. **Evaluate Existing Policies, Programs and Actions**
   Gather baseline data and catalog existing programs.

3. **Modify Programs Based on Goals**
   Recommend modifications to existing programs and propose new programs that might better achieve the sustainability goals. Establish a timeline and measures so that progress and success can be evaluated. Identify the best way to address conflicting priorities.

4. **Implement Programs**
   Identify the staff, program and budgetary resources necessary for full implementation. Prioritize the strategies based on a concrete set of criteria.

5. **Re-evaluate Programs and Modify as Necessary**
   Establish a review and evaluation process that the City can use to evaluate the programs based on how well they met the goals.

6. **Repeat Steps Two through Five as Necessary**

How Do We Measure Our Success?

On a periodic basis, all sustainability programs will be evaluated and the results will be presented to Council. Success will be measured by how well a program performed in meeting the goals. In order to evaluate how successful a program is, performance measures need to be established. Optimally, these measures will allow the City to quantify or qualify the amount of progress a program has made in moving the City towards sustainability.
What If We Need to Modify the Plan Once It’s Been Put Into Action?

Through periodic evaluation, the programs implemented using this strategy will be modified as necessary in order to meet the sustainability goals. As the City becomes more sustainable, however, it may be necessary to re-evaluate and refine the sustainability goals as well. This is allowed through a periodic review and evaluation of how well the goals are meeting the City’s vision of sustainability. When programs are being re-evaluated based on their success at reaching the sustainability goals, the goals themselves can also be evaluated. In this way, the evaluation and implementation cycle is fluid, ensuring that as the City moves towards sustainability, the sustainability strategy is progressively refined so that the City’s sustainability goals remain relevant and progressive.

Figure 3 – Periodically outcomes from sustainability programs are reviewed. During this review, the programs are evaluated based on their success at meeting the goals and the results of the evaluation help determine whether the program is re-instated.

Chapter 5 NEXT STEPS

The Plan establishes guiding principles and goals for sustainability and provides a methodical approach to implementing sustainability actions and programs. The implementation strategy provided in this document is a framework. Once the Plan is adopted, it will be necessary to further develop the implementation strategy into a working process that is integrated into City decision-making and is thereby made a seamless part of how the City conducts business.
Once the Plan is Approved, What is Next?

In order for the Plan to be fully integrated into City processes, a number of additional steps are necessary. These steps further refine the implementation strategy outlined in the Plan and establish standard operating procedures in regards to monitoring, evaluating for success, and reporting results.

Once the Plan is adopted, the next steps include:

- **Developing an implementation and monitoring program** – This puts the Sustainable City Plan into action and is based on the goals, objectives, policies and framework provided.

- **Gathering baseline information on City operations** – This provides information on how the City is performing currently and identifies areas which could be improved.

- **Standardizing a method of reporting** – This establishes a systematic means of providing information on program successes and failures.

- **Identifying Performance Measures** – This provides a means of assessing success and failure at reaching the sustainability policies, objectives and goals.

- **Modifying City activities, operations, and programs** – This facilitating a move in current City processes towards more sustainable options if necessary.

- **Initiating new activities, operations and programs** – This allows the City to introduce additional activities, operations and programs to further the sustainability policies, objectives and goals.

- **Monitoring, periodically reporting and modifying City activities, operations and programs** – This provides a means of periodically assuring that the City is progressing towards the sustainability goals.
Weighing Sustainability against Other City Priorities

As sustainable practices are integrated into City actions, operations and programs, instances may arise when implementation of sustainable alternatives may have to be weighed against other City interests. These situations will most likely occur during the budget process. In the budget process, becoming more sustainable will be evaluated along with many other competing items. As the Plan is implemented, it may become necessary for the City to evaluate the sustainability goals and policies against other City goals and policies and determine how potentially conflicting priorities can be accommodated.
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Prioritizing New Sustainability Programs

It is important for the City to establish a standardized approach to prioritizing future sustainability programs. This chapter provides a method of achieving this by evaluating programs based on how they would forward the City’s sustainability goals in comparison to the costs associated with implementation.

Weighing Outcome vs. Cost

Prioritizing sustainability programs provides a means for the City to determine which actions will be most effective versus which programs will have the highest cost. Based on benefit and cost, the City will have the option of pursuing programs that have large benefits and low costs first, before initiating projects with fewer benefits and higher costs.

Using a matrix, programs can be divided based on how well they meet the values established in the guiding principles and the goals (benefit) versus the cost of initiating the programs. Highly beneficial programs with low costs would fall into the dark green box in the matrix at left. Highly beneficial programs with a high cost would be placed into the medium green box. Minimally beneficial programs with a low cost would be placed into the light green box and, lastly, minimally beneficial programs with a high cost would be placed into the white box.

Organizing programs based on benefit and cost allows the City to then implement those programs that will yield a large benefit for the lowest cost before implementing programs with higher associated costs.

Figure 4 – A Matrix provides a means of prioritizing programs and initiatives based on the level of effectiveness and associated costs.
How Prioritization of New Actions and Programs Fits into the Implementation Strategy

The prioritization of new actions and programs fits into the implementation strategy at the point in which new programs have been proposed. It is at this point that the City will need to decide the order in which to pursue the many programs possible.

Figure 5 – Prioritization Matrix

1st - Implement Programs and Initiatives with a Large Effect and a Low Cost

2nd - Implement Programs and Initiatives with a Large Effect and a High Cost

3rd - Implement Programs and Initiatives with a Small Effect and a Low Cost

Figure 6 – Prioritization allows the City to initiate those actions and programs which will have the greatest effect at the lowest cost first

Figure 7 – Implementation Strategy
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Potential Actions to Consider in Developing an Implementation Strategy

There are numerous sustainable actions and programs that the City may wish to pursue as part of its process of moving towards sustainability. As a beginning point and while the implementation strategy is being fully developed and actions and programs are being prioritized, it is suggested that the City consider the following path.

Current City Path

1. Continue the internal Sustainability Task Force to guide the City facilities and operations elements of the Plan. The Sustainability Task Force was formed after the Sustainability Topic Committee Vision 2025 Report was submitted to the City Council. It consists of staff from all City departments except the Police Department. The Task Force’s goals include coordinating and sharing sustainability information so that all City employees are informed; ensuring a coordinated effort; educating all City departments of their sustainability role, and encouraging each department to participate in sustainability efforts.

2. Continue and expand the use of energy efficient products and technology in City operations. The City can impact energy use by installing and maintaining energy conservation measures such as efficient lighting and space conditioning systems, and through the use of renewable sources such as solar power and water heating systems.

3. Continue to maintain and upgrade the City’s infrastructure according to schedules based on the anticipated life of each system, while adopting proven practices and technologies that will advance sustainability goals, maintain high quality standards and reduce long-term costs.

4. Continue to expand Citywide educational programs to involve and encourage the participation of all segments of the community.

Short-Term Policies and Actions

1. Translate the Goals and Policies in the Plan into programs and actions. This will require that a comprehensive, Citywide sustainability strategy be developed, including the compilation of baseline information (carbon footprint, energy and water use, waste production), and the development of methodology to quantify success.

2. Adopt a Water Efficiency Landscape Ordinance to encourage the use of native and drought-tolerant plants in landscaping and to reduce the amount of water used for irrigation while maintaining the “garden quality of the City.”

3. Develop funding strategies to support the implementation of sustainability initiatives, especially capital investments. Analyze all available options including in-house and outside capital sources.
4. Incorporate lifecycle costing into all decision-making. Lifecycle costing is the total cost of owning, operating, maintaining and eventually disposing of a building or other asset over a given period of time with all costs discounted to reflect the time value of money.

5. Integrate sustainability as a consideration for all commission level decision-making. Each of the City’s commissions should have jurisdiction over programs and initiatives that fall within their respective area of focus.

6. Budget for an environmental expert to advise the City Council with regard to the sustainability of City projects, to coordinate with City staff, and to recommend policy changes to City Council.

7. Provide adequate staff and other needed support to implement all of the Plan’s internal and community-wide goals and policies. Ensure adequate staff training on sustainability principles. Utilize volunteers where possible, particularly in community outreach and community involvement efforts.

8. Increase the City’s outreach, educational and community engagement actions and programs.

9. Report at least annually to the City Council and community on the progress in implementing the Plan. The report should be comprehensive and address all aspects of the Plan.

Long-Term Policies and Actions

1. Undertake the following steps to reinforce the City’s commitment to sustainability. At a policy level, the City became a signatory to the U.S. Conference of Mayors Climate Protection Agreement in February 2007.5

   a. Establish sustainability benchmarks and measurable goals for all key sustainability topics including energy, water, transportation and waste. Use common dates for all baseline data and for all benchmarks. Establish auditing methods to evaluate the extent of success in meeting the goals as well as the effectiveness of the programs, strategies and technologies.

   b. Sign the United Nations Urban Environmental Accords.6 The Accords are a set of twenty-one actions that the U.N. has asked City governments to adopt and implement over a seven-year period.

   c. When qualified, join Green Cities California7, a new organization of California local governments announced in May 2008. To qualify, the City must have a local Sustainable City Plan that includes specific measures and sign both the Conference of Mayors Climate Protection Agreement and U.N. Accords. The 10 founding members

---


7 Green Cities California: No website as of yet; contact Carol Misseldine, Coordinator, 415.388.5273.
include the cities of Los Angeles, Santa Monica, Pasadena, San Francisco, and Sacramento, and Marin County.

2. Adopt General Plan principles that facilitate the vision of a sustainable community.

3. Ensure that all City regulations, codes, rate structures and other programs do not impede and, where possible, do provide incentives for the adoption of sustainable products and strategies by the City, businesses and residents.

4. Reduce traffic-related emissions through investments in the City’s fleet and the implementation of land-use and other strategies that reduce vehicular use and encourage the use of alternate transportation modes.

5. Consider sustainable principles in the development and revision of all future transportation and land-use policies and plans to promote greater options for increasing quality of life and reducing traffic congestion as a benefit for all members of the community.

The lists that follow consist of possible items that the City may want to add in the process of developing the implementation strategy. These actions and programs are organized by sustainability focus area.

**Climate Change and Air Quality**

1. Benchmark the carbon footprint of City facilities and operations. Even though the City may not be under AB 32 regulations, develop a plan, including measurable goals, to strive for emissions reductions consistent with AB 32.

2. Strengthen, to the extent feasible, the Beverly Hills Green Building Ordinance and Green Building/Sustainability Checklist to require the implementation of measures that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and otherwise reduce air emissions.

3. Collaborate with local transit agencies to develop programs and educate employers about employee rideshare and transit; promote mass transit ridership through careful planning of routes, headways, origins and destinations, types of vehicles, and integrated land-uses. Develop a local point of contact for potential rideshares.

4. Continue to utilize low- and zero-emission vehicles for as many City fleet vehicles as feasible.

5. Continue to utilize the City’s Street Tree Plan to help improve the air shed, save water, and minimize urban heat island effects (which raise local temperatures) through tree specimen choices, while maintaining the established historic and aesthetic character of streets.

6. Preserve or replace trees that are removed due to development to provide carbon storage.

7. Coordinate with appropriate partners to educate the community on how greenhouse gas emissions can be reduced and the benefits of such activities.
8. Encourage businesses to promote and facilitate ride-sharing and mass transit options for their employees.
9. Partner with regional agencies and jurisdictions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

**Energy**

1. Develop and implement a comprehensive Energy Conservation Program for City operations that maximizes energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy sources in all City facilities, equipment and operations. When making capital decisions, utilize a lifecycle assessment, which incorporates initial purchase price and projected energy and other costs over each purchase’s expected life. Use third party financing where appropriate.
2. Ensure that all new City buildings are designed to maximize their energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy systems.
3. Strengthen, where possible, the Beverly Hills Green Building Program to increase the required level of energy efficiency and renewable energy use in new construction and major remodeling projects.
4. Encourage and, where appropriate, require, energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy sources in existing public and private facilities, possibly by obtaining Energy Star ratings.
5. Continue to utilize the City’s Street Tree Plan, including tree specimen selection, to maximize shading in order to reduce the urban heat island effect, and thereby reduce energy consumption and improve air quality.
6. Purchase government vehicles that are high mileage per gallon, utilize alternative fuels and minimize emissions.

**Water**

1. Adopt policies that promote the conservation of water resources, a reduction of potable water used for irrigation, and an overall reduction in the amount of storm water runoff directly entering the storm water drainage system.
2. Prepare and implement an integrated water resources plan that evaluates and plans for the use of water in City operations and communitywide. An integrated plan addresses all water issues in a unified manner to maximize water efficiency; maximize the use of alternative sources of water (recycled water, gray water, storm water, and groundwater that otherwise enters the storm water system due to the dewatering of subterranean structures); protect groundwater and the watershed, including receiving waters and Santa Monica Bay, and ensure that the City’s water infrastructure is maintained in a manner that minimizes leakage and ensures adequate supply. As part of the plan, structure rates to encourage efficiency by charging more for higher, non-critical levels of consumption.
3. Explore alternative methods of managing storm water runoff in an effort to decrease the amount of runoff directly entering the storm water drainage system.

---

**What challenges does the City face in providing water in the future?**

Warmer temperatures, altered patterns of precipitation and runoff, and rising sea levels are increasingly compromising the ability to effectively manage water supplies, floods and other natural resources. According to the Department of Water Resources, adapting California’s water management systems in response to climate change presents one of the most significant challenges of this century.
4. Strengthen the City’s water efficiency standards for properties that are sold and new development projects for both landscape and interior water uses to require fixtures and strategies that exceed code requirements.

5. Update the City’s Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Program (SUSMP) to ensure the quality of storm water runoff. The Plan should incorporate the Beverly Hills Storm Water System Plan, Street Tree Plan, and a broad array of strategies including catch basin filters, permeable surfaces, debris removal, and storm water capture and re-charge on both public and private parcels.

6. Prepare and implement a Sanitary Sewer Management Plan that includes a preventative maintenance program, emergency spill response procedures, a construction and restaurant inspection program, and pollution mitigation measures. Continue to inspect and upgrade the City’s sewer infrastructure to minimize deficiencies and reduce leaks and contamination.

7. Continue appropriate water-related partnerships with, for example, the Beverly Hills Unified School District and the City of West Hollywood.

8. Ensure that all new and replacement water system infrastructure is sized to adequately meet the needs of current and future demand without being oversized or over-built.

9. Encourage the use and logical placement of native and drought-tolerant plants in landscaping to maintain and enhance the “garden quality of the City” while reducing overall water used for irrigation.

**Land-use and Transportation**

1. Encourage the use of green building practices, environmentally sensitive building products and renewable energy sources.

2. Encourage new infrastructure and development that reduces automobile dependence and facilitates walking, bicycling and the use of existing and planned public transit.

3. Adopt General Plan goals and policies that mandate, where possible, and otherwise encourage the development of projects that contribute to the City’s sustainability goals.

4. Incorporate requirements and practices into the Municipal Code, including the Zoning Code, that address aspects of sustainability such as the recapture of water, recharge of groundwater, siting of buildings, and the use of architectural features to reduce overall energy use and or production of alternative energy among other options.

5. Encourage the adaptive reuse of buildings through various means, such as historic preservation, to conserve their “embodied energy.”

6. Encourage development projects that incorporate project design features that facilitate low-impact transportation such as secure bicycle storage, showers, and preferred parking for low-emitting vehicles.

7. Apply advanced technology systems and management strategies to improve the operational efficiency of transportation systems and the movement of people, goods and services.

**What does sustainable land-use accomplish?**

Sustainable land-use encourages development that limits or reduces energy consumption, construction waste, air pollution and vehicle congestion.
8. Implement street improvements that relieve pressure on congested roadways and intersections, while also increasing and improving pedestrian oriented street amenities.
9. Encourage large employers, including the City, to develop commute trip reduction plans that help employees who commute alone to consider alternate transportation modes including carpooling, public transportation, and bicycling or walking to work and for work-related trips.
10. Work with the Metropolitan Transportation Agency (MTA) and other regional transit authorities to continue to create a multi-modal transportation system that minimizes pollution and reduces motor vehicle congestion while ensuring access and mobility for all.
11. Continue to support extension of the subway line down Wilshire Blvd.
12. Develop a Safe Routes to School program that promotes walking and bicycling to schools.
13. Design and maintain all open space to meet sustainability goals. Acquire new parks and open space lands when and where feasible. Continue to incorporate sustainability principles into the Parks Plan, including irrigation efficiency, native and other drought-tolerant plant selection, shade trees, and storm water treatment and retention.
14. Develop and maintain an open space system that is equitably distributed throughout the community, is diverse in uses and passive and active recreational opportunities, and includes natural function/wildlife habitat.

**Materials and Waste**

1. Continue to improve the efficiency and innovativeness of the City’s waste management program with a focus on reducing the amount of waste material entering regional landfills.
2. Examine City operations for opportunities to reduce the use of paper and other resources.
3. Establish a green procurement program for City operations that minimizes waste and maximizes the purchase of recycled content and recyclable materials.
4. Create incentives to increase recycling and reduce the generation of solid waste by businesses and residents.
5. Implement a construction and demolition waste recycling ordinance that requires a minimum percentage of recycling.
6. Continue to expand residential and commercial food waste collection and the green waste collection program.
7. Encourage the growth of markets for recycled content products.
8. Anticipate the need for new facilities and equipment adapted to future refuse disposal needs. Ensure that new facilities and equipment are efficient and minimize pollution.
9. Consider an ordinance that requires businesses to reduce waste.

**How can post-manufacture waste be reduced?**

An example of waste reduction is selecting products which are wrapped with fewer packing materials.

If excess packaging were never produced in the first place, no one would have to be concerned with the cost and effort of collecting the excess packaging, separating it for recycling, breaking it down, transporting it to manufacturers, and then integrating the recycled materials back into the manufacturing process.
Environmental and Public Health

1. For public health, promote and support recreational activities and community gardening.
2. For environmental and public health, develop and implement a City green procurement program for all products and services.
3. For environmental and public health, educate residents and businesses about safe alternatives to the use of toxic and hazardous materials, and to healthy lifestyle choices that can reduce smoking, obesity and diabetes.
4. For environmental and public health, continue to work with the County to safely collect and dispose of toxic and hazardous waste.
5. For environmental and public health, limit commercial vehicle idling time, including delivery and construction vehicles.
6. For public health, reduce particulate matter from construction, demolition, debris hauling, street cleaning, and utility maintenance to the greatest extent possible. Require the suspension of all grading operations when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour.
7. For environmental and public health, encourage the cleanup, redevelopment, and reuse of brown fields, including abandoned oil wells.
8. For public health, review and adopt development standards that separate, buffer and protect sensitive receptors (e.g., school facilities, day care and health facilities, residential units located on major arterials, and senior facilities) from significant sources of pollution to the greatest extent possible.
9. For public health, encourage walking, biking and other forms of non-motorized transportation as alternative means of commuting to work, running errands, visiting parks and recreational centers and traveling from one place to another.

Local Economy

1. Develop a process to monitor and regularly report the City’s economic health, including whether the City is developing in an economically sustainable manner.
2. Develop a baseline and regularly publish a report presenting “sustainability indicators” of both City operations and the community as a whole, including such factors as resource efficiency, economic diversity, jobs/housing balance, business reinvestment in the community and the quality of jobs created.

Social Equity

1. Incorporate human dignity and social equity concepts and other related principles and goals into the General Plan and other policy documents.
2. Incorporate environmental and economic sustainability into the City’s quality-of-life and human resources programs.
3. Continue to provide and expand access to all City programs, services, public facilities, and public parks and open spaces.
4. Encourage a greater amount of housing and housing options for all income levels.

Civic Participation

1. Integrate sustainability considerations into all City commission decision-making to support and advise on the development and implementation of the Sustainable City Plan and the implementation strategy.

2. Establish a comprehensive education program to increase sustainability awareness; the costs and benefits of various strategies; the availability of incentives, and the applicable regulations. Involve individuals and organizations from throughout the community in the development and implementation of the outreach program. Ensure that the program reaches all local stakeholders and addresses sustainability in ways that are applicable and easy addressable by community members.

3. Form appropriate partnerships to further the education and implementation of sustainability principles, goals and policies, including with the School District, business community, and community based organizations.

4. Maintain transparency and report regularly on the outcome of the City’s sustainability initiatives and programs, incorporating sustainability indicators and the costs, benefits, successes, challenges and strategies necessary to fully implement the Sustainable City Plan’s goals and policies.
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Additional Resources

3. California Communities Grant & Loan Program, www.treasurer.ca.gov/cpcfa/
8. Global Footprint Network, footprintnetwork.org
12. TreePeople, www.treepeople.org
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Economic Sustainability Plan

Programs and Priorities
2011-2015

CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS
A Message from the City Manager

We are pleased to present the City’s Economic Sustainability Plan – Program and Priorities 2011-2015.

With such pressure on City budgets, we felt the time was ripe to develop an Economic Sustainability plan for City Hall that would provide a framework for us to prioritize and focus our programs on those that most support the economic vitality and attractiveness of Beverly Hills.

We consulted with City staff and officials, our economic partners, residents and businesses. We examined existing economic studies and City programs. At the end of this process we realized two things – first, there were no “magic bullets” for economic sustainability and second, that the City and its partners were already engaged in important economic sustainability work. Missing were priorities, focus and measurement, as well as a lexicon for economic development as it pertained to Beverly Hills.

This plan addresses these issues and has already provided the basis for the 2011 City Council priorities, and principal elements have been incorporated into the City’s Strategic Planning effort.
The severe economic recession of 2007 – 2010 caused disastrous reductions in state and local government revenues. Beverly Hills has responded to that crisis by reducing its General Fund budget by more than $27 million over the past three years, ensuring budgets and strategic plans focus squarely on efficiency and new revenue opportunities, and prioritizing City programs on the basis of economic sustainability.

It is evident that the City cannot rely only on expense reductions to close its budget shortfall without sacrificing its traditional high standards of service. This Plan, representing the third element, presents an array of City programs that support economic activity. They strengthen the revenue sources that are the primary support for the City General Fund: transient occupancy taxes, sales taxes, property taxes, and business taxes.

Beverly Hills does not use redevelopment areas or enterprise zoning, the traditional tools of economic development. Its new General Plan left the areas of scale, height, density, and community character essentially unchanged. Recognizing these policy directives, the City team prioritized programs on the basis of their contribution to economic sustainability. The City also sought feedback from residents and businesses. The Plan outlines both a set of priorities and a set of measures to help the City track its progress going forward.
The plan uses a metaphor of “Foundations” and “Pillars” to organize its efforts. Foundations are themes that underlie and inform all of the City’s work, especially economic sustainability. Pillars are groups of programs, projects and activities that seem likely to improve revenues, although that may not be the only justification for them.

MEASUREMENT

A critical element of the plan is to measure and report on how implementation affects City revenues. There will be two program-wide measures:

1. Whether and how much revenue streams increase, with an attempt to show whether the increases or decreases differ from what would otherwise be expected.

2. Bi-annual surveys to measure business, residential and visitor satisfaction levels.

In addition, a program of more specific measures, intending to evaluate the performance of individual initiatives and Pillars, will attempt to measure how well plan elements are being implemented, and the extent of their effect on program-wide goals.

NEXT STEPS

The City is already incorporating this economic sustainability approach into its decision-making processes. As the plan was being completed, the City launched a more comprehensive strategic planning effort that incorporated economic sustainability principles and goals.

Many of the programs and projects in this plan were identified as high priorities by the City Council for the coming fiscal year. The City will identify resources and develop funding schedules for their inclusion in the budget.

Going forward, the plan will be refined by:

- Improving the ways the City measures the effects of proposed and adopted initiatives on economic activity and City revenues.
- Completing current efforts to improve the City’s revenue forecasting, to offer more specific projections that reflect a better understanding of the City’s economy.
- Integrating economic sustainability as a factor in the City’s strategy and budget framework.
PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND
The Context

Current projections indicate a shortfall between General Fund revenues and expenditures in excess of $5 million by FY 2014/15. To address this issue, the City needs to continue action on three fronts – building the “three-legged stool” of fiscal stability.

**BUDGET CUTS:** The City of Beverly Hills has already reduced its budget by more than $27 million over the past three years, including furloughing staff, postponing maintenance and equipment replacement, addressing labor cost and pension reform, and rethinking service levels.

**INCREASING REVENUE SOURCES:** The current Strategic Planning effort is continuing efforts started during budget reviews to identify appropriate revenue increases.

**DEVELOPING ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY INITIATIVES THAT WILL INCREASE ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND RELATED CITY REVENUES:** This Plan, mandated by the City Council, is designed to address a strategic method of revenue generation.

The City does not have access to the traditional tools of redevelopment or enterprise zoning, and the City has made a strategic policy decision not to modify the General Plan regarding scale, height, density, or community character. Rather, by providing base services and programs at the highest level, the City intends to provide a platform upon which businesses can prosper. In this way, the City hopes to generate the revenues necessary to support the quality of life expected by businesses and residents in Beverly Hills.

Building on previous plans, such as the Economic Profile, the Business Attraction and Retention Plans and the Marketing Strategic plan, the City’s executive management team has taken a long, hard look at much of the City’s existing workload and established priorities and opportunities for programs that directly support the City’s brand, character and other critical areas unique to businesses success and economic development in Beverly Hills.
The City has made a strategic policy decision not to modify the General Plan regarding scale, height, density, or community character.
City Fiscal Structure

The fiscal structure of the City relies on four main sources of revenue: property taxes, sales taxes, transient occupancy taxes, and business taxes. Residents are the primary source of property taxes; the remaining revenue streams are functions of a healthy business community. Approximately 9% of the City’s land is zoned for commercial use; that land, however, produces 75% of the City’s general fund revenues.

Projected General Fund Revenues

Assuming that current strategies remain unchanged, revenues are projected to increase only slightly as the economy recovers from the most severe recession in recent history. Sales tax and transient occupancy tax revenue will likely track the economy as it improves, while property tax revenue will follow trends in property valuation, though on a more muted basis as result of Proposition 13.

Sales tax revenues, transient occupancy taxes, and business taxes are all related to the City’s ability to attract and retain a vibrant business community, which in turn requires attracting clientele to City businesses. Property taxes are sustained by preserving the City’s stature as a premiere residential location. The City will continue to contribute to this by prudently maintaining its physical assets, continuing a high level of public safety and municipal services, and supporting educational excellence in the School District.
Current Efforts to Address Competition

Beverly Hills is in competition with high-end malls featuring luxury retailers; with other municipalities for prestige-address business clusters; and with other premiere residential communities. Recognizing that competitors are improving their products and outreach, Beverly Hills has commissioned the development of research and plans to guide efforts to attract and retain targeted businesses.

Five key reports formed the central part of this effort:

- Beverly Hills Retail Behavioral Study for 2006
- Conference and Visitor’s Bureau Strategic Plan 2010
  (Also known as the Marketing Strategic Plan)

Consistent with these reports, the City manages several activities and programs that bolster revenues from hotels and businesses. The design of City marketing events highlights Beverly Hills’ advantages.

Examples of these efforts include:

- Signature functions such as: · the annual Walk of Style
  · Affaire in the Gardens · Greystone Concours d’Elegance
  · Concerts in the Park · and the more recent 90210 event
- The 2011 Rose Parade float, which won the Mayor’s Trophy for the Most Outstanding City Entry
- Holiday programs and decorations

Implementing the marketing plan for the Conference and Visitors Bureau will place additional focus on developing and promoting events to create “street-life” in order to give visitors – especially LA County residents – a reason to visit Beverly Hills. Recent studies show that nearly 35% of the money spent by shoppers in the City comes from Beverly Hills residents, and that an additional 25% originates with residents of the LA Metro area.
In addition, the City has identified clusters that are central to commercial property tax revenues, especially entertainment services, finance, and professional services. Maintaining a business-friendly city government and partnering with business organizations to maintain open lines of communication are ongoing citywide efforts intended to support these business sectors.

FOCUSING THE "LENS"

There is no shortage of energy or inventiveness in proposed initiatives to support clientele and business attraction. Recognizing this, the Economic Sustainability Plan has not made its primary focus the generation of new projects or programs. Rather, this report seeks to provide a “lens” to focus on implementing existing plans and programs that provide the best overall contribution to the City’s long-term economic sustainability.

Stakeholder Input

To validate City staff priorities, outreach meetings were held with a Homeowners Association, board members of the Conference and Visitor’s Bureau and a cross-section of stakeholders from the Chamber of Commerce, the Citizen’s Budget Group, and the Mayor’s Cabinet. Participants, who represented residents, businesses, and commercial property owners, were chosen because of their interest in the City and their knowledge of its economy and finances. Their comments, reflected in this report, have improved its focus and strengthened its priorities.
STRATEGIC DIRECTION

The City's 2011 Rose Parade float, which won the Mayor's Trophy for the most outstanding city entry, heightens awareness of the Beverly Hills brand.
The city holds the following vision for economic sustainability policies and programs:

Foster a vibrant, sustainable economy, and stimulate sufficient City revenue to maintain the character and quality of the community.

To realize this vision, the plan adopts a metaphor of “Foundations” and “Pillars.” Foundations are strategic themes that underlie and inform all of the City’s work, especially the efforts described in the Pillars. Pillars include programs, projects, and activities intended to improve both the City’s economy and its business revenues.

Pillars

The four Pillars of economic sustainability represent central areas where the government of Beverly Hills has significant ability to support local economic activity and City revenue streams. Many of the initiatives included within the pillars are included in the current Budget and Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Priorities were ranked according to their anticipated impact and are not time related; many will stretch over several years.
Pillar Initiatives | PRIORITY PROJECTS

Clientele Attraction /Business Development

The City partners with the Conference and Visitors Bureau (CVB), the Chamber of Commerce and its business community to encourage clients or customers to patronize Beverly Hills businesses. In addition, business retention and attraction efforts have identified kinds of businesses that fit well with the City’s brand, and with its existing commercial mix. The Business Attraction Plan calls for diversifying revenue streams through attracting “gap” businesses – especially upscale food markets and furniture/appliance stores. The City is also expanding efforts to attract businesses that appeal to younger consumers and grow nightlife in the City.

1. PRIORITY PROJECTS

Clientele Attraction /Business Development Initiatives

- Support CVB in implementation of Marketing Strategic plan
- Create “welcoming” retail districts, including “Disney-level” way-finding
- Support CVB in design and development of signature Visitor’s Center
- Produce broader platform of signature events and destination promotions
- Continue implementing key strategies of Business Retention Plan
- Continue to actively manage and develop City trademark license program as vehicle to brand awareness
- Complete review of and begin implementation of Business Attraction Strategy, including attracting both high-end and unique-local businesses along with community serving businesses. Consider financial incentives
- Revitalize Southeast Beverly Hills. Identify projects such as an Arts District, Parking, Open Space, etc.
- Raise BH virtual profile, e.g., Google/City of NY cooperative effort by improving functionality of current website

Priority 1

Priority 2

Priority 3
City Service and Process Enhancement

Maintaining a business-friendly City government is a priority of economic sustainability. Beverly Hills takes pride in the friendliness and quality of its municipal services, seeking a “Disney” level of satisfaction. One element of these high standards is a commitment to continuous improvement. As part of this effort, Beverly Hills is developing and expanding its e-Gov capability, making it easier to do business with the City on the Internet.

**Priority Projects**

**City Service and Process Enhancement Initiatives**

- Review business tax and permit fee structure with a view to developing potential business attraction/retention incentives; attract both high-end and unique-local businesses along with community serving businesses. Consider financial incentives where appropriate
- Identify, prioritize and develop 5-year schedule to eliminate obsolete zoning provisions and remove obstacles to development, including modification of nightlife/entertainment regulations and fees
- Develop eGov initiatives associated with on-line public zoning and business permit process:
  - Development Review process
  - Electronic Review of Planning & Building documents
- Evaluate and implement strategies that streamline the development process, including Commission review processes
- Install new Finance and HR Enterprise-wide computer system
  - Automate billing and tax payment
- Develop on-line public zoning and land use information, e.g., ZIMAS
- Evaluate establishing a Concierge for City Hall to assist applicants for complex development/permits, especially for proposals and projects targeted in Business Attraction and Retention strategies
City-Owned Asset Enhancement

The City owns real estate assets within Beverly Hills that serve multiple civic purposes. Parking structures are visible examples of the use of City assets to increase the convenience and ease of access of residents and visitors to Beverly Hills business establishments. Beverly Hills also uses its real estate assets to attract business clusters that are important to the economic life of the City and to enhance the quality of life for residents. The 331 Foothill project in the entertainment district is an example. Such holdings are strategic assets that should continue to be used to support commerce and generate City revenues.

- Acquire the median portion of the former railroad right of way at Santa Monica and Doheny in order to implement Gateway improvements at that location; Continue to press for State completion of remediation plan for parcels 12 and 13 and identify funding source for acquisition
- Maximize benefits of projects under construction
  - 9400 Santa Monica Blvd
  - Crescent Garage
- Continue to invest in upgrades at Greystone that will increase the viability of public and private uses
- Complete plans for interim re-use of the Chamber of Commerce building pending initiation of long-term redevelopment for public parking

- Develop City property leasing Master Plan
- Actively pursue entertainment district build-to-suit opportunities at Foothill Road and Third Street
- Increase parking opportunities on the southeast side of Beverly Hills
Infrastructure

The City’s ongoing ability to provide infrastructure – streets, water systems, sewers, traffic systems, parks, libraries, public transportation, etc., that supports its “premier” brand is central to its economic sustainability. Those services are critical to maintaining the property values that, under current California law, have decades-long implications for a primary revenue stream of the City. Businesses, too, expect their patrons to be impressed with the quality of infrastructure – clean, well maintained streets and sidewalks, well-appointed public areas with high-quality lighting and trees, and available parking. Parking can also be viewed as a city-owned asset, as set forth in the previous section. These structures and systems are central to maintaining the City’s brand. Knowing this, the City commits $10 million annually in funding for the Capital Improvement Plan and seeks the maximum impact on economic sustainability from that investment.

Infrastructure Initiatives

Public policy and programs that advocate for, develop or maintain infrastructure elements such as streets, sidewalks, parks, transportation, etc., central to economic strength.

Priority 1

- Implement Street Improvement/Pavement Master Plan
- Complete Municipal Area Network; consider fiber optic applications beyond City needs
- Complete Street Light Replacement Project

Priority 2

- Support extension of the subway and preferred alignment
- Promote City-wide upgrade/renovation to Class A office buildings
- Continue to transfer funds to the Capital Improvement Program budget in order to address deferred maintenance and invest in opportunity projects for the future; implement Master Plans for Parks, Libraries, Street Trees

Priority 3

- Evaluate 2nd Phase Urban Design
Foundations

1. Brand Management  
2. Communication and Outreach  
3. Quality of Life Stewardship  
4. Fiscal Stewardship  
5. Friendly, Smart, Green, Safe City

In order to keep Beverly Hills a world-class community, the City must consistently emphasize central foundational principles. These principles underlie all of the actions of the City, including economic sustainability efforts.

As part of the evaluation of the Foundations, the City identified areas where enhanced focus or attention to the foundations will affect fiscal sustainability. Many of the programs and initiatives in the Pillars were developed with the understanding that they would also provide support to the foundations, especially where gaps were identified.
PEOPLE IDENTIFY WITH THE BEVERLY HILLS BRAND AS A SYMBOL OF THE PLACE TO LIVE THEIR DREAMS.

It is widely held as self-evident, and supported by available research, that the Beverly Hills brand is a key element in attracting the visitors and businesses that support the fiscal strength of the City.

Known internationally for its outstanding residential neighborhoods, distinctive hotels, retail stores, restaurants and premiere business locations, Beverly Hills must maintain its position as a premiere community and destination.

The Beverly Hills brand is an important driver of economic strength, and should be honored in everything the City undertakes.

As examples, going forward:

- As the City improves its services and processes, it will design user-friendly applications and aim to exceed user expectations of friendly, efficient services.
- As the City implements asset management initiatives, it will build, upgrade and maintain real estate assets to high level of physical appearance and efficiency.
- As the City implements infrastructure initiatives, it will ensure that they reflect high design standards, including the pedestrian experience and signage needs.
- As the City improves clientele marketing and business attraction initiatives, it will coordinate its message with the “living the dream” brand.
- As the City reviews and develops its cultural event initiatives, it will strive to ensure that programming and presentation exceed expectations of participants.

All participants in the study agreed that the brand must be continually renewed and refreshed, attracting multiple generations, and providing an environment that beckons new residents, visitors and businesses.
The City will conduct regular and consistent outreach to key communities, including two-way conversations with:

- The residential community, to assure that the character and quality of Beverly Hills are maintained and enhanced
- The business community, to assure that Beverly Hills remains an economically healthy and profitable place in which to do business
- The visiting public, to maintain the attractiveness of Beverly Hills as a desirable place to visit and shop.

The review of this Economic Sustainability plan, itself, embodied this foundation; the recommendations and priorities were vetted by a variety of communities, and resident and business suggestions were incorporated throughout.

Going forward:

- As the City streamlines its services and processes, it will establish partnerships with the residential and business communities to reflect their needs
- As the City implements clientele and business attraction elements, it will base its decision-making on visitor and business opinions
- As the City implements asset management initiatives, it will work with the business, residential, and visitor community to identify the optimum use for facilities
- As the City implements infrastructure initiatives, it will inform communities of and solicit support for infrastructure maintenance plans

The primary goal in this area is to maintain property values and property tax revenues by maintaining important City services at a high level. Of primary importance to high residential satisfaction and consistent high property values is the quality of fire and police services. Those, however, by themselves will not suffice. The City’s excellent library and park services, as well as the cleanliness and repair of its streets and sidewalks, must be preserved to maintain the character of the city. In addition, residents frequently cite outstanding K-12 schools as central in...
maintaining the quality of life. Although education is outside its direct responsibility, the City has a strong and supportive relationship with the Beverly Hills School District to maintain a high quality of education.

Going forward:

- As the City improves its services and processes, it will balance efficiency and revenue potential with the desire to maintain the character and quality of the community.

- As the City implements clientele and business attraction elements, it will seek to manage the impact of visitors on residential communities, and design programs that attract residents as well as visitors.

- As the City implements asset management initiatives, it will balance the demand for space with the desire to maintain the low-rise ambiance of the City.

- As the City implements infrastructure initiatives, it will work with County and State agencies so that their plans and programs support City goals.

Fiscal stewardship calls for wise financial decision-making. The City manages its operating reserves primarily to provide for continuation of necessary services in the event of a severe disaster that might impact revenue sources. The City invests in capital improvements to generate increased revenues, to avoid costs such as escalating maintenance expenses, and to enhance the quality of life for businesses and residents. To the extent that the perceived quality of life results in higher levels of business activity and sustained property values, it is a significant element of fiscal stewardship.

This Foundation will be supported by the development and continued maintenance of improved financial modeling and forecasting currently underway.

Going forward:

- As the City improves its services and processes, it will seek to reduce costs, or improve services at the same cost.
As the City implements clientele and business attraction elements as well as asset management initiatives, it will assess the economic impact on revenue streams.

As the City implements asset management initiatives, it will consider both the need to generate City income and the need to enhance the brand in ways that the private sector cannot.

As the City implements infrastructure initiatives, it will assure the long-term viability of City assets, and make replace/repair decisions that optimize investment and performance.

This foundational element speaks to the importance of Beverly Hills leading the way as a Smart City. It is smart to continually seek ways of improving customer service; smart to adopt strategies such as the Sustainable City Plan (SCP), which enshrines the City’s commitment to environmentally friendly policies; smart to integrate new technologies and media into City programs; and smart to ensure that the community is well protected and prepared to respond to emergencies at a sustainable cost.

Going forward:

- As the City improves its services and processes, it will offer residents and businesses choices regarding personal and technology options when possible.

- As the City implements clientele and business attraction elements, it will emphasize the welcoming spirit of the community, and highlight the safety and security of visitors and residents.

- As the City implements asset management initiatives, it will include new technology and earth-friendly technologies in its design.

- As the City implements infrastructure initiatives, it will use ecologically responsible technologies and ensure new technology is part of its infrastructure priority discussions.

- As the City invests in employee development, it will continue to include “Disney Level” customer service and management training.

5 FRIENDLY, SMART, GREEN, SAFE CITY

Ensuring a friendly, welcoming City that exceeds customer service expectations; integrating green technologies and policies into every level of City programming; continually updating technology and media to improve services and productivity; providing residential and visitor security and safety levels that are among the highest in the nation.
The City will track the success of this program by establishing a “Dashboard” to track changes as they are made to programs and initiatives. The dashboard will be refined as the City learns from its experiences going forward.

The Dashboard will include both overall measures, and Pillar-specific measures.

**Overall measures** ➤ will track the success of the Plan.

**Pillar-specific measures** ➤ are needed for two reasons:

The Pillars represent the best current thinking available about how to achieve program goals.

- By tracking Pillar success, the City will have advance warning of potential problems, and can act more quickly to address them.

- Also it is possible that the City will be able to document success in implementing pillar measures, but the economic sustainability of the City may still be threatened. In that case, it will be necessary to reconsider current assumptions about the importance of the Pillars to the City’s overall fiscal health.

Establishing baseline data and developing the means to track key indicators will be the focus of the measurement effort during 2011. In 2012 and beyond, the City will provide reports that show both current and historical information. The City can then understand and report how programs perform over time, and can include relevant performance information in decisions to keep, modify or abandon specific economic sustainability efforts.
Overall Measures

The overall program will be measured in two ways. Keeping in mind the program’s vision – fostering a vibrant economy while maintaining the character and quality of the community, the City plans to track revenue streams as well as business, residential, and visitor satisfaction.

Revenue Stream Measures

The ultimate measure of any economic sustainability strategy will be how well the City’s revenues support the character and quality of the community. The City will track how well the completion of priority projects affects its revenue streams, and whether those changes are larger or smaller than expected. While it is difficult to isolate the impact of individual projects, the City anticipates that the implementation of the economic sustainability program will increase revenues from the four principal revenue streams. This will be supported by the development and continued maintenance of the financial modeling effort currently underway. In addition, disciplined attention to the economic impacts of City initiatives may help avoid circumstances in which the City unintentionally takes actions that impair its economic growth.

Beverly Hills intends to benchmark its performance against other jurisdictions in order to separate the impact of implementing this Economic Sustainability from the ups and downs of the overall economy. The Plan will go a long way to succeeding if Beverly Hills can show higher percentage gains than competing jurisdictions in similar revenue streams. Beverly Hills will start by identifying which comparable jurisdictions it can best gather data on, and will benchmark:

Property Taxes ➤ Year-to-year change in assessed value of Beverly Hills residential and business properties as compared to year-to-year change in other Los Angeles County communities such as Bel Air, Brentwood, Holmby Hills, San Marino, and Santa Monica.

Transient Occupancy Taxes ➤ Changes in revenues generated through transient occupancy taxes, as compared to increases or decreases in competitive national and international luxury destinations. Monitoring revenue per available room in Beverly Hills and comparing it to competing locations.

Business Taxes ➤ Increases or decreases in revenues drawn from clusters important to the economic health of Beverly Hills, such as entertainment and finance industries seeking to understand how those changes relate to the overall health of the industries in Los Angeles.

Sales Taxes ➤ Changes in revenues generated through sales taxes compared to sales tax revenues in areas that draw similar shoppers, such as West Hollywood, Santa Monica, Costa Mesa and Newport Beach.

By gathering data on competitors, the City will attempt to account for the impact of factors, such as the overall health of the Southern California economy, over which the City has no control.
## Residential, Business and Visitor Satisfaction Measures

From time to time in the past, the City has solicited business and residential views on a variety of subjects. It will be important to regularize those efforts to assure that these programs achieve the intended goal of enhancing the quality of life in the City. In 2011 and 2012, the City will design surveys to gather baseline data on resident and business satisfaction. Of particular interest in survey design will be questions that reveal whether economic sustainability initiatives are successful, or whether changes are warranted. Thereafter, surveys will be administered on alternating years to track and understand how businesses’ and residents’ opinions are changing.

In addition, the City will seek to combine an opinion survey of visitors and shoppers with the visitor impact analysis, coordinated bi-annually by the CVB. It will be important to expand the scope of that effort beyond historical measures to include shopping, spending, and length of stay for non-local visitors. The City will also seek to learn about shopping patterns of residents, local, and regional visitors, as well as their level of satisfaction with City amenities.

### Questions the Survey Will Cover:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PILLARS</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLIENTELE ATTRACTION/</td>
<td>Visitor opinion of Beverly Hills as a destination compared to benchmarked cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>Business satisfaction with events and holiday decorations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of residents that have attended at least one event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY SERVICE AND PROCESS</td>
<td>Business and community satisfaction with City processes, using International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENHANCEMENT</td>
<td>City Management Association or equivalent survey standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>Business, residential satisfaction with physical infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUNDATIONS</td>
<td>Residential understanding of and support for the Beverly Hills Brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEVERLY HILLS BRAND</td>
<td>Business understanding and support for the Beverly Hills Brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION AND OUTREACH</td>
<td>Survey responses showing changes in awareness of City programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey responses soliciting how well the City has responded to requests/concerns voiced by the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>businesses and residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALITY OF LIFE STEWARDSHIP</td>
<td>Business, residential and visitor satisfaction with overall BH experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business and residential satisfaction with parks and library facilities and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDLY, SMART, GREEN, SAFE</td>
<td>Visitor and business satisfaction with directional signage/way-finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>Residential satisfaction with police and fire services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with the level of technology in the City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business and residential awareness of and satisfaction with City’s Green program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pillar Measures

In addition to the overall measures, the City will track the success of some pillars and, within each, selected individual initiatives. Some measures, such as visitor metrics and investment in infrastructure, are already being tracked. The City will benefit from that reporting in the context of its economic sustainability program. Other indicators will require more complete definition and development. As an example, the City must establish the capacity to conduct impact assessments for its signature event programs, and measure the effect of its asset enhancement projects on targeted businesses and sectors.

For each of the pillars, the City will include satisfaction questions in the bi-annual surveys that will be administered as described on the opposite page.

Examples of supplemental measures include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillars</th>
<th>Measures to Supplement Satisfaction Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clientele Attraction/Business Development</td>
<td>- Number of visitors to Beverly Hills/Average length of their stay and spending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Revenues from targeted development areas or clusters, e.g., nightlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of new nightlife-related businesses and businesses offering extended hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Economic impact assessment for signature events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Service and Process Enhancement</td>
<td>- Cycle times for processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Quality measures such as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Letters of commendation or complaint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Results of “mystery” shopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Percentage of staff decisions reversed on appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-Owned Asset Enhancement</td>
<td>- Impact assessment for City-owned real estate investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Parking and lease revenue generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>- Net value after depreciation of real estate and infrastructure assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Percentage of Class A office buildings/Increase in new/renovated Class A square footage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Average age of utility infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The City is already incorporating this economic sustainability approach into its decision-making processes.

- As the plan was being completed, the City launched a more comprehensive strategic planning effort that incorporated economic sustainability principles and goals.
- The City Council priority-setting process incorporated economic sustainability as one of four criteria for priority allocation; Council Members rated many of the programs and projects in this plan among the highest priority for the City in the coming year, elevating relevant projects (such as Greystone Maintenance and Improvement) to a primary level.
- The City will translate Council priorities into reality by identifying resources and developing funding schedules for inclusion in the budget.

These are important first steps. Going forward, the City will continue to include economic sustainability assessments in its budget process as a significant factor in budgeting and resource allocation. City staff will update recommendations for economic sustainability projects in each City Council priority-setting meeting. In addition, several refinements and improvements are planned, specifically:

- Integrating economic sustainability assessment into the City’s Strategic Plan
- Building an assessment tool for economic sustainability benefits that will produce more precise and reliable forecasts
- Completing the development of a refined revenue forecasting model that will provide more specific projections, based on a deeper understanding of the City’s economy
- Providing more refined forecasts for economic sustainability initiatives, including the specific revenue streams they are expected to impact.
Costs associated with implementing this plan will be managed through the City’s annual work program and budget process. Existing staff will be responsible for overall program management. The City may require additional funding for advisory services associated with certain measurement activities such as:

- Developing and enhancing financial modeling and forecasting systems
- Designing assessment systems that the City can regularly apply to gauge the economic impact of signature programs and events
- Refining existing measurements and designing the effective reporting systems
- Enhancing the bi-annual visitor impact analysis, coordinated by the CVB, to include satisfaction measures, and targeting local and regional clientele in the scope
- Creating professional survey instruments.
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INTRODUCTION

In August of 2011, the Southeast Task Force was established as the third of four Mayor's Task Forces convened that year to address specific City Council priorities. Vice Mayor Mirisch chaired the Southeast Task Force with the purpose of coordinating a citizen committee of residents and area stakeholders to discuss, evaluate and form recommendations on the revitalization of the southeast area of Beverly Hills.

DISCUSSION

In addition to Vice Mayor Mirisch, participants on the Task Force included: Chris Biehl, Don Creamer, Brian Goldberg, Howard Goldstein, Andrea Grossman, Isabel Hacker, Noah Margo, Susan Mishler, Dick Seff, and AJ Wilmer.

The first task of the group was to define the Southeast neighborhood geographically. The clear consensus was: southeast of Wilshire Boulevard and Reeves Drive (including both sides of those boundary streets) and all of the area east of Robertson Boulevard within the City boundaries. A Southeast Area Map is attached. The existing strengths of the area were identified as: the neighborhood’s young family demographic, high quality public and private schools, walkability, classic theaters, LaCienega restaurants and LaCienega Park.

The area’s primary challenges were identified as: lack of destination businesses other than LaCienega restaurants; too many vacancies; a lack of parking in older buildings; shallow lots on Robertson and Olympic and a high water table which make parking garages expensive to build; a lack of grocery stores; too many nail salons and a need to be more bicycle and pedestrian friendly. Related challenges include a sense of missed opportunity to provide a Larchmont Boulevard flavor; attracting the types of boutiques that move onto the Los Angeles stretch of North Robertson; attracting a Trader Joe's type grocery; and attracting teen-oriented businesses.
Outreach

The outreach effort was targeted to build on the area’s strengths and to address the primary challenge of parking constraints.

Dick Rosenzweig, who was then Vice-President of Playboy Enterprises, was consulted to explore the connections between the Southeast area and the entertainment industry. One of the fundamental assets of the area is the existence of the Saban Theater, the Fine Arts Theater, the Music Hall Theater, the headquarters of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts & Sciences, the Beverly Hills Playhouse, the Writers Guild Theater and the Horace Mann Auditorium (which pre-dates the school). The idea of creating an Arts District around this historic core is full of potential and was suggested as an identity for the whole area. The history of discussions about a Beverly Hills Film Festival was reviewed and that too could be a powerful tool to weave the area’s assets together in an annual destination event, particularly when the private commercial screening rooms in the district are added to the theater resources. A strong partnership with the Annenberg Center was recommended even though that resource is outside the district.

In order to bring the business owners’ perspective to the Task Force, the outreach effort included identifying two area businesses run by civic-minded owners who were happy to meet with the group to discuss business opportunities and challenges and to develop ideas. Jay Navas of Toppings Yogurt on Robertson and Lupe Prado Sanchez of Cocina Primavera on Olympic were both invaluable resources for the group as their recommendations were being formed. Toppings exemplifies the non-chain, family-friendly, destination business model that the Task Force recommends. The members of the Prado family behind Cocina Primavera are long-time restaurateurs on Larchmont Boulevard providing key perspectives on opportunities for small business success in Beverly Hills and they similarly provide a “local destination” as supported by the Task Force.

The outreach effort included a specific focus on parking, which emerged as one of the key challenges associated with revitalization of the area. The Task Force recommendations include pursuing several approaches to address the parking constraints simultaneously, including increasing on-street parking, expanding the in-lieu parking program, maximizing the usefulness of parking in existing buildings, working with developers to find creative parking solutions such as encroachments beneath the right-of-way and City development of parking garages in targeted locations. One of the key recommended goals is to leverage partnership opportunities as they arise.

Focusing on this goal and the unique opportunity presented by the School District’s plan for major reconstruction at the Horace Mann campus on Robertson, an outreach effort with the District was initiated to see if there was potential to create subterranean public parking in a manner that would not interfere with school operations. This exploration included discussion with District design staff and consultants, with the Board of Education at a Board study session, and with Horace Mann parents at a very well attended Horace Mann PTA meeting. Ultimately it became clear that no design solution was going to address the concerns of the stakeholders and the focus was shifted to a search for other sites on Robertson for public parking.

Additional outreach to area real estate brokers was conducted so that the City can stay informed about opportunities to purchase appropriate public parking sites.
Meeting Date: August 7, 2012

Previous Studies

The Task Force reviewed prior studies related to the southeast including:

- Technical Assistance Panel (TAP) Report: “Energizing Wilshire Boulevard – Rexford to LaCienega” prepared by the Urban Land Institute
- Beverly Hills General Plan Topic Committee Reports
- Small Business Task Force Report of Findings

Task Force Recommendations

The Task Force, after meeting over a 9-month period, reviewing prior related studies and extensive discussion, proposed the following recommendations. The primary themes that developed include parking constraints, the need for business attraction and retention efforts, the need for programming of events and activities to enliven the area and the need to enhance mobility.

Parking

1. Designate investment funds for the revitalization of the Southeast, including the development of parking facilities.

2. Develop a Southeast In-Lieu Parking District.

Business Attraction and Retention

3. Target the remaining vacancies, including the former BMW, International House of Pancakes (IHOP), Blockbuster, Collateral Lender and other sites.

4. Coordinate with the Chamber of Commerce and the Conference & Visitors Bureau (CVB) to brand and market the area as an Arts and Entertainment District including theaters, galleries, museums and related businesses.

5. Convene property owners and brokers to share recommendations on types of businesses recommended by the Task Force.

6. Reinvigorate Restaurant Row with art galleries and a marketing program.

7. Attract a neighborhood “Trader Joe’s type” market

8. Attract a destination indoor farmers market to one of the available sites on Olympic. This concept has been successful on a larger scale at the Ferry Building in San Francisco and Oxbow in Napa.


10. Conduct business retention efforts both for strong existing businesses such as O’Gara Coach on Olympic and Restaurant Row and for unique neighborhood destinations such as Toppings and Cocina Primavera.
Meeting Date: August 7, 2012

**Programming**

11. Coordinate with the School District to incorporate school site events into the neighborhood.

12. Encourage outdoor dining and make sure all blocks have enough trash cans.

13. Introduce events such as a film festival, an art fair or food event for greater business exposure.

14. Introduce seasonal banners to identify the Southeast and its sub-districts.

**Mobility**

15. Create bike routes that connect the Southeast to other areas and install bike racks in strategic locations.

16. Introduce a trolley route between the City’s hotels and the Southeast.

17. Designate Robertson tree type and expedite ficus replacement along with other initiatives to make the area more pedestrian friendly.

18. Study the potential for diagonal parking on the west side of Robertson, between Charleville and Olympic. The concept to be evaluated would provide for: parallel parking on the east side; one northbound travel lane; two southbound travel lanes; diagonal parking on the west side. The study should also evaluate “back-in” diagonal parking.

**Additional Capital Improvements**

19. Improve the LaCienega median at the park and consider a pedestrian bridge.

20. Acquire the Los Angeles property adjacent to LaCienega Park at the northeast corner of LaCienega and Olympic for additional park space and creation of a City gateway.

21. Create a minor league baseball field at LaCienega Park, with stands for 1,200-3,000 spectators, to attract a Dodger farm team.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

One of the positive results of the Task Force’s work is that many of the recommendations are not dependent on additional funds. The commitment of staff time to work toward these goals, along with the City’s partners at the Chamber of Commerce and the CVB, is the major resource needed to start addressing these recommendations.

Exceptions include: the development of parking and other area investment, such as LaCienega Park expansion and improvements, toward which $4.675 million has been designated over the next 5 years; creation of a banner program and implementation of other marketing tools which will require funding as would a trolley program (typically not able to be self-sustaining with operating costs of $38/hour). If supported in concept, staff will develop program proposals for these efforts and return to the City Council for
Meeting Date: August 7, 2012

prioritization and confirmation of funding sources. There is sufficient funding in the current LaCienega Park capital improvement budget to address the median refurbishment.

While the recommendation to study diagonal parking on Robertson could lead to a net increase in parking, the removal of one of the two existing northbound travel lanes could have mobility impacts for the region. If the City Council directs further study of diagonal parking on Robertson, the first step would be to initiate a traffic feasibility study at an estimated cost of $30,000. This study would be funded from the Southeast Revitalization capital improvement budget created this year. Further environmental assessment costs would be likely if the concept proves feasible along with costs to reconfigure the street which are not yet known.

Further study would be required in order to know the proper scope of a feasibility study for a minor league baseball stadium at La Cienega Park and City Council direction to study this further would be needed in order to estimate the costs to pursue this idea.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the City Council direct staff to incorporate these proposed programs into the Work Plan effort designated as Implementation of Southeast Task Force Recommendations in this year's budget for Policy & Management, and to coordinate with Community Development, Community Services, Public Works, the CVB and Chamber of Commerce on the creation of related work plans. Specific City Council guidance is requested with respect to further study of diagonal parking on Robertson and exploration of developing a minor league baseball facility.

David Lightner
Approved by
Attachment 1
This Map is Provided by The City of Beverly Hills
July, 2012, All Rights Reserved
Map is for informational purposes only. All items depicted are approximate.
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INTRODUCTION

The City of Beverly Hills would like to explore the feasibility of implementing angled parking on South Robertson Boulevard between Whitworth Drive and Wilshire Boulevard within the city limits to enhance the visitor experience and potentially increase the supply of on-street parking. This study is intended to serve as a high level review of angled parking concepts for Robertson Boulevard based on the roadway characteristics and available right-of-way. This report summarizes the existing roadway characteristics and parking configuration along Robertson Boulevard and offers three preliminary design concepts for the City’s consideration.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing roadway characteristics of Robertson Boulevard between Whitworth Drive and Wilshire Boulevard were reviewed based on aerial photographs and a field visit. The existing right-of-way, lane configurations, traffic controls, on-street parking, driveways and mid-block pedestrian crosswalks were documented, as summarized below and shown in Figure 1.

- Robertson Boulevard within the City of Beverly Hills has a 54-foot cross-section with two travel lanes in each direction, parallel parking on both sides of the street (155 spaces) and exclusive left-turn lanes at the two major intersections in the study area (Olympic & Wilshire Boulevards).
- Robertson Boulevard is classified as a “Minor Arterial Street” in the City's General Plan¹, which places more emphasis on land access than principal arterials. A minor arterial street does not always have exclusive left-turn lanes at cross street intersections due to narrow rights-of-way and the need to provide on-street parking.
- The portion of Robertson Boulevard in the study area has high peak period traffic volumes, with two major arterial intersections that currently operate at Level of Service (LOS) D at Robertson Boulevard & Wilshire Boulevard and LOS E at Robertson Boulevard & Olympic Boulevard during the weekday commute periods².
- One bus line operates on Robertson Boulevard³ (Line 220 connecting to the Expo LRT Culver City Station). A total of 28 buses run on a typical weekday with 14 buses in each direction.

¹ City of Beverly Hills General Plan Updated Technical Background Report
² Westside Subway Extension FEIR shows that the existing intersection LOS is LOS D during the weekday AM and PM peak hours at Robertson Boulevard & Wilshire Boulevard and at LOS E during the weekday AM and PM peak hours at Robertson Boulevard & Olympic Boulevard. http://www.metro.net/projects_studies/westside/images/final_eir-eis/44.%20Existing%20plus%20Project%20Traffic%20Impact%20Analysis%20Report.pdf
³ Metro website at http://www.metro.net/around/maps/
FACTORS AND CONSTRAINTS
The following factors and constraints were identified to inform the design concepts for Robertson Boulevard:

- Existing roadway classification
- Roadway width, number of travel lanes, and operating conditions
- Transit routes and frequency of service
- City of Los Angeles 2010 Bicycle Plan

PROPOSED CORRIDOR CONCEPTS FOR ROBERTSON BOULEVARD
Based on the available right-of-way on Robertson Boulevard, three design concepts were developed, including two designs featuring angled parking on the west side of the street. Since angled parking would only be feasible on one side of the street due to available right-of-way, the west side was chosen for implementation because fewer driveways are located on the west side of the roadway than the east side (Figure 1 shows the driveways located along Robertson Boulevard) and the western parcels are located within the City of Beverly Hills whereas the eastern parcels are in the City of Los Angeles. The third design concept would maintain the parallel parking and provide a “complete streets” design with on-street bike lanes and a center turn lane to reduce vehicular travel speeds, reduce delays caused by vehicles making a left-turn along the corridor, and improve access for active modes.

With a 54-foot cross-section, angled parking would be possible on only one side of Robertson Boulevard and would require a reduction of travel lanes from two travel lanes to one travel lane in each direction. Therefore, the original request to retain two northbound travel lanes is not feasible. Based on the characteristics of Robertson Boulevard, a typical parking stall angled at 45 degrees from the curb and with front-in operations would take the least amount of right-of-way while allowing cars to park and maneuver safely. A 9.5-foot buffer lane would be located adjacent to the angled parking lane to allow cars to enter and exit the parking spaces without disrupting through traffic along Robertson Boulevard. During peak travel periods, vehicles may choose to drive in this lane; however, since vehicles would experience frequent delays due to vehicles entering and exiting the angled parking spaces, this lane has been identified as a “buffer area” and not a vehicular travel lane.

Robertson Boulevard between Wilshire Boulevard and Whitworth Drive currently has 155 on-street metered parking spaces, as shown in Figure 1. Table 1 summarizes the estimated on-street parking for existing conditions and each design concept. Figures 2, 3, and 4 illustrate the cross-sections and the benefits and constraints for each concept compared to the existing configuration.

---

4 Los Angeles Department of City Planning 2010 Bicycle Plan
http://planning.lacity.org/cwd/gnlpln/transelt/NewBikePlan/Txt/LA%20CITY%20BICYCLE%20PLAN.pdf
The following summarizes the key features for each design concept:

- **Concept A – Maximize On-Street Parking (Angled Parking):** This option would provide angled parking on the west side of the street for the entire study corridor, which would provide approximately 69 additional parking spaces, resulting in a 45 percent increase in on-street parking along the corridor. Implementing angled parking would require the number of travel lanes to be reduced from two lanes to one lane in each direction. The two existing travel lanes would merge into one lane on the northern end of the segment just south of Wilshire Boulevard and on the southern end of the segment just north of Whitworth Drive. Figure 2 illustrates the cross-section and summarizes the benefits and constraints for this concept.

### Table 1. Preliminary Corridor Design Concepts for Robertson Boulevard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Segment</th>
<th>Existing Parallel Parking</th>
<th>Concept A Angled Parking</th>
<th>Concept B Angled Parking for Select Blocks</th>
<th>Concept C Complete Streets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire Blvd to Charleville Blvd</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25(A)*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleville Blvd to Gregory Wy (N)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41 (A)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Wy (N) to Gregory Wy (S)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7 (A)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Wy (S) to Chalmers Dr</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29 (A)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalmers Dr to Olympic Blvd</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22 (A)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Blvd to Whitworth Dr</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29 (A)*</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total On-Street Parking Spaces by Direction</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>153 (A)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total On-Street Parking Spaces</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change in Total Parking Count</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change in Total Parking Count</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+45%</td>
<td>+22%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (A): Angled Parking; assumes 45-Degree front-in angled parking on Robertson Boulevard.
- **Concept B – Balance On-Street Parking Supply with Roadway Capacity (Angled Parking for Select Blocks):** This hybrid option would provide angled parking on the west side of the street along the middle section of Robertson Boulevard from Charleville Boulevard to Chalmers Drive where additional on-street parking can serve the adjacent retail uses. This concept would provide approximately 34 additional on-street parking spaces, resulting in a 22 percent increase in the on-street parking supply along the corridor. The roadway capacity would be maintained along the northern and southern ends of Robertson Boulevard where it connects with major intersections at Wilshire and Olympic Boulevards. The roadway would be reduced to one travel lane in each direction in the areas designated for angled parking. Figure 3 illustrates the cross-section and summarizes the benefits and constraints for this concept.

- **Concept C – Complete Streets (Maintain Parallel Parking and Provide Bike Lanes):** This option would provide one travel lane in each direction, a center turn lane to reduce delays caused by vehicles turning left, and Class II bicycle lanes on both sides of the street. Currently, there are no left-turn lanes at intersections or mid-block along Robertson Boulevard between Wilshire Boulevard and Olympic Boulevard. A left-turn vehicle intending to turn onto a side street could result in a queue on Robertson Boulevard during peak periods, and the addition of a center turn lane would facilitate the left-turn movement into properties on both sides of the corridor. This option would retain the parallel parking on both sides of Robertson Boulevard. Figure 4 illustrates the cross-section and summarizes the benefits and constraints for this concept.

Concept A and Concept B would provide additional angled parking for the Robertson Boulevard corridor. Concept C introduces new bike lanes to the corridor and adds a center turn lane to reduce delays caused by left turning vehicles along the corridor. Due to the high traffic volumes along Robertson Boulevard, the removal of vehicular lanes could result in congestion and potential shifts in traffic volumes to adjacent streets.

**BACK-IN ANGLED PARKING**

The feasibility of other angled parking options less than 45-degree, such as 30-degree parking with front-in operations, was also explored. However, 30-degree angled parking with front-in operations is not recommended due to the potential difficulty that drivers, particularly older drivers, have when backing into moving traffic. Therefore, parking angled at less than 45 degrees would operate more safely with back-in operations. Back-in angled parking provides motorists with better visibility of bicyclists, pedestrians, cars and trucks as they exit a parking space and enter moving traffic. Back-in angled parking is usually recommended for “non-arterial” streets as a traffic calming measure for locations where speeding is a problem and increased parking is needed. Given the high traffic volumes on Robertson Boulevard, implementation of back-in operations would require further investigation and engineering design review.
TRAFFIC OPERATIONS

The angled parking concepts presented above would all require some amount of travel lane reduction along Robertson Boulevard. To maximize the amount of on-street parking under Concept 1, Robertson Boulevard would be reduced from two to one travel lanes in each direction along the entire study corridor. To provide additional vehicular capacity at the two major intersections along the study corridor, angled parking was only recommended along select blocks of Robertson Boulevard under Concept 2.

Any reduction in travel lanes along Robertson Boulevard would increase the amount of congestion along the corridor during peak travel hours. Existing traffic volumes (from counts collected in 2009) are reported below.

Traffic volume on Robertson Boulevard just south of Wilshire Boulevard:
- Northbound: AM Peak Hour - 910; PM Peak Hour - 835
- Southbound: AM Peak Hour - 805; PM Peak Hour - 1,030

Traffic volume on Robertson Boulevard just north of Olympic Boulevard:
- Northbound: AM Peak Hour – 1,005 vehicles; PM Peak Hour - 905
- Southbound: AM Peak Hour – 825 vehicles; PM Peak Hour - 895

As shown above, between 800 and 1,000 vehicles travel along Robertson Boulevard in each direction in the peak hour. These volumes exceed the capacity of a single travel lane in both directions for an urban area. A reduction in travel lanes along the corridor would increase congestion along Robertson Boulevard and likely result in a shift of vehicles to parallel corridors.

CONCLUSIONS & NEXT STEPS

In summary, it is possible to replace parallel parking with angled parking on the west side of Robertson Boulevard while retaining parallel parking on the east side of Robertson Boulevard. Such a configuration would require the removal of one travel lane in each direction. Three corridor concepts were presented in this report for the City’s consideration. Concepts A and B provide additional angled parking for the Robertson Boulevard corridor. Concept C introduces new bikes lanes and a center turn while maintaining the existing parallel parking. In all three concepts, the removal of vehicular lanes could result in increased congestion and potential shifts in traffic to adjacent streets.

This study was intended to serve as a high level review of angled parking concepts for Robertson Boulevard based on the roadway characteristics and available right-of-way. If the City of Beverly Hills would like to continue to explore angled parking along this corridor, we recommend that a detailed traffic operations study be conducted to determine the potential LOS impacts along Robertson Boulevard and potential impacts caused by vehicles diverting from Robertson Boulevard into the adjacent neighborhood during peak travel periods with the reduction in roadway capacity.
54' Roadway Width
4 Travel Lanes & 2 Lanes Parallel Parking

Benefits
• No change to existing conditions

Constraints
• No parking space gain

Total Parking Spaces: 155

Benefits

Constraints

Total Parking Spaces: 155
**54’ Roadway Width**
2 Travel Lanes, Angled Parking on West Side, Buffer Lane, Parallel Parking on East Side

---

**Benefits**
- Gain 69 additional parking spaces (45% increase)
- Provision of space for potential curb extensions at intersections and mid-block crosswalk, which will reduce pedestrian crossing distance and improve pedestrian visibility
- A wider parking buffer between pedestrians on the west side of the street and through traffic

**Constraints**
- Lose one travel lane in each direction
- Could result in high peak period congestion

**Total Parking Spaces: 224**

---

**Project # File Location**: CONCEPT A: MAXIMIZE ON-STREET PARKING

---

**Legend**:
- **Travel Lane**
- **1 Hour Parking 8 AM - 6 PM (Angled)**
- **1 Hour Parking 8 AM - 6 PM (Parallel)**
- **Signalized Intersection**
- **Stop Sign Location**
- **Driveway**
- **# of Parking Spaces on Segment**
- **High-Visibility Crosswalk**

**NOT TO SCALE**
**Benefits**

- Gain 34 additional parking spaces (22% increase)
- Provision of space for potential curb extensions at intersections and mid-block crosswalk, which will reduce pedestrian crossing distance and improve pedestrian visibility
- A wider parking buffer between pedestrians and through traffic on blocks with angled parking
- Minimize vehicle impacts on blocks that maintain parallel parking

**Constraints**

- Lose one travel lane in each direction for selected blocks
- Could result in high peak period congestion on blocks with angled parking

**Total Parking Spaces: 189**
Benefits

- Reduce traffic speeds
- Additional left turn capacity at driveways and at intersections
- Would allow for implementation of City of Los Angeles bike lanes per 2010 Bike Master Plan

Constraints

- Lose one travel lane in each direction; could result in high peak period congestion

Total Parking Spaces: 155
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since 1976, the City of Beverly Hills has administered an in-lieu parking program within the Business Triangle. The program was created as an option for prospective developers, or those wishing to change the uses of existing buildings, to pay a fee in lieu of building the required amount of parking on-site. The program was intended to foster a more vibrant and sustainable business environment, and to enhance the pedestrian experience by encouraging redevelopment of properties into restaurants, retail shops, theatres, museums, and other pedestrian-attracting uses. Revenue gained from the in-lieu parking program is earmarked for provision, operation and maintenance of public parking.

The most recent update to the program came in 2013, when a pilot leasing option was introduced to allow food sales and service commercial users to pay the in-lieu parking fee as an annual “lease” rather than paying the full lump sum. This option is due to expire in October 2014.

The City is interested in assessing the performance of the in-lieu program performance and exploring potential expansion of the program to five commercial corridors within Beverly Hills with a particular focus on the Southeast Area: South Robertson Boulevard, Wilshire Boulevard, Olympic Boulevard, South Santa Monica Boulevard, and South Beverly Drive.

Nelson\Nygaard has been contracted by the City of Beverly Hills to:
- Evaluate the City’s existing in-lieu program in the Business Triangle district;
- Determine the cost and feasibility of constructing new public parking in the potential expansion areas of the in-lieu program; and
- Make recommendations on parking needs and maximizing parking resources in these expansion areas.

EXISTING PARKING CONDITIONS IN THE BUSINESS TRIANGLE

Assessment of the in-lieu program is done in the context of an understanding of wider parking conditions and policies for the City. Based on the current inventory of parking spaces, there are 11,517 parking spaces in the Business Triangle, including 584 on-street spaces, 4,474 public off-street space, and more than 6,186 private off-street spaces.

Pricing policies between these different sources of parking differ markedly. City-operated facilities are priced well below the private market values with most facilities offering free parking for one and two hours followed by an hourly rate of $6 up to a daily maximum of $22. Private garages generally charge between $6 and $15 per hour.

Despite the provision of free and below-market parking in City-operated facilities, studies show parking occupancy is close to optimal within the Business Triangle, though public perception would suggest a shortage. Based on a parking survey conducted in October 2012 by Kimley-Horn as well as more recent data on public garages, parking utilization at peak times (1 p.m. on
Thursday) was 76% on-street, 76% in private garages, and 87% in public garages, bringing total parking utilization to just 80%, which is a little lower than the target of 85% utilization and suggests that there is still a surplus of parking within the Business Triangle.

Parking occupancy is not evenly distributed, however, with some facilities at almost 100% capacity while others fall below 50%. This unevenness suggests a need for the use of parking pricing to appropriately spread parking availability throughout the district. It may also suggest the need for different strategies regarding where to place monthly parking in the area as well as improved wayfinding information to help people to find available parking spaces. It is noted that the City may have other policies and priorities that interfere with optimal utilization of parking. For example, free 1-hour parking is seen as a means of attracting shoppers and visitors to the city.

**IN-LIEU PROGRAM PERFORMANCE**

The in-lieu parking program is one tool for achieving the community vision outlined in the Beverly Hills General Plan. This vision encompasses attracting new businesses, enhancing residential quality of life, creating a built environment that enlivens pedestrian activity, and limiting negative externalities caused by vehicles. In this context, the in-lieu program is an element in Beverly Hills’ efforts to remain a competitive destination for businesses and a desirable home for residents.

Since its inception in 1976, more than $13 million has been raised by the City through the in-lieu parking program. This is equivalent to $19.1 million (in 2014 dollars) paid in lieu of 748 parking spaces. Although a great deal of public parking has been created over the lifetime of the program, the revenues from in-lieu fees have been used for parking maintenance rather than increasing parking supply since the fees collected are dwarfed by the cost of land acquisition and parking construction in this high-value urban area.

From a development and planning sense, however, the program can be viewed as a success. The relatively constant rate of participation in the program denotes that the in-lieu option has helped to facilitate investment in the Business Triangle, and has allowed the City to maintain a high standard of urban design and streetscape uninterrupted by fragmenting and unsightly parking lots or curb cuts/driveways in the sidewalk that may impede the pedestrian experience.

Based on this evaluation, a number of features of the present in-lieu parking program and wider parking policies seem to be working well:

- The City has provided parking through creative use of subterranean space and retail wrapping to mask structured above-grade parking facilities. While this is a very expensive way to provide parking, it has facilitated high rates of vehicle access with limited negative impacts to the pedestrian realm.
- The provision of installment options for payment of the in-lieu program provides flexibility for developers and lessees, and ensures a relatively consistent revenue stream for the City.
- Likewise, the new in-lieu lease option provides similar benefits to the installment option, though the low contribution rates are even less likely to generate sufficient funds to embark on potential parking-related projects.

Relative to program goals and comparable programs, there are a number of features of Beverly Hills’ in-lieu parking program that could be improved:
• Many land uses and activities are prohibited from participating in the in-lieu program, which means that developers are required to provide more parking while existing parking resources reach only 80% peak occupancy even with free and below market rates.

• The City’s current minimum parking requirements are similar to comparable communities, but not in line with industry best practice which is shifting away from minimum parking regulations and toward a market-based approach.

• The application fee for Beverly Hills’ in-lieu parking program is an order of magnitude higher than that of comparable communities.

• The in-lieu fee itself for Beverly Hills is also considerably higher than the fee in many comparable cities.

• There is a need to allow more flexible use of in-lieu revenues for projects that increase parking capacity or reduce trips in the most effective and efficient manner possible.

• One means of increasing capacity includes shared parking arrangements as a way to fill vacancies in underutilized private parking facilities before considering the development of new parking supply.

• The policy of free parking for the first one to two hours undermines the business of private operators and incentivizes driving and reparking.

• Likewise, nearly-free parking for City employees does not encourage sustainable commute patterns or reflect the cost to provide, operate, and maintain parking facilities.

PARKING AND DEVELOPMENT IN COMPARABLE CITIES

Examining the City’s in-lieu parking fees in relation to comparable cities, such as Culver City, Santa Monica, and West Hollywood, helps to gauge the impact that the program has on the regional competitiveness of the City in attracting high-end retail and desirable commercial firms.

The minimum parking requirements of Culver City (1 space per 350 sf) are equivalent to that of Beverly Hills for general office, retail, and restaurant space; however Culver City allows for businesses to enter a 10-year lease program for space in public garages at the cost of $80 per month. Over the course of the 10-year lease developers in Culver City would end up paying $23,800 to provide the required amount of parking for 1,000 sf of development (2.9 spaces) compared to payment of between $87,300 and $137,300 (based on location) for an in-lieu payment and application fee in Beverly Hills paid over four years.

Minimum parking requirements in the City of Santa Monica are slightly higher than that of Beverly Hills, but uses a scheme which charges the in-lieu parking fee based on the assessed value of new development. By using a present value rate, the fee in Santa Monica works out to $1.50/sf annually or $12,993 in a 10-year period. Santa Monica’s existing in-lieu fee program is set to expire in 2016. It will likely be replaced with a new in-lieu fee with an initial cost of $20,000 per space, which is still lower than the lowest fee offered by Beverly Hills.

The City of West Hollywood has higher minimum parking requirements than Beverly Hills and does not offer a traditional in-lieu program. Instead the City offers a parking credit program for businesses less than 10,000 square feet located within its parking district. The program is not designed to fund construction of new spaces, but to facilitate the creation of small independent businesses and restaurants. Over the course of ten years the $382.50 annual fee and $650 application fee for the credit program would cost a business $12,247—far less than the fee in Beverly Hills.
Although Beverly Hills has equivalent or lesser minimum parking requirements than that of comparable cities, its higher in-lieu fees can be seen as discouraging to small business.

**EXISTING AND FUTURE PARKING CONDITIONS IN THE EXPANSION AREAS**

The City of Beverly Hills is considering expanding the in-lieu parking program to five commercial corridors: South Beverly Drive, South Santa Monica Boulevard, South Robertson Boulevard, Wilshire Boulevard, and Olympic Boulevard. Along these corridors there is only one City-owned parking garage so on-street and private parking facilities play a more dominant role. Based on an inventory of private parking, there are almost 5,000 private parking spaces throughout the expansion areas, with many located along Wilshire Boulevard.

Occupancy data indicates that parking is most scarce along South Beverly Drive, where occupancies reach 83% in the peak (1 pm on Thursday). This occupancy level is close to ideal and suggests the need for shared parking arrangements, wayfinding and pricing aids to encourage optimal use of all parking resources. Other corridors have lower occupancies of around 70% on South Robertson, 60% on Olympic Boulevard, 50% on South Santa Monica Boulevard and 40% on Wilshire Boulevard. The distribution of parking between on-street and private off-street facilities suggests the need for integrated approaches to parking provision along these corridors such as shared parking through public private partnerships.

Calculations of the built ratio of parking (the amount of parking per square foot of development provide insight on the quantity of parking and potential blended parking rates. The built ratio of parking ranges from 0.72 off-street spaces per 1,000 square feet on South Santa Monica Boulevard (south of Wilshire Boulevard), to 2.9 off-street spaces per 1,000 square feet on South Robertson Boulevard. When translated to the equivalent square footage, all corridors except Santa Monica and Wilshire Boulevard dedicate more area to parking than land uses.

Comparisons to code requirements were misleading, with 140% of required parking provided on South Beverly where there is the lowest parking availability, and only 50% of required parking provided on South Santa Monica where there is a surplus of parking. Based on the ratio of improvements to land value, it may be possible to add between 1.74 and 2.98 million square feet of development along the expansion area, which translates to between 782 and 1,740 additional net parking spaces under a 30% build out scenario, and 2,690 to 5,550 spaces under an 85% build out scenario.

**COST AND FEASIBILITY OF CONSTRUCTING NEW PUBLIC PARKING IN EXPANSION AREAS**

As part of this study, new parking supply costs were examined in order to provide decision makers with more specific information needed to assess the feasibility of potential options. New parking supply costs include both construction and real estate costs. Construction costs for parking structures will be comparable from site to site, but real estate and land costs vary by corridor.

Several garage scenarios were developed to reflect different types of facilities (surface, above grade and below grade, with and without automated parking) and potential assemblage of parcels within the expansion areas. Based upon the CPI and Engineering Cost Index, the cost of constructing different parking facilities varies greatly depending on size and design. The lowest-
cost facility for potential opportunity sites within the study area would be a surface lot accommodating 76 stalls at a cost of $6,247 per stall ($0.48 million total). In contrast, a below grade structure could provide 159 stalls with a more appealing and efficient use of space but at a cost of $86,178 per stall (or a total cost of $10.9 million). The two facilities which provide the greatest parking capacity of 300 stalls include an above grade structure with automated operation and a combination above/below grade structure with automated operation. These facilities come at a cost of $37,523 per stall ($11.3 million total) and $49,792 per stall ($14.9 million total) respectively.

In addition to construction costs, new public parking within the expansion areas would require acquisition of land. These land costs vary according to location. The most inexpensive site is located on Olympic Boulevard, where land values are $260 per square foot ($6.4 million for a 159 stall garage). On South Robertson Boulevard, land values are somewhat higher at $420 per square foot ($9.3 million for a 152 stall garage). South Santa Monica Boulevard land values are $600 per square foot ($14.4 million for a 159 stall garage). And finally, land values on South Beverly Drive are $990 per square foot (or $21.8 million for a 159 space garage).

It should be noted that approximately $13 million in revenue has been generated by the in-lieu program since its inception in 1976. This four-decade income is insufficient to fund even the lowest cost facility when construction and land costs are combined.

DEVELOPMENT FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS

In order to determine whether developers require a parking in-lieu fee as an incentive to develop new mixed-use projects along the Robertson Boulevard and Olympic Boulevard corridors, this analysis evaluated the feasibility of developing three prototype projects under existing parking requirements and a parking in-lieu fee. Development prototypes include:

- 3-Story Mixed Use Office/Retail on Robertson Boulevard,
- 3-Story Mixed Use Office/Retail on Robertson Boulevard, and
- 3-Story Mixed Use Rental Residential/Retail on Olympic Boulevard.

The development feasibility models show the residual land value that an owner could charge for his/her site and still attract a developer. Negative land values or those that are below current market values indicate the need for subsidies or other incentives to attract desired development projects. Under current market conditions, none of the development prototypes are feasible and would require a subsidy to attract a developer.

Although expanding the parking in-lieu fee program to the Robertson Boulevard and Olympic Boulevard corridors would improve feasibility conditions, it would not make the prototype projects feasible without an additional subsidy or incentive, or changes in existing market conditions. The City could consider reducing parking requirements and/or allowing automated parking to meet parking requirements as an additional incentive.

INDUSTRY BEST PRACTICES

As Beverly Hills continues to attract high level development and businesses to the city, particularly in underserved areas, the City will need to consider new techniques to correctly price parking, provide new capacity, and raise funds for new parking. Several strategies have been used in other California cities to meet these goals.
Parking Impact Fees, such as those in Palo Alto, allow a city to collect revenue from new developments that are driving demand for additional parking and its associated impacts.

Parking Improvement Districts (PIDs), such as Austin’s Parking Benefit District, are defined geographic areas which return revenue generated from on-street and off-street parking facilities within the district to finance neighborhood improvements.

Parking Assessment Zones, such as the Old Pasadena Management District, involve defined geographic areas in which property owners are assessed in order to generate a new revenue stream, which is then leveraged for funding parking enhancements.

Parking User Fees, such as Redwood City’s Dynamic Pricing approach, establish market values for parking spaces and adjust prices according to levels of demand to ensure that a city can actively manage parking supply through all periods of the day and year.

Public-Private Partnerships, such as the shared parking arrangement between Washington Elementary School and San Diego’s Centre City Development Corporation, is an effective use of underutilized existing capacity which can save a city millions of dollars in the construction of new facilities and allow for space to be allocated to higher and more attractive uses.

These strategies could be considered for use within the potential expansion areas of Beverly Hills’ in-lieu parking program.

**ZONING STANDARDS ON ROBERTSON BOULEVARD**

Zoning standards were examined more closely in relation to potential development along the South Robertson Boulevard corridor, relative to similar corridors in Los Angeles (North Robertson Boulevard), Santa Monica (Main Street) and Palo Alto (University Avenue).

Based on this assessment, it appears that there are many potential improvements that could be made to Beverly Hills’ zoning code, including greater organization and readability. On the other hand, the City of Beverly Hills tends to be no more restrictive in categories such as height limits, minimum parking requirements, and permitted uses.

One regulation which is more restrictive in Beverly Hills is the special setback requirements that apply to South Robertson Boulevard. Combined with the City’s minimum parking requirements, these regulations determine a feasible FAR of less than 1.1 for new development along the corridor even though the maximum allowed FAR is 2. As a result, a typical restaurant and commercial development along South Robertson would be required to set aside more than 40% of the site for parking and setback, thereby limiting the potential profitability of the development. For larger restaurant-related projects, higher parking requirements apply, which lower the feasible FAR to less than 0.7, and mean that more than two-thirds of the site would be set aside for parking and setback.

If a developer is able to assemble multiple parcels (with dining and bar areas kept below 1,000 sf), greater economies of scale could be achieved to boost the ability of developers to make profit on redevelopment projects. By assembling several parcels, developers may also be able to achieve an FAR of 2 by providing subterranean parking. Given the high land values in Beverly Hills and the high cost of subterranean parking, however, parking and setback requirements may affect the viability of potential redevelopment opportunities.
Expansion of the in-lieu program would allow developers to forego this parking requirement. In addition, the City could consider revising its parking requirements as part of its efforts to encourage greater revitalization and redevelopment along these corridors.

**RECOMMENDATIONS ON PARKING NEEDS AND RESOURCES**

Based on this assessment a number of strategies are recommended for meeting parking needs and maximizing the efficient use of parking resources. These recommendations are listed below:

- Collect and use parking data to shape parking policy
- Create parking partnerships with private parking operators, schools, and abutting cities
- Reduce minimum parking requirements and give credit for more efficient parking arrangements such as automated, tandem or valet parking
- Retain the in-lieu parking program including the lease option, and expand the program to the potential expansion areas
- Allow more flexible use of in-lieu revenues for streetscape improvements, travel demand management (TDM) strategies, wayfinding, and transit enhancement in any of the in-lieu areas
- Improve parking and wayfinding aids to help motorists locate available parking more easily
- Adjust the parking pricing structure to better distribute demand between on-street and off-street, public and private facilities
1 INTRODUCTION

This study seeks to evaluate the performance of Beverly Hills’ in-lieu parking program, which is currently in place within the City’s “Business Triangle” or Central Business District. The program and its accompanying parking conditions and arrangements will therefore be examined within the district.

In addition, the study will assess the implications for potential expansion of the in-lieu parking program to five commercial corridors within the city. This assessment will consider parking utilization in these corridors, likely costs of providing new parking supply within expansion areas, and other potential parking policies that could be considered. A particular focus will be given to the Robertson Boulevard and potential zoning changes or options for that area.

STUDY AREA

Beverly Hills is one of the premier locations in the world. The city is part of the Westside Cities subregion within Southern California, surrounded by the Westside neighborhoods of Los Angeles, and West Hollywood to the east. The city is home to 34,622 residents and a thriving business district, anchored by the Business Triangle. It attracts visitors, workers, and residents from throughout the region, across the country, and around the world. This activity brings incredible vitality, which adds to the city’s attractiveness as a center for tourism, luxury retail, and high-end restaurants. It also presents a great challenge in terms of parking.

Business Triangle

The in-lieu parking program currently operates within the Business Triangle of Beverly Hills, defined as the area bounded by the centerlines of Wilshire Boulevard, Santa Monica Boulevard north roadway, and Crescent Drive. This area represents the Central Business District of Beverly Hills including a mix of offices, luxury retail stores, and high-end restaurants and entertainment destinations. The in-lieu program has been in effect in the area since the 1970s.

Potential Expansion Corridors

Five potential corridors are under consideration for expansion of Beverly Hills’ in-lieu program. Expansion Area A includes the three non-contiguous north-south commercial corridors of South Santa Monica Boulevard, South Beverly Drive and Robertson Boulevard. Potential Expansion Area B includes the two east-west corridors of Wilshire Boulevard and Olympic Boulevard. For each corridor, the study area includes commercial parcels along either side of the respective road. In most cases, commercial uses are only one parcel deep. Along the Santa Monica Boulevard corridor, however, commercial uses stretch to Durant Drive between Charleville Boulevard and S.

1 Beverly Hills Municipal Code §10-3-3301A.
Lasky Drive. Given the land use conditions in the vicinity of South Beverly Drive, that expansion area also includes the built-up commercial areas within two blocks of the road (between Charleville and Wilshire Boulevards).

**South Santa Monica Boulevard**

The Santa Monica Boulevard study corridor connects to the southwest corner of the Business Triangle at Wilshire Boulevard and extends southwest to the city limit at Moreno Drive.

The corridor has a number of low-rise retail establishments, small offices, medical clinics, restaurants, and a fitness center. Close to the Business Triangle, there are continuous, transparent and engaging building frontages on the north side, and the high-end Peninsula Hotel on the south side of the road. As one travels further to the southwest, however, shop frontages become sparser and less attractive to pedestrians or business activity. There are long stretches of blank ground floor walls, as well as vacant properties, a large parcel under construction, unsightly surface parking lots, and unwrapped structured parking facilities. All of these elements diminish the quality of the streetscape. Despite the presence of street trees and relatively low traffic volumes (as a parallel route to N. Santa Monica Boulevard), the road lacks enclosure due to its excessive width. The six-lane road features two lanes of (2-hour) on-street parking and very wide travel lanes which allow for speeding.

**South Beverly Drive**

The South Beverly Drive study corridor extends due south from the Business Triangle between Wilshire Boulevard and Olympic Boulevard.

This north-south corridor is a successful commercial district that connects directly to the Business Triangle across Wilshire Boulevard. Near Wilshire Boulevard, the corridor has mostly two-story buildings with ground floor retail and high-end restaurants. There are also a number of mid-rise office buildings and structured parking garages along the roadway. The road has four travel lanes plus angle parking on both sides of the road. On-street parking has a one-hour time limit between 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. Despite the wide traffic rights-of-way, the corridor is relatively walkable, with corner bulb-outs reducing pedestrian crossing distances at intersections and angled parking providing a buffer between pedestrians and traffic. Closest to Olympic Boulevard, the corridor’s urban design attributes break down, with blank walls and a large parking facility.

**Robertson Boulevard**

The Robertson Boulevard study corridor extends due south from Wilshire Boulevard and runs along the city’s border between Gregory Way and Olympic Boulevard.

This corridor features predominantly single-story retail uses, with a small number of two and three story office buildings. Many land uses can be characterized as older, low-end retail activities including hair and nail salons, auto repair facilities, cafés, restaurants, and several vacant properties. There is also a screened educational institution (a public school) and a number of medical clinics. The road has four to six lanes, with two-hour meter parking (between 8 a.m. and 6 p.m.) on both sides. New investment along the corridor appears to have been patchy, with buildings and landscaping in different states of disrepair.
Wilshire Boulevard

The Wilshire Boulevard study corridor extends east of the Business Triangle to the city limit at N. San Vicente Boulevard.

This corridor serves as an extension of Beverly Hills’ Central Business District, with mid-rise office buildings interspersed between older uses such as medical clinics, banks, low-rise offices, food sales, small scale retail, auto sales and repairs, and older entertainment uses such as theaters. The road has seven travel lanes during peak hours (7 a.m. – 10 a.m. and 3 p.m. – 7 p.m.), with the outside lanes available for on-street parking at other times. High traffic volumes, wide street widths, and a lack of human scale design, ground floor activity, transparency, or visual interest give the corridor the character of an automobile thoroughfare, rather than an economically vibrant destination. Several office, auto sales, and entertainment spaces along the corridor are currently vacant.

Olympic Boulevard

The Olympic Boulevard study corridor connects to the southern end of Robertson Boulevard and extends west to S. Rexford Drive.

Olympic Boulevard is a major east-west arterial road connecting Santa Monica to East Los Angeles through Beverly Hills. The commercial corridor between Robertson and Rexford Drive includes a mix of small scale retail, low-rise offices, medical clinics, private schools, auto sales and repairs, restaurants, gas stations, and car rental services. Most buildings are one to two stories high, with limited ground-floor activity and a lack of human scale design. There are also conventional strip mall developments at several intersections. Several parcels along the corridor are currently vacant or even boarded up. The road has seven travel lanes during peak hours, with a center turning lane and 2-hour metered on-street parking in the middle of the day (10 a.m. – 3 p.m.).

PARKING PROGRAM OVERVIEW

In order to address the challenge of parking, Beverly Hills has adopted a three-pronged strategy of Park-Once-and-Walk, minimum parking requirements, and an in-lieu parking program.

Park-Once-and-Walk

Under the Park-Once-and-Walk strategy, visitors leave their cars at one end of the downtown and access multiple destinations along pedestrian corridors, instead of driving between each site as happens in some other cities. This approach reduces traffic congestion associated with cruising for parking access, and adds foot traffic and economic vitality to the downtown.

On the other hand, it hinges on the assumption that most people will reach the area by car and therefore need somewhere to park. To help fulfill the high demand for parking, the City operates 19 public parking structures, 15 of which are located within the busy Business Triangle district. Most of these facilities are owned by the City of Beverly Hills’ Parking Authority. These structures have various pricing regimes including first hour free, first two hours free, meters, and pay-as-you-go. Monthly parking rates are also available for several parking facilities, with monthly rates ranging from $75 to $200. All facilities also have below-market transient rates, which means that hourly parking is charged below that of private facilities.
Minimum Parking Requirements

In addition to the city’s public parking, the City’s zoning code has minimum parking requirements for new developments or uses within the city. These requirements aim to ensure that land use changes have adequate off-street parking for use by occupants, customers, clientele, and employees. Different uses have different parking requirements. There is no requirement for pricing of parking, and in some cases, the Municipal Code specifies that parking must be free (see §10-3-2730.3C on auctions and §10-3-2730B on free validated valet parking for medical office buildings). Given the high cost of land and build-out conditions in Beverly Hills, this policy has been perceived as a deterrent to businesspeople who wish to undertake new developments or establish new uses within the city because of the high cost of building new parking spaces.²

In-Lieu Parking Program

In the 1970s, the City Council augmented its parking program with an in-lieu parking program in the City’s Business Triangle to offer developers, or those who seek to change certain building uses, the option of paying a fee in lieu of building the required parking on-site. Revenue gained from the program is to be used to fund future public parking. The city therefore achieves a more vibrant and sustainable business environment, while developers experience fewer obstacles to entering the market. In return for paying the in-lieu fee, developers receive permission to build or change uses, but they do not receive the actual physical asset of parking spaces. To meet their parking needs, they may arrange for parking in other facilities including leasing spaces from the City’s existing parking supply.

The in-lieu parking program was initially implemented in 1976, and subsequently updated a number of times including in 2013, when a pilot leasing option was introduced which allowed food sales and service commercial users to pay an annual “lease” rather than “buying out” permission to not build parking spaces under the usual in-lieu program. This pilot program was initiated at the request of an applicant seeking to open a new restaurant and jazz club, and the opportunity to seek this option is due to expire in October 2014. A detailed history of the City’s in-lieu parking program can be found in Chapter 3 of this report.

The in-lieu program is currently implemented within the Business Triangle district of Beverly Hills. As recommended in the General Plan, the program is now under consideration for wider implementation along several commercial corridors outside of the Business Triangle.³ The present study will evaluate the in-lieu parking program with a view to informing future parking investment and parking management policies within both the Business Triangle and potential program Expansion Areas.

---

³ City of Beverly Hills, General Plan Policy Cir 4.10 calls for the city to investigate potential “extension of the In-Lieu Fee Program to commercial districts throughout the City”. 
2 EXISTING PARKING CONDITIONS IN THE BUSINESS TRIANGLE

The Business Triangle has a relatively large supply of various forms of parking including on-street parking, off-street public parking structures, and off-street private parking facilities.

ON-STREET PARKING

On-Street Parking Supply in the Business Triangle

Beverly Hills’ on-street parking represents the most convenient source of parking for the large number of retail customers and visitors to the area. There are 584 on-street parking spaces within the Business Triangle. This on-street parking provides direct access to shops, creates a buffer between pedestrians and vehicle traffic, and narrows the street rights-of-way for through vehicles, which in turn, reduces vehicle speeds and creates a more pedestrian-friendly environment. In this way, high-turnover on-street parking is a tool for enhancing the sense of place and business vitality in the Business Triangle. The location of on-street parking is shown in Figure 1.

The City has implemented a rather innovative approach to its on-street metering technology by using regular single-space parking meters that have been retro-fitted with small solar panels to support coin and credit card payment. These flexible payment options further enhance the convenience of the City’s on-street parking supply, which contribute to making Beverly Hills a great place to visit.

The City’s on-street parking spaces are charged at a rate of $2 per hour between the hours of 8 a.m. and 9 p.m. While this rate is higher than that of the City’s parking garages, which are free for the first two hours, it is still substantially lower than the price charged in nearby private parking garages—between $5 and $15 per hour. If the City wishes to adopt a more consistent approach to its total parking supply, this pricing structure should be reviewed periodically and incrementally adjusted in conjunction with changes to parking fees at public and shared parking garages.

Generally, on-street parking should cost more than off-street parking but may vary by location according to average demand. Off-street public parking should be charged at a rate that is relatively consistent with market prices at private facilities.

For on-street parking spaces within the Business Triangle, time limits have been set at one hour between 8 a.m. and 6 p.m., and three hours between 6 p.m. and 9 p.m. This strategy aims to generate parking turnover through government regulation. A more market-based approach would employ dynamic pricing, where parking turnover is generated by meter prices that are set

---

6 Communications with Chad Lynn, 14 March 2014.
according to parking demand at specific times and locations. Examples of dynamic pricing are discussed further in Chapter 7.

The exception to both time limits and parking pricing is placard vehicles. In California, all vehicles with a valid Disabled Person (DP) or Disabled Veteran (DV) placard or license plate are entitled to free, time-unlimited parking in any time-limited curb zone, metered parking space, or blue curb zone. The initial rationale behind this policy was that people with disabilities may have difficulty in handling coins, turning a dialing and getting up and down unramped curbs. The initial rationale behind this policy was that people with disabilities may have difficulty in handling coins, turning a dialing and getting up and down unramped curbs. Subsequent advocates for the policy also highlighted equity arguments for the policy, since those with disabilities are overrepresented among the poor. Parking researchers have found that this state policy is detrimental to local efforts to manage parking (since it reduces on-street parking turnover), ineffective at reducing inequality, and conducive to placard fraud, which undermines accommodations for those with disabilities. Given the changes that have occurred in parking meter technology and ADA standards over the past several decades, the rationale for the policy is no longer valid.

In the absence of appropriately coded duration survey data, it is unclear how much Beverly Hills’ on-street parking supply is affected by both legitimate and fraudulent use of placards as well as scofflaw parking, but research in Los Angeles suggests that placard parking and other non-payment may constitute a significant portion of on-street parking usage by time. Information on the presence of placards or other non-payment would be beneficial in understanding the nature and scale of placard parking within Beverly Hills and should be included as a standard element of future parking duration studies in the City.

**On-Street Parking Utilization in the Business Triangle**

According to parking utilization data, peak parking occupancy for on-street parking in the Business Triangle is 76%. This data represents 1 p.m. Thursday parking utilization rates as estimated by a parking occupancy survey, which was taken over two days in October 2012 and calibrated using transactional data from the City’s IPS meters. Transactional data for metered

---


parking in Beverly Hills may underestimate actual occupancy due to the presence of placard parking and meter violations, therefore it is possible that true occupancies were slightly higher than calculated. Nevertheless, the data probably provides an adequate understanding of parking at the peak time of day, day of the week, and season of the year.

Peak parking occupancy of 76% (446 out of 584 spaces) suggests that there is only a limited amount of additional capacity in Beverly Hills' on-street parking, and therefore parking meter rates may be close to optimal under present conditions. If free parking is eliminated in public parking garages, a higher or dynamically-set meter parking fee may be required in order to maintain on-street utilization rates of around 85%.\(^\text{10}\)

On the other hand, the distribution of this parking was quite uneven across the Business Triangle during the observation periods. As seen in Figure 2, some street segments—particularly those in the western portion of the Business Triangle—were operating between 96 and 100% of capacity. Other street segments within the vicinity, however, displayed much lower occupancy rates of less than 50%. In the case of Rodeo Drive, this unevenness can be seen on either side of the same street, yet surveyors could not identify any justification (such as street sweeping or filming) for this large difference.\(^\text{11}\)

Figure 2: On-Street Parking Utilization within the Business Triangle

\(^{10}\) 85% is the target peak parking occupancy rate for parking best practice case studies including the City of San Francisco and the University of California, Davis. At this rate, the site maintains a small amount of parking availability, while maximizing the efficiency of its use of parking resources.

\(^{11}\) Communications with Brett Wood of Kimley-Horn, March 13, 2014.
In the absence of an alternative explanation, this unevenness in on-street parking occupancy suggests that there may be opportunity to employ some mix of dynamic or tiered pricing, wayfinding, and realtime parking aids to guide visitors through the area and better distribute parking demand in order to maintain an appropriate parking occupancy of one free space per street block, which is equivalent to about 85% occupancy.

**OFF-STREET PUBLIC PARKING**

**Off-Street Public Parking Supply in the Business Triangle**

Beverly Hills has twenty (20) public parking garages that provide 6,451 off-street parking spaces in different locations throughout the City. As shown in Figure 3, fifteen of these parking garages, accommodating 4,747 spaces, are located within the Business Triangle. There are another 1,385 parking off-street city-owned parking spaces within walking distance of the Business Triangle, including the City’s parking garage on Civic Center Drive, and sizable facilities on Rexford Drive, S. Beverly Drive, and W. Third Street.

Within the Business Triangle there are two basic types of off-street public parking: gated parking garages representing ten (10) facilities with 4,350 parking spaces, and metered parking lots representing five (5) facilities with 397 spaces. The location of City operated public on-street and off-street parking within the Business Triangle is shown below. Metered parking lots are located along Santa Monica Boulevard.

---

12 City of Beverly Hills, Off-Street City Parking Information, February 2014.
As shown in the table below, all City-operated gated parking facilities in the Business Triangle provide free parking for the first hour or two. This fee structure means that most of the City’s public parking supply within the Business Triangle is essentially free parking for most patrons. This usage is confirmed by statistics on parking gate entries, which is discussed in the next section.

Figure 4: Public Off-Street Parking Capacity and Pricing in Beverly Hills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Hourly fee</th>
<th>Free parking</th>
<th>Quantity Discounts</th>
<th>Hours (M-F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>345 N Beverly Drive</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7am–12am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9510 Brighton Way</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8am–9pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440 N Camden Drive</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>6am–11pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450 N Rexford Drive</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438 N Beverly Drive – 439 N Canon Drive</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>6am–1am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241 N Canon Drive – 242 N Beverly Drive</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>24 hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The provision of free public parking within the Business Triangle introduces a number of challenges in terms of parking management.

Firstly, any commodity that is provided free of charge will be over-consumed by customers, thereby resulting in an apparent scarcity of the good. While free 1- and 2-hour public parking may be desirable for encouraging parking turnover, it also encourages overconsumption of City parking facilities by those who might otherwise use alternative modes or park in private facilities. This underpricing and shifting of demand from private to public facilities undermines the economic viability of private parking operators, who have to compete with City-subsidized free parking for customers. As the use of realtime parking aids becomes more prevalent, private sector players are likely to be increasingly disadvantaged within Beverly Hills’ parking market. As discussed in the following sections, private parking garages already experience significantly lower patronage than public garages. Given these effects, the City may wish to consider alternative ways of achieving the goals of generating parking turnover and preventing parking spillovers without distorting the market through free parking.
Secondly, the provision of 1- or 2-hour free parking encourages serial reparking—where visitors and employees shuffle or move their cars every hour or two in order to avoid paying parking fees. This reparking activity increases traffic congestion and reduces garage efficiency. Increased traffic congestion, in turn, increases pedestrian exposure and reduces quality of life within the district. It also undermines the City’s policy of Park-Once-and-Walk by encouraging visitors to move their cars rather than walk between nearby destinations within the Business Triangle.

Finally, the City’s free parking policy makes it difficult to plan for future parking supplies, since there is no way of calculating the actual demand for a commodity when the usage data is based on a situation where it is given away for free.

Beyond the period of free parking, parking in the City’s gated facilities is charged at a rate of $6 per hour up to a daily maximum of between $10 and $22. In addition to daily maximums, the public garages also provide other quantity discounts in the form of flat rate early bird parking fees, flat rate evening fees, and monthly parking rates. The variety of fee structures at the City’s public garages are represented in Figure 5 below. As the parking fee increases from zero over the length of a parker’s stay, there is greater incentive to relocate one’s car in order to continue to get free parking.

Figure 5: Parking Rates by Duration of Stay at Public Parking Facilities in Beverly Hills

![Figure 5: Parking Rates by Duration of Stay at Public Parking Facilities in Beverly Hills](Source: City of Beverly Hills, Nelson\Nygaard, February 2014)
The flat, non-zero portions of this figure show flat rate quantity discounts such as daily maximums and early bird rates that are available at public parking facilities. These quantity discounts have been adopted with the goal of reducing parking spillovers to adjacent neighborhoods by making City garages more attractive. Like free parking, however, the use of quantity discounts encourages over-consumption of parking resources. In this case, those who are encouraged to over-consume parking through early bird and monthly rates are the people who would be most likely to respond to commuter subsidies and sustainable transportation improvements—employees and long-term visitors to the area. For this reason, the City may wish to reconsider policies of early bird and monthly parking rates along with alternative strategies (such as residential permit parking) aimed at reducing parking spillovers to residential areas. Evening rates may be justified on the basis of encouraging higher rates of usage during off-peak times.

In the City’s off-street metered lots, parking is charged at the rate of $2 per hour, with a three hour maximum time limit. As discussed in relation to 1- and 2-hour free parking, the use of time limits at these lots tends to encourage serial reparking and therefore undermines Park-Once-and-Walk. Best practice parking management relies on dynamic pricing rates to generate optimal parking turnover, with no time limits.

**Off-Street Public Parking Utilization in the Business Triangle**

According to parking utilization data from 2012 to 2014, peak parking occupancy for off-street public parking in the Business Triangle is 87% (4,113 out of 4,747 spaces). This data represents 1 p.m. parking utilization rates taken over several months. Other than the metered parking, which may be slightly underestimated (as discussed above), the ticket data from public parking garages would provide a more accurate view of utilization for the peak time of day, day of the week and season of the year though it does not provide information on usage patterns such as exiting the garage to repark.

Based on a rate of 87%, the City’s parking garages are operating at close to optimal levels. However, as shown in Figure 6 this capacity is unevenly distributed—with one garage near Rodeo Drive and a couple of the metered lots close to 100% full during the peak while many other facilities are operating at only 0-50% capacity during the peak. Occupancy rates in the Business Triangle monthly parkers and vehicle storage, which could potentially be reassigned by the City.

---

13 Correspondence with Timothea Tway, 4 April 2014.
In order to better distribute parking demand across the area, the City may wish to consider the addition or improvement of its realtime parking aids and wayfinding tools to guide visitors to the appropriate parking facility and maintain 15% availability at all facilities. The City may also wish to set parking fees at slightly different rates within different parking garages in order to encourage better distribution of parking. In general, garages that are further from the center of town should have the lowest fees, and on-street parking should have the highest.

Garage ticketing data indicates that most of those parking within the public parking garages are receiving free tickets for parking under one or two hours. In 2013, free parking represented 72% or 2.48 million parking entries. As discussed previously, a significant portion of this usage likely represents people reparking their vehicles in order to stay within the free parking period. In order to establish a more healthy parking market and provide consistency with the City’s Park-Once-and-Walk policy, a consistent hourly parking rate would be preferable.

Figure 7 shows the ratio of paid to free parking use in off-street public parking for the last five years, illustrating a steady increase in non-paying entries.
In 2013, the City generated $5.51 million from paid parking in its off-street parking garages. A shift to hourly rates would result in lower utilization for public garages, but higher revenue collection per entry. This shift would enable private garages to better compete within the city, and would provide a more consistent message to customers in relation to parking once and walking.

Source: City of Beverly Hills, Nelson\Nygaard, February 2014
OFF-STREET PRIVATE PARKING

Off-Street Private Parking Supply in the Business Triangle

In addition to on-street parking and public garages, the Business Triangle has 39 private parking facilities that have been identified through a parking inventory effort thus far. This includes facilities that are open to the public, in addition to small surface lots that are associated with private businesses. These facilities provide 6,186 parking spaces for customers, employees and visitors to the district, bringing the total public and private parking space count to 11,517. The private parking inventory is in progress and may underestimate the actual number of private parking spaces within the study area.

A number of additional parking facilities can be found within walking distance of the Business Triangle—particularly on the southern side of Wilshire Boulevard. While these facilities may not provide optimal access to land uses within the district, they may provide back-up capacity during times of extra high demand such as special events.

Figure 9: Private Off-Street Parking Locations within the Business Triangle

The pricing structure for privately held garages differs dramatically from that of public garages in the Business Triangle. This difference is illustrated in Figures 10 and 11, which may be compared with public parking pricing in Figures 4 and 5.

14 City of Beverly Hills, GIS Data, February 2014.
Figure 10: Private Off-Street Parking Pricing in the Business Triangle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Hourly fee</th>
<th>Free parking</th>
<th>Early bird flat fee</th>
<th>Evening flat fee</th>
<th>Daily max</th>
<th>Monthly rate</th>
<th>Hours (M-F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9777 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Valet Parking Service</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7am-6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9725-9735 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Imperial Parking Industries</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15.75</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6am-6:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Center, 465 N Roxbury Dr</td>
<td>Unified Valet Parking</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8am-6:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441 N Roxbury Dr</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:30am-7pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435 N Roxbury Dr</td>
<td>Modern Parking</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$16.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:30am-6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9701 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Standard Parking</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7am-7pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Roxbury, 450 N Roxbury Dr</td>
<td>Standard Parking</td>
<td>$8.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6am-8:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415 N Bedford Dr</td>
<td>Modern Parking</td>
<td>$8.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$16.50</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7am-7:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9665 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>LAZ Parking</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7am-4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436 N Bedford Dr</td>
<td>Modern Parking</td>
<td>$8.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$16.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:30am-6:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 N Bedford Dr</td>
<td>Hodes Parking</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8am-6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9601 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>$9.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$18.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5am-11:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433 N Camden Dr</td>
<td>Central Auto Parks</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6am-7pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9595 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Standard Parking</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8am-6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Medical Arts, 414 N Camden Dr</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>$8.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$18.90</td>
<td>$174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7am-7pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468 N Camden Dr</td>
<td>Modern Parking</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8am-5:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417 N Rodeo</td>
<td>Hodes Parking</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7am-6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436 N Rodeo Dr</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:30am-6:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rodeo Collection, 421 N Rodeo Dr</td>
<td>Hodes Parking</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7am-6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenquest Properties, 499 N Canon Dr</td>
<td>Hodes Parking</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8am-6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire Beverly Center, 9465 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$20.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7am-9pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodeo Drive Public Parking, 9471 Dayton Way</td>
<td>Hodes Parking</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9475 Brighton Way</td>
<td>Allied Parking Services</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11am-6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9355 S Santa Monica Blvd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$2/2h</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 hours?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Rodeo Parking, 9480 Dayton Way</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>2 hrs</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td>7am-12am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421 N Beverly Dr</td>
<td>Towne Park</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$22.50</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:30am-8pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9440 Santa Monica Blvd</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7am-6:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village On Canon Parking, 301 N Canon Dr</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>$8.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$16.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7am-12am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to compete with public garages offering free first hour parking, most privately held lots... offer more attractive daily rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Hourly fee</th>
<th>Free parking</th>
<th>Early bird flat fee</th>
<th>Evening flat fee</th>
<th>Daily max</th>
<th>Monthly rate</th>
<th>Hours (M-F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beverly-Canon Gardens Parking, 235 N Canon Dr</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>2 hrs</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253 N Canon Dr</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8am-5pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270 N Canon Dr</td>
<td>Valet Parking Service</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12</td>
<td></td>
<td>9am-5pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 N Canon Dr</td>
<td>Ace Parking</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>validn</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td></td>
<td>$14</td>
<td></td>
<td>9am-12am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9359 Brighton Way</td>
<td>Express Valet Parking</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$8/2h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGM Place Parking, 9472 Dayton Way</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>7am-12am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunrise Assisted Living, 201 N Crescent Dr</td>
<td>Hodes Parking</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6</td>
<td></td>
<td>8:30am-4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Grand Passage, 345 N Crescent Dr</td>
<td>Valet Parking Service</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>7am-10pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platinum Equity &amp; Paradigm, 373 N Crescent Dr</td>
<td>Express Valet Parking</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>7am-11pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills North Buildg, 415 N Crescent Dr</td>
<td>Standard Parking</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14</td>
<td></td>
<td>8am-6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9355 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>1h w validn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ParkMe Parking Information, March 2014

In contrast to the public garages which offer free parking for the first hour or two, only three of the 39 privately-held facilities offer free 1- or 2-hour parking. Typical hourly rates at privately held garages are also significantly higher than that of private facilities, ranging from $6 per hour—the maximum hourly rate for public garages—to $15 per hour.

This difference in parking rates gives a competitive advantage to City-owned lots, particularly for those who intend to park for short durations or are willing to repark their car every couple of hours. In order to compete with public garages offering free first hour parking, most privately held lots therefore offer more attractive daily rates of between about $14 on the low end to about $22 on the higher end (with a number of facilities falling outside of that range). This strategy targets those who stay in the district for longer durations, but do not visit frequently enough to invest in the cheaper monthly parking that is offered by the City-owned facilities. The difference in pricing strategies results in different utilization of private and public parking facilities. Private facilities typically reach daily maximum occupancy (which is lower than capacity) within two to three hours, whereas City lots take as long as five to six hours to reach their daily maximum occupancy.
The price difference between public and private players in Beverly Hills’ parking market skews both parking demand and economic performance of private actors in the market. This results in underutilization of private facilities while City lots are closer to capacity. As realtime parking aids and parking-related navigation devices become more prevalent, the City’s competitive advantage may put stress on public garages while other parking resources remain underutilized.

**Off-Street Private Parking Utilization in the Business Triangle**

As suggested by pricing differentials, there is a large amount of underutilized capacity in privately held parking facilities. During peak observation periods, most of the city’s privately-held facilities (that were accessible to surveyors) had parking occupancies of 50-75%. Those within the western portion of the Business Triangle were more likely to have slightly higher occupancies than those in the east. Private parking facilities to the south of Wilshire Boulevard are generally underutilized, with peak occupancies of less than 75%.

The relatively low occupancy rates at private parking facilities suggests that there is potential to more efficiently use the city’s parking resources through strategies such as shared parking.
Figure 12: Private Off-Street Peak Parking Utilization in the Business Triangle
3 EXISTING IN-LIEU PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

POLICY FRAMEWORK

Parking is a major concern within Beverly Hills. And yet, the provision of an ample supply of low-cost parking is a means to an end, and not an end in itself. The more fundamental ends of business vitality, residential quality of life, and efficient circulation are outlined in key policy documents such as the City’s General Plan.

General Plan

The Beverly Hills General Plan establishes a community vision of the types of values, procedures, and physical elements on which future growth and development will be based. The General Plan outlines key community goals within Beverly Hills, including the following goals that are relevant to this study:

- Encouraging symbiosis between a vibrant business community and the residential quality of life
- Attracting new businesses in existing industries and new industries
- Locating and designing buildings to energize and enliven pedestrian activity, especially in the business triangle and the commercial corridors
- Using the scale of development to foster a sense of place and identity rather than a sense of anonymity
- Moving vehicles into, out of, or through Beverly Hills as expeditiously as possible
- Limiting negative effects caused by vehicles (Beverly Hills, 2010, pp. 20, 66, 103)

As described in the General Plan, parking contributes to these goals in several ways. It helps employees and clientele to access businesses within the city, and it helps reduce cruising congestion on the streets. On the other hand, the cost of building parking can impede new private investment and regeneration of the city.

The Beverly Hills General Plan outlines several policies which hold the potential to mitigate the conflict between creating districts that offer a highly attractive walking environment while simultaneously providing sufficient parking.

- Policy ES 3.3 encourages strong public transportation links throughout commercial corridors that connect to the Business Triangle.
- CIR 4.9 supports measures that work to reduce parking demand and the space required for parking.
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- CIR 4.1 proposes implementation of Transportation Demand Measures to reduce the need to expand parking facilities in light of future developments and further growth.
- CIR 4.7 aims to manage parking costs in order to discourage single occupant vehicle trips.
- LU 11.6 seeks to expand parking supply in underserved commercial districts.
- LU 11.7 requires commercial and office districts to be linked to parking areas and garages.

The above policies in the Beverly Hills General Plan confirm that the city recognizes the need to manage parking demand and encourage sustainable travel patterns, particularly to and from the Business Triangle. At the same time, the community desires more parking capacity or parking options for underserved commercial corridors outside of the Business Triangle.

**Municipal Code Parking Requirements**

In addition to providing public on-street and off-street parking, the City requires applicants for the development of new structures and those seeking to establish new uses for existing structures to provide a supply of off-street parking spaces “to accommodate the motor vehicles used by the occupants, customers, clientele, and employees of such structure[s] or use[s]” (Municipal Code §10-3-2730).

**Parking Minimums**

The City’s minimum parking requirements are articulated in the City’s Zoning Code (Municipal Code §10-3-2730), which specifies development standards and regulations for specific categories of land uses and activities.

The City requires many commercial uses such as offices and retail use to provide one off-street parking space per 350 square feet of development—equivalent to 2.9 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of development.

A number of land uses have higher parking standards as specified under the zoning code and displayed in Figure 13. For example, public assembly areas are required to provide one space per 28 square feet (36 spaces per 1000 sf); eating and bar facilities larger than 1,000 square feet in floor area are required to provide one space per 45 square feet of floor area (22 spaces per 1,000 sf); and exercise clubs are required to provide one space per 100 square feet (10 spaces per 1,000 sf).

In some cases, lower rates of parking provision are required. For example, medical offices and laboratories are required to provide one space per 20 square feet of floor area; and outdoor dining on public rights-of-way do not require any additional parking. Additionally, the Planning Commission may waive parking requirements for outdoor dining on private property.
Figure 13: Beverly Hills’ Off-Street Parking Requirements for Selected Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Off-Street Parking Spaces Required</th>
<th>Spaces/1000 sf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial uses not otherwise specified</td>
<td>1 space per 350 sf floor area</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public assembly areas without seats</td>
<td>1 space per 28 square feet</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater, auditorium, public assembly (includes secondary schools)</td>
<td>1 space per 4 seats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating and bar facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total dining and bar area of 1,000 sf or more:</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First 9,000 sf: 1 space per 45 square feet</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond 9,000 sf: 1 space per 65 square feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total dining and bar area of less than 1,000 sf:</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 space per 350 sf floor area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor dining on public right-of-way:</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no additional parking required(^{15})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise club</td>
<td>1 space per 100 sf floor area</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>1 space per rentable room/unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary schools and childcare (excluding family daycare homes)</td>
<td>1 space per classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical office</td>
<td>1 space per 200 sf floor area(^{16})</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical laboratory</td>
<td>1 space per 200 sf floor area(^{17})</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1 space per 500 sf floor area</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>1 space per 1500 sf floor area</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses not mentioned</td>
<td>Greater of the number of spaces required for a “similar” use or 1 space per 500 sf floor area</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{15}\) The Planning Commission may also waive the parking requirement for outdoor dining on private property.

\(^{16}\) Medical office buildings constructed before December 6, 1989, that received building permits before December 16, 2005, to restrripe parking areas to increase the number of parking spaces and permit additional medical floor area in the building, shall maintain on site free validated valet parking for all medical patrons and maintain posted signage in the parking garage and all medical offices indicating the availability of free validated valet parking for patrons as required by the zoning code at the time such projects were permitted. Any building area converted to medical use on or after December 16, 2005, which relies on a valid restrripe permit shall also comply with these requirements.

\(^{17}\) This provision is rarely used, however, buildings constructed after July 1999 may provide parking for medical laboratory uses at less than 1 space per 200 square feet of floor area upon the granting of a minor accommodation and provided the parking ratio is at least 1 space per 350 square feet. Buildings constructed before July 1999, with an existing parking ratio that satisfies the city’s 1961 parking requirements, may satisfy the 1 space per 200 square feet requirement for new medical laboratory use by any combination of tandem and compact spaces, and restripping provided a parking attendant is present whenever access to the site is permitted. Any building constructed before July 1999, with an existing parking ratio that satisfies the city’s 1961 parking requirements, but less than 1 space per 200 square feet may convert commercial space to medical laboratory space upon the granting of a minor accommodation.
Parking in Mixed Use or Joint Use Areas

For mixed-use projects, “the total requirements for off-street parking shall be the sum of the requirements for the various uses” (Municipal Code §10-2730D). The City’s additive approach to mixed use development parking requirements means that in planning for off-street parking supply, developers are not able to take advantage of the potential parking and transportation advantages associated with mixed-use environments. For example, mixed use commercial environments tend to result in lower parking demand due to the time-of-day differences in parking demand (between, say, offices and restaurants), as well as the increased likelihood that patrons of one use will walk or at combine trips (trip chain) within the area.

This characteristic is partially addressed in the joint use clause of the parking code. Under this clause, the Planning Commission may authorize the shared or joint use of off-street parking facilities. Up to fifty percent (50%) of the parking facilities of a use considered to be primarily a daytime use may be used to satisfy the parking facilities required by this article for a use considered to be primarily a nighttime use. The Planning Commission may also grant reduced parking in certain circumstances. While these accommodations address time-of-day differences in parking demand they do not systematically reflect the trip reduction effects associated with mixed use development.

Requirement Purpose

The off-street parking requirements in the Beverly Hills municipal code appear to have been established with the objective of requiring individual applicants to fully accommodate all of the potential demand for parking associated with their proposed use(s) on-site. The broader intent of many other local municipalities in adopting similar off-street parking requirements was to ensure that the demand for vehicle access and parking associated with any new structure, use, or activity in the area does not unduly reduce the accessibility of adjacent and nearby land uses and establishments by private vehicle (principally by ensuring that trips attracted to new uses within a given district would not have reason to utilize the available supply of on-street and public off-street parking in the nearby area). Other, more effective means for achieving these goals include actively managing the use of on-street and public off-street parking by enforcing time limits, issuing a limited supply of parking permits, and charging market-based prices for parking.

The City of Beverly Hills does not currently require private land owners/users to charge for off-street parking, and in fact requires the provision of access to parking free of charge to users in limited circumstances. Providing free parking is often a condition of approval for projects.
THE IN-LIEU PARKING PROGRAM

1976 Origins of the In-Lieu Parking Program

Beverly Hills’ in-lieu program was one of the first to be implemented in the United States. The program was introduced in 1976 because the built-up character of the Business Triangle meant that there was little vacant land for individual property owners to develop privately owned parking areas, and the lots that were available were too small for parking development. As a result, the cost of providing individual private off-street parking on or adjacent to improved properties was considered prohibitive for many property owners.

The City therefore passed an ordinance to allow property owners to pay a fee in-lieu of providing off-street parking that was required under the Municipal Code. The program was limited “to uses which are either retail or are necessary for the development of comprehensive retail trade within the District...” The initial version of the program adopted a case-by-case approach for estimating in-lieu fees. Under this approach, a developer who wished to participate in the program was required to pay a fee that was determined by dividing the current assessed land value of the site area by the square footage of the site and multiplying the result by seven hundred and fifty (750), provided that the payment was not less than $5000 nor did it exceed $10,800 per parking space. The calculation of the assessed land value was based on the land column of the County’s Local Assessment Roll, as clarified in a 1978 amendment of the law. This resulting value was adjusted annually based on an index of construction costs in the Los Angeles area, as published by the Engineering News Record (ENR). In addition to paying the in-lieu fee, participants in the program were required to pay an annual maintenance fee of $100 per in-lieu parking space. In exchange for this fee, they received parking permits or stickers that entitled them to park in a city-owned parking facility.

Between 1976 and 1982, the program generated 14 development projects associated with 122 in-lieu parking spaces (averaging 17.4 spaces per year).

1980s In-Lieu Fee Calculations

To provide greater rigor in the way that the in-lieu fee was calculated, the City introduced a new fee calculation process in 1983 and further amended this process in 1989 and 1991. Under this process, a developer who wished to participate in the program would file an application and initial fee to request notification of the applicable in-lieu fee. The City then estimated the fee based on an appraisal of the high, low, and median value of comparable properties within a 300-foot radius of the site. These values were used to estimate the land value of parking, with each parking space assumed to consume 60-square feet, plus 15% for administrative costs.

In addition to the land value, the in-lieu fee included the cost of constructing parking spaces within municipal parking structures, which was estimated at $13,000 in 1983 and adjusted annually based on the ENR index of construction costs. For food sales and service commercial

---

18 Beverly Hills Ordinance 76-O-1608, effective June 17, 1976.
19 Beverly Hills Ordinance 76-O-1608, effective June 17, 1976.
activities, the construction portion of the in-lieu fee was set at 35% of the estimated parking construction costs.

As before, an annual maintenance fee was also imposed for in-lieu participants, and this was set at $300 per year. Property owners were then required to provide one hour validated parking for paying customers who parked at municipal facilities.

While this new process may have improved the accuracy of in-lieu fee calculations, it was complex, costly, and time-consuming for developers. Often it took four to six months for the City to estimate the fee and notify the developer. After receiving notification of the fee, developers regularly appealed to the City for a reduced fee, adding further time and costs associated with commercial development in Beverly Hills. Developers also faced uncertainty under the program, since the length of delay and resulting fees varied quite dramatically from one project to another. This uncertainty, time, and cost may have discouraged development in Beverly Hills during this period. This version of the in-lieu parking program generated development associated with 82 in-lieu parking spaces over 10 years, which is about half the rate of participation in the earlier program.

During this period a 1991 Amendment allowed for two new payment options: The first option allowed for payment in 25% installments over a 4-year period, and the second allowed restaurant lessees or sublessees to pay the fee in 10 equal installments over a 10 year period.

Between 1983 and 1993, the program generated 5 development projects associated with 82 in-lieu parking spaces (averaging 7.5 spaces per year).

1994 Amendment

Due to the problems of uncertainty and variability associated with the previous version of the in-lieu program, the city updated the language and structure of the in-lieu parking program in 1994. The updated version transformed the in-lieu fee to a uniform per-space fee for participating projects, with different fee tiers for new construction or reconstruction in three locations—Rodeo Drive ($25,000 per space in 1993), Beverly Drive ($20,000 per space in 1993), and elsewhere ($15,000 per space in 1993). The ordinance also provided discounted rates for land uses that were more desirable for attracting foot traffic and retail customers such as theaters (50% of the above rates) and food sales or service commercial use (35% or $6,070 in 1993), and it allowed for museum uses and adaptive reuse of historic buildings to participate in the program.

Since the in-lieu fee has always been applicable to different types of commercially zoned property, its impact varies dramatically. The Municipal Code minimum parking requirements require most commercial uses to provide 2.9 spaces/1000 square feet, whereas new restaurants are required to provide 22 spaces/1000 square feet. This means that restaurant developments, which generate high levels of foot traffic and street vitality and are desirable to the City, tend to pay higher in-lieu fees because of their higher minimum parking requirements.


fees because of their higher minimum parking requirements—even after factoring in the 65% discount for food sales and service commercial uses.

Between 1994 and 2012, the program generated 34 development associated with 477 in-lieu parking spaces (approximately 25.1 spaces per year). Participation rates varied dramatically from year to year with peak participation in 2000 (138 spaces), 1999 (93 spaces) and 2006 (60 spaces).

**2013 Lease Option**

At the request of an applicant seeking to develop a new restaurant and jazz club, a new payment structure was recently introduced for the in-lieu parking program. Under this pilot program, food sales and service commercial users are entitled to opt for a leasing arrangement, whereby lessees or sublessees pay an annual in-lieu fee in perpetuity for the life of the business, instead of purchasing in-lieu parking spaces. The annual in-lieu lease is equivalent to 50% of the in-lieu fee amount that would be paid under the 10 equal installment payment option in the code, with payments made in perpetuity for the life of the business.

Since 2013, the program has generated 67 in-lieu parking spaces (averaging 33.5 spaces per year). So far, one development (Spaghettini) has adopted the lease option for 59 in-lieu parking spaces.

**How the In-Lieu Fee Works Today**

Today’s in-lieu parking program in Beverly Hills is reflected in the Municipal Code Sections 10-3-3301 – 3318. Under this program, participants may opt to pay a fee in-lieu of providing the minimum level of off-street parking required under the Municipal Code. The fee permits the developers to build new developments, or permits lessees to change building uses to more parking-intense uses without building the requisite off-street parking. Instead, they pay into a special in-lieu parking district fund that finances future development, operation and maintenance of shared public parking spaces within the city.

**Applicable Land Uses and Changes of Use**

The in-lieu parking program applies to commercially-zoned property that is 16,000 square feet or less, with a floor-to-ground area ratio of 2:1 or less, and a height not to exceed 45’ or three stories if the building was built after June 16, 1976. Properties larger than 16,000 square feet are allowed to participate in the program if they are to be used for museum uses or for adaptive reuse of historic buildings. These size and bulk restrictions impose a de facto limit on the extent to which one can substitute the required parking with the fee.

Land uses that are permitted to participate in the program include general retail sales commercial activities, convenience sales and service commercial activities, food sales and service commercial activities, equipment rental and leasing services, museum uses, and historic places.

Excluded uses include a range of commercial office uses, including legal, medical, dental, financial, banking, savings and loans, reservations, travel agencies, communication services, research, consultative, real estate, insurance, and administrative office purposes. Other excluded uses include auto-oriented short order eating places; eating establishments that do not primarily provide full table service to their customers; motor vehicle sales and rental; equipment rental and

---

leasing services for vehicular, heavy duty equipment or sanitation units; manufacturing; repairs; wholesale sales; construction sales and service; and adult entertainment businesses.

Fee Type and Amount

For those participating in the program, the in-lieu fee is a sliding fee that is based on the location and types of land use. As outlined in Figure 14, the fee is highest along Rodeo Drive, with an intermediate rate for Beverly Drive, and a lower rate for other areas within the Business Triangle.

New construction or reconstruction is associated with the highest in-lieu fees of $47,007.40, $37,605.80 and $28,284.60 for Rodeo Drive, Beverly Drive and elsewhere respectively. Theater uses within existing buildings have a rate set at 50% of the above levels, while expansion of food sales and service commercial uses have a flat in-lieu fee of $11,675. Museums or historical places, which are likely to generate attraction without unreasonably depleting parking resources, may receive a whole or partial fee waiver as allowed by the City Council or Planning Commission.
Figure 14: Beverly Hills’ In-Lieu Fee Rates, 2013/14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of use or development</th>
<th>In-Lieu Fee per parking space for additional floor area or reconstruction</th>
<th>Associated provisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rodeo Drive</td>
<td>Beverly Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New construction or reconstruction</td>
<td>$47,007.40</td>
<td>$37,605.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater with existing building</td>
<td>$23,503.70</td>
<td>$18,802.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum uses and adaptive reuse of historic buildings listed on the National Registry of Historic Places</td>
<td>$0 – $47,007 i.e. possible fee waiver</td>
<td>$0 – $37,606 i.e. possible fee waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of Food sales &amp; service commercial (eating establishments that primarily provide full table service to customers)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion of Food sales &amp; service commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Beverly Hills FY 2013-14 Schedule of Taxes, Fees and Charges

---

25 Beverly Hills Municipal Code §10-3-3310
26 Beverly Hills Municipal Code §10-3-3310
27 Beverly Hills Municipal Code §10-3-3311
28 Beverly Hills Municipal Code §10-3-3310
29 This estimate assumes a CPI of 3% for the 10-installment plan.
30 Beverly Hills Ord. 13-O-2644, 9/10/2013
Approval Process

In general, participation in the in-lieu program involves submission of an application to the Director of Community Development to assess whether the proposal is eligible for participation. The application must be accompanied by payment of a program application fee, which is in addition to any in-lieu fee that is charged should the application be successful. The application fee covers the City’s cost to process the application.

The application for participation in the in-lieu program is then scheduled for public hearing before the Beverly Hills Planning Commission (at the same time that other aspects of the proposal are considered). For restaurant uses involving 10 in-lieu parking spaces or fewer, the Community Development Director may approve an application for participation without going through a public hearing process. The Director may also administratively approve up to 10 spaces at a lower cost to the applicant.

Approval is given based on satisfaction of the following criteria:

- Participation will promote harmonious development and will not adversely affect current and future development in the area.
- Participation will not create significant negative traffic impacts, pedestrian-vehicle conflicts or parking impacts.
- Participation will not be detrimental to public health, safety and welfare.

Payment Options and Duration

Three options exist for paying in-lieu parking fees. Development owners must pay the in-lieu fee over four years. Lessees or sublessees also have flexibility of paying over ten years or in perpetuity.\(^\text{31}\)

Firstly, the fee may be paid within a four-year period using four equal installments of 25% of the in-lieu parking fee. The first installment is due before the change or expansion takes place or before the certificate of occupancy is issued. The remaining three payments are due annually on the anniversary of the first installment. No interest accrues on the unpaid balance, but the balance is annually adjusted to account for inflation based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI), not to exceed 10% per year. Early payment is credited with a discount to the present monetary value of the payment otherwise due.

The second option for payment of the in-lieu fee is available for lessees or sublessees of restaurants in existing buildings, where the lease is 15 years or less and the building owner or lessee does not have a direct or indirect beneficial interest in the restaurant. In this case, the in-lieu fee may be paid within a 10-year period using ten equal installments of 10% of the in-lieu fee plus the equivalent of the CPI adjustment (in equal payments over the ten years). The first installment is due before the change or expansion occurs or before the certificate of occupancy is issued. The remaining nine payments are due on the anniversary of the first installment. CPI adjustment is not to exceed 10% and early payments are

\(^\text{31}\) Beverly Hills Municipal Code §10-3-3313
IN-LIEU PROGRAM COSTS AND FUNDS

Program Costs

The costs of administering the in-lieu parking program are covered under the program application fee of $11,625.40 per applicant. Therefore the program does not impose any additional program costs on the City of Beverly Hills.

As outlined in Chapter 4, other cities have implemented in-lieu parking programs or parking credit programs as part of a wider economic development strategy that is funded by the City’s general revenue. Depending on the relative importance of this goal, the City of Beverly Hills may wish to transfer some of the costs of program administration from potential developers to economic development functions within the City.

Program Funds

Consistency of revenues

On average the in-lieu parking program has been associated with 20 spaces per year, however, demand for in-lieu parking varies substantially from year to year in line with fluctuations in the surrounding economy. Annual in-lieu program participation is indicated in Figures 15.
As a result of reforms to the in-lieu program, the average adjusted fee per space associated with Beverly Hills’ in-lieu parking program has become more consistent from year to year. The annual adjusted average fee was calculated as the mean in-lieu fee for all in-lieu spaces approved within a particular year. Since 1976, the average in-lieu fee charged to developers was $33,000 with CPI adjustment. Using a polynomial trend line, the adjusted average fee risen and fallen, with recent averages close to $40,000.

This narrowing of amplitude can be seen in Figure 16, which displays annual average fee charged to participants of the in-lieu program. This chart calculates the annual average in-lieu fee based on the total revenue divided by total spaces associated with the in-lieu parking program each year. The greatest volatility in this fee rate can be seen between 1982 and 1995, when the annual average in-lieu fee rate ranged from a low of $5,269 per space for two spaces in 1989 (equivalent to $9,939 in 2014 dollars) to a high of $56,188 per space for two spaces in 1995 (equivalent to $86,242 in 2014 dollars).
Use of revenues

In accordance with the Municipal Code, revenues that are generated from the in-lieu program are deposited in a special “in-lieu parking district fund” that is to be “used exclusively for the purpose of acquiring, developing, operating, and maintaining off-street parking facilities to serve the in-lieu parking district”.32

Given the goal of using in-lieu revenues for parking supply, it is useful to understand the level of volatility or consistency in in-lieu revenues.

As discussed above, in-lieu fee rates that are charged to individual developers have become more consistent over the last ten years. This consistency allows for better planning of projects to be funded by the program.

On the other hand, the total revenue generated by the in-lieu parking program tends to vary dramatically according to the surrounding economic mood and the ease or difficulty of obtaining credit. For example, 2009 saw development associated with only two in-lieu parking spaces, whereas 60 in-lieu parking spaces have already been approved in 2014.

Over the long-term, however, there is no apparent trend either upward or downward in relation to revenues from the in-lieu program. Instead, average revenues have remained relatively constant.

---

32 Beverly Hills Municipal Code §10-3-3312
at a little more than $500,000 per year for new developments associated with the in-lieu parking program. This is reflected in the approximately trend line in Figure 17.33

Figure 17: In-Lieu Program Participation Rates Based on Associated Revenues, 1976-2014

In total, $13,009,336 in revenue has been raised the in-lieu parking rate. This is equivalent to adjusted revenue of $19,125,099 (in 2014 dollars) for 748 spaces. Although much parking has been developed by the City over the past four decades, the in-lieu program revenues have not been sufficient to fund the large acquisition and construction costs associated with building parking garages. Instead, the in-lieu program revenues have been generally directed toward maintenance costs associated with the City’s public parking supply.

**Development and Other Impacts**

Given the relatively constant rate of participation in Beverly Hills’ in-lieu parking program, the program can be seen as having a positive effect on facilitating development and regeneration of the Business Triangle. More detailed analysis of development costs and impacts will be outlined in the pro-forma analysis.

The presence of the in-lieu program has also allowed Beverly Hills to maintain a high standard of urban design and a streetscape that is uninterrupted by disjointed and unsightly parking lots.

33 City of Beverly Hills, In-Lieu Parking Data, February 2014. Please note that actual revenues received by the City will lag behind the participation rates shown above due to processing time and the use of installment and lease options for payment of in-lieu fees.
The program has therefore facilitated near-continuous and interesting shop frontages throughout much of the Business Triangle, which in turn promotes higher rates of foot traffic, more vital businesses, and a more pleasant street environment.

By reducing the number of parking spaces that is required to be built by individual developers, the in-lieu program may be associated with a lower parking ratio per square foot of development. Lower rates of parking provision are, in general, associated with lower rates of travel demand and higher rates of participation in park-once-and-walk. As discussed previously, however, this effect may be counteracted by the City’s parking pricing, which tends to encourage serial over-parking and re-parking within the Business Triangle.

**IN-LIEU PROGRAM EVALUATION**

The Beverly Hills in-lieu program has been operating for almost four decades and has undergone a number of shifts in terms of how the fee is calculated over that time. The current program is evaluated here in terms of what has worked, what needs some improvement, and what needs substantial improvement for the program as it operates within the Business Triangle. This evaluation incorporates the program analysis covered in this chapter as well as an assessment of comparable communities (in Chapter 3) and industry best practices (in Chapter 7).

**What is working?**

1. **Innovative provision of parking**

Beverly Hills has provided a large supply of parking for current uses within the Business Triangle. The innovative use of subterranean space allows for a high level of motor vehicle access and efficient use of space within the Business Triangle. It also minimizes disruptions to shop frontages that result from other types of parking arrangements.

The wrapping of parking facilities with ground floor retail in some locations also helps to minimize negative impacts on the local streetscape and maximize foot traffic and the effectiveness of the Park-Once-and-Walk strategy. On the other hand, the requirement to wrap parking with retail reduces surface level space available for parking facilities and makes above ground and below ground parking inevitable, thereby adding greatly to the cost of public and private off-street parking. This parking design approach therefore contributes to achieving the City’s goals of quality of life, but has mixed results in terms of business vitality. Any further parking capacity expansion should maintain these high building-form standards, while carefully assessing the need to construct new parking capacity relative to other options such as shared parking arrangements.

2. **Installment Options**

The in-lieu fee program provides developers and (sub)lessees with the option of paying the fee in installments over four-years or 10-years respectively. This installment payment structure provides some flexibility to developers and lessees who participate in the program, and ensures a relatively consistent revenue stream for the city.

The trade-off that occurs with this payment structure is that the City does not receive funds for addressing parking impacts at the time when the impact occurs. Given that the key goal of the program is to encourage property improvement and regeneration, this seems to be a reasonable tradeoff for the program.
3. In-Lieu Lease Option

The lease payment option presents similar trade-offs to the installment options, but this option is less in the interest of the City since the annual contributions of around 5% of the in-lieu fee are unlikely to generate sufficient funds to embark on potential parking-related projects. Also, since the lease option lasts only for the life of the business, it is not clear this option will generate the anticipated funds in either the short- or long-term.

On the other hand, the lease option provides property lessees the flexibility to make in-lieu payments over a longer time period, which may allow them to redevelop properties sooner than they might otherwise. This payment option may therefore be seen as beneficial in meeting the program goals of attracting pedestrian-oriented development. If minimum parking requirements are reduced, there may be less need for lessees to use this payment option.

What needs improvement?

1. Excluded Uses

As outlined in Section 10-3-3304 of the Municipal Code, a number of land uses or activities are specifically excluded from participating in the in-lieu program. These excluded activities include the following:

   “...commercial office use, including, but not limited to, legal, medical, dental, financial, consultative, real estate, insurance, and administrative office purposes or manufacturing, repairs, reservations, banking, savings and loans, travel agencies, financial services, communication services, research, wholesale sales, auto oriented short order eating places, eating establishments that do not primarily provide full table service to their customers, construction sales and service and adult entertainment businesses...”

The above uses were excluded on the basis of the in-lieu program goal of enhancing the retail experience and pedestrian activity within the Business Triangle.34

On the other hand, the exclusion of these uses represents lost opportunities for encouraging more sustainable travel behavior and more efficient use of parking resources since developers are forced to build abundant parking supplies anyway. The result is that employers or businesses forego one of the greatest incentives to encouraging more sustainable commute patterns (namely realization of cost savings) while undermining other efforts to encourage the use of alternative modes. Since the private parking supply in the Business Triangle is underutilized, the exclusion of these uses imposes an unnecessary cost on businesses in the area because developers are forced to build parking spaces that sit idle.

2. Minimum Parking Requirements

The City’s current minimum parking requirements are similar to those of comparable communities such as West Hollywood, Santa Monica, and Culver City. On the other hand, these requirements are not in line with industry best practice, which is shifting toward reduction or elimination of minimum parking requirements. For mixed use districts similar to the Beverly Hills Business Triangle and commercial corridors, industry best practice also reflects the

---

34 Beverly Hills Municipal Code §10-3-3305
synergistic benefits of different peak parking demand by hour, day or season. This may occur through reduced parking requirements or use of blended parking rates.

In terms of its impacts on the in-lieu parking program, a reduction in minimum parking requirements is likely to result in lower participation in the in-lieu program as the parking supply is right-sized. Such a strategy would likely be even more effective than the in-lieu program in terms of encouraging economic development since it would reduce the costs of development as well as the administrative burden associated with participating in the in-lieu program.

3. In-Lieu Application Fee Level

In order to apply for the in-lieu fee, applicants need to submit an application fee of $11,625.40. This fee is more than an order of magnitude higher than application fees for in-lieu programs in comparable communities.

4. In-Lieu Fee Level

Since 1976, the average fee that has been paid by developers participating in the program is $22,764, which is equivalent to $33,477 when adjusted to 2014 dollars.

This fee level is substantially higher than comparable programs. As comparable locations become more competitive, the high cost of Beverly Hills’ in-lieu fee could therefore be expected to hinder potential economic regeneration of the downtown area.

In reconsidering the fee level, the City should focus on the key goals of the program, which are to encourage improvement of properties and generate pedestrian and retail activity (as outlined in the Municipal Code). A lower in-lieu fee rate would support both of these goals.

5. Flexibility in the Use of In-Lieu Funds

Currently the Municipal Code stipulates that the in-lieu fund is to be used exclusively for the acquiring, developing, operating, and maintaining off-street parking facilities in the in-lieu district. This requirement limits the potential use of the in-lieu fee and limits the City’s efforts to use the community’s resources in the most effective and efficient manner possible. By focusing exclusively on off-street parking, this stipulation also conflicts with industry best practice and may potentially undermine the achievement of Beverly Hills’ broader stated community goals.

For this reason, the city should amend requirements for use of the in-lieu program funds. The proposed code amendment would allow the city greater flexibility in using the in-lieu funds to pay for a range of potential strategies that maximize the efficient use of parking resources, and replace motor vehicle trips with walking, bicycling, and transit trips. Specific options to consider included in the amendment are listed below:

- leasing of privately held spaces that are currently underutilized
- wayfinding and access to alternative parking facilities
- real-time information on parking availability
- improvement of pedestrian and bicycle facilities to and within the area
- travel demand management (TDM) strategies that result in trip reduction
- contributions to efforts that increase transit access, enhance shuttle services, and provide commuter subsidy programs within the study area
- possible restriping of parking facilities to increase capacity
6. Providing Parking through Shared Parking

As discussed more thoroughly in Chapter 7, it is always better to increase the efficiency of how the current supply of parking is used than to simply build more parking. The City therefore should consider ways to fill parking vacancies, particularly those in underutilized private parking garages, before considering the development of new parking supply. This might include shared parking arrangements or lease arrangements with private parking providers.

Shared parking arrangements would allow the City to save money associated with new parking provision. It may also allow for more efficient provision of new parking, since the cost of new spaces tends to be lower if it is undertaken in conjunction with an existing development proposal for the area.

7. Free Parking in the Business Triangle

Like any commodity, if parking is provided for free, it will be over-consumed by customers. When a free commodity is over-consumed, the provider of this commodity will either find it difficult to keep pace with demand or spend more money on the free commodity to the detriment of their other goals.

For Beverly Hills’ city operated parking facilities, the practice of providing free parking for the first hour or two creates a subsidy to one player within the parking market (the City), which disadvantages other players (private parking operators). This makes it difficult for private operators to function in a sustainable business manner. Some private parking players are required to match the City’s first-hour free policy as part of their Development Agreement, but most private parking operators do not provide such a discount and therefore attract fewer patrons. In this way, the City’s free parking policy undercuts private parking providers while encouraging excessively high rates of parking and reparking within City-owned garages. With an increase in the use of real-time aids and apps for parking, this distinction is likely to result in even further disadvantage to private competitors in the future.

From a parking policy perspective, the 1- and 2-hour free policy also undermines broader community goals that are associated with the Park-Once-and-Walk approach. These goals include quality of life, business vitality, pedestrian activity, limiting negative vehicle effects, and enhancing sense of place. The free parking policy undermines these goals by encouraging visitors and employees to either prematurely leave the city or repark every two hours in order to maintain free parking. The resulting cruising traffic increases downtown congestion, degrades the quality of urban life, and detracts from business activity in Beverly Hills.

A final problem created by the non-competitive nature of Beverly Hills’ parking market is that it prohibits city planners and administrators from gaining an understanding of actual parking demand or determining optimal levels of parking supply.

8. Free City Employee Parking

As discussed previously, parking is a commodity which costs money to provide, operate, and maintain. To reflect this cost, parking for City employees and officials should be operated in the same manner as other parking garages, where those who choose to park, pay to do so or receive a financial reward for not doing so. The current price of approximately $1 per month for City employees fails to reflect the cost of providing this parking or the benefits that the City gains...
when employees choose to commute using alternative modes. In order to set an example of efficiency and send a consistent message to employees and others, the City should consider a parking program for City employees and officials that includes parking charges and incentives to encourage alternative modes of travel.
4 PARKING AND DEVELOPMENT IN COMPARABLE COMMUNITIES

Retailers and office users looking for a premier location compare Beverly Hills to a select group of cities within Los Angeles County. This section uses city parking data along with market lease rate data from loopnet.com, an online listing of commercial real estate data, to compare Beverly Hills’ parking requirements, in-lieu fees, and market lease rates to those in Culver City, Santa Monica, and West Hollywood, to determine the comparability of the cities, as well as to provide a basis for understanding how changes to Beverly Hills’ existing in-lieu fee program could impact its regional competitiveness.

In cases where the comparable city requires in-lieu payments over multiple years, this analysis uses a present value calculation to compare the cost of one-time payments to a series of required annual payments. Present value calculations use a discount rate to show the total value of a stream of periodic payments in today’s dollars. In this case, a 2.7 percent discount rate, based on the ten year U.S. Treasury rate, is used to calculate the present value of a stream of annual payments required elsewhere and compare it with the in-lieu fee payment required in Beverly Hills, which can be paid in four annual installments.35 In the case of ongoing monthly or annual payments that would continue throughout the life of a business or building, the present value calculation assumes that a developer would hold a property and make the periodic payments for ten years before selling the property.

CULVER CITY

Culver City is emerging as a place for retail, office and entertainment in the Westside subregion of Southern California. As it grows and attracts new upscale restaurant and creative office users, it will compete more with places like Beverly Hills, West Hollywood, and Santa Monica.

The proposed Platform retail development, for example, will bring new designer boutiques and celebrity chef restaurants to Culver City. In addition, Culver City has emerged as a center for creative office spaces in Los Angeles. Its recent emergence as a destination for both office and retail follows the opening of the Culver City Metro Station.

Parking Requirements

Culver City’s parking requirements are equivalent to Beverly Hills’ requirements for general office, retail, and restaurant spaces. Thus, there is no differential or preference based on parking

---

35 Because money loses value over time, and the City of Beverly Hills does not charge interest for paying the in-lieu fee over the allowable four-year period, developers have a financial interest paying in installments, rather than paying the entire fee up front. For payment calculation purposes, this analysis assumes that developers would choose to pay in installments.
Culver City currently offers a much lower parking fee through its lease program than Beverly Hills offers through its in-lieu fee program.

In-Lieu Fee Programs

Culver City currently has a parking in-lieu program that considers fees for commercial uses on a case-by-case basis; however, to date the City Council has not approved any in-lieu parking applications. Rather, the City typically enters a 10-year lease for public garage spaces with businesses at a cost of $80 per space, per month. In order to compare the monthly cost of renting a public space in Culver City with the City of Beverly Hills’ in lieu fee, this analysis compares the present value of renting garage space in Culver City for ten years with the City of Beverly Hills’ in lieu fee payment paid over four years.

Figure 18: Parking Requirements in Beverly Hills and Culver City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Beverly Hills</th>
<th>Culver City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1 space per 350 square feet</td>
<td>1 space per 350 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1 space per 350 square feet</td>
<td>1 space per 350 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>1 space per 350 square feet</td>
<td>1 space per 350 square feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: City of Beverly Hills; City of Culver City; BAE, 2014.

Culver City currently offers a much lower parking fee through its lease program than Beverly Hills offers through its in-lieu fee program.

Figure 19: In-Lieu Fee Programs in Beverly Hills and Culver City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Application Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
<td>$28,284.60 - $47,007.40 in four payments</td>
<td>$11,625.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver City</td>
<td>$80/space monthly</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: City of Beverly Hills; City of Culver City; BAE, 2014.

Using a present value calculation to compare the cost of the two programs over a ten-year period allows for the comparison of renting a space in Culver City over ten years with paying an in lieu fee over four years in Beverly Hills. Using an annual discount rate of 2.7 percent, and multiplying the number of spaces required for 1,000 square feet of building space shows that parking leases would cost developers $23,800 over ten years in Culver City, compared to in lieu fee payment of $87,300 - $137,300 over four years in Beverly Hills.

---

36 Parking in-lieu fees in Beverly Hills vary by location.
37 Based on the 10-year US Treasury Rate as of March, 2014.
38 Both Culver City and Beverly Hills require 2.9 spaces to serve 1,000 square feet of commercial space.
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Figure 20: In-Lieu Program Costs in Beverly Hills and Culver City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Present Value of Fee and Application for 1,000 sf</th>
<th>Number of Spaces</th>
<th>Discount Rate</th>
<th>Number of Years/Payments Compared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
<td>$87,265 - $137,334</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver City</td>
<td>$23,759</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: City of Beverly Hills; City of Culver City; US Treasury 10-yr rate; BAE, 2014.

Currently, Culver City’s parking policy indicates a stronger interest in filling its current public parking than constructing new parking spaces. If Culver City continues to improve its competitive position to the point where new parking spaces are required to meet demand, it may increase its parking fees and/or begin approving parking in-lieu applications.

Commercial Lease Rates

Although Culver City’s office and retail markets are becoming more attractive, its lease rates are significantly lower than Beverly Hills’s annual lease rates, indicating that Beverly Hills is a stronger market than Culver City.

Figure 21: Commercial Lease Rates in Beverly Hills and Culver City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Beverly Hills Annual Lease Rate/Sf</th>
<th>Culver City Annual Lease Rate/Sf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$44.28</td>
<td>$39.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>$77.49</td>
<td>$42.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Loopnet.com; BAE, 2014.

Comparability to Beverly Hills

Culver City is only beginning to compete with Beverly Hills for new commercial uses. Currently, Beverly Hills and Culver City have very different identities that factor into developer or business location decisions. Because this analysis is focused on parking requirements and programs offered in competitive cities, it does not account for differences in land values, identity, overall attractiveness, demographics, or economic base, all of which impact a city’s desirability to developers and businesses. It only considers parking costs and requirements, which represent one factor in a developer or business’ location decision.

Although Culver City and Beverly Hills have comparable parking requirements for general commercial uses, Culver City currently offers a much lower parking fee through its lease program than Beverly Hills offers through its in-lieu fee program. Thus, businesses that are parking-cost sensitive may prefer to locate in Culver City, all else equal. However, if Culver City continues to improve its regional prominence as a retail and office destination, it will likely need to increase its lease rates and/or codify its in-lieu fees, reducing its competitive position relative to Beverly Hills, all else equal.

In addition, higher lease rates in Beverly Hills could reflect higher parking costs, as well as a stronger overall market. Once Culver City exhausts its available parking stock, the cost of constructing parking and/or an in-lieu fee may be passed on to tenants in the form of increases in lease rates, making Culver City less attractive relative to Beverly Hills, all else equal.
SANTA MONICA

The City of Santa Monica competes with Beverly Hills as both a retail and office destination. Santa Monica’s 3rd Street Promenade and Main Street shopping districts are internationally renowned, along with Beverly Hills’ Golden Triangle district. Most recently, Santa Monica is attracting high-tech and venture capital firms, making it a very desirable office location. As Santa Monica’s cachet as an office destination increases, it will continue to compete with Beverly Hills’ Wilshire corridor as a highly sought after office location.

Parking Requirements

Santa Monica’s parking requirements are higher than Beverly Hills’ requirements. The following table shows the parking requirements most applicable to the existing and new parking in-lieu fee programs. Appendix B shows the City of Santa Monica’s detailed parking requirements per land use.

Figure 22: Parking Requirements in Beverly Hills and Santa Monica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Beverly Hills</th>
<th>Santa Monica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1 space per 350 square feet</td>
<td>1 space per 300 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1 space per 350 square feet</td>
<td>1 space per 300 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>1 space per 350 square feet</td>
<td>1 space per 300 square feet (inside the BSCD, C3, and C3C districts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: City of Beverly Hills; City of Santa Monica; BAE, 2014.

As the table shows, Santa Monica requires 1 space per 300 square feet of retail and office space, compared to one space per 350 square feet in Beverly Hills. Thus, if users were required to deliver the required parking spaces, those users that are relatively parking-cost sensitive would prefer to locate in Beverly Hills, all other things being equal.

That being said, strong participation in Santa Monica’s in-lieu fee program has allowed the downtown to set a lower target parking ratio of 1 space per 500 square feet (or 2 spaces per 1,000 square feet). This is a significantly lower rate of parking provision than that required under the municipal code of either Santa Monica or Beverly Hills.

In-Lieu Fee Programs

The City of Santa Monica charges a parking in-lieu fee based on the assessed value of new development. Commercial uses inside of the Downtown Mall Assessment District, which is bounded by 2nd Street to the west, 4th Street to the east, Wilshire Boulevard to the north, and Broadway Avenue to the south, can currently pay $1.50 per square foot annually as a parking in-lieu fee. In order to compare Santa Monica’s annual in lieu fee payments to Beverly Hills’ in lieu fee, this analysis calculates the present value of Santa Monica’s annual in-lieu fees paid over ten years to compare with the City of Beverly Hills’ in lieu fee payment paid over four years.
Figure 23: In-Lieu Fees in Beverly Hills and Santa Monica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Application Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
<td>$28,284.60 - $47,007.40</td>
<td>$11,625.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>$1.50/sf annually</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: City of Beverly Hills; City of Santa Monica; BAE, 2014.

Using a present value calculation allows for the comparison of paying in lieu fees in Santa Monica over ten years with paying in lieu fees in Beverly Hills over four years. Using an annual discount rate of 2.7 percent\(^{40}\), and multiplying the number of spaces required for 1,000 square feet of building space\(^{41}\), shows that developers would pay $13,000 in in-lieu fees in Santa Monica over ten years, compared to payment of $87,300 - $125,700 over four years in Beverly Hills.

Figure 24: In-Lieu Parking Costs in Beverly Hills and Santa Monica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Present Value of Fee and Application</th>
<th>Number of Spaces</th>
<th>Discount Rate</th>
<th>Number of Years/Payments Compared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
<td>$87,265 - $137,334</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>$12,993</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: City of Beverly Hills; City of Santa Monica; US Treasury 10-yr rate; BAE, 2014.

Santa Monica’s existing in-lieu fee is set to expire in 2016. Once it expires, the City Council has voted to implement a new parking in-lieu fee at an initial cost of $20,000 per space, which is lower than the in-lieu fees under Beverly Hills’ existing in-lieu program.\(^{42}\) Like in Beverly Hills, developers would be able to pay the fee over four annual installments, which will increase annually based on a construction cost index. It will also be voluntary and apply to changes in use as well as new development. After 2016, Santa Monica’s in lieu fee will remain less than Beverly Hills’ fee.

Figure 25: In-Lieu Parking Costs in Beverly Hills and Santa Monica after 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Application Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
<td>$28,284.60 - $47,007.40</td>
<td>$11,625.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>$20,000 in four payments</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: City of Beverly Hills; City of Santa Monica; BAE, 2014.

---

\(^{39}\) Parking in-lieu fees in Beverly Hills vary by location.  
\(^{40}\) Based on the 10-year US Treasury Rate as of March, 2014.  
\(^{41}\) Santa Monica currently requires 3.3 spaces per 1,000 square feet of commercial space, compared to 2.9 spaces in Beverly Hills.  
Commercial Lease Rates

Santa Monica’s office and retail lease rates are higher than Beverly Hills’s annual lease rates, indicating that Santa Monica is a stronger market than Beverly Hills.

Figure 26: Lease Rates in Beverly Hills and Santa Monica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>and Use</th>
<th>Beverly Hills Annual Lease Rate/Sq.Ft.</th>
<th>Santa Monica Annual Lease Rate/Sq.Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$44.28</td>
<td>$57.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>$77.49</td>
<td>$81.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Loopnet.com; BAE, 2014.

Comparability to Beverly Hills

Although Beverly Hills has lower parking requirements for general commercial uses, the City of Santa Monica’s new in-lieu fee that begins in 2016 will continue to offer a lower parking in-lieu fee than Beverly Hills offers, and is partially subsidized by local Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) and other stakeholders in return for offering 90-minute free parking. As local market lease rates show, Santa Monica has strong retail and office markets. Because its new in-lieu fees will remain below Beverly Hills’ and visitors will continue to enjoy free parking, Santa Monica will maintain its competitive position relative to Beverly Hills, all else equal.

WEST HOLLYWOOD

The City of West Hollywood competes with Beverly Hills for office and high-end retail uses. With compact high-end shopping corridors along Melrose Avenue and Sunset Boulevard, West Hollywood and Beverly Hills share an international reputation as shopping destinations.

Parking Requirements

West Hollywood’s parking requirements are higher than Beverly Hills’ requirements. The following table shows the parking requirements most applicable to the existing and new parking in-lieu fee programs. Appendix B shows the City of West Hollywood’s detailed parking requirements per land use.

Figure 27: Parking Requirements in Beverly Hills and West Hollywood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Beverly Hills</th>
<th>West Hollywood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>2.9 spaces per 1,000 square feet (1 per 350 square feet)</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>2.9 spaces per 1,000 square feet (1 per 350 square feet)</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>2.9 spaces per 1,000 square feet (1 per 350 square feet)</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: City of Beverly Hills; City of West Hollywood; BAE, 2014.

As the table shows, West Hollywood requires 3.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet of retail and office space, compared to one space per 350 square feet in Beverly Hills. Thus, if users were required to
deliver the required parking spaces, those users that are relatively parking cost-sensitive might prefer to locate in Beverly Hills, all other things being equal.

**In-Lieu Fee Programs**

The City of West Hollywood does not have an in-lieu program, per se. It offers parking credits on a first come, first served basis to those businesses under 10,000 square feet that are located within its parking district, which is bounded by Santa Monica Boulevard, Melrose Avenue, San Vicente Boulevard, and Robertson Boulevard. As the following table shows, credits cost $382.50 annually, with an application fee of $650, compared to Beverly Hills’ in-lieu fee, which costs $28,284.60 - $47,007.40 paid over four years, depending on the business’ location, and application fee of $11,625.40. In order to compare West Hollywood’s annual credit payments to Beverly Hills’ in-lieu fee, this analysis calculates the present value of West Hollywood’s annual credit paid over ten years to compare with the City of Beverly Hills’ in-lieu fee payment paid over four years.

**Figure 28: In-Lieu Fees in Beverly Hills and West Hollywood**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Application Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
<td>$28,284.60 - $47,007.40 over four years</td>
<td>$11,625.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hollywood</td>
<td>$382.50 annually</td>
<td>$650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: City of Beverly Hills; City of West Hollywood; BAE, 2014.

Using a present value allows for the comparison of paying for parking credits in West Hollywood over ten years with paying a single in lieu fee in Beverly Hills. Using an annual discount rate of 2.7 percent, and multiplying the number of spaces required for 1,000 square feet of building space, shows that parking credits would cost developers $12,200 over ten years in West Hollywood, compared to in lieu fee payment of $87,300 - $137,300 over four years in Beverly Hills.

**Figure 29: In-Lieu Parking Costs in Beverly Hills and West Hollywood**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Present Value of Fee and Application</th>
<th>Number of Spaces</th>
<th>Discount Rate</th>
<th>Number of Years/Payments Compared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
<td>$87,265 - $137,334</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hollywood</td>
<td>$12,247</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: City of Beverly Hills; City of West Hollywood; US Treasury 10-yr rate; BAE, 2014.

Unlike a traditional in-lieu fee program, West Hollywood does not anticipate that its credit program will deliver new spaces. Rather, it sets the parking credit low to encourage small businesses to locate in West Hollywood that otherwise could not afford parking costs, either in new developments or after a change in use. The City sets the number of available credits every six

---

43 Parking in-lieu fees in Beverly Hills vary by location.
44 Based on the 10-year US Treasury Rate as of March, 2014.
45 West Hollywood currently requires 3.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet of commercial space, compared to 2.9 spaces in Beverly Hills.
months, typically around 300 available credits. Once the credits are exhausted, new businesses must provide parking per City requirements. City staff indicate that parking credits are usually fully allocated within four to six weeks from availability. Thus, West Hollywood currently provides a less expensive option for delivering parking than Beverly Hills when credits are available; however, they are in high demand and quickly exhausted.

**Commercial Lease Rates**

West Hollywood’s office and retail lease rates are comparable but slightly lower than Beverly Hills’s annual lease rates, indicating that although they compete for users, Beverly Hills is a stronger market than West Hollywood.

**Figure 30: Lease Rates in Beverly Hills and West Hollywood**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Beverly Hills Annual Lease Rate/Sq.Ft.</th>
<th>West Hollywood Annual Lease Rate/Sq.Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$44.28</td>
<td>$41.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>$77.49</td>
<td>$70.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Loopnet.com; BAE, 2014.

**Comparability to Beverly Hills**

Although Beverly Hills has lower parking requirements for general commercial uses, the City of West Hollywood currently offers a much lower parking fee through its credit program than Beverly Hills offers through its in-lieu fee program. Once the parking credits are exhausted, which happens within four to six weeks, new businesses in West Hollywood must provide onsite parking, making Beverly Hills’ program more competitive for small businesses and other users that either do not have the space onsite or the financial capacity to provide parking space.

Parking requirements and costs also factor into the cities’ market lease rates. If developers must construct parking or pay for in-lieu fees when they build new commercial or change existing uses, they will pass along as much of those costs to tenants as the market allows. Thus, the market lease rates reflect the existing parking conditions in West Hollywood and Beverly Hills. Higher lease rates in Beverly Hills could partially reflect higher parking costs. However, higher lease rates and relatively low vacancies in the Golden Triangle indicate that Beverly Hills has a stronger overall market, and its ability to attract tenants has not been impacted to date by parking costs.

**CONCLUSION**

Although Beverly Hills has the highest parking fees of all four cities considered, its strong retail and office markets indicate that developers and businesses are not foregoing Beverly Hills for other locations. Beverly Hills’ office and retail markets remain more competitive than West Hollywood and Culver City. However, it is less competitive than Santa Monica from a parking fee perspective, and will remain so once Santa Monica’s new in-lieu fees take effect.
5 EXISTING AND FUTURE PARKING CONDITIONS IN THE POTENTIAL EXPANSION AREAS

The City is interested in exploring the potential for expansion of the in-lieu program to five corridors within Beverly Hills. Potential Expansion Area A includes the three non-contiguous north-south commercial corridors of South Santa Monica Boulevard, South Beverly Drive and Robertson Boulevard. Potential Expansion Area B includes the two east-west corridors of Wilshire Boulevard and Olympic Boulevard.

For each corridor, the study area includes commercial parcels along either side of the respective road. In most cases, commercial uses are only one parcel deep. Along the Santa Monica Boulevard corridor, however, commercial uses stretch to Durant Drive between Charleville Boulevard and S. Lasky Drive. Descriptions of the potential expansion areas are provided in Chapter 1.

Parking supply and demand varies from corridor to corridor. This chapter outlines the existing supply of parking in each corridor along with the existing parking demand, which is estimated using three different metrics: actual demand ratios, built ratios and code comparisons. Following this analysis, an assessment of future demand is undertaken based on likely redevelopment potential along the corridor.

EXISTING PARKING SUPPLY

On-Street Public Parking

Within the expansion areas, there is considerably less public parking than the Business Triangle. In total, there are 650 public parking spaces, including both on-street and off-street supplies. On-street parking constitutes the major component of public parking supplies.

On-street parking is particularly important along the north-south corridors of South Santa Monica Boulevard, South Beverly Boulevard and Robertson Boulevard where there are 142, 138 and 74 on-street spaces respectively (see Figures 31). There is almost twice as much on-street parking on South Beverly Drive as Robertson Boulevard due to the use of an angle-parking configuration for part of the street. Despite its very wide right-of-way, streetscape features such as this angle-parking, corner bulbouts, and street plantings produce both ample convenient parking and a relatively walkable environment along South Beverly.

On-street public parking is much more limited on the east-west corridors of Olympic Boulevard (5 spaces) and Wilshire Boulevard (60 spaces) due to clearway conditions during certain hours of the day.
Figure 31: Public Parking in the Potential Expansion Areas

Data Sources: City of Beverly Hills
Off-Street Public Parking

In contrast to the 19 public parking garages within the Business Triangle, there is only one city-operated garage in all five corridors of the expansion areas. This 233-spaces facility is located on South Beverly Drive near Charleville Boulevard. As shown in Figures 32 and 33, the South Beverly garage has a similar pricing structure to city-operated facilities in the Business Triangle, with 2-hours of free parking, followed by an hourly rate of $6 up to a daily maximum of $22.

Figure 32: Public Off-Street Parking Capacity and Pricing in the Expansion Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Hourly fee</th>
<th>Free parking</th>
<th>Quantity Discounts</th>
<th>Hours (M-F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>216 S Beverly Drive</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>Early bird flat fee</td>
<td>6am–12am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evening flat fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321 S La Cienega Blvd</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>6am–11pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Beverly Hills, Off-Street Parking Information, February 2014

Figure 33: Parking Rates by Duration of Stay at Public Parking Facilities in Beverly Hills

Off-Street Private Parking

Given the limited supply of public parking, the main source of parking within the expansion areas is private lots, privately owned garages, and other parking facilities associated with private developments. The total supply of private parking within the expansion areas is 4,891 spaces, 7.5 times the number of public on- and off-street spaces. The location of these facilities is shown in Figure 34.
Figure 34: Private Off-Street Parking in the Potential Expansion Areas
The bulk of these facilities are located along the Wilshire Boulevard, where there are 31 facilities, charging between $4 and $12 per hour up to a daily maximum of between $12 and $21. A substantial number of off-street facilities also exist along South Beverly Drive: there are 9 facilities, charging between $5 and $12.50 per hour up to a daily maximum of between $15 and 36 per day. South Santa Monica Boulevard corridor has two facilities, with hourly rates at $8 to $9 and daily rates at $9 and $23. The other three corridors have no off-street parking facilities, though one could feasibly use facilities at the corner of Wilshire and Robertson for accessing destinations in the northern segment of South Robertson Boulevard.

In addition to paid parking facilities that are noted here, there are a number of surface spaces located in the rear of land uses along each of the corridors. These lots along with paid parking facilities are displayed in Figure 35.

**Figure 35: Private Off-Street Parking Pricing in the Expansion Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Hourly fee</th>
<th>Free parking</th>
<th>Quantity Discounts</th>
<th>Hours (M-F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Santa Monica Boulevard Corridor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hilton, 9876 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Self Parking</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9811 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Allied Parking Services</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td></td>
<td>$38.00</td>
<td>8am-7pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Beverly Drive Corridor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Bank, 9460 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Parking Management Services</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>0.5 h</td>
<td></td>
<td>9am-8pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9454 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Imperial Parking Industries</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>6:30am-10pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9460 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Parking Management Services</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>0.5 h</td>
<td>$16.25</td>
<td>9am-10pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 S. Rodeo Drive</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>8am-6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280 S. Beverly Drive</td>
<td>Parking Management Group</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17.50</td>
<td>8am-6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 S. Beverly Drive</td>
<td>Parking Management Group</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>8am-6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314 S. Beverly Drive</td>
<td>Parking Management Group</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>9am-5pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315 S. Beverly Drive</td>
<td>LAZ Parking</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td></td>
<td>$36.00</td>
<td>8am-7pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 S. Beverly Drive</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>$12.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>7am-7pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Robertson Boulevard Corridor (at Wilshire)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire/Robertson Lot, 150 S Clark Dr</td>
<td>Hodes Parking</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td></td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>8am-5:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8750 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Hodes Parking</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>6:30am-7pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Hourly fee</th>
<th>Free parking</th>
<th>Early bird flat fee</th>
<th>Evening flat fee</th>
<th>Daily max</th>
<th>Monthly rate</th>
<th>Hours (M-F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire Boulevard Corridor</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>$7.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16.50</td>
<td>$175-$225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7am-8pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9320 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9300 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Modern Parking</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$15.75</td>
<td>$192</td>
<td></td>
<td>8am-6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9250 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Modern Parking</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>8am-6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9171 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Imperial Parking Industries</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>7am-7pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire Palm Office Bldg, 9150 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>8am-7pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9100 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>7:30am-6:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9100 Wilshire Blvd (on Doheny)</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>$7.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$15.60</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$198</td>
<td>6am-10pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9107-9111 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Imperial Parking Industries</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>7am-8pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9090 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>7am-6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9101-9111 Parking, 140 S Doheny Dr</td>
<td>Imperial Parking Industries</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td></td>
<td>9am-9pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archway Medical Plaza Parking, 9033 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Seton Parking</td>
<td>$5.55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$16.65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>6am-6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9025 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Car Park</td>
<td>$5.55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$16.65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>8am-8pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8942 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8901-8929 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Imperial Parking Industries</td>
<td>$4.95</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$16.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>8am-6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8920 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>$8.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$16.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>6am-9pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8900 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>$185</td>
<td></td>
<td>7am-5pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire/Arnaz, 8730 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Hodes Parking</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>7am-6:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8671 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Ace Parking</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$10.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>9am-5pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8665 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Standard Parking</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$90-$110</td>
<td></td>
<td>7:30am-7:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8641 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Hodes Parking</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>6am-6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8530 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>8am-7pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8501 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>7:30am-10pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8500 Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>Imperial Parking Industries</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$130-$160</td>
<td></td>
<td>7am-7pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is available parking capacity in each of the potential in-lieu expansion corridors, particularly when one considers private off-street parking supplies.

South Beverly Drive has the least available capacity, at 83% occupancy during the peak. This level of peak occupancy is considered target occupancy within the parking industry, and suggests that the right amount of parking is available for existing demand along South Beverly Drive. At this level, however, there is a need for wayfinding aids or pricing tools to ensure that available parking is readily accessible and evenly distributed along the corridor.

**EXISTING DEMAND RATIOS**

The most useful metric for understanding parking demand is that of utilization, or demand ratios, which provide a measure of actual demand under the local conditions and land use context. As shown in Figure 36, there is available parking capacity in each of the potential in-lieu expansion corridors, particularly when one considers private off-street parking supplies.

There is available parking capacity in each of the potential in-lieu expansion corridors, particularly when one considers private off-street parking supplies.

---

**Figure 36: Parking Demand Ratios in the Expansion Corridors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Private off-street</th>
<th>Public off-street</th>
<th>On-street</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Peak utilization</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Peak utilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Beverly Drive</td>
<td>2,298</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Blvd</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Robertson Blvd</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Santa Monica Blvd</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ParkMe Parking Information, March 2014
The corridor with the lowest occupancy rates is Wilshire Boulevard, where there is a great deal of private parking supply (see Figure 37) and more than 60% available capacity even during periods of peak demand. This suggests that the Wilshire Boulevard corridor has been over-provided in terms of parking and most parking remains unused almost all of the time.

The remaining three corridors fall between these two extremes, with peak occupancy rates at 50 – 70% during the peak. The total peak occupancy and parking availability (combining on-street, public and private parking) is illustrated in Figure 37 below.

Figure 37: Peak Parking Occupancy and Availability in the Expansion Corridors

While demand ratio data suggests that there is available capacity along each corridor, the distribution of this demand differs from site to site. As shown below in Figure 38, on-street parking is more limited in the southern end of South Robertson Boulevard, possibly due to less intense land uses or the large number Wilshire Boulevard parking facilities that are available to serve the northern end of the street.

Along South Beverly Drive, private parking (Figure 39) is most constrained near Gregory Way while public and on-street parking (Figure 38) is most constrained near Charleville Boulevard. This differing availability suggests the need for an integrated approach to parking supply and demand along the corridor.
Figure 38: Public Parking Peak Utilization in the Expansion Areas
Figure 39: Private Off-Street Peak Parking Utilization in the Expansion Areas

Data Sources: City of Beverly Hills
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EXISTING BUILT RATIOS

Calculations of built ratio provide an understanding of the amount of parking that is provided relative to the square footage of built development in the area. They may therefore help to understand the present amount of parking that is provided, which can be used as a basis for adjusting minimum parking requirements and/or introducing blended parking rates.

Built ratios may be calculated in terms of parking spaces per square foot of built development, or as a ratio of the square footage of parking divided by the square footage of built development. Traditionally, built ratios are calculated in relation to the amount of off-street parking that is available within an area. They therefore underestimate the total parking supply (especially if there is angle-parking) because on-street parking is excluded.

In the case of the Beverly Hills expansion areas, the estimated built ratio is based on per space sizes that vary depending upon whether parking is provided in surface lots, below grade or above grade. Assumed per space area is outlined in Chapter 6.

Figure 40: Parking Built Ratios in the Expansion Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expansion Corridor</th>
<th>Off-Street Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Built Square Footage</th>
<th>Built Ratio (off-street spaces / 1000 sf)</th>
<th>Built Ratio (sf parking / sf development)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S Beverly Drive</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>1,034,394</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Boulevard</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>403,007</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Robertson Boulevard</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>205,301</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Santa Monica Boulevard</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>354,893</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire Boulevard</td>
<td>4857</td>
<td>3,258,794</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Triangle</td>
<td>10,933</td>
<td>6,088,469</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: City of Beverly Hills, Nelson\Nygaard, March 2014

As shown in Figure 40, the built ratio of off-street parking in the expansion areas ranges from a low of 0.32 (0.72 spaces per 1000 sf) on South Santa Monica Boulevard to a high of 1.3 (2.9 spaces per 1000 sf) on South Robertson Boulevard. Other built ratios include 0.8 (1.8 spaces per 1000 sf) for Wilshire Boulevard, 1.0 (2.3 spaces per 1000 sf) for Olympic Boulevard, and 1.1 (2.5 spaces per 1000 sf) for South Beverly Drive. A built ratio or more than 1 indicates that more square footage is allocated to parking than the land uses within the area.

EXISTING CODE REQUIREMENT COMPARISONS
Beverly Hills’ parking requirements were introduced in 1962 and have undergone little change over the past half century. For example, the City’s commercial parking requirement of 1 space per 350 square feet of development was established in the 1965 Amendment and has persisted since that time. While the basis of Beverly Hills’ original parking requirements is not clear, similar codes were usually based on data from the Institute of Transportation Engineer (ITE)’s Parking Generation publication, or similar rates in other cities. In the 1960s, when data was difficult to come by, minimum parking requirements were a proxy for likely parking demand associated with a particular land use.

Today, data is cheap but land and parking in places like Beverly Hills is expensive. Furthermore, the City’s minimum parking rates are problematic because they are both out of date and out of context. They are based on data from before 1965, and (in line with ITE data from that era) are probably derived from peak parking demand in isolated, single-use developments in suburban locations with cheap land and free parking. When applied to urban locations such as Beverly Hills’ expansion areas the minimum parking requirements can become a self-fulfilling prophecy because they limit the types of development that are feasible and influence the resulting travel demand (see discussion on feasible FAR in Chapter 8).

Since parking and transportation are derived demands, they help to achieve people’s primary goals but these goals could also be met without the need for parking and transportation. For example, if pedestrian facilities are convenient and attractive, people may reach food or social opportunities (primary needs) without the need to drive and park. For this reason, the notion of conflating minimum parking requirements and “parking need” is inaccurate. If businesses are vibrant and there are increasing levels of foot traffic, the city is achieving its goals. At that point, adding more parking to fulfill the minimum parking standard is moot and may be counterproductive if it reduces available square-footage, diminishes the streetscape, encourages more vehicular traffic, and discourages certain business initiatives (such as green businesses).

Notwithstanding the above issues, this section provides the ratio of existing off-street parking to the City’s parking requirements. Based on this assessment, the ratio of parking supply to code requirements is approximately 50% along South Santa Monica, Olympic, and South Robertson Boulevards, 100% on Wilshire Boulevard and 140% along South Beverly Drive. This is shown in Figure 41.

**Figure 41: Parking Built to Code Comparison in the Expansion Corridors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expansion Corridor</th>
<th>Required Off-Street Spaces</th>
<th>Existing Off-Street Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Code Requirement / Supply</th>
<th>Supply / Code Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S Beverly Drive</td>
<td>1,792 – 1,812</td>
<td>2,531</td>
<td>0.71 – 0.72</td>
<td>140 – 141%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46 City of Beverly Hills Ordinance No. 1195 regarding Municipal Code §10-3.2730, 1965
In the absence of demand data, this information would lead to the opposite conclusions regarding the location and scarcity of parking. By comparing to code requirements, one might come to the erroneous conclusion that much more parking is needed along South Santa Monica Boulevard, but that South Beverly Drive is already overbuilt with respect to parking. As shown in Figures 35 – 39, however, South Santa Monica still has a large amount of available parking, whereas South Beverly Drive is approaching 85% occupancy. This discrepancy demonstrates the fallacy of using code requirements as either a predictor or indicator of parking need within the City.

**FUTURE PARKING REQUIRED UNDER THE CURRENT CODE**

While parking requirements are not a good indicator of parking demand, they do indicate the level of parking that would required according to the current Municipal Code. For this reason, we have used the current parking requirements to consider how much additional parking would be required under build out conditions for the expansion corridors according to the current code.

This analysis used County Assessor data on the value of land and the value of improvements in order to identify those parcels that are ripe for redevelopment within the corridors. Those with a ratio of improvements to land of less than 1 were considered ripe for redevelopment, while those with a ratio of 1 or more were considered unlikely to redevelop. Schools were assumed to retain in their present land use regardless of the relative value of improvements to land value.

For this analysis we have included two scenarios. The first scenario calculates that number of additional parking spaces would be required if the corridors were built out to the maximum bulk requirements defined by the City’s zoning code, that is an FAR of 2 and building heights of up to 45 feet. The second scenario calculates the number of additional parking spaces that would be required if the corridors were built out to the maximum when one accounts for at or above-grade parking that is required under the Municipal Code. As outlined in Chapter 8, current parking standards reduce the feasible FAR to 1.03 along Robertson Boulevard and 1.19 along the other potential expansion corridors.47

Based on the improvements to land ratio, it is possible to add between 1,74 and 2.98 million square feet of development within the potential expansion areas. This level of redevelopment was based on an improvements-to-land ratio of 1.00, that is, where the value of land exceeds the value of improvements and therefore suggests that the property is ripe for redevelopment. Schools and properties in excess of current zoning standards were omitted from the calculation.

For a 30% build out scenario, this translate to a total lot area of 460,000 square feet, or a floor area of between 538,000 and 921,000 square feet of redevelopment (for feasible FAR and FAR respectively). This 30% build out would be associated with between 782 and 1,740 additional net spaces of required parking under the feasible FAR and allowable FAR scenarios respectively. The improvements-to-land ratios associated with 30% build out are extremely low, ranging from 0.1

---

47 City of Beverly Hills Municipal Code §10-3-2726, §10-3-2755, §10-3-2730
on Olympic and Wilshire Boulevards to 0.34 on Santa Monica Boulevard. These low IL ratios indicate that redevelopment is extremely ripe for the associated properties. It may also suggest that other factors such as site geometry and parking requirements are limiting redevelopment.

For an 85% build out scenario, the total lot area of redevelopment would be 1.28 million square feet, or a floor area of between 1.50 and 2.57 million square feet. This redevelopment would be associated with between 2,690 and 5,550 additional net spaces of required parking associated feasible FAR and allowable FAR respectively. The IL ratios associated with this level of redevelopment fall between 0.45 on Robertson Boulevard and 0.80 for Wilshire Boulevard. The above levels of new parking are outlined in Figures 42 and 43. Levels could be reduced under lower minimum parking requirements.

**Figure 42: Additional Required Parking Spaces for Build Out in the Expansion Corridors**

**Figure 43: Redevelopment and Additional Required Parking Spaces for Build Out in the Expansion Corridors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expansion Corridor</th>
<th>30% Build Out</th>
<th>85% Build Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redeveloped lot area (sf)</td>
<td>Additional required spaces based on FAR 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Beverly Drive</td>
<td>63,244</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Boulevard</td>
<td>121,160</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Robertson Boulevard</td>
<td>60,410</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Santa Monica Boulevard</td>
<td>27,389</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire Boulevard</td>
<td>188,208</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>460,411</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,739</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Nelson\Nygaard, Los Angeles County Assessors Office, City of Beverly Hills, March 2014
6 COST AND FEASIBILITY OF EXPANDING THE IN-LIEU PROGRAM AND CONSTRUCTING NEW PUBLIC PARKING IN EXPANSION AREAS

This chapter will consider the financial implications of expanding the in-lieu program, including an analysis of construction and real estate costs associated with building new municipal parking garages and development feasibility analysis for potential new development within the expansion areas.

CURRENT CONSTRUCTION COSTS FOR NEW PARKING FACILITIES

As part of the study of parking capacity in the potential expansion areas of the in-lieu program, the following are cost analyses for several potential parking structure types – surface lot, above grade parking structure, below grade parking structure, and above and below grade parking structures with automated operations. Each parking structure is assumed to be accompanied with retail that fronts the street. As the parcels within the City of Beverly Hills are relatively standard in size, the parking structure cost estimates assume a standard structure footprint that can be sited within four parcels of typical size while taking into account the required setbacks and height limits.

The cost of new parking ranges from $38,000 per space to $86,000 per space for anything other than surface parking.

The construction cost for the parking structures and retail will be comparable from site to site regardless of the location within the Expansion Area. However, the real estate and land costs will vary between South Beverly Drive, South Robertson Boulevard, South Santa Monica Boulevard, Wilshire Boulevard, and Olympic Boulevard. Below is a chart summarizing the parking structure data for each type, and cost breakdowns per square foot and per vehicle stall. The construction cost of new parking ranges from $38,000 per space to $86,000 per space for anything other than surface parking. Following the chart are summaries of each parking structure type with more detailed information, and the assumptions that were taken to derive the costs.

The cost estimates do not take into account unforeseen conditions that may be found on a particular site during the course of site excavation or construction. Any unforeseen conditions that are discovered and that results in additional work or remediation will be an additional cost to
the following estimates. The cost analyses are based on CPI and Engineering Cost Index parameters.

**Figure 44: Parking Structure Construction Cost Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Stalls</th>
<th>Floor Levels</th>
<th>Site (sf)</th>
<th>Building Area (sf)</th>
<th>Cost per Square Foot</th>
<th>Cost per Stall</th>
<th>Equivalent Construction Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface Lot</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24,360</td>
<td>24,360</td>
<td>$19.49</td>
<td>$6,247</td>
<td>$475,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Grade Parking Structure</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24,360</td>
<td>76,320</td>
<td>$89.51</td>
<td>$42,966</td>
<td>$6,830,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade Parking Structure</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24,360</td>
<td>73,710</td>
<td>$147.31</td>
<td>$86,178</td>
<td>$10,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Grade Parking Structure with Automated Operation</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24,360</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>$147.15</td>
<td>$37,523</td>
<td>$11,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade Parking Structure with Automated Operation</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24,360</td>
<td>73,710</td>
<td>$227.33</td>
<td>$62,060</td>
<td>$16,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of Above Grade and Below Grade Parking Structure with Automated Operation</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24,360</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>$195.26</td>
<td>$49,792</td>
<td>$14,900,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: City of Beverly Hills, Watry Design, March 2014

**Surface Lot**

For the surface lot cost analysis, the following assumptions were made:

- A 24,360 square foot site (203 feet by 120 feet), the equivalent of combing four adjacent typical sized parcels in the City of Beverly Hills
- Two parking drive aisles, providing two-way traffic and 90 degree parking, with one exit/entrance driveway provided
- An estimated 76 parking stalls
- An efficiency of 321 square feet per parking stall
- Basic landscaping, site lighting, drainage, grading and paving, and parking stall striping
- Overhead and Markup of 15%
- Design Contingency of 10%
- Escalation cost of 4%, based on today’s dollar
- A normal current construction market

Based on the above assumptions, we estimate that the surface lot will be approximately $19.49 per square foot, which is a cost per parking stall of $6,247.

**Above Grade Parking Structure**

For the above grade parking structure cost analysis, the following assumptions were made:
• A 24,360 square foot site (203 feet by 120 feet), the equivalent of combing four adjacent typical sized parcels in the City of Beverly Hills
• A total of four parking levels—one level on grade, and three supported levels
• The structural system of the parking structure is cast-in-place concrete, long span, with shear walls acting as the lateral system, and shallow foundations
• A high level of finish
• An estimated 159 parking stalls
• An efficiency of 480 square feet per parking stall
• A total building area of 76,320 square feet, which includes ground level retail fronting the street
• A cold shell ground level retail space of approximately 5,890 square feet
• Overhead and Markup of 15%
• Design Contingency of 10%
• Escalation cost of 4%, based on today’s dollar
• A normal current construction market

Based on the above assumptions, we estimate that the above grade parking structure will be approximately $89.51 per square foot, which is a cost per parking stall of $42,966.

**Below Grade Parking Structure**

For the below grade parking structure cost analysis, the following assumptions were made:

• A 24,360 square foot site (203 feet by 120 feet), the equivalent of combing four adjacent typical sized parcels in the City of Beverly Hills
• A total of three parking levels below grade
• The structural system of the parking structure is cast-in-place concrete, long span, with shear walls acting as the lateral system, and shallow foundations
• A moderate level of finish (finish is focused on the interior, as there is no exterior finish for the below grade structure)
• An estimated 126 parking stalls all below grade (no parking stalls at grade level)
• An efficiency of 585 square feet per parking stall (retail square footage not included in efficiency calculation)
• A total building area of 73,710 square feet, which includes ground level retail fronting the street
• A cold shell ground level retail space of approximately 12,214 square feet (approximately half of the site, allowing for vehicle entrance into the parking structure at the rear of the site)
• Additional cost included for the roof of the retail, as the parking structure is not providing the roof
• A premium was included in the cost of the parking structures' top level (base of the retail) to account for a stronger structural system in order to support the live load of the retail, which is greater than the live load for a parking structure.
• Overhead and Markup of 15%
Design Contingency of 10%
Escalation cost of 4%, based on today's dollar
A normal current construction market

Based on the above assumptions, we estimate that the below grade parking structure will be approximately $147.31 per square foot, which is a cost per parking stall of $86,178.

Above Grade Parking Structure with Automated Operation
For the above grade parking structure with automated operation cost analysis, the following assumptions were made:

- A 24,360 square foot site (203 feet by 120 feet), the equivalent of combining four adjacent typical sized parcels in the City of Beverly Hills
- A total height of four parking levels, the equivalent of a self-park above grade parking structure
- The structural system of the parking structure is cast-in-place concrete, long span, with shear walls acting as the lateral system, and shallow foundations
- A high level of finish
- An estimated 300 parking stalls
- An efficiency of 255 square feet per parking stall
- Four entry/exit portal bays to provide a level of service appropriate for 300 vehicles
- A total building area of 76,500 square feet, which includes ground level retail fronting the street
- A cold shell ground level retail space of approximately 5,890 square feet
- An estimated lump sum amount of $4,000,000 for the mechanical parking system
- Overhead and Markup of 15%
- Design Contingency of 10%
- Escalation cost of 4%, based on today's dollar
- A normal current construction market

Based on the above assumptions, we estimate that the above grade parking structure will be approximately $147.15 per square foot, which is a cost per parking stall of $37,523. The cost per parking stall is lower than the self-park above grade structure due to the greater number of vehicles that the structure can accommodate, i.e. better efficiency. However, the square foot cost is higher in comparison to the self-park structure due to the added cost of the mechanical parking system.

Below Grade Parking Structure with Automated Operation
For the below grade parking structure with automated operation cost analysis, the following assumptions were made:

- A 24,360 square foot site (203 feet by 120 feet), the equivalent of combining four adjacent typical sized parcels in the City of Beverly Hills
- A total depth of three parking levels below grade, the equivalent of the self-park below grade parking structure
The structural system of the parking structure is cast-in-place concrete, long span, with shear walls acting as the lateral system, and shallow foundations.

A moderate level of finish (finish is focused on the interior, as there is no exterior finish for the below grade structure).

An estimated 270 parking stalls below grade.

An efficiency of 273 square feet per parking stall.

Four entry/exit portal bays to provide a level of service appropriate for 270 vehicles.

A total building area of 73,710 square feet, which includes ground level retail fronting the street.

A cold shell ground level space of approximately 19,109 square feet that includes the retail and enclosure for the vehicle entry and exit portals in the rear of the site. Additional cost was included for the roof of the retail, as the parking structure is not providing the roof.

A premium was included in the cost of the parking structures’ top level (base of the retail) to account for a stronger structural system in order to support the live load of the retail – which is greater than the live load for a parking structure.

An estimated lump sum amount of $4,000,000 for the mechanical parking system.

Overhead and Markup of 15%.

Design Contingency of 10%.

Escalation cost of 4%, based on today’s dollar.

A normal current construction market.

Based on the above assumptions, we estimate that the above grade parking structure will be approximately $227.33 per square foot, which is a cost per parking stall of $62,060. The cost per parking stall is lower than the self-park below grade structure due to the greater number of vehicles that the structure can accommodate, i.e. better efficiency. However, the square foot cost is higher in comparison to the self-park structure due to the added cost of the mechanical parking system.

**Combination Above Grade and Below Grade Parking Structure with Automated Operation**

For the combination above grade and below grade parking structure with automated operation cost analysis, the following assumptions were made:

- A 24,360 square foot site (203 feet by 120 feet), the equivalent of combining four adjacent typical sized parcels in the City of Beverly Hills.
- Two levels of parking above grade and two levels of parking below grade.
- The structural system of the parking structure is cast-in-place concrete, long span, with shear walls acting as the lateral system, and shallow foundations.
- A high level finish for the above grade levels of parking structure, and a moderate level of finish for the below grade levels of parking structure (finish is focused on the interior, as there is no exterior finish for the below grade structure).
- An estimated 300 parking stalls.
- An efficiency of 255 square feet per parking stall.
- Four entry/exit portal bays to provide a level of service appropriate for 300 vehicles.
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- A total building area of 76,500 square feet, which includes ground level retail fronting the street
- An estimated lump sum amount of $4,000,000 for the mechanical parking system
- Overhead and Markup of 15%
- Design Contingency of 10%
- Escalation cost of 4%, based on today’s dollar
- A normal current construction market

Based on the above assumptions, we estimate that the above grade parking structure will be approximately $195.26 per square foot, which is a cost per parking stall of $49,792.

**SUITABILITY ANALYSIS FOR MUNICIPAL PARKING GARAGES**

Conceptual drawings were developed to determine the feasibility of providing above grade self-park structured parking within Expansion Areas A and B. Four streets were analyzed: South Robertson Boulevard, South Beverly Drive, South Santa Monica Boulevard, and Olympic Boulevard.

**Conceptual Drawings**

The conceptual drawings for each location present the ground level floor plan of a parking structure that encompasses four parcels, each parcel being approximately 50 feet wide. A minimum of four parcels are needed in order to provide a parking structure that operates efficiently and satisfies the City’s parking regulations for stall sizes, aisle widths, and ramp slopes. Each parking structure also accommodates a retail space of approximately 5,800 square feet that fronts along the street. Vehicle entry and exit access is located in the rear of the structure to take advantage of the rear alley behind each site.

Along with each floor plan a Summation Chart is provided that specifies the overall vehicle stall count for each structure.

**Current Land Costs in Expansion Areas**

The cost to acquire parking sites for new garages varies by location. Los Angeles County Assessor 2014 data provides the value of land and improvements for recently sold and recorded parcels located in Expansion Areas A and B. Local brokers verified Assessor provided values. As expected, land values are lowest along Olympic Boulevard at $260 per site square foot, and highest along South Beverly Drive at $990 per site square foot. Figure 39 shows the land value per square foot for each corridor in Expansion Areas A and B.

---

48 Only properties recorded between 2012 and 2014 were evaluated for land value.
## Figure 45: Suitability Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Stalls</th>
<th>Floors</th>
<th>Parcel size (SF)</th>
<th>Land cost by area</th>
<th>Equivalent land cost</th>
<th>Notes on access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Boulevard</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24,460 (4 parcels)</td>
<td>$260/ SF</td>
<td>$6,360,000</td>
<td>Vehicle access at rear alley. Pedestrian access along street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson Boulevard</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22,228 (4 parcels)</td>
<td>$420/ SF</td>
<td>$9,340,000</td>
<td>Vehicle access at rear alley. Pedestrian access along street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Drive</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22,000 (4 parcels)</td>
<td>$990/ SF</td>
<td>$21,800,000</td>
<td>Vehicle access at rear alley. Pedestrian access along street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica Boulevard</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24,000 (4 parcels)</td>
<td>$600/ SF</td>
<td>$14,400,000</td>
<td>Vehicle access at rear alley. Pedestrian access along street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: City of Beverly Hills, Watry Design, March 2014
Figure 46: Conceptual Ground Level Floor Plan for New Parking Structure on Olympic Boulevard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMATION CHART</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOURTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Olympic Blvd.
Figure 47: Conceptual Ground Level Floor Plan for New Parking Structure on Robertson Boulevard
Figure 48: Conceptual Ground Level Floor Plan for New Parking Structure on Beverly Drive
Figure 49: Conceptual Ground Level Floor Plan for New Parking Structure on Santa Monica Boulevard

SUMMATION CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>ACCESSIBLE (9'-0&quot; x 19'-0&quot;)</th>
<th>STANDARD (9'-0&quot; x 19'-0&quot;)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOURTH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECOND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUND</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEVELOPMENT FEASIBILITY AND PRO FORMA ANALYSIS

In order to understand the implications of the current parking requirements on areas where the City wants to encourage new development, this analysis uses local market and construction cost data to determine the financial feasibility of new mixed-use construction located on Robertson and Olympic Boulevards. Development feasibility analysis provides a basis for understanding whether a developer would be attracted to the site to construct new uses under existing zoning and parking requirements, given current market conditions. In this case, a residual land value calculation indicates whether the value of new development, based on net operating income, is greater than the cost of development plus the land value and a reasonable developer profit, and thereby able to attract a developer to build the desired project types.

Methodology

Financial feasibility analysis uses current real estate market and construction data to determine whether a developer would be willing to undertake new development, using the following analytical steps:

- **Development Program:** Nelson/Nygaard, BAE, and the City of Beverly Hills formulated development programs for each prototype project based on actual parcel sizes located along Robertson Boulevard and Olympic Boulevard. The development programs include a description of the site area, development density, mix of uses and unit types, and parking requirements. Assumptions about how parking requirements would be fulfilled are reflected in allocations of parking to new surface parking spaces, spaces in above-grade parking podiums/structures, and underground parking spaces.

- **Cost Assumptions:** The analysis uses data from RS Means and local developers for each prototype project to estimate hard and soft construction costs for the development program, including on- and off-site costs, land costs, financing costs, and required developer rates of return. RS Means publishes construction cost estimates for different building types, with adjustment factors to reflect localized conditions. Parking cost estimates are based on the Parking Development Cost Analysis included in this chapter. Development costs are reported by building component (i.e., office, retail, restaurant, residential).

- **Revenue and Project Value Assumptions:** Data from Costar and local brokers provide the basis for revenue estimates for each prototypical project. Rental and sales revenue estimates are based on current market conditions in each corridor, and are used to calculate the value of completed projects by capitalizing net operating income (revenues less operating expenses) using market capitalization rates applicable to the real estate product category.

- **Residual Land Value:** To determine the residual land value, the pro forma model calculates the amount by which the total value of the completed project exceeds the total development cost, including required developer returns. If the residual land value is positive and equal to higher than the corridor’s market land value, a developer would be attracted to the project. A negative residual land value, or value that is positive, but still lower than corridor’s market land value, indicates that some level of subsidy would be required to attract a developer to the project under current economic conditions.

BAE prepared a series of static pro formas to conduct this feasibility analysis. A static pro forma uses the assumptions described above to calculate the residual land value of the site without
accounting for the time value of money (i.e., inflation and discount rates). Instead, a static pro forma relies on capitalization rates determined in the market to account for the total value of the development if purchased outright at the time of analysis. This is the same method that is used by developers to screen potential projects for feasibility. The pro formas for each of the prototype projects are appended to this report as Appendix D.

Prototype Projects

The City of Beverly Hills, Nelson/Nygaard, and BAE conceptualized the following three prototype projects. Associated development envelopes, parking requirements, building heights, and other requirements are taken from the City’s zoning code and other relevant regulations. Each prototype project consists of two or three parcels that are considered in aggregate and evaluated under current parking requirements. Figure 50 summarizes the specifications of the three prototype projects.

Figure 50: Development Prototypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Use</th>
<th>Robertson Office/Retail</th>
<th>Robertson Office/Restaurant</th>
<th>Olympic Rental Residential/Retail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Size</td>
<td>16,350</td>
<td>16,350</td>
<td>12,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gross Area (Sq.Ft.)</td>
<td>41,250</td>
<td>41,910</td>
<td>35,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (Sq.Ft.)</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Restaurant (Sq.Ft.)</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>4,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (Sq.Ft.)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>9,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU/Acre</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stories</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (sf)</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>32,160</td>
<td>21,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robertson Boulevard: Office/Retail

This project consists of three parcels on Robertson Boulevard that, combined as a single project, would contain 11,500 gross square feet of office space, approximately 7,750 gross square feet of ground-floor retail, and 50 parking spaces. The office space has an assumed efficiency factor of 90 percent, resulting in approximately 10,350 rentable square feet. The same 90 percent efficiency factor is applied to the retail space as well, netting approximately 5,175 rentable square feet.
Parking requirements are one space per 350 gross office and retail square feet, all of which would need to be provided in an above ground parking structure, due to parcel size which makes underground facilities technically infeasible.

Robertson Boulevard: Office/Restaurant

This project consists of the same three Robertson Boulevard parcels considered in aggregate. Under this prototype, the site would be developed as office over restaurant space. Combined as a single project, this site would contain 6,500 gross square feet of office space, approximately 3,250 gross square feet of ground-floor restaurant, and 67 parking spaces. The office space has an assumed efficiency factor of 90 percent, resulting in approximately 5,850 rentable square feet. The same 90 percent efficiency factor is applied to the restaurant space as well, netting approximately 2,925 rentable square feet. The reduced development size compared to the office/retail prototype results from increased parking requirements for restaurant compared to retail uses.

Parking requirements are one space per 350 gross office and back of house restaurant square feet. The bar and dining area of restaurant space requires one parking space per 45 gross square feet. Due to the size of the site, all of the required spaces would need to be provided in an above ground parking structure.

Olympic Boulevard: Retail/Rental Residential

This project consists of two parcels on Olympic Boulevard that, combined as a single project, would contain 4,730 gross square feet of ground-floor retail, 11 rental residential units, and 44 parking spaces. The retail space has an assumed efficiency factor of 90 percent, resulting in approximately 4,494 rentable square feet.

The rental residential project component contains six studio units measuring 600 square feet per unit, five one-bedroom units measuring 1,000 square feet per unit, and 200 square feet of open space per unit that would be located on the roof. The units have an efficiency factor of 90 percent to accommodate circulation.

Parking requirements are one space per 350 gross retail square feet, one space per studio residential unit, and two spaces per one bedroom residential unit, per City of Beverly Hills parking requirements. Due to the site’s size, all parking spaces would need to be provided in an above ground parking structure.

Key Assumptions

The analysis uses market data from CoStar, a commercial real estate data vendor, and construction cost data from RS Means as the basis for modeling development feasibility. Interviews with City of Beverly Hills planning staff, local brokers, and developers complement this data and provide additional insights into current development and market conditions in Beverly Hills. These data are input into the pro forma model as assumptions to generate the findings of this analysis. Below are some of the key assumptions used for each type of development tested.
All Development Types

The following key assumptions were used for all development types and do not change significantly by use.

- **Development Size and Above Grade Parking:** All analyzed scenarios assumed a above grade parking due to the difficulty associated with assembling enough parcels to develop subterranean facilities. If a larger number of parcels were to be assembled, this might enable development to an FAR of 2 with subterranean parking. The tradeoff is the higher parking construction costs, larger number of parking spaces required, and the greater difficulty of assembling at least four parcels.

- **Parking Costs:** Per the findings in the Parking Structure Construction Cost Analysis contained within this chapter, the analysis assumes that underground parking costs $86,180 per stall, while podium or above ground structured parking costs $42,970 per stall, and new surface parking costs $6,250 per space.

- **Financing Costs:** The analysis assumes that developers can obtain financing for 60 percent of the total costs and will be charged two percent in loan fees and a seven percent annual interest rate.

- **Developer Profit:** This analysis assumes that developers would not be attracted to a project unless they could earn a 10 percent return on costs, excluding land costs. At the height of the market in 2006, developers required a 12 percent return on costs to undertake a project, while during the great recession, their required rate of return dropped to eight percent. This analysis uses a return-on-costs requirement that falls in the middle of the range.

Office Uses

The following assumptions specifically apply to office uses. Changes in market conditions and their corresponding assumptions could significantly impact development feasibility.

- **Parking Ratios:** This analysis assumes that new office development would require one parking space per 350 gross square feet.

- **Development Costs:** Based on current data from RS Means and interviews with local developers, this analysis assumes that office construction hard costs range from $155 to $183 per gross square foot, delivering a warm shell with an additional $65 per leasable square foot in tenant improvements (TIs). Office construction costs vary by the size of the development, because larger developments can spread fixed construction costs over more square footage; thus developing a 5,800 square foot building would cost more on a per square foot basis than developing a 12,600 square foot building.

- **Net Operating Income:** According to Costar, office space along Robertson Boulevard commands rental rates of approximately $4.00 per square foot per month, full service. Assuming that new space can command a premium from existing space, this analysis assumes that new office space could receive $4.15 per month on a full service basis. Interviews with local developers and data from BOMA’s 2013 Experience Exchange Report indicate that operating expenses would be approximately $12 per square foot for newly built Beverly Hills Class A office space.
Retail/Restaurant Uses

The following assumptions specifically apply to retail and restaurant uses. Changes in market conditions and their corresponding assumptions could significantly impact development feasibility.

- **Parking Ratios:** This analysis assumes that new retail and back of house restaurant development would require one parking space per 350 gross square feet, while bar and dining restaurant space would require one space per 45 square feet.

- **Development Costs:** Based on current data from RS Means and interviews with local developers, this analysis assumes that ground floor retail construction hard costs range from $101 to $109 per gross square foot with an additional $55 per leasable square foot in TIs, while ground floor restaurant construction hard costs range from $166 to $182 per gross square foot with an additional $55 per leasable square foot in TIs. Retail and restaurant construction costs vary by the size of the development, because larger developments can spread fixed construction costs over more square footage; thus developing a 3,000 square foot building would cost more on a per square foot basis developing a 7,600 square foot building.

- **Net Operating Income:** Market data from CoStar on similar properties within the Robertson Boulevard corridor of Beverly Hills show that ground floor retail in a mixed-use project can charge approximately $3.95 per square foot per month on a triple net basis. For restaurant uses, the assumed rental rate is higher at $5.25 per rentable square foot per month on a triple net basis.

Residential Uses

The following assumptions specifically apply to residential uses. Changes in market conditions and their corresponding assumptions could significantly impact development feasibility.

- **Development Costs:** Based on current data from RS Means and interviews with local developers, this analysis assumes that residential construction hard costs range from $133 to $140 per gross square foot with an additional $5,000 for appliances per rental unit. As with commercial uses, larger developments have a lower cost per square foot than smaller developments that cannot take advantage of economies of scale.

- **Rental Unit Prices:** The analysis uses rental rates from other studio and one-bedroom units advertised on Craigslist to project rental revenues from new apartment development along Olympic Boulevard. Rents range from $1,400 per month for a studio to $3,600 per month for a 3-bedroom unit and average $2.30 per square foot of living space.

Findings

As Figure 51 shows below, under current parking requirements and market conditions, all of the prototype developments are infeasible. Mixed-use office with retail would require the least amount of subsidy, compared to mixed-
use office with restaurant, which would require the largest subsidy due to the higher amounts of parking required for restaurant uses. In order to realize desired development on Robertson and Olympic Boulevards, office and retail lease rates would have to increase approximately 40 percent and/or the City could reduce parking requirements, either through a parking in-lieu fee, reduced parking requirements, or a combination of both.

Figure 51: Development Feasibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Use</th>
<th>Robertson Office/Retail</th>
<th>Robertson Office/Restaurant</th>
<th>Olympic Rental Residential/Retail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Parking Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Value</td>
<td>$10,444,260</td>
<td>$6,697,240</td>
<td>$6,514,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Costs</td>
<td>($7,649,273)</td>
<td>($7,126,498)</td>
<td>($5,557,499)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Profit</td>
<td>($764,927)</td>
<td>($712,650)</td>
<td>($555,750)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Land Value</td>
<td>$2,030,060</td>
<td>($1,141,909)</td>
<td>$400,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Land Value/Sq.Ft.</td>
<td>$124</td>
<td>($70)</td>
<td>$32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Land Value/Sq.Ft.</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasible?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feasibility Under a Parking In-Lieu Fee Alternative

If the City of Beverly Hills expands its in-lieu fee program to include the Robertson Boulevard and Olympic Boulevard corridors, thereby allowing developers to pay a parking in-lieu fee per required retail or restaurant parking space, it could lower development costs and incentivize development, thereby reducing the subsidy required to realize desired uses along the Robertson Boulevard and Olympic Boulevard corridors. In order to test the sensitivity of parking requirements compared to a parking in-lieu fee, this analysis tests the financial feasibility of the three prototype developments under a parking in-lieu fee alternative.

Development Prototypes

Under a parking in-lieu fee alternative, developers would be able to pay $28,285 per retail and restaurant space rather than build parking within their development projects.49 As office and residential uses are not eligible to pay parking in-lieu fees under the current program, this analysis assumes that only retail and restaurant uses would be eligible for an expanded parking in-lieu fee program.

49 This is the lowest parking in-lieu that the City charges under its current in-lieu fee program. The analysis uses this fee amount to reflect that land values are lower along Robertson and Olympic Boulevards than in the Golden Triangle.
As Figure 52 shows, not only is the parking in-lieu fee less expensive than building structured parking, it would also allow developers to use more of the parcel for revenue generating uses, compared to under existing parking requirements, thereby getting closer to the allowable FAR.

**Figure 52: Development Prototypes under Parking In-Lieu Fee Alternative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Use</th>
<th>Robertson Office/Retail</th>
<th>Robertson Office/Restaurant</th>
<th>Olympic Rental Residential/Retail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking In-Lieu Fee Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Size</td>
<td>16,350</td>
<td>16,350</td>
<td>12,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gross Area (sf)</td>
<td>40,200</td>
<td>40,200</td>
<td>35,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (sf)</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Restaurant (sf)</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (sf)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU/Acre</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stories</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (sf)</td>
<td>19.200</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>12,480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings**

Under a parking in-lieu fee, feasibility improves for all uses. This is due to a combination of factors:

- More space can be used for revenue generating uses than if the site also had to accommodate on-site parking;
- Larger developments can take advantage of economies of scale to achieve a lower construction cost per square foot than smaller development; and
- The parking in-lieu fee per space is less expensive than the cost of building a parking space.

As Figure 53 shows, the parking in-lieu fee alone does not make the prototype developments feasible. However, if the City charges restaurant users the same rate for a parking in-lieu fee for new development as it currently charges for expanding an existing restaurant ($11,675 per space), then the residual land value would improve to $178 per square foot, requiring a less drastic change in market conditions and/or reduced subsidy to attract a developer.

**Figure 53: Development Feasibility under Parking In-Lieu Fee Alternative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Use</th>
<th>Robertson Office/Retail</th>
<th>Robertson Office/Restaurant</th>
<th>Olympic Rental Residential/Retail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Parking Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Value</td>
<td>$12,714,752</td>
<td>$14,424,824</td>
<td>$10,514,995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In general, lowering the in-lieu fee alone would not be sufficient to incentivize new development. Although the mixed-use office/retail and rental residential/retail uses show positive land values, they are considerably lower than market land values along Robertson and Olympic Boulevards.

In order for these development prototypes to become feasible, markets would have to improve along the Robertson Boulevard and Olympic Boulevard corridors, in addition to the expansion of the parking in-lieu fee program. In addition to rising rents, another way the market could improve (from a developer feasibility standpoint) is if the cost for developers to acquire property declines. Based on conversations with City staff, it has been a number of years since developers have undertaken new construction in the Robertson and Olympic Boulevard areas that are the subject of this study. It is possible that the real estate sales transactions which established the market land values referenced above were premised on development expectations that are no longer valid. Given the fact that this pro forma analysis has shown such a large gap between residual land values for likely project types and the market values set by recent sales, it is possible that future land sales prices would be significantly lower, as land sales prices should reflect the economic utility of the property being purchased. Unless there are alternative uses of the property which are much more lucrative than the development prototypes modeled herein, the real estate market should eventually correct itself and land prices should decline. However, property owners will likely need to see significantly higher land values than the residual land values calculated for the different development scenarios, in order to have sufficient financial motivation to sell their property to developers.

In the meantime, the City could also consider reducing parking requirements for retail and other land uses as a tool for incentivizing development along these corridors, which would further reduce parking costs and improve development feasibility, regardless of whether parking is constructed on-site or an in-lieu fee is paid.

### Feasibility Under an Automated Parking Alternative

In addition to expanding the existing in-lieu fee program, the City could allow parking to be developed in automated parking facilities. According to Watry Design, automated parking facilities require considerably less space per parking stall than standard garages, which translates into reduced costs per parking space. In addition, the reduction in required space per stall would

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Costs</th>
<th>($8,580,337)</th>
<th>($13,291,684)</th>
<th>($7,656,665)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developer Profit</td>
<td>($858,034)</td>
<td>($1,329,168)</td>
<td>($765,666)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Land Value</td>
<td>$3,276,381</td>
<td>$(196,029)</td>
<td>$40,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Land Value per Square Foot</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$(12)</td>
<td>$168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Land Value per Square Foot</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially Feasible?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
allow the developer to use more of its parcel for revenue-generating uses, thereby generating more revenue and getting closer to the allowable FAR. Thus, compared to existing parking requirements, allowing property owners to deliver parking in an automated garage would improve feasibility from baseline (existing) conditions. Whether an automated garage would improve development feasibility more or less than a parking in-lieu fee will depend on a variety of factors, including the relative number of spaces that could be delivered off-site under an expanded parking in-lieu fee program.

In order to update the code to allow developers to count parking spaces in automated garaged spaces toward their parking requirements, the City would need to better understand the potential traffic and congestion impacts related to queuing on the street to get into the automated spaces, as well as any potential impacts to public garages and/or public safety from malfunctioning garages.
7 INDUSTRY BEST PRACTICES

This chapter provides a review of industry best practices from cities that have managed their parking to alleviate localized inefficiencies while spurring economic growth. The strategies described in this chapter are informed by a search of published articles, online sources, unpublished documents from cities or agencies with similar programs in their downtowns or commercial districts, and Nelson\Nygaard’s previous experience with similar cities.

Historically, “solving the parking problem” often meant increasing the supply of free or underpriced parking. Unfortunately, constantly increasing the supply of a finite but underpriced commodity encourages inefficient overconsumption of that commodity. Providing “adequate” parking is therefore impossible when it is given away for free because the market for parking is not operating in a competitive and sustainable manner. Where parking is free, people will drive more, repark their car more often, use transit less, and walk less than is desirable or necessary.

This market inefficiency also degrades the quality of “place” due to increased traffic congestion, decreased foot traffic and business vitality, and degradation of the streetscape associated with frequent driveways and a large parking footprint. Parking provision is therefore only one tool available for managing parking demand and supply, and—more importantly—creating vibrant places. Studies of travel demand and elasticity highlight other factors that affect parking and travel demand, including land use density, distance to key destinations or events, land use mix, streetscape design, transportation system redundancy (or the availability of different routes and modes with comparable travel times), and pricing. Complex interactions between these factors (and wider social and economic conditions) affect the attractiveness of a place as well as the demand for parking and different modes of transportation.

A holistic package of parking and transportation demand management tools is needed to produce great places that are attractive to new development, vibrant for businesses, walkable for customers, and healthy for local residents, with appropriate levels of parking. Managing parking is one of the most effective tools for managing traffic congestion and its environmental impacts, even when densities are relatively low and major investments in other modes have not been made. Parking management can also have a significant impact on commute mode choice, which translates directly to reductions in auto congestion and improved livability of commercial districts and adjacent neighborhoods.

As Beverly Hills continues to evolve, its parking needs will change as well. This chapter provides descriptions and case studies of industry best practices for alternative programs that aim to correctly price parking, provide new parking facilities, and raise funds for new parking. These strategies utilize policies and programs that will enable more efficient utilization of existing supply, while alleviating parking congestion in certain areas.

IN-LIEU PARKING FEE

An in-lieu parking fee gives developers the option to pay a fee “in-lieu” of providing a portion of the number of parking spaces ordinarily required by a city’s zoning ordinance.

Why implement it?

In-lieu fees are particularly appropriate for creating great places and undertaking adaptive reuse projects (to renovate and reuse historic buildings for something other than their original purpose) when these projects would be neither financially attractive nor architecturally feasible if forced to provide all required spaces on-site. An in-lieu fee can therefore encourage new development of the highest architectural and urban design quality as well as redevelopment of vacant, underutilized, dilapidated, and historic buildings in a downtown—often spurring a more successful and walkable district with a unique character and identity.

In-lieu fees have many benefits for both cities and developers. The fees provide flexibility for developers. If providing all of the required parking would be difficult or prohibitively expensive for developers, then they have the option to pay the fee instead. In addition, since the fees can be used to pay for spaces in public facilities, in-lieu fees are a good mechanism to facilitate shared parking between uses, thereby maximizing use of existing parking supply and forgoing the need to construct costly new parking facilities.

How will it work?

An in-lieu fee allows developers to undertake their developments without the required parking provision, by paying a fee “in-lieu” of parking. For example, a 3,500 square-foot restaurant that is required by municipal code to provide one parking space per 350 square feet of floor area would need to have 10 parking spaces on-site. However, a developer or restaurant owner may feel that only six spaces are needed on-site, and could therefore pay a per-space fee to make up for the remaining four spaces.

In-lieu fees are typically structured as either a fixed one-time fee per space or an annual fee per space. The one-time option provides upfront payments to the city at a time that closer aligns with parking impact, though the payment is unlikely to result in new parking supply until well after the impact. On the other hand, the annual payment option provides flexibility to the developer or lessee, as well as a steady income stream to the city so long as the business remains operational.

The in-lieu fees that are collected can then be used to build public parking spaces, purchase or lease private spaces for public use, support transportation demand management (TDM) strategies...
that reduce trips, and improve overall mobility and access to the site. An in-lieu fee can also be combined with other techniques for meeting parking requirements including the use of shared parking, tandem or valet parking, or stacked parking to encourage better management of parking spaces provided on- and off-site.

**What are the challenges?**

In-lieu fees present certain challenges. First, setting the level of the in-lieu fee is complicated. The fee should be high enough to generate revenue for needed parking and mobility projects. If the fee is set too low then it will not be able to fund projects to replace parking or reduce the demand for parking in a timely manner. On the other hand, the fee should not be set so high that a developer would simply rather build parking themselves. In this case, the city is also unlikely to generate a sufficient stream of revenue to fund parking and parking demand projects. In some cases, the fee may even be cost-prohibitive for developers, which may lead to empty storefronts or cancelled projects—thereby reducing the economic vitality and regeneration of the city.

Secondly, the success of an in-lieu fee is highly dependent on the overall health of the development market. If no projects are being built, then there is no chance for payment of in-lieu fees. If a city is seeking to finance new public parking facilities, in-lieu fees may not be the most stable revenue source.

**In-lieu fees in selected California cities**

Beverly Hills’ in-lieu parking fee ranges from $11,675 per space for restaurant expansions to $47,007 per parking space for new construction on Rodeo Drive. As discussed in Chapter 3, the average fee over the life of the program has been $33,000 (adjusted to 2014 dollars). As shown in Figure 54, this fee is somewhat higher than other California cities, which often falls between $10,000 and $25,000 per space, with annual adjustment based on the CPI. On the other hand, Beverly Hills’ in-lieu fee is lower than Palo Alto’s fee of $67,100, which was designed to cover 100% of the cost of parking construction in that city. Unlike Beverly Hills’ lease option (which is only available for restaurant expansions by lessees), most cities charge a one-time, per-space fee.

While many cities have in-lieu fee programs, they have mixed success in generating the amount of revenue required to actually build additional parking. This is the result of the challenge of setting an in-lieu fee high enough to account for construction costs of parking but low enough to ensure that the fee is still economically attractive to developers. Since cities have struggled to achieve this balance, the result is a limited amount of parking revenue. Given that in-lieu fees are inherently tied to the development market, most fee programs have not generated substantial amounts of revenue in recent years.

Additionally, most cities dedicate revenue to fund construction, operation, or maintenance of parking facilities, yet there are a few cities (such as Ventura and recently, Santa Monica) that also use in-lieu fee revenue to fund other mobility programs.
Figure 54: In-Lieu fees in selected California cities\textsuperscript{51}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Fee Amount</th>
<th>Fee Adjustment</th>
<th>Fee Revenue Expenditures</th>
<th>Year Initiated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
<td>Rodeo: $47,007.40</td>
<td>Annually based on CPI (not to exceed 10%)</td>
<td>Used to construct parking garages on city owned lands and in partnership with private development</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beverly: $37,605.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other CBD: $28,284.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurant expansion: $11,675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver City</td>
<td>Case-by-case based on assessed value for specified land use (parking lease is $80 per space per year)</td>
<td>Based on LA County assessed property value</td>
<td>Held in a fund for development of public parking facilities (but so far developers have opted to lease private spaces instead of participating in the in-lieu program)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>As-needed</td>
<td>Held in consolidated off-site parking fund program for construction of public parking resources and parking structures downtown</td>
<td>1970's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000 (Central Commercial &amp; Mixed Use)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>$7,300</td>
<td>As-needed</td>
<td>Dedicated to construct parking. No revenue has been generated by the fee.</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermosa Beach</td>
<td>$29,500</td>
<td>As-needed</td>
<td>Used for construction of parking garages</td>
<td>1980's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Beach</td>
<td>$27,350</td>
<td>Annually based on CPI (not to exceed 3%)</td>
<td>Used to provide additional parking opportunities or reduce parking demand downtown (shuttles, valet parking, bike valet, street re-striping), and design/engineering costs for new parking</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae</td>
<td>$13,391</td>
<td>Annually based on CPI</td>
<td>Used to improve parking in the city's commercial district. Has been used to enhance and modify the city's three municipal lots and re-stripe the downtown area</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>As needed based on cost of construction</td>
<td>Used to construct parking garages in downtown, provide shared parking facilities</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>$67,100</td>
<td>Annually based on construction cost index</td>
<td>Used for construction of public parking spaces within the assessment district</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Pasadena</td>
<td>$151.07 per space per year</td>
<td>Annually based on CPI</td>
<td>Used to build parking garages</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pismo Beach</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>As-needed</td>
<td>Used for parking improvements inc. property acquisition, construction, lot lease fees, maintenance and downtown paid parking</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{51} Fee amounts based on most recent data available.
Old Pasadena Parking Credit Program

In recent years, Old Pasadena has gained a reputation for being a pedestrian-friendly, vibrant downtown that combines a mix of uses with easy access by the automobile. Yet much of the area’s success can be attributed to its parking management policies that have spawned a wide variety of streetscape improvements and new opportunities for increased transit ridership and development.

Old Pasadena was not always so prosperous. In the 1970s, much of Pasadena’s downtown had been slated for redevelopment, as the decaying neighborhood had become the city’s “Skid Row.” In 1987, the city’s “Parking Credit Program” was established to allow property owners to enter into a contract with the city in order to buy “zoning parking credits” in lieu of constructing additional parking spaces to satisfy minimum parking requirements.

Similar to Beverly Hills’ in-lieu lease option, the parking credit program allowed new in-fill projects to make use of existing public parking for a modest annual fee. The fee was set at a very low rate ($50 per space in 1987) to encourage business development. The fee has increased...

---
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following yearly CPI adjustments and was $146.53 per space per year in 2008, which is still far below the market cost to build a new parking space. This fee structure allows developers to avoid financing problems due to high up-front costs, but has created some revenue collection issues, particularly where properties change owners.

Pasadena’s Parking Credit Program, however, is not a typical in-lieu fee program. As described by Former Pasadena Development Administrator, Marsha Rood, each parking credit is “an entitlement to apply parking spaces in a publicly available garage towards parking requirements for development.” The city issues 1.5 parking credits per space in the public garages, and therefore credits are limited. When existing parking reserves are completely subscribed on a shared basis, the credits are no longer available.

The program therefore depends upon the availability of some public parking in the vicinity. According to Marsha Rood, “without the parking structures, revitalization of Old Pasadena would not have happened—period.” For the Beverly Hills expansion areas, it is conceivable that the City could implement a similar program involving shared parking arrangements with private parking operators or owners of private lots. However, if no public or private garages are available (such as on Robertson Boulevard), this model may not be applicable until after nearby public or private parking facilities are developed.

Since its inception, the Parking Credit Program has been particularly important in allowing adaptive reuse of historic buildings that were built without parking, where minimum parking requirements would be triggered by a change in use. Since few of the buildings in this historic part of the city have off-street parking, this removed a major barrier to adaptive reuse. In 2002, the criteria were tightened, with eligibility limited to designated historic buildings, and buildings that would require additional parking following rehabilitation or a change in use.

As a result of these policies, Old Pasadena has been revived. Stefanos Polyzoides, a local architect and urban designer and co-founder of the Congress for the New Urbanism, attributes much of the success of Old Pasadena to the “rules that allowed development to go forward with less than the traditional parking requirements. This has encouraged pedestrian activity in Old Pasadena, giving it a dynamic pedestrian environment.”

Evidence of this revival is seen in sales tax revenue, which increased more than tenfold over 10 years, to more than $2 million per year in 1999. By contrast, sales tax revenue at the adjacent shopping mall, Plaza Pasadena, which provided free parking, stagnated. The mall was “turned inside out” and converted to mixed uses in 2001. Its blank walls were changed to storefronts that resemble those in Old Pasadena, while hundreds of apartments were added on top.

Revenue generated by parking credits has also helped to maintain and operate Old Pasadena’s four public parking facilities. Although the parking credit revenues provide only 5% of the funding needed to operate the garages, they do provide the link between the waiver in minimum parking requirements and the availability of public parking for a variety of uses. The City’s public parking structures provide almost 1,600 parking spaces, with 90 minutes of free parking followed by $2 per hour up to a maximum of $6 per day. This provides spaces for visitors who are unwilling to pay the $1 per hour charge for metered spaces.

Since the early 2000s, additional public parking spaces have been added to the general credit pool (approximately 102 spaces/153 credits at the One Colorado development), and dependent on demand for credits, more public spaces may be added in the future. As of 2009, 67 credits were available to eligible applicants.
Parking scholar Donald Shoup calculates that the Parking Credit program reduced the cost to the developer of parking provision for adaptive reuse projects to just 2.5% of the cost of on-site provision. This strategy represents an innovative way to mitigate limiting parking minimum requirements.

**Petaluma’s In-Lieu Fee and Sunset of Minimum Parking**

In June 2003, Petaluma, California, adopted a development code for approximately 400 acres of the central city. Revitalization of the area, a mixture of partly vacant historic buildings, tired strip malls, abandoned car dealerships, riverfront warehouses, and greenfield parcels, had been difficult. The existing code was largely designed to produce single-use, auto-oriented, conventional suburban development.

The newly adopted code was the first example in the nation of implementing a New Urbanist SmartCode. Originally developed by Duany Plater-Zyberk & Company, an architecture and planning firm based in Miami, Florida, the SmartCode aimed to create walkable neighborhoods using a form-based code, and zoning categories that were linked to their urban or rural character or “rural-urban transect”. All zones allowed for mixed development, and emphasized human-scale, pedestrian facilities and streetscape design.

As part of Petaluma’s Central Petaluma Specific Plan, the SmartCode was designed to provide “…a system for ensuring that the design of the public realm and the design of private buildings are rigorously coordinated, and are focused on the pedestrian experience. It defines what is essentially a “kit of parts”, with instructions, for building an urban district...” Like many zoning codes, the SmartCode included guidance on location of parking, size of parking spaces, specifications on access to parking, and requirements for lighting and surfacing for parking lots.

*Figure 55: Form-based parking restrictions from the Petaluma SmartCode*

In addition, the Petaluma SmartCode outlined two policies to improve parking in central Petaluma. These policies were designed to accomplish the goal of maximizing opportunities for
shared parking by encouraging structured parking facilities (Policy 4.1) and establishing procedures such as in-lieu fees for financing structured parking facilities (Policy 4.2).

Although the Code identified baseline parking minimum requirements, it introduced a phase-out of the requirements (§ 6.10.030). It also permitted waivers or reductions in minimum parking space requirements under the following circumstances:

- Alternative parking arrangements including payment of a parking in-lieu fee of $20,000 per parking space (with annual fee adjustments), waiving the right to protest the formation of a parking district, or providing some other fair share contribution;
- Shared on-site parking where two or more uses on the same site have distinct and different peak parking usage periods;
- Quantitative information (such as sales receipts or land use standards from other cities) provided by the applicant that documents the need for fewer spaces;
- Off-hour use if it is determined that the site operates exclusively after the evening peak demand period when sufficient on-street parking will be available; and
- Reductions in water pollution and stormwater run-off for sites that are surfaced with permeable paving (eligible for a fraction of a 20% reduction in minimum parking requirement).

Perhaps the most striking element of Petaluma’s SmartCode parking requirement was its inclusion of a sunset clause—a specific date on which the required parking minimums expired (§ 6.10.070). According to this clause, central Petaluma has not had any minimum parking requirements for any land use since January 1, 2008. Development teams may include as much or as little parking as they wish, so long as they comply with building-form requirements. The amount of parking provided is therefore no longer dictated by the government, but guided by what development teams think that lenders, buyers, tenants, and the community will accept. This reduction, and eventual abolition, of minimum parking requirements has proven to be a key element of Downtown Petaluma’s success.

The specific geometry of Downtown Petaluma is more akin to a downtown district such as the Business Triangle than a linear corridor such as that of the potential expansion areas. Form-based code requirements are highly suitable for linear corridors, however, because community members from adjacent residential areas have a more accurate sense of potential development in the area. If coupled with a shift away from use-based requirements (such as parking requirements that are linked to specific land uses), this approach is likely to be more attractive to developers since there is less of an administrative burden on new development so long as the form-based requirements are met.

---


PARKING IMPACT FEE

An impact fee differs from an in-lieu because an in-lieu fee is optional, whereas an impact fee is not. Many communities throughout California are increasingly relying on transportation-specific impacts fees to ensure that the costs of transportation infrastructure and services necessary to support new development are not borne disproportionately by existing residents, businesses, or property-owners. Instead, the developer pays a fee and passes along the costs to future owners and tenants of the development.

The power to exact impact fees for development arises from the City’s police power to protect public health, safety, and welfare. Various types of impact fees are used to fund a variety of public facilities and services including roads, pedestrian facilities, transit service expansions, parking facilities, parks, schools, public art, and libraries. However, there must be a nexus between the impact for which the fee is charged and the type of project on which the fee is spent. This nexus is determined by a nexus study that is conducted in relation to the fee.

A Parking Impact Fee allows a city to collect revenue from new developments that are driving the demand for additional parking and its associated impacts. The cost of required parking is normally embedded in the cost of development, but impact fees expose the true cost of parking spaces and allow cities to express the parking requirements in terms comparable to municipal impact fees. 54

Why implement it?

Development impact fees are a widely used, well-accepted practice in California. They offer an efficient way to pay for new infrastructure, help sustain job growth in local economies, and contribute to economic prosperity. Above all, impact fees are one of the most efficient and effective ways to create a link between new development and the impacts it will have on the community.

Parking impact fees offer cities a revenue stream that can be used to fund a variety of transportation improvements which can help to mitigate or offset parking impacts. By law, these fees cannot simply go to a city’s general fund, but must be specifically allocated to transportation and parking projects. California cities have used revenue from parking impact fees to finance:

- Additional public parking supplies
- Parking management and shared parking programs to increase the efficiency of how existing parking supplies are used
- Enhanced transit services, bicycle facilities and pedestrian infrastructure to encourage a shift from driving to other modes
- Transportation demand management (TDM) programs that reduce trips and parking demand
- Commuter subsidies and shuttles that reduce

54 Shoup, Donald (1999) Instead of Free Parking. Access 5, Fall 1999
How will it work?

Each parking space facilitates a certain number of vehicle trips with impacts on regional congestion and greenhouse gas emissions. A parking impact fee could be assessed based on a local nexus study quantifying these impacts. The provision of matching grants to cities that opt to pilot such a per-space municipal parking impact fee could lay the ground work for eventual implementation of a region-wide parking fee—a concept that could provide benefits along jurisdictional borders such as Robertson Boulevard.

The California Mitigation Fee Act requires cities to make certain findings and conduct a nexus study in order to establish an impact fee. These findings must identify the purpose of the fee and the use to which the fee is to be put. It must also determine how there is a reasonable relationship (nexus) between the fee’s use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.

The required nexus study is typically the venue by which the exact fee amount is determined. The methodology for determining the impact fee can vary from city to city, but generally involves a growth projection based on various land use scenarios, a synthesis of costs for potential capital projects and transportation programs to be funded by the fee, a traffic analysis to determine peak-hour vehicle trips, trip generation rates and impacts, and a final determination of fees by land use.

In terms of parking impact fees, the fee level could potentially be determined by the parking demand (spaces per 1,000 square feet) and a proportion of the cost to provide parking spaces. The parking impact fee would be charged on the basis of the square footage of a particularly land use, and not the number of parking spaces. Funds generated by the fee would then be placed into a mobility fund to be used to finance the planning, design, construction, and implementation of needed parking- and transportation-related facilities, improvements, and programs.

What are the challenges?

Impact fees are exactions that require a finding of a nexus between the type of exaction and the projects toward which funds are allocated. This requirement adds legal, planning, and administrative costs to the process of implementing impact fees. In particular, the City would need to undertake a nexus study to ensure that there is a reasonable relationship between the Parking Impact Fee and the projects for which the fee is used.

Since passage of Proposition 218 in 1996, many fees now equate with taxes, which means that they also require a vote of property owners. This requirement adds further cost, time and difficulty to the process of establishing impact fees in California cities.

Impact fees in selected California cities

Until a nexus study is conducted, it is difficult to determine the level of a potential impact fee. As seen in Figure 56, impact fees in Californian cities vary dramatically. Many impact fees are for uses other than parking or trip reduction. Impacts fees on new housing are often used for road capacity expansion, schools, and parks that serve new populations associated with development.

55 Government Code Section 66000 et seq.
Figure 56: New development impact fees among selected California cities, 2009 (n=42)\textsuperscript{56}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail (per sf)</td>
<td>$10.35</td>
<td>$8.80</td>
<td>$0.39</td>
<td>$46.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (per sf)</td>
<td>$6.48</td>
<td>$4.54</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>$22.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (per sf)</td>
<td>$3.59</td>
<td>$2.76</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$12.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family (per unit)</td>
<td>$6,197</td>
<td>$4,612</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$26,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family (per unit)</td>
<td>$4,059</td>
<td>$2,934</td>
<td>$63</td>
<td>$16,934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Palo Alto’s Transportation Impact Fee**

Palo Alto faces the dilemma of many great places: it is interesting to many different people and businesses, and therefore attracts more cars than it can handle. Recognizing this concern without wanting to diminish the attractiveness of the city, Palo Alto adopted a General Plan that emphasizes the importance of non-automobile modes and minimizes increases in vehicle trips throughout the city. To support these goals, the city replaced its previous traffic impact fee (which applied in a small part of the city and only allowed for intersection widening and roadway capacity expansion), with a citywide Transportation Impact Fee. Nelson/Nygaard drafted the new fee and undertook the associated nexus study on behalf of the City.

The new Transportation Impact Fee focuses on reducing motor vehicle trips associated with new development, and generates funds for bicycle, shuttle, transportation demand management (TDM), and computerized traffic management programs. The fee structure also provides financial incentives for developments to minimize their trip generation by locating close to transit, providing a mix of land uses, or implementing TDM programs.

In conjunction with the Transportation Impact Fee, the city instituted new, lower minimum parking requirements that were based on on-street and off-street parking demand as calculated within the fee’s nexus study. The City’s parking requirements apply a single “blended” parking rate to all non-residential uses. This approach confers a significant economic advantage on businesses and developers (as well as city administrators), because uses can change without parking requirements becoming an obstacle. The blended rate approach therefore allows

Palo Alto’s mixed-use areas to compete with conventional shopping centers, which are able to change their tenant mix quite freely, without triggering requirements to build additional parking. In this way, the strategy has helped downtown Palo Alto to thrive, while many other historic districts struggle with storefronts that remain vacant, primarily because parking requirements cannot be met.

By combining lower minimum parking rates with the Transportation Impact Fee, Palo Alto has been able to simultaneously enhance business vitality, preserve historic assets, and increase walkability and multimodal mobility.

**PARKING IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS**

Parking improvement districts (PIDs) are defined geographic areas, typically in downtowns or along commercial corridors, in which any revenue generated from on-street and off-street parking facilities within the district is returned to the district to finance neighborhood improvements.

**Why implement it?**

Paying for parking can be unpopular for a number of reasons. One of the primary reasons is that when motorists feed the meter, their money seems to disappear and they feel they derive little benefit from the transaction. This is largely because most cities have traditionally sent their parking revenue into the general fund, and not necessarily to improving parking or enhancing the transportation system. In recent years, some cities have sought to reverse this dynamic by implementing Parking Improvement Districts (PIDs).

The primary goal of a PID is to effectively manage an area’s parking supply and demand so that parking is, above all, convenient and easy for motorists. PIDs typically employ a number of parking management techniques to manage parking supply and demand, including demand-based pricing and removal of time limits. However, experience has shown that in order to secure community and business support for new pricing of parking, the revenue needs to be reinvested back into the community. Drivers will always prefer not to pay for parking, but a PID can create a new local constituency for parking pricing.

PIDs require local parking revenue to stay local, while financing neighborhood improvements. They allow local merchants and property owners to clearly see that the monies collected are being spent for the benefit of their district, on projects that they have chosen. In turn, they become willing to support, and often advocate on behalf of, demand-based pricing.

**How will it work?**

A successful PID would typically incorporate a number of key elements. Firstly, the city would need to adopt an ordinance to create a PID, and stipulate that all parking revenue generated within the area be used to fund designated neighborhood improvements. The city would also
designate a governing body to develop and oversee the PID program. This governing body could take several forms. It could be an existing community organization such as a business improvement district (BID); or a newly created private advisory board, comprised of property owners or businesses. Alternatively, the body might be an appointed or volunteer advisory board representing residents, property owners, businesses, and city staff; or a non-profit community development corporation.

The governing body would then develop an approved program of revenue expenditures, subject to Council approval. Once the program is adopted, parking meters and pricing structures should then be implemented to facilitate demand-based pricing—whereby parking is priced to maintain desired occupancy levels (of say 85%). The governing body should also develop a coordinated public relations plan, which uses wayfinding, signage, and public outreach to explain the role of demand-based pricing and to articulate how parking revenue is being utilized to benefit the District and the city. Periodically, PID management systems, policies and expenditures should be evaluated.

Potential expenditures to be included in the PID program might include a range of parking and street related items:

- Purchase and installation costs of meters through revenue bonds or a “build operate-transfer” financing agreement with a vendor
- Transit, pedestrian, and bicycle infrastructure and amenities
- Shuttle services to remote park-and-ride facilities during peak periods
- Valet parking services during peak periods
- Leasing of private spaces for public use
- Additional parking enforcement
- Construction of new parking, if deemed necessary
- Streetscape improvements and landscaping
- Street cleaning, power-washing of sidewalks, and graffiti removal;
- Marketing and promotion of PID and local businesses
- “Mobility Ambassadors” to provide visitor assistance and additional security
- Management activities for the oversight entity

**Austin Parking Benefit District**

In 2007, the City of Austin, Texas initiated a pilot program to extend metered parking coverage along a commercial strip near the University of Texas in an effort to capture spillover where drivers were congesting adjacent streets to avoid existing parking meters. As the area has grown considerably in recent years due to proximity to the university, the City rolled out a full PID program (entitled the Austin Parking Benefit District) in 2012 to encourage both the turnover of spaces and to fund local improvements. The PID allows residents and business owners to distinguish boundaries extending out from the metered areas with the approval of the City where revenue generated from the meters can be applied to street and sidewalk enhancements. The program covers all of the City’s expenses (meter/pay station installation, credit card processing, back office support, and state sales tax) while still returning 51% of revenues to the district.
Expenditure of funds is community-driven; neighborhood associations develop prioritized project lists which are then submitted to the City for implementation. Since its inception, the program has been successful in effectively managing parking demand while funding street improvements which create a better environment for walking and cycling in the neighborhoods in which revenues are generated.  

**Parking Assessment Zoning**

A parking assessment zone or parking assessment district is a defined area in which property owners are assessed in order to generate a new revenue stream, which is then leveraged for funding parking improvements.

**Why implement it?**

Assessment districts provide an independent source of revenue for funding public infrastructure, operations, and maintenance. Using an assessment district, the City is able to levy a special assessment against all properties within the assessment zone in order to implement a range of parking and trip reduction strategies. Unlike property taxes, which are based on the value of the property, the special parking assessment would be based on level of benefit that each property would receive as a result of implementing the associated projects. In this way, assessment districts can be seen as a fair way of funding improvements in public infrastructure, as well as operations and maintenance.

Since cities have become less able to rely on local tax revenues, many cities have implemented assessment districts to help fund local infrastructure and services. Assessment districts are typically used to fund specific infrastructure such as streetlights, landscaping, and curbing and guttering. They have also been used for construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities such as libraries, fire protection services, roads, parks, and water and sewer systems.

**How will it work?**

Assessment districts became very popular in the 1980s and 90s, when many assessment districts were created without the need for a vote of affected property owners. In these cases, the district was formed by the city after receiving a petition from property owners in favor of providing the associated public improvement. Today, establishment of an assessment district requires a preliminary support petition, followed by a vote of affected property owners, and a public hearing.

Once an assessment district is established, it operates by levying an assessment on each property in accordance with the benefit that the property will receive from the associated project(s). Property owners have the opportunity to pay this assessment in cash prior to the period of bond

---


58 City of Austin. [https://austintexas.gov/department/parking-benefit-district](https://austintexas.gov/department/parking-benefit-district).

59 Fulton and Shigley (2005) attribute this to the effects of Proposition 13 in 1978, which limited increases in property tax rates, as well as shifts in the funding of school districts in the early 1990s.
issuance. Otherwise, an assessment lien is recorded against each affected property, and the property owners pay through annual installments that are included on their county property tax bill. The payment period is usually in the range of 15 to 20 years. During this time, revenue that is generated is returned to the area to finance the agreed improvements.

What are the challenges?

Since the passage of Proposition 218 in 1996, the process of establishing an assessment district has become more difficult and requires a vote of affected property owners. Proposition 218 states that all local taxes are invalid unless they are approved by a two-thirds majority of local voters or a simple majority of property owners within the affected area.\textsuperscript{60} It also provides the opportunity to protest assessment districts through a process that is similar to an election. These requirements add cost and effort to the process of establishing an assessment district.

Old Pasadena Management District

Old Pasadena Management District provides an example of how various tools can be combined within a single parking area. In this case, the City used a combination of a parking credit program (1987), existing public parking supplies, district improvements funded by parking meter revenues (1993), and a management district funded by property assessments (2000).

By the early 1990s, the City of Pasadena’s efforts to revive Old Pasadena were hindered by a lack of convenient and available parking spots for customers. At that time, Old Pasadena had no parking meters, and proposals to install them were opposed by local merchants, who feared charges would drive customers away.

In 1993, the Old Pasadena Parking Meter Zone was created and meters were installed. Borrowing against future parking meter revenues, the City funded substantial streetscape, parking, maintenance, beautification, and safety projects. These investments helped to reverse the decline in the district, and an increase in sales tax revenue has created a cycle of revival and reinvestment, making Old Pasadena a popular destination. By 2001, net parking meter revenue (after collection costs) amounted to $1.2 million, all of which is used for public services in that part of the city.

To further this work, the Old Pasadena Management District (OPMD) was formed in 2000. This non-profit management entity obtains most of its funds from annual tax assessments on privately

The best way to balance parking supply and demand is to treat parking like any other scarce commodity... There will always be a scarcity of a commodity if it is given away for free.

PARKING USER FEES AND DYNAMIC PRICING

Parking is not an end in itself, but rather a means to achieve and support broader community goals and priorities. People do not park their vehicle simply to “park,” but rather to accomplish a task, such as shopping or having dinner, or arriving at their final destination such as work or home. A city’s parking supply is also a public good that needs to be actively managed so that it can meet parking demand during different seasons, different days of the week, or even at different times throughout the day.

The best way to balance parking supply and demand is to treat parking like any other scarce commodity, and require motorists to directly pay for use of a space. There will always be a scarcity of a commodity if it is given away for free. By setting a price for parking, a city can establish the “market value” for each parking space and adjust those prices depending on the level of demand. Just as hotel room rates increase or decrease based on availability, dynamic parking pricing seeks to increase prices when and where demand is highest and reduce prices when and where demand is low.

Dynamic pricing does not generate parking turnover through rigid time limits (like 3-hour parking), but uses progressive pricing structures that take into account how long one has been parked. In other words, the goal is not to punish someone for wanting to stay longer, but allow them to stay as long as they are willing to pay for the space being used.

New advances in parking meter technology, such as wireless “smart” meters, make demand-based pricing a feasible option and can dramatically increase motorist convenience.

Why implement it?

The primary goal of user fees and dynamic pricing is to make it as easy as possible to find a parking space. By setting specific availability targets and adjusting pricing, demand can be effectively managed so that when a motorist chooses to park, they can do so without circling the block or searching aimlessly. User fees and dynamic pricing can result in the following benefits:

- Consistent availability and ease in finding a parking space

---

• Longer time limits, which eliminate the need to move a vehicle to avoid time restrictions
• Convenient payment methods (credit cards, pay-by-phone) that eliminate the need to “plug the meter” and make it easier to avoid parking tickets
• Reduced search time for parking, resulting in less local congestion and vehicle emissions
• Reduced illegal parking and improved safety and street operations
• More equitable and efficient accounting for the real costs of providing parking
• Reduced need to construct costly new parking supplies

How will it work?

An ideal occupancy rate for on-street, curb spaces is approximately 85% at even the busiest hour, a rate which leaves about one out of every seven spaces available, or approximately one empty space on each block face. For off-street facilities where motorists turn over less frequently, target rates should be even higher, at approximately 95%, to ensure that supply is optimally utilized. These rates provide enough vacancies that visitors can easily find a spot near their destination when they first arrive. For a given block or off-street facility, the “right price” is the price that will achieve this goal. This means that pricing should not be uniform: the most desirable spaces need higher prices, while less convenient lots are cheap or may even be free. Prices could also vary by season, day of week, or time of day.

In order to implement user fees and dynamic pricing the City would need to carry out a number of actions:

• Remove all on-street and meter parking time limits.
• Eliminate all free, 1-hour free and 2-hour free parking that undermine a competitive parking market.
• Eliminate quantity discounts such as early bird parking and monthly employee rates.
• Determine the program’s hours of operation. Hours of operation for metered parking are often set from 10 a.m. – 8 p.m., seven days per week with extended hours on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday for nighttime destinations. Structured parking hours may be based initially on the existing operating hours.
• Determine the pricing structure during operation, and use pricing to generate turnover. Pricing could start at $0.50 an hour and be adjusted periodically (e.g. quarterly) to meet a target occupancy rate of 85%. These rates would be communicated via online parking tools or apps, as well as by the individual parking meters themselves.
• Monitor on- and off-street supply with regular occupancy counts.
• Grant city staff discretion to adjust hours or pricing in response to seasonal or weekend demand. Meter pricing would continue to be adjusted until it reaches target availability rates of one open space per block.
• Allow businesses to petition for future changes.
Dynamic Pricing in Redwood City

Redwood City is one of the foremost examples of a city that has implemented demand-based pricing to manage on-street demand and maintain availability across the on-street parking inventory.

The City created an ordinance that grants its parking management director authority to adjust meter rates based on documented utilization patterns and an explicit availability target of 15%. The City’s smart parking program then varies the price of parking in order to better distribute parked cars throughout the downtown—charging more for parking on Main Street than they do for off-street supplies, and providing free parking on the edge of the downtown. This pricing structure increases the efficiency of parking use, reduces cruising congestion and delays to motorists, and provides new foot traffic to businesses in the city.

The City has three types of paid parking. Firstly, the City continues to operate a number of coin-operated parking meters that operate from 10 a.m. – 6 p.m. Monday through Friday at a fixed rate. Over time, the City has upgraded to solar-operated pay-by-space smart meters for numbered on-street spaces. Installation of smart meters has occurred in conjunction with streetscape improvements that make the downtown more attractive and walkable. The smart meters accept coins, bills, credit cards, and phone payments, and will even call motorists to check if they need more time when the meter is about to expire. Finally, the City’s parking inventory includes public and private pay-on-exit garages.

This multi-layered approach allows the City to manage parking demands that vary dramatically over time. The system also integrates both public and private parking into a single system with consistent signage, wayfinding, real-time information, and easy payment options.

Using revenue generated from parking meters under this pricing strategy, the City of Redwood City has built a new public parking facility and financed other district improvements.

PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS AND PARKING LEASES

Shared parking is one of the most effective public-private partnerships in parking management. Under public-private shared parking arrangements, parking spaces are not treated as individual units specific to particular businesses or uses, but are considered as a potential asset within a common pool of shared, publicly available spaces. These spaces may be leased to the City by private operators, or may be operated in a joint manner. These types of public-private partnerships and parking leases are particularly useful in places like Beverly Hills where there is a
high demand for parking and large private parking supplies that are underutilized for much of the day and the year (as discussed in Chapter 2).

**Why implement it?**

Building new parking in built-up environments such as Beverly Hills is extraordinarily expensive. It is always better and less expensive to first increase the efficiency of how existing parking supplies are used, than to simply build more spaces. This increase in efficiency can be obtained by creating public-private partnerships or lease arrangements that leverage existing private parking spaces for use as shared public parking supplies.

More efficient use of existing parking supplies yields economic benefits to the community, since property owners can make money from their underused parking supplies, and the city can benefit from businesses operating on land that would otherwise be given over to parking. Since different land uses (such as banks and restaurants) have different hours, days and seasons of parking demand, they can easily share a common parking facility, thereby reducing the need to provide additional parking. This is a key benefit of a mixed use district, and one that should be reflected in parking policies.

In Beverly Hills, public-private parking partnerships and parking leases also complement the City’s policy of Park-Once-and-Walk, which allows motorists to park just once and complete multiple daily tasks on foot before returning to their vehicle. This policy reduces vehicle trips and impacts, as well as reducing parking demand because spaces are efficiently shared between different uses.

Public-private parking partnerships and parking leases also result in streetscape improvements associated with a smaller total parking footprint in the city. No great city is known for its abundant parking spaces, though many cities that are dominated by parking have become unattractive to residents, pedestrians and shoppers alike. Fewer, more strategically placed lots and structures allow for better urban design and more contiguous shop frontages. They also allow for a more active public life on the streets because motorists are transformed into pedestrians, who walk instead of drive to different destinations and therefore generate additional patrons of street-friendly retail businesses.

**How will it work?**

In Beverly Hills, there are a number of specific policies that will help to facilitate public-private parking partnerships or parking leases. These are listed below.

- Eliminate 1-hour free and 2-hour free parking policies that undermine the viability of private parking operators and encourage serial reparking.
- Improve wayfinding and real-time parking information to maximize use of the existing public and private parking supplies.
- Allow parking to be shared among different uses within a single mixed-use building by right.
• Require as a condition of approval that all newly constructed private parking in any development or adaptive reuse project be made available to the public.

• Work with property owners and businesses to ensure that private parking is made available to the public when not needed for its primary commercial use.

• Work with property owners and businesses to develop mutually-agreeable operating and liability arrangements for public use of private parking facilities.

• Purchase or lease existing private parking lots or structures from willing sellers and add this parking to the shared public supply before building expensive new garages.

• Reduce minimum parking requirements to reflect the efficiencies that are gained as a result of public-private parking partnerships.

San Diego’s Centre City Development Corporation

The Centre City Development Corporation (CCDC) is a public, non-profit corporation created by the City of San Diego to implement Downtown redevelopment projects and programs. Formed in 1975, CCDC serves as the City’s catalyst for public-private partnerships and redevelopment projects. In terms of parking, the organization aims to achieve affordable, convenient, short- and long-term parking using multiple strategies, better utilization of existing parking supplies, and alternative forms of transportation.

Significant revenue from on-street parking meters funded and bonded CCDC’s first public parking structure—Park It on Market. Much of the revenue from this first garage was used to fund a second parking structure—6th and K Parkade. While these facilities have generated significant revenue, their rates nonetheless represent the least expensive parking in downtown.

One of CCDC’s goals for expanding the parking supply was to make use of the area’s significant amount of private parking spaces (typically accessory to office uses) for public parking during evenings and weekends. Its first venture was to make parking facilities serving an office building and elementary school in the Little Italy neighborhood available to the public from Friday night through Sunday afternoon.

A shared-use agreement was formulated between the City, the Little Italy Association, and the two parking owners, outlining the following arrangements:

• The City paid the building owner to stay open;

---

Parking was initially free to entice users to the formerly private parking facilities;

- Fees would be introduced when demand rose with the evening rate capped at $5.00;
- Evening and weekend revenue would be distributed in a 40:60 split between the CCDC and operator respectively; and
- The program was managed through the Little Italy Association to simplify administration and ensure that local business was invested in program success.

The program has been successful in creating new supply. The school surface lot continues to be leased and now charges for parking. Parking income is collected by the School District on behalf of the school, and deposited into Washington Elementary School’s account as discretionary income. School staff are pleased with the program and are not aware of any problems relating to safety or property damage.63 Part of the rental fee also includes the cost of having a janitor on-site for security purposes whenever the facility is open.64

Under this shared parking program, the school’s south parking lot is open when school is not in session and is located adjacent to a small public park. This facility is highly visible, and well used by weekend and evening visitors to the area. The north parking lot is locked much of the time (when the school is not in session), and only rented when there are local events such as the San Diego ArtWalk, which annually attracts over 120,000 people to the district. This lot therefore helps to boost the area’s parking capacity in times of greatest demand. As a result of these arrangements, the City has been relieved from the need to construct more facilities in order to accommodate demand for just a few days each week (or each year). This type of arrangement could be considered in relation to the Horace Mann School on Robertson Boulevard.

The less-visible office-related parking garage was not well utilized and was unable to compete with other local parking, which is free after 6 p.m. The City therefore suspended use of this garage, but considers the facility a potential resource or parking bank that is available to meet future demand. This strategy has therefore yielded considerable opportunity savings for the City in terms of undue development of public parking.

**Santa Monica Using In-lieu Fees for Shared Parking**

In 1986, Santa Monica’s downtown area was identified as both a special assessment district and Developer Parking Fee (in-lieu fee) zone. The assessment district provided funding for the revitalization of the downtown, and the in-lieu fee was intended to fund existing municipal structures and future expansion of public parking garages in the pedestrian-oriented Park-Once-and-Walk area. A shared parking supply was already in place and functional when the assessment and fee districts were initiated.

The current in-lieu fee in Santa Monica is an annual fee of $1.50 per square foot of building area for which parking is not provided. For example, if a 100,000 square foot project is developed but the developer only provides parking to satisfy the demand for 80,000 square feet of space, then the project is assessed an annual fee of $30,000 ($1.50 per square foot times the 20,000 square feet). This revenue is earmarked for constructing or replacing public parking in the Downtown

---

63 Telephone communication with Trudy Gingery, School Secretary, Washington Elementary School, April 25, 2014
64 Telephone communication with Debora Beaver, Real Estate Specialist, San Diego Unified School District (SDUSD), April 25, 2014.
Santa Monica, Inc. (DTSM) District. The ability to collect these annual fees is scheduled to expire in 2016, along with the Bayside Mall Assessment District.

In 2013, the City approved a new in-lieu fee of $20,000 per space (for 2016), and evaluated the feasibility of allowing in-lieu fee revenues to be spent on other cost-effective programs that reduce demand for parking or more effectively utilize existing parking resources, such as the leasing of private parking spaces.

Developers have been very receptive to this in-lieu policy, as the fee is much lower than the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining private parking, covering about 10% of structured parking construction costs. The efficiencies gained from the in-lieu and shared parking programs have therefore allowed the City to establish a parking supply target of 2.1 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of commercial floor area, which is markedly lower than the City’s standards for general office, retail, and small restaurants. The downtown continues to thrive with this low level of supply, which attests to the benefits of a park-once shared parking management district model.


66 The general standards for the City of Santa Monica are 3.3 spaces per 1,000 square feet for general office, retail, and small restaurants. Fast food restaurants have higher standards of 13.33 spaces per 1,000 square feet.
8 ZONING STANDARDS ON ROBERTSON BOULEVARD

As discussed in Chapter 1, new investment along the Robertson Boulevard corridor has been slower than other commercial areas within Beverly Hills and elsewhere. Land uses along the corridor are predominantly single-story commercial uses, including older, low-end retail activities such as hair and nail salons, auto repair facilities, cafés, restaurants, and several vacant properties. This chapter will consider zoning standards on Robertson Boulevard in relation to their likely effect on new development. These standards will be compared with those of comparable corridors in other cities, in order to identify potential code-related levers for new investment and business regeneration along the corridor.

COMPARABLE CORRIDORS

In an effort to showcase the potential of the Robertson Boulevard Expansion Area, we have selected three comparable corridors in other cities in California (Los Angeles, Santa Monica, and Palo Alto) which have successfully achieved vibrant and aesthetically appealing retail environments that allow for “park once” activity through innovative zoning and parking policies.
Robertson Boulevard, Los Angeles

Just a few blocks to the north of the expansion area, Robertson Boulevard runs through an appealing stretch of the City of Los Angeles from Burton Way to the border of the City of West Hollywood, just a few parcels short of Beverly Boulevard. The three block area predominately features single-story upscale retail. The road has a turning lane and one travel lane in each direction (as opposed to two lanes in each direction in Beverly Hills), with two-hour meter parking (between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m. on Monday-Saturday and 11 a.m. and 8 p.m. on Sunday) on both sides. In addition to on-street parking, the City of Los Angeles operates Lot 703, a garage priced at $1.20 per half hour and $1.20 for each fifteen minutes after three hours (maximum $12). In addition to utilizing ground floor space for retail, the garage has a casing façade which masks parking from street view. Additionally, many businesses offer off-street parking in the rear, similar to the segment of the street located in the Expansion Area.

Main Street, Santa Monica

The Main Street Special Commercial district of Santa Monica runs along Main Street from Bay Street in the north to Pier Avenue in the south. The corridor accommodates a variety of uses, providing appealing independently owned retail and dining options for residents and visitors alike. The road has a turning lane and one travel lane in each direction, with two-hour meter parking on both sides and municipally owned pay-by-space surface lots located behind businesses.
University Avenue, Palo Alto

The University Avenue corridor in downtown Palo Alto extends from Tasso Street to High Street towards the campus of Stanford University. The corridor features two and three story mixed-use buildings with predominately higher-end retail activities and independently owned restaurants, cafés, and bars located on ground floors. The road has one travel lane in each direction with alternating free two-hour parking and free thirty-minute angled parking along the curbs.

The University Avenue corridor is zoned as a special Ground Floor Combining District which is purposed as an adaptation to the City’s CD commercial downtown district, with an emphasis on encouraging ground floor uses which facilitate pedestrian activity. By selecting to eliminate a few on-street spaces on each block, the City plants street trees in parking lanes, and widens curbs at intersections, allowing more room for pedestrians and street furniture. Additionally the City has recently installed six bike corrals in spots previously occupied by curb parking, for a total of sixty new on-street spaces for bikes.

Parking in the prime real estate district of downtown Palo Alto is underpriced and heavily subsidized. On-street parking meters, which had been used since 1947, were decommissioned in the 1970s due to fears of economic encroachment by the newly-built Stanford shopping mall.\textsuperscript{68} All curb and surface lot parking within the district has remained free but time-limited since that time, though these policies are currently under review as part of a major parking study. Public garages are also underpriced, with annual permits costing $420, and City employees able to park for free.

Unfortunately for Palo Alto, the underpricing of parking in the district has led to congestion and the incentivized use of single occupancy vehicles (SOVs) in the downtown area,\textsuperscript{69} which already offers an abundance of transit options. The city is currently exploring the possibility of implementing dynamic pricing schemes for on-street parking, such as those employed by SFpark in San Francisco, and a number of TDM measures to alleviate these concerns.

**BULK REGULATIONS**

**Height Limits and FAR**

Under the Beverly Hills Zoning Code, most of the Robertson Boulevard Expansion Area is identified as C-3, a Low Density General Commercial Zone as described in the General Plan with a floor area ratio (FAR) of 2.0 and height limits of 45 feet.\textsuperscript{70} The Municipal Code specifies that no

\textsuperscript{68} Goebel, Bryan. “Palo Alto, choked by famously free parking, may consider pricing the curb.” StreetsBlog SF, July 30, 2012.


alterations or additions to existing and future buildings exceed a height of 45 feet or three (3) stories, whichever is less.\textsuperscript{71}

In addition to commercially zoned areas, the Robertson Blvd Expansion Area has a site zoned for Public School, which is the site of the Horace Mann School.

Height limits and allowable FAR for commercial districts in Beverly Hills are generally consistent with, or more lenient than, such regulations in the comparable cities. In terms of setback requirements, however, new development along Robertson Boulevard is required to provide a 10-foot setback from the property line (presumably at the front) in addition to a 6-foot rear setback adjacent to residential uses.\textsuperscript{72} Given the relatively shallow depth of parcels (about 100-feet between the front property line and rear alley), this requirement limits the potential development footprint and therefore reduces the viability of new construction along the corridor. A more detailed development pro forma analysis is underway to assess the impact of these types of conditions on the feasibility of new development in the potential expansion areas.

Relative to comparable corridors, however, this minimum setback would tend to create a financial disadvantage for those who wish to undertake new construction along Robertson Boulevard. Coupled with the high land values in Beverly Hills, the geometric constraints produced by the setback and parking requirements (discussed below) reduce the potential profitability of new development projects.

\textsuperscript{71} City of Beverly Hills Municipal Code §10-3-2726 Height Limits of Buildings in Commercial Zones.

\textsuperscript{72} City of Beverly Hills Municipal Code §10-3-2755 Robertson Boulevard and Third Street Setbacks.
Figure 57: Bulk Requirements in Beverly Hills and Comparable Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Robertson Blvd, Beverly Hills</th>
<th>Robertson Blvd, Los Angeles</th>
<th>Main Street, Santa Monica</th>
<th>Downtown Palo Alto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Height Limit</td>
<td>45’ or 3 stories (C-3)</td>
<td>45’ (C2)</td>
<td>27’ or 2 stories (CM-2, CM-3, CM-4) 35’ or 3 stories (preferred permitted projects)³³</td>
<td>50’ (CDC(GF)(P))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</td>
<td>2 (C-3)</td>
<td>1.5 (C2-1VL)</td>
<td>0.8 (CM-2) 1.0 (CM-2 w 30% housing) 1.5 (CM-2 preferred, CM-3, CM-4) 2.0 (CM-3 or CM-4 preferred)</td>
<td>1.0 (CDC(GF)(P)) 2.0 (hotels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Setback</td>
<td>0’ front (C-3) 6’ rear (C-3) 10’ (Robertson)</td>
<td>0’ (C2)</td>
<td>0’ front 25’ (if frontage is on Second Street and abuts residential) 0’ rear (CM-2 on west side) 5’ rear (CM-2 on east side) 15’ rear (3 story portions)</td>
<td>0’ (CDC) 10’ (abutting or opposite residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>No requirement</td>
<td>Minimum lot: 50’ width 5,000 ft² lot</td>
<td>Maximum lot: 6,000 ft² lot</td>
<td>Maximum size (ft²): 2,500 (personal services) 15,000 (retail) 20,000 (grocery) 5,000 (dining/drinking)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Off-Street Parking Requirements

As discussed in Chapter 3, the City imposes minimum off-street parking requirements that are generally one space per 350 square feet of development, which is equivalent to 2.9 spaces per 1,000 square feet of development. Higher minimum parking requirements are imposed for specific land uses that are likely to generate trips—along with higher rates of foot traffic and business vitality. These uses include eating and bar facilities larger than 1,000 square feet, which are required to provide 23 spaces per 1,000 square feet for the first 9,000 square feet, and 16 spaces per 1,000 square feet beyond that. Also, exercise clubs have a minimum parking

³³ Preferred permitted projects include: 100% affordable housing; historic preservation; child day care centers; congregate housing; domestic violence shelters; homeless shelters with less than 55 beds; mixed use commercial-residential projects where at least 90% of floor area at the second floor and above is dedicated toward residential uses, 25% of the residential units are 3-bedroom or larger, 66% of remaining residential units are 2 bedrooms or larger, and the project is registered with the USGBC to receive a LEED rating of silver or higher level; places of worship; senior group housing; senior housing; and transitional housing (City of Santa Monica Zoning Code 9.04.08.28.060 CM Main Street Commercial District Property Development Standards).
requirement of 10 spaces per 1,000 square feet. Parking requirements may not be met through tandem or compact parking.\(^{74}\)

**Figure 58: Parking Requirements in Beverly Hills and Comparable Cities (spaces/1,000 square feet)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Robertson Blvd, Beverly Hills</th>
<th>University Ave, Palo Alto</th>
<th>Main Street, Santa Monica</th>
<th>Robertson Blvd, Los Angeles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>2.9 (≤1000sf)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>2.9 (1000–9000sf)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>23 (1000–9000sf)</td>
<td>3.3 (support area)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 (spaces beyond 9000sf)</td>
<td>13.3 (service and seating areas open to customers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 (separate bar area)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>1 space/rentable room</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prohibited Land Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/unit</td>
<td>0.5 space/unit (after first 30 guest rooms)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33 space/unit (rooms beyond 60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theaters</td>
<td>1 space/4 seats</td>
<td>4 (land use permitted only above ground floor)</td>
<td>4 (≥1000sf of total FA of building)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5 per 1000sf of assembly area, whichever is greater</td>
<td>3.3 (&lt;1000sf of total FA of building)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical office / lab</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 (land use permitted only above ground floor)</td>
<td>4 (≥1000sf of total FA of building)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 (&lt;1000sf of total FA of building)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>1 space/classroom</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1 space/classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Training Center &lt;= 2,000 sf</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 *Requires CUP</td>
<td>12.5 (per 1000sf of assembly area) or 1 space/each 4 fixed seats, whichever is greater</td>
<td>20 or 1 space/each 5 fixed seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Requires CUP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise club</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>12.5 (per 1000sf of exercise space)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 (per 1000sf of locker room, sauna, or shower area)</td>
<td>*Requires CUP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Restricted land use</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>Restricted land use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{74}\) City of Beverly Hills, Minimum Parking Standards Rev 0308.
As shown in Figure 36, minimum parking requirements for retail, restaurant, and office uses in Beverly Hills are similar to that of other cities with comparable corridors. Key differences are outlined below.

**Restaurant Rates for Robertson Boulevard (LA) and Main Street (Santa Monica)**

Restaurant uses are an important tool for encouraging more street-level pedestrian activity and complementing retail uses within a corridor.

Robertson Boulevard in Los Angeles has lower parking requirements for key land uses such as restaurants with dining and bar area larger than 1,000 square feet in size. The minimum parking requirement for this land use is 10 spaces per 1,000 square feet in Los Angeles compared to 22 spaces per 1,000 square feet in Beverly Hills. Similarly, Santa Monica’s minimum parking requirement for restaurant uses is 13.3 spaces per 1,000 square feet for service and seating areas open to customers, 20 spaces per 1,000 square feet for separate bar areas, in addition to 3.3 spaces per square foot of support area.

These requirements provide a clear financial incentive for new or expanded restaurant uses along Robertson Boulevard, Los Angeles—especially when parking spaces are provided above or below grade (see Chapter 5 on parking construction and land costs).

If restaurateurs or restaurant developers do choose to locate in Beverly Hills, the City’s parking requirements provide a strong financial incentive to keep dining and bar areas below 1,000 square feet. Yet, with the high cost of land in Beverly Hills, it is difficult to make new construction profitable unless the cost is spread over a larger-sized development. For this reason, prospective developers are in a predicament of either paying excessive costs to build the required parking for projects that are large enough to pencil out, or receiving inadequate expected returns and dealing with difficult geometries for developments that fall below 1,000 square feet.

**The Blended Rate on University Avenue in Palo Alto**

Downtown Palo Alto’s special parking assessment district adopts a “blended” parking requirement that is shared over all uses so it is difficult to compare to Robertson’s parcel-by-parcel rate. Palo Alto’s blended parking rate provides an incentive for more mixed use and pedestrian-oriented development, and eliminates administrative and cost barriers associated with changes in land uses within the corridor. In addition, Palo Alto allows for minimum parking requirements to be met through the provision of on-site parking or off-site parking within a reasonable distance from a site.

Within Palo Alto’s University Avenue corridor, all nonresidential developments may also meet parking requirements through the payment of in-lieu fees. The City of Palo Alto allows for the payment of in-lieu fees if:

- Construction of on-site parking would necessitate destruction or substantial demolition of a designated historic structure;
The site is less than ten thousand square feet and it would not be physically feasible to provide on-site parking;

The site is greater than ten thousand square feet, but of such an unusual configuration that it would not be physically feasible to provide required spaces on-site;

The site is located in an area where city policy precludes curb cuts or otherwise prevents use of the site for on-site parking;

The site has other physical constraints, such as a high groundwater table, which preclude provision of on-site parking without extraordinary expense.\(^75\)

Palo Alto’s blended parking rate provides an incentive for more mixed use and pedestrian-oriented development, and eliminates administrative and cost barriers associated with changing land uses.

For each 250 square feet of gross floor area in a development, in-lieu payments in Palo Alto require an initial fee equal to the sum of construction costs, land acquisition, and administrative costs which can be attributed to the provision of one new parking space. The current fee as calculated by the City is $60,750 per space.\(^76\)

Feasible FAR is Determined by Parking Requirements

While the current parking requirement along Robertson Boulevard is roughly similar to comparable corridors, the City of Beverly Hills could consider adopting a blended rate for minimum parking, lowering the parking requirement, or even eliminating off-street parking requirements in order to attract new investment and development along the corridor.

The City’s current minimum parking requirements artificially increase the cost of urban development and discourage turnover of land uses.\(^77\) In addition to project time and administrative costs, the provision of surface, above grade, and below grade off-street parking facilities comes at a high opportunity and fiscal cost to developers. Surface lots and above grade structures fragment walkable and vibrant retail corridors at the expense of more productive uses that could generate higher levels of employment and tax revenue. Excavating sites for underground parking is an even more expensive, lengthy, and environmentally insensitive process that can bleed new projects of capital before they are even off the ground.

Equally damaging to developers is using a building’s floor area as the determinate for setting minimum parking requirements. In many cases project size is driven by minimum parking requirements, not by bulk or setback requirements. Due to lofty and overly complex minimum

\(^75\) City of Palo Alto, Zoning Ordinance Update – Information on Parking, April 9, 2003.

\(^76\) This value is from the City of Palo Alto Development Impact Fees, 02/21/2013


\(^77\) Donald Shoup and Michael Manville. “People, Parking, and Cities.” ACCESS 25. 2004, pp. 4-6
parking requirements, floor space and differentiation of uses is often constrained by the number of parking spaces that a developer can afford.\textsuperscript{78}

Take for example a new 1,500 square foot ground floor restaurant with 1,000 square feet of dining and bar to be built in a three-story commercial building with an allowable FAR of 2. In meeting Beverly Hills’ minimum parking requirement for a small restaurant and commercial uses (2.9 spaces/1,000 square feet of dining and bar area), and given the average area of an above grade off-street parking space (480 square feet per space), the developer would need to dedicate 5,760 square feet for parking. Taken over three floors, this requirement results in a ground floor built area of 10,260 square feet. Assuming a square lot,\textsuperscript{79} and accounting for a 6-foot rear setback adjacent to residential uses and 10-foot front setback along Robertson Boulevard, this translates to a total lot size of 4,356 square feet, which reduces the feasible FAR of the site to 1.03 (4,500 divided by 4,356) and results in 44% of the lot being used for parking.

A similar calculation for a two-story building with surface parking yields a feasible FAR of 0.67 (3,000 divided by 4,455) and 58% of the lot being used for parking.

If the developer wished to double the size of the development, a higher parking rate would apply to the restaurant uses. As a result of this parking requirement, the feasible FAR would drop to 0.61, with 67% of the lot being used for parking. In all three cases, the City’s minimum parking requirement means that the dominant use of land on the sites is parking and not the “land use” itself. These calculations are shown below.

\textbf{Figure 59: Feasible FAR Calculation under Robertson’s Zoning Standards}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>3-story restaurant + commercial with above grade parking</th>
<th>2-story restaurant + commercial with surface parking</th>
<th>3-story restaurant + commercial with above grade parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land use</td>
<td>1,500 sf ground flr restaurant (1,000 sf bar &amp; dining) 3,000 sf upper flr commercial</td>
<td>1,500 sf ground flr restaurant (1,000 sf bar &amp; dining) 3,000 sf upper flr commercial</td>
<td>1,500 sf ground flr restaurant (1,000 sf bar &amp; dining) 3,000 sf upper flr commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking requirement</td>
<td>2.9 spaces / 1000 sf</td>
<td>2.9 spaces / 1000 sf</td>
<td>2.9 spaces / 1000 sf coml. 22.2 spaces / 1000 sf dining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking spaces</td>
<td>12 spaces</td>
<td>8 spaces</td>
<td>62 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area / space</td>
<td>480 sf/space</td>
<td>321 sf/space</td>
<td>480 sf/space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking area</td>
<td>5,760 sf</td>
<td>2,568 sf</td>
<td>29,760 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use + parking</td>
<td>10,260 sf</td>
<td>5,568 sf</td>
<td>38,760 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setback required</td>
<td>10’ front + 6’ rear</td>
<td>10’ front (rear parking)</td>
<td>10’ front + 6’ rear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built footprint</td>
<td>4,356 sf</td>
<td>1,500 sf</td>
<td>12,920 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built + setback side</td>
<td>58’</td>
<td>39’</td>
<td>114’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{78} Donald Shoup. \textit{The High Cost of Free Parking}. American Planning Association, 2011, pp. 133-134

\textsuperscript{79} The impact of the rear setback requirement would be lower for rectangular lots with a narrow street frontage, and greater for rectangular lots with a relatively wide street frontage. Since there are both narrow and wide street frontages in the potential expansion areas, a square built footprint was chosen to provide an average representation.
### Basis of Minimum Parking Requirements

Minimum parking requirements have a profound effect on the built environment, yet even for most urban planners the basis from which they are formulated remains unclear. Because few cities have the staff or financial resources to conduct comprehensive parking studies, they depend on minimums already produced by other cities and *Parking Generation* handbooks produced by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). The purpose of the ITE’s handbooks is to set “parking generation rates,” defined as the peak parking occupancy for a specific land use, such as a restaurant or supermarket.

While such studies are well intended, the utilization of parking generation rates is problematic for numerous reasons. The vast majority of data used for these studies is collected at suburban sites, which often boast ample free parking and limited or no transit access, artificially inflating parking demand when applied to more transit-accessible, urban locations.

Secondly, rates are further skewed by focusing on peak demand. Many land uses, such as banks, only utilize their parking capacity during the workday while other large facilities, such as theaters, may only achieve peak parking demand during weekend evenings. Under the City’s parking requirements, mixed use environments such as Robertson Boulevard are treated in an additive manner, which means that intrinsic efficiencies associated with sharing parking resources are not rewarded. The City does, however, provide a partial discount where there is a day-and-night difference in uses associated with shared parking. In this case, up to 50% of the parking facilities associated with primarily daytime uses, may be used to satisfy the parking requirements for primarily nighttime uses.

The revitalization of the Horace Mann campus provides the perfect opportunity to adopt a shared parking scheme along the corridor, allowing for local businesses to utilize the school’s new parking capacity during evening and weekend periods when local parking demand is at its peak.

---

83 City of Beverly Hills, Municipal Code §10-3-2730D.
84 City of Beverly Hills, Municipal Code §10-3-2730F.
and the school is not in session. A successful example of shared parking with a public school facility is the Washington Elementary School in San Diego’s Little Italy district, which is discussed further in Chapter 7. Under the shared parking arrangement, the school district rents out the school’s parking facility under the Civic Center Act (California Education Code § 38130-38139). According to the Civic Center Act, school districts may rent out school facilities through a joint use agreement, long term use agreement or civic center use permit for public or non-profit (501C) uses when school is not in session. The rental fee of opening the school to access its parking facility includes the cost of paying for a custodian to remain on site while the facility is being used. Rental income that is generated from shared use arrangements is credited to the school as a source of discretionary income.85

**Parking Pricing**

Under the City’s Municipal Code, there is no requirement for pricing of parking, and in some cases, the municipal codes specifies that parking must be free (see §10-3-2730.3C on auctions and §10-3-2730B on free validated valet parking for medical office buildings). The rationale for these regulations is the desire to prevent medical office users or auction attendees from parking in residential areas. The provision of parking, however, is never free. Therefore this requirement imposes a significant cost on developers and businesses without giving them the option of passing on appropriate price signals to those who reach their facilities by different modes of transportation.

**USE REQUIREMENTS**

Within C-3 zones, including much of the Robertson Boulevard Expansion Area, various uses are permitted. Permitted uses include cafes, retail or wholesale shops, stores, parking garages, offices (excluding medical uses), exercise clubs, cinemas or theaters, studios, photography galleries, and various other uses.86 These uses as well as other allowed building purposes and conditionally permitted uses are listed in Appendix C along with use requirements for the other comparable corridors.

The City’s use requirements are rather specific and repetitive, which reduces the readability of the Municipal Code, but would not likely affect the level of commercial regeneration within the Robertson Boulevard Corridor. The City requires conditional use permits for quite a number of uses, which would increase the time and costs associated with planning, discretionary reviews, and staff level hearings for these types of developments. However, none of the land uses which require conditional use permits, with the possible exception of hotels, are desirable uses for the redevelopment area. Therefore it is unlikely that these requirements are hindering they type of development that is desired along this corridor.

In reorganizing the code, the City could simplify language on allowed uses and reduce the complexity of the permitting process for new businesses. The Municipal Code which regulates Downtown Palo Alto provides an example of more simple but effective language. Palo Alto states the intention of Commercial Ground Floor Combining Districts as: “to modify the uses allowed in the City’s commercial downtown district to allow only retail, eating and drinking and other service-orientated commercial development uses on the ground floor of developments”; the Code

---

85 Telephone communication with Debora Beaver, Real Estate Specialist, San Diego Unified School District (SDUSD), April 25, 2014.

86 City of Beverly Hills, Municipal Code §10-3-1601 Uses Permitted in C-3 Zones.
also provides a very short but comprehensive list of permitted uses.\textsuperscript{87} This demands that only uses which generate significant pedestrian activity dominate the streetscape, to create an appealing retail and dining experience. Likewise, the Municipal Code of the City of Santa Monica defines the purpose of the Main Street Commercial District to accommodate a variety of uses “which provide daily necessities, places of employment, and leisure time opportunities for those living in the surrounding community.”\textsuperscript{88}

Considering that the Robertson Boulevard Expansion Area is flanked by relatively dense commercial districts, the City could consider pursuing developments which will provide more benefit and amenity to local stakeholders, while incubating businesses that later populate the more high-end retail areas within the city. This approach could generate foot traffic, and ensure that activity is sustained for longer and more frequent periods of the day.\textsuperscript{89} One element of the Municipal Code use requirements that could be reconsidered is the approach to incubator uses. The Municipal Code makes it illegal to establish or conduct business in any vacant lot, or to conduct business activity outside of a permanent building that is fully enclosed by walls and a roof.\textsuperscript{90} It also does not allow for any sort of housing, including mixed-use work-home lofts. In some cities, a more lenient approach toward vacant buildings and parcels has allowed incubator businesses to fuel the regeneration of regular commercial spaces within the city. Examples include the Brazil Café in Berkeley, which started as a café-food truck enterprise in a vacant lot on University Avenue. The café generated pedestrian life in that part of the city before moving into a brick-and-mortar commercial space nearby. In Silicon Valley, many tech start-ups have also been incubated in unconventional, low-cost spaces before moving into more regular accommodations. These types of incubator activities add street life and a new consumer base of local businesses, while allowing for space at street level to remain open for retail and similar uses.

Another section within the Code which could be reconsidered is the restrictions on live musical accompaniment, which precludes any dancing, singing, or spoken word performances by performers, patrons or any other persons.\textsuperscript{91} Based on this regulation, live acoustic music that involves the human voice is not permitted within eating establishments in the Robertson Boulevard area, thereby limiting the range of experiences that are available within the corridor. On the basis of this regulation, highly successful restaurants such as Demetra Café in Carmel, California, and Max’s Opera Café Restaurant in San Francisco would be illegal on Robertson Boulevard.

In general, the use requirements of the Municipal Code are comparable to other cities, but could be reconsidered in order to increase simplicity and allow for incubator and pedestrian-oriented uses that contribute to the regeneration of the corridor.

\textsuperscript{87} City of Palo Alto, Municipal Code §18.30(C).010.
\textsuperscript{88} City of Santa Monica, Municipal Code §9.04.08.28.010.
\textsuperscript{90} City of Beverly Hills, Municipal Code §10-3-2702 Businesses on Vacant Lots and §10-3-2703 Businesses Outside of Permanent Buildings.
\textsuperscript{91} City of Beverly Hills, Municipal Code §10-3-2703
FORM-BASED REQUIREMENTS

The City’s General Plan does not provide form-based requirements for the Robertson Boulevard corridor. It does provide basic form-based requirements for other designated pedestrian-oriented areas within the city. These requirements include:

“... that buildings in business districts be oriented to, and actively engage the street through design features such as build-to lines, articulated and modulated façades, ground floor transparency such as large windows, and the limitation of parking entries directly on the street. Parking ingress and egress should be accessed from alleys where feasible.”

In order to generate redevelopment and activity along Robertson Boulevard, the City of Beverly Hills could consider designating Robertson Boulevard as a pedestrian-oriented area and implement form-based requirements that contribute to the sense of place along this corridor. In Santa Monica, the comparable approach to form-based requirements stipulates maximum building square footages (7,500 sf) and maximum linear frontages (75 feet) along Main Street. This approach produces land uses with the unique character of boutique retail and mom-and-pop outlets.

Another element that contributes to the sense of place along the corridor is the street right-of-way, which is considerably wider than that of Robertson Boulevard in Los Angeles. To create a more intimate and attractive street environment, the City could consider traffic calming techniques such as narrowing of lanes, and corner bulb-outs. These elements would create a safer and more appealing environment for cyclists and pedestrians.

EVALUATION

Based upon this analysis, it is not conclusive that zoning standards are restricting regeneration and redevelopment along the Robertson Boulevard corridor substantially more than similar standards do in comparable corridors. In comparison to other California cities, which have achieved success attracting desirable commercial activity along similar corridors, the City of Beverly Hills tends to be no more restrictive in categories such as height limits, floor area ratio, minimum parking requirements, and permitted uses.

In regard to permitted land uses, the City accommodates a variety of uses, despite laborious language in the zoning code and the requirement of conditional use permits for uses which can be deemed undesirable for this particular corridor. The City could improve the clarity and conciseness of language in the zoning code with respect to the intended purpose of the Robertson Boulevard commercial district. Similar to University Avenue, Palo Alto, and Main Street, Santa Monica, the City might consider defining the district to promote ground floor pedestrian-oriented park-once activity. It could also provide a more concise list of permitted uses and more lenient requirements with respect to incubator spaces and musical accompaniment.

The one requirement that differs significantly from comparable corridors is the special 10-foot setback requirements along Robertson Boulevard. Setback requirements do not apply to any of the comparable corridors and do not match the land uses that already exist along the Robertson Boulevard corridor.

---
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These setback requirements along with the City’s prevailing parking requirements impose a significant challenge on new potential developments. In the absence of an in-lieu option, the City’s setback requirements and parking code forces developers to dedicate most of the land area for new construction to required parking and setbacks. For commercial developments, parking alone would constitute 40 – 60% of the site area. Parking and setback requirements prevent developers from being able to achieve the maximum Floor-Area Ratio (FAR) established by City’s zoning code, but site geometry and feasible FAR is instead set by the parking and setback standards.

Given Beverly Hills’ high land values, it may be difficult to make a profit on smaller redevelopment projects therefore developers may normally wish to consider spreading their costs over larger projects. In Beverly Hills, however, higher parking standards apply to larger restaurant uses so an even greater proportion of the site must be dedicated to parking (two-thirds of the lot for a typical 3-story restaurant/commercial development). Not only would this impose costs on development, it would also have a significant negative impact on the quality of the streetscape along Robertson Boulevard and the rear transition to residential areas.

While the City’s parking code has a profound effect on the shape and viability of potential redevelopment along Robertson Boulevard, the basis of these standards is unclear. In all likelihood, the City’s parking rates are inherited from Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Parking Generation publications, which are problematic and are based on parking rates at suburban sites.

In borrowing from the successes of other cities, the City could consider implementing parking policies similar to the “blended” requirements of Palo Alto as well as the in-lieu fee program that is implemented in the Business Triangle. Finally, the City could seek innovative ways to meet parking capacity needs for local businesses, such as a shared parking scheme between a non-profit organization of business owners and the Horace Mann School.
9 RECOMMENDATIONS ON PARKING NEEDS AND RESOURCES

Based on this analysis of the in-lieu program and its potential expansion to other commercial corridors, a number of policy approaches and parking-related strategies are recommended. These recommendations aim to address parking needs and maximize parking resources in the expansion areas.

1. COLLECT AND USE PARKING DATA

Regular data collection regarding occupancy rates for on-street parking, off-street public parking, and off-street private parking would be beneficial. This data should aim to provide a more complete inventory of private parking supplies, as well as more accurate data on parking utilization across different types of parking. Parking occupancy data should be collected both during the week and on the weekend in order to provide insight on temporal shifts in parking demand.

Occasional parking duration surveys are also recommended to gain a better grasp on parking practices. Duration surveys should employ license plate recognition technology and should make note of whether parked vehicles are displaying a DP/DV placard or plate. This information would improve the calibration of parking occupancy based on parking revenues. It would also help to understand the nature and scale of different parking practices such as reparking within the Business Triangle.

Parking data should be used to inform parking policy. For example, the City may consider shifting away from minimum parking requirements that were established in the 1960s, and toward parking requirements that are based on actual demand for parking.

2. CREATE PARKING PARTNERSHIPS

Current data indicates close to optimal levels of parking supply in the Business Triangle and Beverly Drive, despite less than market rate pricing. If additional parking capacity is sought, the City could address parking demand through pricing, TDM and transportation alternatives, and/or increase parking capacity through new supply and more efficient use.

It is always better to make more efficient use of existing parking resources before building new parking structures. Therefore we recommend that the City develops public private partnerships to facilitate shared parking within the Business Triangle and along the city’s commercial corridors. Shared parking arrangements save the City money while generating income for private parking owners, allowing for more productive land uses, and preserving the high quality of Beverly Hills’ streetscapes.
Along Robertson Boulevard, shared parking facilities could include public private partnerships with private property owners, in addition to “Civic Center” use of parking at Horace Mann School when school is not in session, and cooperative parking arrangements with property owners or agencies in the City of Los Angeles (on the east side of the street).

3. REDUCE MINIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENTS

Beverly Hills’ minimum parking requirements are comparable to peer cities but not in line with industry best practice, which is moving toward lower minimum parking requirements.

At current levels, Beverly Hills’ minimum parking requirements reduce the feasible FAR of development to 1.19 along most commercial corridors and 1.03 along Robertson Boulevard (where there is a special front setback requirement). This means that unless developers are willing to build underground parking at a cost of $86,000 per space, they are not able to build to the level that is outlined in the General Plan and Municipal Code. As a result, the minimum parking requirements affect the feasibility of potential development within the city.

To address these concerns, the city could adopt lower minimum parking requirements, implement a blended parking rate (which would reduce administrative burdens associated within changing land uses), or eliminate the minimum parking requirement and allow the market to determine the amount of new parking that is provided. All three of these strategies would have benefits on the feasibility of development and the likely attractiveness of streetscapes within the city.

At a minimum, the City could make it easier for developers to meet minimum parking requirements by allowing requirements to be met through more efficient parking arrangements such as automated or stacked parking arrangements. Under certain conditions, the City may also provide credit for tandem parking in residential uses, and valet parking associated with restaurant uses.

4. RETAIN AND EXPAND THE IN-LIEU PARKING PROGRAM

The in-lieu parking program has been successful in attracting development to the Business Triangle on a consistent basis (other than during the years of recession). This program participation has allowed for redevelopment of pedestrian-oriented businesses and generation of retail customers in the area.

Given the success of the program, and the difficulty of meeting minimum parking requirements, it is recommended that the in-lieu program be extended to the potential expansion areas within the city. The Robertson Boulevard corridor would particularly benefit from the expanded program since the feasible FAR is lowest along this corridor and many properties are ripe for redevelopment.

In order to provide an attractive program for businesses, it is recommended that the City continue and extend the lease option that is available for restaurant expansion projects under the in-lieu program.

---
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5. ALLOW MORE FLEXIBLE USE OF IN-LIEU REVENUES

The current in-lieu parking program requires that all revenues be used for the purposes of acquiring, constructing, operating and maintaining new parking facilities. Based on the large amount of available capacity within private parking facilities, we recommend that in-lieu revenues used for more flexible purposes including rental and other costs associated with shared parking arrangements.

Additionally, we recommend that the City allows in-lieu revenues to be used for a range of strategies that increase the retail attractiveness of commercial areas and reduce trip generation or parking generation to the area. Potential uses could include streetscape improvements, shared parking arrangements, travel demand management (TDM) strategies, parking signage and real time wayfinding aids, shuttle services, and transit enhancements.

It is recommended that these funds be available for use across all in-lieu areas so that in-lieu revenues that are generated within the Business Triangle can be applied to related projects in any of the expansion areas.

In conjunction with this strategy, the City may also wish to consider implementation of a hybrid model that combines elements of a parking improvement district with the in-lieu program. This strategy could potentially allow in-lieu funds to be combined with parking meter and parking garage revenues in order to provide effective range of area improvements that may be selected by local stakeholders.

5. IMPROVE PARKING WAYFINDING AIDS

In areas where parking demand is uneven, wayfinding aids can greatly assist in helping people to locate available parking and distribute parking demand more evenly. Wayfinding aids include real time counts of available spaces that are displayed on the street and made publicly available via online tools. It may also include signage and directions to different parking facilities.

Given that parking is most constrained in the South Beverly Drive corridor, wayfinding aids could be implemented in this location first. Wayfinding may also help to alleviate perceptions of parking shortages in the Business Triangle by directing visitors to underutilized facilities.

6. ADJUST THE PARKING PRICING STRUCTURE

Finally, the City could consider adjusting parking pricing structures to better distribute parking and to encourage more retail activity via a Park-Once-and-Walk approach. Key strategies to reconsider include adjustment of on-street meter rates to encourage better distribution of parking across the Business Triangle, as well as elimination of 1 and 2 hour free parking to discourage reparking patterns.
# APPENDIX A: COMPETITIVE CITY PARKING REQUIREMENTS

## CULVER CITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessory food service</td>
<td>Same as primary use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory retail use</td>
<td>Same as primary use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal boarding and kennels</td>
<td>1 space per 350 square feet of indoor use area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto and vehicle sales</td>
<td>3 spaces if for full service station, 1 space if for self service station, plus 1 space for each 100 sf of retail, and requirements for automobile repair where applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks and financial services</td>
<td>1 space per 250 square feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars and nightclubs</td>
<td>1 space per 100 square feet, plus 1 space for every 30 square feet of dance floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience stores</td>
<td>1 space per 225 square feet, with a minimum of 8 spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child or adult day care centers</td>
<td>1 space per 300 square feet of floor area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large family day care home</td>
<td>1 space per employee, in addition to required residential spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small family day care home</td>
<td>As required for the single-family dwelling (see parking requirement for residential uses).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food retail</td>
<td>1 space per 350 square feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels and motels</td>
<td>1 space for each guest room; plus 1 space for each 20 guest rooms; plus retail, restaurant and conference uses calculated at 1 space per 100 square feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>1 space for each 1.5 patient beds, plus required spaces for accessory uses as determined by the Director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical/dental offices, clinics and labs</td>
<td>1 space per 350 square feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices, administrative, corporate, professional</td>
<td>1 space per 350 square feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant nurseries</td>
<td>1 space per 350 square feet of indoor use area; plus 1 space for 1,000 square feet of outdoor use area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General (Table Service) 1,500</td>
<td>1 space per 350 square feet. With a minimum of 3 spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Required Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>square fee or less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General (Table Service) Greater than 1,500 square feet</td>
<td>1 space per 100 square feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeout (counter service), with customer tables</td>
<td>1 space per 75 square feet, with a minimum of 8 spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeout (counter service 750 square feet or less), no tables</td>
<td>1 space per 250 square feet, with a minimum of 3 spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located in shopping centers:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25% of floor area of center for all restaurants</td>
<td>Parking requirement covered under the general requirement for shopping center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% or greater of floor area of center for all restaurants</td>
<td>Portion of restaurant(s) exceeding 25% of shopping center's floor area shall use the same parking requirement for general restaurants above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor dining</td>
<td>No parking required for first 250 square feet of outdoor dining area. Any outdoor dining area exceeding 250 square feet shall be included as restaurant floor area in determining the parking area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail and service uses, general</td>
<td>1 space per 350 square feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping centers general (2) (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 acres in net parcel area</td>
<td>1 space per 250 square feet (also see restaurant requirements).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage, personal storage facilities</td>
<td>1 space per 50 storage units or 5,000 square feet of storage area, whichever is greater. Plus 2 additional spaces for the manager's office, with a minimum of 5 spaces per facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car wash self service</td>
<td>2 spaces for each washing stall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car wash – full service</td>
<td>10 spaces; plus 10 space queuing area for drying of vehicles; plus queuing area for 3 vehicles ahead of each wash lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car wash – automated, accessory to fueling station</td>
<td>4 spaces; plus queuing area for 3 vehicles ahead of the wash lane (in addition to the parking required for fueling station).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fueling stations</td>
<td>1 space per 225 square feet (includes convenience store), with a minimum of 3 spaces. For parking required above the minimum of 3, half of the parking provided at pump islands may be credited towards meeting parking requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance, repair, installation, and detailing</td>
<td>3 spaces per service bay (work station), plus 1 space for each 350 square feet of additional retail sales and service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

(1) Parking for certain uses within the CD Zone are subject to the requirements of Subsection 17.220.035.C.

(2) Parking requirements for bars, nightclubs, health/fitness facilities and theaters shall be calculated separately in all cases.

(3) A multitenant regional shopping center with a floor area of 600,000 square feet or more, with 1 or more traditional department stores, excluding those common areas as described in Subsection 17.320.020.C. of this Chapter, may provide a parking ratio as recommended in a parking in a parking demand study approved by the City; provided, that the parking demand study: (i) is prepared, at the sole cost and expense of the applicant, by an independent traffic
engineer licensed by the State of California, who is reasonably approved by the Director prior to the commencement of that study; and (ii) presents reasonable justification for modification to the parking ratio(s) otherwise required under Table 33 (Parking Requirements by Land Use) of this Chapter. If, as reasonably determined by the Director, the parking demand study supports requiring a parking ratio greater than that otherwise required in this Title, then the higher parking ratio shall apply.

Sources: Culver City; BAE, 2014.

### SANTA MONICA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automobile rental agency</td>
<td>1 space per 500 sf of FA plus 1 space per 1,000 sf of outdoor rental storage area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile repair</td>
<td>1 space per 500 sf of non-service bay FA plus 2 spaces per service bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile service station with or</td>
<td>3 spaces if for full service station, 1 space if for self service station, plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without mini-mart</td>
<td>1 space per 100 sf of retail, and requirements for automobile repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile sales</td>
<td>1 space per 400 sf of floor area for showroom and office, plus 1 space per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto washing (self-service or coin</td>
<td>2 spaces for each washing stall, not including the stall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operated)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General office</td>
<td>1 space per 300 sf of FA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels, motels</td>
<td>1 space per guest room plus 1 space for each 200 sf used for meetings and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumber yards, plant nurseries</td>
<td>1 space per 300 sf of FA for interior retail plus 1 space per 1,000 sf of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets of less than 5,000 square feet,</td>
<td>1 space per 225 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liquor store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets 2,500 square feet or less in</td>
<td>1 space per 300 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the BSCD, C3 and C3C Districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets with floor area greater than</td>
<td>1 space per 250 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 square feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants, 2,500 square feet or less</td>
<td>1 space per 300 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with no separate bar area located in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSCD, C3 and C3C Districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>1 space per 300 sf of support area, 1 space per 75 sf of service and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast food, take-out, drive-in, drive-</td>
<td>seating area open to customers, and 1 space per 50 sf of separate bar area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through restaurants</td>
<td>1 space per 75 sf of FA. Minimum of 5 spaces must be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars and nightclubs (dance halls,</td>
<td>1 space per 50 sq. ft of FA. Portions of restaurants that include bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discos, etc.)</td>
<td>shall be calculated using this standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Retail:
- Retail, general and service: 1 space per 300 sf of FA.
- Retail, furniture and large appliance: 1 space per 500 sf of FA.

Notes:
1. No required off-street parking space shall be used for sale, rental or repair of autos.

Sources: City of Santa Monica; BAE, 2014.

**WEST HOLLYWOOD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult retail businesses</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult day care facilities</td>
<td>1 space for each 7 clients for which the facility is licensed plus adequate drop-off area as approved by the Director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art galleries</td>
<td>2 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisan/craft product manufacturing</td>
<td>2 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisan shops</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto and vehicle maintenance and repair</td>
<td>4.5 spaces for each service bay, plus adequate queuing lanes for each bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto and vehicle sales/rental, auto parts sales</td>
<td>2.5 spaces per 1,000 sf plus 3 spaces per 1,000 sf of parts department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated teller machines (ATMs), exterior, not associated with an on-site financial institution.</td>
<td>4 spaces for one or two machines plus 2 spaces for each additional machine over 2; no parking requirement within 1,000 feet of the intersection of San Vicente Boulevard and Santa Monica Boulevard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks and financial services (see also ATM, above). 1,200 sf or less, tenant space existing prior to May 2, 20012 (2)</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior ATM machines</td>
<td>1 space for each exterior ATM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and breakfast (B&amp;Bs) and urban inns</td>
<td>In historic buildings: 0.5 spaces per guest unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and breakfast (B&amp;Bs) and urban inns</td>
<td>In non-historic buildings: 1 space per guest unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and breakfast (B&amp;Bs) and urban inns</td>
<td>All projects: Plus owner/operator parking as required for multi-family residential projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting studios</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf, for the first 25,000 sf, and 3 spaces for each 1,000 sf thereafter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building material stores</td>
<td>1.6 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business support services</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardrooms</td>
<td>9 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child day care centers</td>
<td>1 space for each 10 children that the facility is licensed to accommodate, plus adequate drop-off area as approved by the Director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Required Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs, lodges, and meeting halls</td>
<td>1 space for each 2.5 fixed seats, or 28 spaces per 1,000 sf of assembly or viewing area where there are no fixed seats. (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centers</td>
<td>1 space for each 5 seats, or 14 spaces per 1,000 sf of assembly areas where there are no fixed seats. (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention centers</td>
<td>1 space for each 2.5 fixed seats, or 28 spaces per 1,000 sf of assembly or viewing area where there are no fixed seats. (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General retail stores (see also the parking requirements for shopping centers)</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery stores</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/fitness facilities</td>
<td>10 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/fitness facilities, personal training</td>
<td>4 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>1 space for each guest room; plus retail, restaurant, and conference uses calculated at 50% of the requirements of this table, and all other uses at 100% of the requirements of this table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor amusement/entertainment facilities</td>
<td>Determined by Conditional Use Permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiosks</td>
<td>No parking required. Outdoor dining related to kiosk must meet requirements of this table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundries and dry cleaning plants</td>
<td>2 spaces per 1,000 sf, including incidental office area comprising less than 20% of the total floor area. Parking requirements for additional office area shall be calculated separately as required by this table for offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundromats</td>
<td>1 space for each 3 washing machines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries and museums</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live/work units</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media production</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf for the first 25,000 sf, plus 3 spaces for each additional 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical marijuana dispensaries</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinics, offices, labs, and other outpatient facilities of 1,200 sf or less, tenant space existing prior to May 2, 20012</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended care</td>
<td>1 space for each 3 beds the facility is licensed to accommodate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>2 spaces for each patient bed the facility is licensed to accommodate, plus spaces for ancillary uses as required by the Review Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbreweries in conjunction with on-site sales</td>
<td>9 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Land Use and Required Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mortuaries and funeral homes</td>
<td>1 space for each 5 seats, or 14 spaces per 1,000 sf for areas without fixed seats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsstands and flower stands</td>
<td>None required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night clubs and bars</td>
<td>15 spaces per 1,000 sf, plus 28 spaces per 1,000 sf for all dance floor areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf for the first 25,000 sf plus 3 spaces for each additional 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor commercial recreation</td>
<td>Spectator seat areas: 1 space for each 3 seats. (3) Sport courts: 2 spaces per court, plus 4 spaces per 1,000 sf of floor area other than courts. Ancillary uses: as required by this table for the specific use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm readers, fortune tellers, psychics</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawn shops</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200 sf or less, tenant space existing prior to May 2, 2001. (2)</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet shops</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacies</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant nurseries and garden supply stores</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf of indoor use area; 1.5 spaces per 1,000 sf of outdoor use area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and publishing</td>
<td>2 spaces per 1,000 sf, including incidental office area comprising less than 20% of the total floor area. Parking requirements for additional office area shall be calculated separately as required by this table for offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety facilities</td>
<td>3 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling facilities</td>
<td>0 spaces; see Section 19.36.260(C)(5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious facilities/places of worship</td>
<td>1 space per 5 fixed seats, 14 spaces per 1,000 sf for areas without fixed seats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and development (R&amp;D)</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200 sf or less, tenant space existing prior to May 2, 2001</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>9 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor dining</td>
<td>9 spaces per 1,000 sf if outdoor dining area is 251 sf or more; none required otherwise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service stations</td>
<td>1 space per pump island; plus 1 space per service bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping centers (4)</td>
<td>5 spaces per 1,000 sf for new centers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smoking areas</td>
<td>No parking required for smoking areas that do not have food and/or alcoholic beverage service. Otherwise, 250 sf allowed without parking; 251 sf or more shall be provided parking at the ratio required for the underlying use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studios—Art, dance, music, photography</td>
<td>5 spaces per 1,000 sf for facilities with classes of up to 10 students at a time or facilities that cater exclusively to children under 17 years of age. 10 spaces per 1,000 sf for facilities with more than 10 students per class excluding classes only for children under 17 years of age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supper clubs</td>
<td>9 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theaters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live performance facilities</td>
<td>1 space per 2.5 fixed seats, or 28 spaces per 1,000 sf of assembly or viewing area without fixed seats. (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinemas—Single-screen</td>
<td>1 space per 3 seats, plus 6 additional spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinemas—Multi-screen</td>
<td>1 space per 5 seats, plus 10 additional spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility facilities</td>
<td>2 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinarians, animal hospitals, kennels, boarding</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing, wholesaling and distribution, accessory</td>
<td>2 spaces per 1,000 sf, including incidental office area comprising less than 20% of the total floor area. Parking requirements for additional office area shall be calculated separately as required by this table for offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale design showrooms</td>
<td>1.6 spaces per 1,000 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. See Section 19.28.090.D.2 for parking space enclosure requirements.
2. Two or more tenant spaces that are each under 1,200 square feet may be reconfigured and continue to qualify as preexisting spaces.
3. Where fixed seating is in benches or bleachers, a seat shall be construed to be 18 inches of continuous bench space for the purpose of calculating the number of required parking spaces.
4. Applies only when less than 50% of floor area in center is occupied by restaurants, medical offices, personal services, or medical facilities, provided that restaurants may comprise only 25% of the total shopping center area; otherwise parking shall be provided as required for each separate use, subject to any parking reduction granted in compliance with Section 19.28.060 (Reduction of Off Street Parking Requirements) or 19.28.070 (Shared Use of Parking Facilities). Parking requirements for bars, nightclubs, health clubs, theaters and cinemas shall be calculated separately in all cases.

**Sources:** City of West Hollywood; BAE, 2014.
APPENDIX B: PRESENT VALUE OF PARKING FEE CALCULATIONS

Parking Fee Comparison Calculator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Building Size (Sq.Ft.)</th>
<th>Parking Spaces (a)</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Fee Term</th>
<th>Discount Rate</th>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Present Value</th>
<th>Application Fee</th>
<th>Total Cost (PV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills, Mid</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>$26,861</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$100,566</td>
<td>$11,625.40</td>
<td>$112,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills, Low</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>$20,203</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$75,639</td>
<td>$11,625.40</td>
<td>$87,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills, High</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>$33,577</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$125,709</td>
<td>$11,625.40</td>
<td>$137,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hollywood</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$1,339</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$11,597</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
<td>$12,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$12,993</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$12,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver City</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>$2,743</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$23,759</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$23,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica, Post 2016</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>$16,667</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$62,399</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$62,399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
- (a) Based on the following parking requirements:
  - Beverly Hills: 350 Sq.Ft per Space, $37,605.80 per Space
  - West Hollywood: 286, $382.50 (b)
  - Santa Monica: 300, $1.50 (c)
  - Culver City: 350, $960.00 (c)
  - Santa Monica, Post 2016: 300, $20,000.00

Source: BAE, 2014.
APPENDIX C: PERMITTED USES ON ROBERTSON AND COMPARABLE CORRIDORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Robertson Blvd, Beverly Hills</th>
<th>University Ave, Palo Alto</th>
<th>Robertson Blvd, Los Angeles</th>
<th>Main St, Santa Monica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Uses</td>
<td>Cafe</td>
<td>Eating and drinking</td>
<td>Any use permitted in a C1.5 Limited Commercial Zone or in a C1 Limited Commercial Zone Art or antique shop. Bird store or taxidermist, or a pet shop for the keeping or sale of domestic or wild animals, other than those wild animals specified in the definition of “Accessory Use” Carpenter, plumbing or sheet metal shop Catering shop Feed and fuel store Interior decorating or upholstering shop Sign painting shop Tire shop Restaurant, tea room or cafe (including entertainment other than dancing) or a ground floor restaurant with an outdoor eating area. An outdoor eating area for</td>
<td>Single uses occupying less than 7,500 square feet, conducted within an enclosed building, and with ground floor Main Street frontage not exceeding 75 linear feet: Appliance repair shops Art galleries Artist studios Banks and savings and loan institutions Barber and beauty shops Bed and breakfast facilities provided that any dining facility shall be limited to use by registered guests only (only two such facilities may be permitted in the district) Child day care centers Congregate housing Domestic violence shelters Florists and plant nurseries Furniture upholsterer’s shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carpenter shop</td>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cinema or theater</td>
<td>Personal services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservatory</td>
<td>Retail service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dancing academy</td>
<td>Theaters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dressmaking or millinery store</td>
<td>Travel agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exercise club</td>
<td>Entrance, lobby or reception areas serving non-ground floor uses All other uses permitted in the underlying district, provided such uses are not on the ground floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lunchroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office (excluding medical uses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paint, paperhanger, or decorating shop or store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking garage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photography gallery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plumbing shop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private training center of no more than two thousand (2,000) square feet of floor area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roofing or plastering store or office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shop for the conducting of wholesale or retail business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERTSON BLVD, BEVERLY HILLS</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY AVE, PALO ALTO</td>
<td>ROBERTSON BLVD, LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>MAIN ST, SANTA MONICA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store</td>
<td>General offices</td>
<td>General offices</td>
<td>On parcels with frontage on Second St. and which abut residentially zoned property on at least one side, permitted uses are limited to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>General retail uses</td>
<td>Homeless shelters with fewer than 45 beds</td>
<td>All uses permitted in the OP-2 District. (Congregate housing, Domestic violence shelters,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>Homeless shelters</td>
<td>Laundromats, dry cleaners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upholsterer</td>
<td>Homeless shelters</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any similar use</td>
<td>Homeless shelters</td>
<td>Medical, dental and optometrist facilities above the first floor provided the use does not exceed a 3,000 square feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless shelters</td>
<td>Multi-family dwelling units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless shelters</td>
<td>Print or publishing shops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless shelters</td>
<td>Restaurants with 49 seats or fewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless shelters</td>
<td>Senior housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless shelters</td>
<td>Senior group housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless shelters</td>
<td>Shoe repair stores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless shelters</td>
<td>Sidewalk cafés not more than 200 square feet, subject to limitations in §9.04.10.02.460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless shelters</td>
<td>Single family dwelling units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless shelters</td>
<td>Single room occupancy housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless shelters</td>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless shelters</td>
<td>Theaters with 75 seats or fewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless shelters</td>
<td>Transitional housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless shelters</td>
<td>Wholesale stores where the public is invited.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Building Uses

- Church
- Clubhouse
- Commercial garage
- Hotel
- Places of amusement
- Playground
- School

- Church
- Clubhouse
- Commercial garage
- Hotel
- Places of amusement
- Playground
- School
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses requiring Conditional Use Permits</th>
<th>Robertson Blvd, Beverly Hills</th>
<th>University Ave, Palo Alto</th>
<th>Robertson Blvd, Los Angeles</th>
<th>Main St, Santa Monica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospice facilities, Multi-family dwelling units, One-story accessory buildings and structures up to 14 feet in height, Public parks and playgrounds, Single family dwellings placed on a permanent foundation (including manufactured housing), Single room occupancy housing, Small family day care homes, Senior housing, Senior group housing, Transitional housing</td>
<td>Artistic studios</td>
<td>Child day care facility</td>
<td>General office above the first floor, provided the use does not exceed four thousand square feet and all access is from Main Street.</td>
<td>General retail, including art gallery, provided the use does not exceed 7,500 square feet and all access is from Main Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amusement parks, Ancillary brewing or manufacture of alcoholic beverages. Ancillary car washes for auto sales, leasing or rental. Licensed childcare uses. Convenience stores not occupying</td>
<td>Business or trade school. Commercial recreation. Day care. Financial services, except drive-in services. General business service. All other uses conditionally</td>
<td>Shoe repair shops, provided all access is from Main Street</td>
<td>Theaters, provided the use does not exceed 7,500 square feet and seventy-five seats and all access is from Main Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson Blvd, Beverly Hills</td>
<td>University Ave, Palo Alto</td>
<td>Robertson Blvd, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Main St, Santa Monica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a tenant space whose primary entrance opens into the interior of a commercial building Drive-up, drive-in and drive-through facilities Educational institutions Hotels Mini-shopping centers Museums Off-site parking Private training centers of more than 2,000 square feet of floor area Public utility uses Religious institutions Vehicles sales, service or fuel stations</td>
<td>permitted in the applicable underlying CD district, provided such uses are not on the ground floor</td>
<td>Exercise facilities. Fast-food and take-out establishments. Homeless shelters with 55 or more beds Medical, dental and optometrist facilities at the first floor or in excess of 3,000 square feet Meeting rooms for charitable, youth and welfare organizations Museums Music conservatories and instruction facilities Open air farmers markets, which may include the sale of merchandise by individual businesses located on Main Street that have valid business licenses Places of worship Restaurants with 50 seats or more. Existing restaurants that add a private dining facility Retail stores with 30% or less of the total linear shelf display area devoted to alcoholic beverages Sign painting shops. Theaters having more than seventy-five seats Trade schools Wine shops devoted exclusively to sales of wine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: amlegal.com, City of Beverly Hills; City of Palo Alto Municipal Code §18.30, City of Santa Monica Municipal Code §9.04.08.28
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THE ALLURE OF BEVERLY HILLS

Few cities are so uniquely remarkable that you can’t help falling in love with them. Places filled with experiences so exceptional you leave inspired, rejuvenated and wanting more—where every detail is seamless and everything you could possibly want is at your fingertips. Sure. A few cities might come to mind. But only one stands apart from the rest, easily setting the standard by which all other luxury destinations are measured.

BEVERLY HILLS

With only 5.71 square miles of sun-drenched sidewalks and impeccable landscapes, Beverly Hills isn’t big. Let’s face it, it doesn’t have to be. When you have a bigger-than-life presence and a megawatt vibe, that’s all that really matters. When you’ve earned a legendary reputation as one of the world’s most desired destinations, it’s not about competing because there are no rivals. It’s about doing what you do best—making people feel special.

Beverly Hills is a one-of-a-kind village experience that offers the perfect mix of culture, luxury and fun. Where else can you walk in the footsteps of Hollywood’s elite, shop the world’s finest stores, indulge in exceptional cuisine, and then come home to relax in the splendor of an iconic hotel? Yes—there’s a lot to do in Beverly Hills. That’s why just one day is never enough.

The legendary allure of Beverly Hills has endured for decades. It’s why people who live here are so proud to call this city home and why our visitors fall in love with it the minute they step foot onto its famed streets.
MESSAGE FROM THE BOARD CHAIR

Dear Friends,

It is my honor to serve as the 2014/2015 Board Chair for the Beverly Hills Conference & Visitors Bureau (BHCVB). Tourism is one of the key economic drivers for our city; our hotels, restaurants and attractions employ more than 11,500 workers and tourists represent more than $2 billion in direct and indirect spend in our city. Our city’s tourism continues to thrive thanks in part to the efforts of BHCVB and the work of our hospitality partners, even as our surrounding cities improve infrastructure and expand their promotional budgets.

The theme for the next three years is to be bold—both in the development of ideas, as well as the manner in which they are executed. We want to be fearless and always be willing to try something new if we believe it will have a positive impact. That being said we will also stay the course on many of the initiatives which we know are tried and true.

The coming years will see continued focus on geo-targeted efforts in proven markets, refinement of interactive offerings with a concentration on audience growth as well as growing the value proposition of our Visitor Center. New areas of development include proactive expansion of activities in emerging markets including events, initiatives and partnerships that create excitement and tell our brand story. A focus on positioning Beverly Hills as a viable group and incentive destination is a key goal.

On the behalf of the Board of Directors, I look forward to continuing our work with the talented BHCVB team and, with the support of our city, fulfilling our strategic objectives through innovative marketing and branding activities that showcase our storied destination.

Thank you!

Ben Trodd, Board Chair
General Manager, Beverly Wilshire, A Four Seasons Hotel

“The theme for the next three years is to be bold—both in the development of ideas, as well as the manner in which they are executed.”
Hello,

Beverly Hills, one of the world’s most coveted destinations, is synonymous with refined luxury and unrivaled service. Our strategic initiatives are designed to maintain that brand integrity and reinforce the attention to detail paid by our hotels, merchants and restaurants. The past several years have been a time of great growth for Beverly Hills and for the tourism industry as a whole. Last year we welcomed 6,000,000 visitors to our city, representing a 23% growth in volume and a 33% growth in spend over the last six years. Projections by leading travel industry analysts indicate this trend will continue over the coming years.

Marketing our storied city is both a privilege and an honor for all of us at Beverly Hills Conference & Visitors Bureau. We travel all over the world representing our incredible city and no matter where we go, not only do people know about Beverly Hills, they have either been here or want to visit. However, we cannot rest on our laurels! We need to continue working to make our destination top-of-mind so that we are the first choice when people think about luxury travel.

In the coming years we will be focused on keeping existing programs fresh and developing new programs to expand our reach into new markets, new demographics and new channels. We will continue to enhance our brand awareness with sophisticated and smart initiatives that reinforce our key message points. Lastly, we will work to make sure that our community understands the value we bring to the city and that they will seek us out as subject matter experts in all things tourism.

These are exciting times for Beverly Hills and for tourism as a whole. I, along with my talented team, look forward to the coming years and the opportunity to continue representing this incredible destination and our many stakeholders who work so hard to make it so unique.

Sincerely,

Julie Wagner
Chief Executive Officer
Beverly Hills Conference & Visitors Bureau
IMPORTANCE OF TOURISM TO A VIBRANT BEVERLY HILLS

OVERVIEW
The Beverly Hills Conference & Visitors Bureau (BHCVB) is the tourism marketing arm of the city. Our organization is funded by the City of Beverly Hills from Transient Occupancy Tax, otherwise known as “bed tax.”

Every guest who stays at one of the city’s hotels, pays a 14% tax on the room rate for every night they are here. The majority of that tax revenue is used to fund city services with a portion given back to fund marketing initiatives which help build awareness and drive revenue to the local businesses. BHCVB is a non-profit 501(c)(6) and is governed by a Board of Directors comprised of leading business owners and managers in our community. The organization itself is guided by the Chief Executive Officer and initiatives are developed and implemented by a talented team of eight full time team members.

ECONOMIC IMPACT
It is important to understand why many destinations like ours place so much importance on tourism. Aside from the obvious benefit of driving revenue to local business and tax revenue to the city, tourists create an environment of social vibrancy. It supports more than 11,500 jobs, and generates a total of 6,000,000 visits per year in our city. This vibrancy impacts economic development—businesses want to be here—and impacts consumer demand. Our tourists want to see what all the excitement is about! It also helps the city to give back to the community, funding slightly more than $3,100 in services per household per year.

A SNAPSHOT ON THE VALUE TOURISM TO BEVERLY HILLS
Tourism adds value to Beverly Hills by:
- Bringing more than 6,000,000 visitors per year;
- Supporting more than 11,500 jobs; and
- Generating $3,100 annually in services per resident household.

HOW BHCVB IS FUNDED
BHCVB is 100% funded by Transient Occupancy Tax revenue to the city. In 1994, the city adopted a measure which raised TOT tax in the city from 12% to 14% which stated that the 2% increase would be used to fund tourism and other like marketing initiatives. BHCVB is funded out of that pool of money and for 2014/15, BHCVB received slightly more than 60% of the total funds available.
LOVE BEVERLY HILLS

Seamless....

The way every detail lays in wait before you even notice it.
The manner in which everything you could possibly want is at your fingertips.
You don’t even have to ask, everyone just knows what you are looking for, maybe even before you do.
Experiences curated for you and by you, it doesn’t matter because either way you’ll be delighted.
Bright sunshine beckons you to walk in the footsteps of Hollywood’s elite.
A village-like atmosphere with global appeal.
Iconic, legendary, modern and current—all in the same breath.
This is Beverly Hills—and you have arrived.
OUR STRATEGIC ANCHORS

VISION

To be the most traveled luxury destination in the world.

Why is our Vision important?
As the saying goes, “If you don’t know where you’re going, any road will take you there.” As one of the first steps in creating our strategic plan, we took a collective step back and asked ourselves what we believe is possible for Beverly Hills as a destination because of the work we do.

Having a clear vision not only provides a source of inspiration and meaning for all that we do to promote our destination, it also serves as a galvanizing point of strategic alignment for our many stakeholders and strategic partners. With all of us taking steps to realize our vision, we believe wonderful things are in store for our destination. It’s a great time for our city and we look forward to furthering the momentum we have created over the years.

MISSION

As the designated marketing organization for Beverly Hills, we enhance the economic and social vitality of our community by driving incremental business to hotels, retailers, restaurants, and attractions.

Why is our Mission important?
Many people ask, “What’s the difference between a vision and mission?” It’s a good question—the line between the two is often easily blurred. We took time to make sure the distinction was clear early on in the strategic planning process. We all agreed that having both is important. A vision without a mission to get there is simply wishful thinking.

Our vision statement defines the ideal future we’re committed to creating for Beverly Hills as one of the world’s most desirable destinations. Our mission statement grounds us in more practical terms by clearly articulating what we do each day in order to realize our vision. In many ways, our mission statement bridges the present and the future.

VALUES

Beverly Hills Conference & Visitors Bureau is an open-door workplace where fresh ideas are nurtured to thrive as we work together to promote Beverly Hills as a preeminent luxury destination.

Ours is an environment where everyone’s opinions matter—with no idea being too big or too small. We’re responsible individuals, each willing to lend a helping hand and empower one another to perform at their best. We’re a bold team that strives for excellence just like the destination we represent.

All for one and one for all!

Why are our Values important?
We believe our organizational culture plays a critical role in our ability to serve our stakeholders, support one another internally, be a great collaborator with our partners and consistently implement all aspects of our strategic plan.

We worked as a team to develop our values. Our values are a unifying expression of how we work together and what we stand for as an organization. For us, they are not words on a piece of paper—but rather the bedrock for our actions and behaviors.
**UNIQUE VALUE PROPOSITION**

As a nationally recognized DMO, we are the dedicated marketing organization responsible for promoting Beverly Hills both domestically and internationally.

Why is our Unique Value Proposition important?

Providing clear value in all that we do is paramount. Our Unique Value Proposition helps to keep us focused on what’s most important to the stakeholders we serve. Within the context of our vision and mission, having a relevant Unique Value Proposition that stands the test of time requires us to proactively seek out and understand what’s most important to our stakeholders and to ensure we have the resources necessary to deliver on their expectations. It also requires us to have the flexibility and foresight to evolve as the destination evolves.

---

**BRAND INTENTION**

Leader | Savvy | Bold | Responsive

Why is our Brand Intention important?

Every organization has a brand. The best organizations are those that recognize that their brand is among their most important assets and, as a result, take time to nurture and strengthen it. As a global representative for Beverly Hills, we take our organization’s brand as seriously as the brand of our city. We believe doing so is part of what will enable us to deliver meaningful results for our stakeholders, widen the pool of global brands with which we partner and execute an innovative program of work.

As part of our planning process, we came together as a team to identify the key attributes that describe the ideal experience we intend to create at every touch point our stakeholders, partners and community have with our organization.

---

**AREAS OF FOCUS**

Grow demand for the destination | Leverage strategic partnerships
Enhance the Beverly Hills brand | Ensure a vital CVB

Why are our Areas of Focus important?

As the designated marketing organization for Beverly Hills we serve many needs for a wide range of stakeholders. We love what we do—but make no mistake—the pace is fast and exhilarating and every day is different.

In order to deliver the results we are accountable to deliver, having specific areas of focus are critical. Working in partnership with our Board of Directors, we have identified four areas that we believe will help us move closer to realizing our vision of becoming the most traveled luxury destination in the world. Our areas of focus provide a clear framework for what we must accomplish over the next three years (2015-2017) and they are anchored by our key objectives and strategic initiatives.

Our strategic areas of focus make it clear what we’re focused on, and by omission, what we have determined are not priorities.
## OUR 2015-2017 GOALS AND INITIATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS OF FOCUS</th>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th>INITIATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grow demand for the destination</td>
<td>• TOT/sales tax growth on par with City projections</td>
<td>• Utilize third party agencies in key markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of sales leads</td>
<td>• Tradeshows, sales missions, and trade events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrated market growth in targeted markets</td>
<td>• Establish outreach that supports our group sales efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Bolster shoulder season activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify and execute franchise events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage strategic partnerships</td>
<td>• Sponsorships</td>
<td>• Leverage franchise events to obtain key sponsorship/partnership opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In-kind dollars</td>
<td>• Provide quality exposure in exchange for in-kind contributions from partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hard dollars</td>
<td>• Align efforts as appropriate with other city organizations, i.e., Beverly Hills Chamber of Commerce, city and the Rodeo Drive Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Audience impressions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the Beverly Hills brand</td>
<td>• Digital Engagement</td>
<td>• Attract more people to Beverly Hills digital channels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Website traffic</td>
<td>• Achieve coverage in key/targeted media outlets—tell the right story in the right places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Social following</td>
<td>• Optimize and align all brand touch points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased media exposure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(use 2014/15 as the baseline)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Favorable visitor perception via intercept studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure a vital CVB</td>
<td>• Achieve DMAI accreditation by January 2016.</td>
<td>• Enhance organizational credibility by achieving DMAI accreditation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase year over year CVB funding level using 2014 as the baseline—at a minimum, keep pace with TOT growth.</td>
<td>• Further engage the Board in supporting the CVB mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Achieve and maintain a minimum of 85% staff engagement/satisfaction on key measures.</td>
<td>• Explore funding opportunities to fulfill “Bold Box” initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Utilize CRM technology to develop and maintain relationships.
• Engage third-party agencies to sell the destination and drive business.
• Engage in activities that provide opportunities to develop new business contacts and strengthen business already booked.
• Explore potential for coverage in emerging/new markets that have growth potential.
• Continue to nurture and grow existing relationships with agencies currently under contract.
• Participate in and grow relationships with luxury travel shows and their producers.
• Conduct independent sales missions in domestic and international markets.
• Partner with organizations like Visit California and Brand USA to gain exposure during international sales missions.
• Develop and execute communications strategy that features hotels during spring and fall.
• Refresh branding to utilize for marketing the destination during these periods.
• Develop specials and offers for local businesses that drive traffic to the market.
• Continue popular “franchise events” that have a proven track record of delivering results.
• Develop new event concepts targeting key message points that can be executed in the future.
• Create regular events that are featured around the visitor center to reinforce positioning as a resource for locals and travelers both.
• Develop international events that can be repeated to drive awareness and create desire targeted to trade and press.

• Develop sponsorship strategy document for existing events – to include benefits, businesses to target and financial and audience goals to meet objectives.
• Educate and continue conversations with existing and new partners regarding benefits of partnering with BHCVB events.
• Define targets for future event ideas once strategy is developed by Grow Demand Team.
• Leverage Ferrari weekend and other brands having milestone anniversaries.
• Build on or extend current city events such as the Art Show or Summer Concerts and better utilize city venues.
• Enhance visitor center events, display merchandise and retail sales focus.
• Design and implement co-branded products and services with local businesses.
• Grow media exposure.
• Grow travel trade exposure.
• Clarify and align roles and responsibilities throughout the year to maximize all respective efforts.
• Identify opportunities to partner together on initiatives.
• Work together with other city organizations so budget asks complement instead of compete with each other.

• Maximize exposure to the destination by increasing website traffic.
• Increase social followers and engagement.
• Increase size of email database and engagement.
• Create a compelling Beverly Hills message and consistently spread the word.
• Define opportunities and channels which support key message points.
• Nurture and maintain existing relationships.
• Develop newsworthy events and activities.
• Enhance branded visitor center merchandise.
• Refresh the Beverly Hills brand with specific guidelines that can consistently be used throughout all channels.
• Develop evergreen content that can be used throughout communication channels year-round.

• Complete DMAI accreditation.
• Conduct at least one retreat/team building exercise for the Board of Directors and BHCVB management team.
• Create more active roles and responsibilities for each Board committee.
• Communicate BHCVB wins.
• Enlist BHCVB Board of Directors to determine opportunities and champion them in the city.
• Work with partner organizations to identify areas of overlap to reduce required funding.
IMPLEMENTING OUR PLAN

Having a great strategic plan is worthless without a roadmap for implementing it.

As an organization, we have a proven track record of getting the right things done—on-time and on budget. Our results-oriented reputation is due in part to the way we plan. For example, rather than a “top-down” approach, we developed this strategic plan based on in-depth strategic guidance from our Board of Directors and community stakeholders, followed by a structured series of internal plan development work sessions that included our entire staff.

Following the development of our strategic plan, our team created a user-friendly plan management tool that enables all of our team members, as well as our Board of Directors, stakeholders and partners to quickly and accurately see our progress at any given time.

Our implementation tool is organized in a way that allows us to pull reports and, just as important, course correct if a particular strategy or action step isn’t positively contributing to the results we intend.

Going forward, the implementation of our plan will be a full team effort. Internally, each of us within the Bureau has an important role in the process. Our Board of Directors will also play a key role.

THE ROLE OF THE BOARD

We are fortunate—and grateful—to have such a supportive and involved Board of Directors. Each member plays an invaluable role as an advocate for our organization’s mission, as well as for the strategic plan we created to guide our efforts over the next three years and beyond.

To ensure consistency and focus, a strategic plan subcommittee of the Board has been formed. The role of this committee is to provide ongoing strategic guidance and implementation support as we move through each year of our plan. Our leadership team meets with the subcommittee regularly to share progress, discuss challenges and troubleshoot as needed. In addition, each month we meet with the full Board of Directors. Time is set during each of these scheduled meetings to address specific aspects of the strategic plan. Quarterly, we provide formal reports to the Board of Directors that demonstrate our progress against each of our stated objectives and key initiatives tied to our annual operational plan.

Each year, we host a Board of Directors retreat that primarily focuses on both on short- and long-term strategic plan updates. The guidance we receive from Board members during the retreat is incorporated into our annual staff-driven operational plan, which includes our strategies, action steps and owners, as well as our budget and resource planning work.

Annual Planning Milestones

Q1
- Annual performance report

Q2
- Strategic plan update

Board of Directors retreat
**OUR PLANNING CYCLE**

- **July 1**
  - Plan assessment

- **April 1**
  - Budget development and tactical planning

- **October 1**
  - Next-year planning

- **January 1**
  - Budget and plan approvals from City Council

- **Q3**
  - Propose annual plan and budget to the Board

- **Q4**
  - City Council approves plan and budget
The Board of Directors of the Beverly Hills Conference & Visitors Bureau proudly endorses and fully supports the 2015-2017 strategic plan. We believe the direction it sets forth will help us to realize our vision of becoming the most traveled luxury destination in the world. It will also enable us to support our mission of enhancing the social vitality of our community by driving incremental business to our hotels, retailers, restaurants and attractions.
We would like to thank everyone who played a role in developing the Beverly Hills Conference & Visitors Bureau Strategic Plan. The shared vision and passion to make Beverly Hills the most traveled luxury destination in the world were key in creating the roadmap to our bright future.

Beverly Hills City Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Dr. Julian</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirisch</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Vice Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien</td>
<td>Dr. William</td>
<td>Council Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krasne</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Council Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosse</td>
<td>Lili</td>
<td>Council Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beverly Hills City Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aluzri</td>
<td>Mahdi</td>
<td>Interim City Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedling</td>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Deputy Assistant Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roach</td>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Marketing/Economic Sustainability Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BHCVB Board of Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trodd</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>BHCVB Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abaunza</td>
<td>Sal</td>
<td>BHCVB Vice Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finkel</td>
<td>Eliot</td>
<td>BHCVB Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nissenbaum</td>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>BHCVB Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briskman</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>BHCVB City Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>BHCVB City Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>BHCVB Marketing Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garland</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>BHCVB Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Noel</td>
<td>BHCVB Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mense</td>
<td>Vicky</td>
<td>BHCVB Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman</td>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>BHCVB Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlich</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>BHCVB Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenzweig</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>BHCVB Board Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BHCVB Partner Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stettinski</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tronstein</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>President of the Rodeo Drive Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BHCVB Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Hoyos</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Sr. Director of Business Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Brien</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Director of Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delacruz-Soe</td>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>Communications Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strom</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Sales and Marketing Services Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravanda</td>
<td>Malarie</td>
<td>Marketing Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>Visitor Center Concierge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tab 13
First Community Meeting Summary
July 1, 2015
Focus: La Cienega Subway Station Area
July 1, 2015 7:00 PM

30 members of the public in attendance

Brief presentation from the Mayor and staff followed by opportunity for public to visit several stations and provide input

Input built upon work completed by the Southeast Task Force and will help establish vision for the Southeast Area of Beverly Hills that can inform a Community Plan
Participants visited several stations to provide thoughts and input including:

• Visioning
• Mobility
• Land Use
• Ideas from the Southeast Task Force
• Amenities around Station
• La Cienega Park
• Transit Oriented Development

A summary of the comments received at the meeting is provided in this document.
Participants were asked to complete the phrase:

The Southeast is...

- Hip
- Entry Point into Beverly Hills
- Walkable and friendly
- Quiet/boring residential community (in a good way)
- Close to the good stuff

Crowded dirty and tired
Perceived as cheaper and overlooked compared to rest of City
Steinway piano on corner of Robertson doesn’t attract people
Foot massages and nail salons on Robertson still feel empty
South of La Cienega/Wilshire is ghost town – unfriendly
Fairfax to Beverly is empty
Lacks creativity
Participants were asked to complete the phrase:

I want the Southeast to...

Provide parking
Markets open late
Coffee shops
Grocery stores
Mix of restaurant options
Be walkable
Eateries
Have a basketball court
Be historic
Vibrant, clean desirable - all corridors
Places you WANT to walk to (compare to S. Beverly and Charleville and Southwest BH)
Reinvigorating restaurant row is just one piece – need more restaurants and lunch places throughout the Southeast
Theaters are spread out, district maybe doesn’t make much sense

Have timed traffic lights
More traffic bumps/more monitoring
Have a grocery store
Be one with west BH connections
Have a small movie theater
Need not-so-upscale creative restaurant

Want “village feel”
Trendy
Beautiful
Affordable
Tech-savvy (wifi)
Have neighborhood services
Participants were asked to complete the phrase:

My Idea for the Southeast is:

Permit development that is responsive to subway
Subway station intersection as entrance to Arts and Entertainment District
Youth centered businesses and neighborhood
Brand the neighborhood differently than the Triangle/Rodeo
Outreach to businesses should be greater, in addition to Chamber’s efforts
Robertson needs mixed use development with affordable housing above and retail (commercial) below at the street level (need for affordable housing and pedestrians)
Continue the medical use overlay zone
Nightlife
Be a hub to Downtown Los Angeles
Beverly Hills history museum
Dining and music
Pedestrian friendly outdoor cafe
Station could be a destination in itself
To have a themed station
Movie theaters
Encourage more attractions for Saban
Make it an entry point- a destination
It needs to feel like Beverly Hills
Participants were asked how they would get to the subway station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop off/pick up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Parking is very difficult when visiting
Pedestrian access-way near station
All parking below grade
Biking concerns because Wilshire is busy
Taking the bus is an option if it is efficient
Improved red light timing along Wilshire
Create east-west mobility with the area (bike lanes-pedestrian amenities)
Wilshire is not pedestrian friendly (not even crossing with the light)!
Shuttle service along Wilshire for teens/nondrivers, make sure shuttle is accessible and promoted
Walking is an option if there is life on the street and more amenities – merchants could create some sort of program to incentivize walking
Need pedestrian amenities along La Cienega and Gregory/Wilshire
Need point of interest between Beverly Drive and station (example historic walk)
Participants were asked what land uses they would like to see in the Southeast

- Housing: highest preference
- Hotels
- Neighborhood Services
- Space for outdoor events
- Markets
- Retail
- Pocket Parks/Greenspace
- Casual Restaurants
- Upscale Restaurants
- Theaters/entertainment
- Parking
- Other - Mixed use

Comments:

- Honor historic assets
- Emphasize aesthetics
- There are already upscale restaurants on La Cienega, Canon, in the Triangle - focus on other uses
- SE merchants association on Wilshire to coordinate business between the two stations to get a coordinated effort to retain foot traffic and make that strip its own destination
- Youth is an underserved population in our area – let new ideas and leaders in – gotta evolve or die – brand SE as hip, don’t need to copy the Triangle but get the same level of services and amenities, cafes, robust businesses involvement
- If mixed use then ground floor restaurants on Wilshire only, make it an inviting environment for smaller businesses, businesses incubator, come up with a lease program over five or so years where their rent goes up over time
- Diverse business outreach (tech/startups, b2b services, entertainment – think beyond FLARE (finance, legal, accounting, real estate)
- I am concerned about height and density because of noise, crowding, traffic, cut through, speeding
Participants were asked about which Southeast Task Force ideas they would support

- Introduce trolley route between Southeast and rest of City
- Create bike routes to connect Southeast to City
- Hold events like film nights and arts fairs
- Attract family serving restaurants
- Attract neighborhood style market
- Reinvigorate restaurant row
- Brand the area as an arts and entertainment district
- Develop parking facilities
Participants were asked which amenities they would like to see around the subway station

- Shuttle to other parts of the city
- Parking structure
- Enhanced bicycle infrastructure
- Public restrooms
- Place to grab coffee/food
- Kiss and ride
- Welcome center for visitors
- Unique community branding
- Childcare facilities
- Enhanced pedestrian amenities
- Enhanced neighborhood wayfinding and maps

Comments:

- Restaurants are good to keep
- Lively environment needed
- Remove car dealerships and create parking for subway
- Family area for children’s play area, feeding area (at subway station)
- Olympic is undervalued. More stores and neighborhood and community serving businesses e.g. Floyds Barber Shop
- More cafes, neighborhood services along Wilshire
- Clock market – city needs to buy this property after Porche leaves. Restore it to a market use! Whole Foods, new more affordable store - start the dialogue with them now
- More activity (bridal shops, often are dead at night), more diverse and types of businesses, neighborhood services – coffee shops and markets
- Needs to be an area that illustrates a transition and continuation from affluent area of triangle to more artsy area of LA/Miracle Mile
- Attracting New Businesses (corporate mixers, fill vacancies, incentivize smaller businesses, support local merchants)
Participants were asked which amenities they would like to see at La Cienega Park

- Increased parking
- Pedestrian bridge over La Cienega
- Improved walking/jogging path
- Bike path
- More picnic tables/greenspace
- Swimming pool/aquatic facility
- New playground area with shade
- Renovated or additional athletic fields
- Gymnasium
- New community center

**Comments:**

- Fencing or natural solution to protect children from traffic
- Educational and interactive historical displays for children
- Dog park
- Park ranger or BHPD presence
- Improvement in restrooms
- La Cienega park had a pool, and was removed. It was used mostly by the LA community- water is an issue – no pool (+4 votes)
Participants were asked about their thoughts on Transit Oriented Development

I would support TOD if:

- A strong business outreach effort to include a variety of new businesses
- You balance what you’re getting with what you’re giving back to the community e.g. Greenspace street improvements, architectural character
- Community benefits: street improvements, affordable housing that fits into the neighborhood, architecturally high quality, visually compatible
- No demolition of valuable historic architecture/resources
- It were designed with sound mitigation for the surrounding homes

I would not support increased height/density immediately around a transit stop because:

- No more height or density
- Bad for health and safety
- Already so congested no more height or volume

Additional Comments:

- If mixed use development were to existing only permit it on Wilshire Boulevard
- Height/density – support with adequate noise mitigations and compatibility with neighborhood, concerns about noise and overcrowding
- Village atmosphere appealing like Larchmont
- Include open plaza, family restaurant, higher end casual (The Luggage Room), landscaping
- Types of shops: florists, restaurants, diners, bars, restaurants, ice cream!
- Wilshire/Western (station) is too big and too intense
Additional Comments from Participants

Create a Facebook event page for this effort

Thank you for holding this meeting/workshop...it feels nice to be heard and to be an active participant in the Planning of how to make our City (and our neighborhood) even more of the best place to live in California

It was fun and informative, let’s do it again, I will bring along more residents

This is a great way to get the community involved and get some plans in action
Tab 14
Second Community Meeting Summary

November 15, 2015

Focus: La Cienega Subway Station Area
and Olympic and Wilshire Boulevard Corridors
November 15, 2015 2:00 PM

35 members of the public in attendance

Brief presentation from the Mayor and staff followed by opportunity for public to visit several stations and provide input

Input built upon work completed by the Southeast Task Force, as well as a public meeting held in July, and will help establish vision for the Southeast Area of Beverly Hills that can inform a Community Plan.
Participants visited several stations to provide thoughts and input including:

- Visioning
- Land Use
- Ideas from the Southeast Task Force
- Amenities around Station
- Desires for an Arts & Entertainment District
- Development along Wilshire and Olympic Corridors

A summary of the comments received at the meeting is provided in this document.
Participants were asked to complete the phrase:

The Southeast is...

- Untapped potential (properties not being developed to highest & best use)
- Unique
- Walkable
- Youthful (a lot of young people)
- Transition zone between regional densities
- A place to raise a family
- Robertson is freeway connection
- A gateway into BH from LAX
- Not walkable, less vibrant than other areas
- Full of potential, but currently underutilized
Participants were asked to complete the phrase:

In my community I value...

- Sense of community
- Proximity to schools
- Walkability to adjacent areas (2)
- Parks
- Safety / eyes on the street
- Great lighting on the street during AM & PM
- Quiet – do not make it a “destination” with crowds... events that overwhelm the neighborhood. Too many people come into the area on a daily basis w/ the Saban theatre... noise... parking.... Traffic congestion...
Participants were asked to complete the phrase:

**My Idea for the Southeast is:**

- Central community area to foster interaction
- Need parking
- Encourage family-oriented businesses (restaurants, coffee, books)
- Art walk
- Discovery trail
- Schools as a community focal point
- Calm traffic
- Add ground floor retail
- Plaques along the street
- Art galleries
- Ground floor retail, housing/office above; higher density/height permitted, public structured parking
- Parking for the subway (metro funded)
- Taller buildings on east side of La Cienega (adjacent to Multifamily Residential)
- Attractive for younger demographic
- Interspersed open space to preserve light & air
- Parking underneath existing & new buildings
- Parking structure on Robertson with ground floor retail
- Density – I’m in support of higher density to improve property values
- Don’t duplicate Roxbury park at La Cienega
- Housing that is affordable
- A community to develop around the subway station
- Multi-plex theater
- Modified street designs for walkability
- No more car dealerships or service
- Affordable housing (smaller units)
- Additional height, but maintain activity on ground floor (retail)
- Community interaction (get neighbors to know each other)
- Connection between the park and the subway
- Bus only lane on Wilshire
- Monthly events (outdoor movies at parks)
Participants were asked complete a budget exercise to determine how they would allocate 100 dollars toward various community improvements.

This table depicts the average amount allocated to each improvement (21 individuals participated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Average Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Infrastructure</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Facilities</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and public spaces</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public art</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Improvements</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individuals also noted they would allocate money toward:
More restaurants
Safety
Housing
Movie Theaters
Participants were asked what land uses they would like to see in the Southeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Services</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for outdoor events</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Parks/Greenspace</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Restaurant</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upscale Restaurant</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theaters/entertainment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Not upscale retail, but not low-scale (example, 7-Eleven) either – need neighborhood serving
Shallow lots on Olympic, which makes development difficult (esp. for parking)
City to target redevelopment by... tax incentives for small businesses that fit into specified arts uses so landowners can get tenants: “Build it and they will come”
Additional housing
Encourage walking by: outdoor dining, coffee, food
Maintain park space
Avoid strip mall
Small residential units for young professionals
Height
Opposed to behemoth scale of mixed use (eg, Wilshire/ La Brea)
Outreach: email and online tools for people to give easy input
Distill down the ideas that come
Property owner: lots are too small to be able to redevelop with larger mixed use buildings
How will BH residents get to subway:

Idea: franchise 3-5 taxi companies, set flat fee (e.g. airport shuttle flat fees) for BH residents to get to subway for less than cost of parking / make a deal with TNC (Uber, Lyft) / special rates for seniors / more immediate timing than shuttle or trolley (e.g. per 30 minutes)
Participants were asked about which Southeast Task Force ideas they would support.

- Introduce trolley route between Southeast and rest of City
- Create bike routes to connect Southeast to City
- Hold events like film nights and arts fairs
- Attract family serving restaurants
- Attract neighborhood style market
- Reinvigorate restaurant row
- Brand the area as an arts and entertainment district
- Develop parking facilities

Ideas from the Southeast Task Force

The Southeast Task Force has generated several ideas for the Southeast. Please place a sticker on the three ideas that are most interesting to you. If you have additional ideas, please provide them on the other boards in this station or share them with a planner.
Participants were asked which amenities they would like to see around the subway station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shuttle to other parts of the city</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking structure</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced bicycle infrastructure</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public restrooms</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place to grab coffee/food</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiss and ride</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome center for visitors</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique community branding</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced pedestrian amenities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced neighborhood wayfinding and maps</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

- No food court atmosphere, shops should service community, not just riders.
- They need more parking in the eastern area.
- Do not allow a food park look to overpower the station – create a sense of Beverly Hills.
Participants were asked to finish the sentence:
“When I think of an arts and entertainment district I think of...

- Don’t name it “arts & entertainment” district, would benefit Saban Theatre too much
- The Grove is too synthetic & commercial, I think of Culver City – it’s more like Paris
- Neighborhood is too dense. Don’t build more entertainment venues. Do note add anything new besides current venues. Focus on La Cienega Park instead
- No entertainment venues, outdoor entertainment spaces, food & entertainment, and nightlife categories
- LA residents seem to visits arts & entertainment districts that are structured (i.e., LA Live in DTLA) or Bergamot Station in Santa Monica
- The need for parking. The City of BH needs to buy land in order to create parking – good for commercial & good for residents
- I want parking for the commercial areas, NOT park and ride for the subway
- Focus on La Cienega park:
  - Renovate
  - Improve BH gateway into City
  - Don’t build theaters, etc.
  - Keep our neighborhoods the same
  - Focus on renovating current city assets
  - Don’t make us a “destination” → keep historic charm
- European atmosphere
- Evening activity with great lighting and walkability
- Small theaters
- Elegant restaurants, like French bistro-pub
- Outdoor dining
- NoHo – and who wants to go there?
- The Grove, Century City
- Culver City has handled arts & entertainment well
- Rooftop activity (x2)
- Density with open space
- Palm trees on La Cienega median
- Tech, restaurants, retail
- Pedestrian overpasses
- Affordable artists housing
- No dinner theater, need younger ideas
- Green walls.
- Outdoor dining
- Saban is fine. No more.
- Limited number of bars
- No bars
Participants were asked to complete a questionnaire about what would be in their ideal arts district.

- art galleries
- cafes with life music
- unique pedestrian amenities
- art studios
- murals
- medium sized live entertainment venues
- artist live work spaces
- art walks
- restaurant with dinner theater or live music
- bars
- plazas for performances
- small live entertainment venues
- movie theaters
- sculptures
- entertainment in parks
- district specific maps
- unique street signs
- unique city gateways
- food trucks
- banners
- city sponsored signage
- Other public art

Number of responses
Participants were asked about their thoughts on Wilshire Boulevard

Wilshire Boulevard is...
Busy!
Parking Lot
Wilshire/Robertson is key intersection, could be activated
Steinway, Italian furniture, office ← not best uses

I want it to be...
Flowing
Mixed use w/increased height
Moving & destination stop
Mixed use w/increased height so people live there, don’t just park there. Make developers build extra parking!

Other comments:
Keep Wilshire & La Cienega quiet at night – side streets should only be residential and larger streets only commercial
“I would support increased height density on Wilshire...” – 3-4 stories maximum
Participants were asked to write comments on pictures of Wilshire Boulevard (the following is a summary)

Wilshire/Tower/San Vicente
- More activities/community at Saban & buildings around it. Make it a destination spot, not just a venue.
- Need parking for retail.
- Needs ordinances, regulations and/or property tax breaks for ‘mom & pops’ type retail, restaurant, and service industries. Will enhance the community/neighborhood appeal of area, inviting more business overall.
- Make a ‘high line’ walking park in ‘moat’/island area of section of La Cienega, San Vicente. I know it’s LA, but it will be a ‘bridge’ between BH and LACMA. Also do ‘high line’ in center area of San Vicente → benches, handcart vendors, etc. → People will use this! Will tie in to west Blvd. District.
- Fix current infrastructure sidewalks/parks. Don’t need to develop more/different. Keep our neighborhoods the same – please do not change zoning.
- Use Metro’s staging lot at Gale & Wilshire for public parking after construction” “For commercial use. Not for park and ride.

Wilshire/ La Cienega/ Hamilton (alongside Flynt bldg.)
- Get Larry Flynt’s Name off this building!
- Get Larry Flynt to open up bottom floor for anchor/ brand celebrity chef restaurant or brand/interesting retail.
- Corner of Doheny & Olympic – architectural style of building is nice (northwest corner).
- Improve streetscape to create more pedestrian scale.” “YES!”
- Need landscaping and public space.
- Get these office bldgs. to open up bottom to retail & if possible sidewalk dining, etc.
- reduce traffic through Gale → it’s the ghetto-est street in BH / no reason for it not to be beautiful w/park.

Wilshire between Swall & La Peer
- Outdoor dining. Maintain theatre & Music Hall uses for after visitng the theater & restaurants.
- Only 3 places for movies (Music Hall, the Academy, & the Fine Arts). Preserve them
- Parking structure, mixed use
- Not like the Grove, but like Culver City
- A variety of uses & restaurants
- Different levels of dining
- Mixed use is good – we want walkers in the area – not more drivers!
- Height doesn’t matter – in 25 years everything will be tall.
Participants were asked to write comments on pictures of Wilshire Boulevard (the following is a summary)

Wilshire between Doheny and Wetherly
- Echo Beverly Drive environment
- Need to make a 24/7 environment – need housing / retail mixed use to breathe life into the area.
- Love the Music Hall & we must save it. Humanity for the neighborhood. Thanks.
- Crosswalk with flashing lights. Santa Monica has this.
- Open up bottom retail of office buildings to retail/dining so we can be the link to LACMA / Miracle Mile/ West 3rd/ Farmers market → it is all walking distance
- Needs beautification, not appealing
- Entice tech: startups, co-working spaces/ incubators = brings jobs, people want to live where they work → then they want services, food.
- Pathetic
- Needs to invite people to walk

Wilshire between Wetherly and Almont
- Support for parking
- Soften the streetscape and add height to buildings to 6-10 stories, with attractive fenestration to facades
- More programs like Sunday concerts
- Should be more walking environment
- Opposed to strip malls
- Car dealerships and medical don’t serve community – have detracted greatly from neighborhood.
- Mixed use development (residential) would contribute to pedestrian activity and neighborhood appeal
- Mixed use with pedestrian friendly activities and cafes.
Participants were asked to write comments on pictures of Wilshire Boulevard (the following is a summary)

**Wilshire between Robertson & Arnaz**
- Beautiful (arrow to building on north side of street)
- Safer crosswalks everywhere!
- Need mixed use both vertical and horizontally.
- Need streetscape enhancement
- Need ground floor retail (arrow pointing to building no south side of Wilshire)

**Wilshire between Swall & Clark**
- Smart development being sensitive to both the residents and the merchants consisting of a combination of small & large bldgs. including restaurants, stores and galleries.
- No more car dealerships
- No more surface lots
- More restaurants, outdoor eating

**Wilshire between Stanley & Le Doux**
- Ghost Tower
- A little retail isn’t bad but not like theaters
- Music, art gallery like Culver City. More courtyards/ public space
- Variety of restaurants & similar to Beverly Dr. with café, etc. must be open late
- Wilshire should be more pedestrian friendly, restaurants, cafes, shops, mixed use (commercial & residential)
- Increase density and remove inappropriate uses (eg., gas station). Maintain historically/ culturally significant buildings/ businesses. At least façade as a minimum.
- Maple & Wilshire – we have a customer service center on S. Maple that is dangerous/ out of code & should not be allowed adjacent to residential. Bad neighbors for 7 years.
- This is a beautiful underutilized building. Keep the theater, develop restaurants, stores around it, have community activities there. (arrow to Fine Arts Theatre)
- More and safer crosswalks
Participants were asked about their thoughts on Olympic Boulevard

“Olympic Boulevard is...”
- Too much traffic. One way!
- Encourage quiet uses
- No more mini malls on Olympic
- No more car dealerships
- Inadequate parking all along Olympic
- No one way!!! More underground parking

“I want it to be...”
- One way (2)

“I would support mixed use developments on Olympic if...”
- Older buildings are not destroyed → repair & refurbish

“I would not support mixed use developments on Olympic because...”
- Lots are too small for mixed use

“I would support increased height/density along Olympic Blvd if...”
- More affordable housing (2)

“I would not support increased height/density on Olympic because...”
- Charm of the city on Olympic is that bldgs. are lower in height which creates a calmer atmosphere being able to see Century City Skyline in distance = more light on Olympic
Participants were asked to write comments on pictures of various parts of Olympic Boulevard

**Olympic between Oakhurst and Doheny**
- Not 24/7 – dislike
- like neighborhood serving retail
- parking too limited
- development along these lines” (arrow to Roxbury pharmacy at Doheny)
- parking needed
- Public market
- farmer market
- family restaurants
- bank

**Olympic between Crescent and Canon**
- Attractive housing without driveway on Blvd. – like
- Dense housing – like
- Save this historic charming building” (written near northeast corner of intersection)

**Olympic between Palm and Oakhurst**
- Public Market
- Farmers Market
- Restaurants → Higher scale retail & business
- More traffic calming measures on Olympic such as tree planters in median
- more parking for businesses
- more and safer crosswalks
Participants were asked to write comments on pictures of various parts of Olympic Boulevard

**Olympic between Wetherly and Almont**
- Dislike car dealers & surface parking on street front
- Incorporate median on Olympic to create friendlier pedestrian experience
- More crosswalks
- Limit traffic on residential streets
- Get rid of car wash and/or limit hours (with arrow to car dealership on south side of Olympic)
- Let’s apprise neighbors of new uses of property after being lobbied for other uses

**Olympic between Clark & Robertson**
- No places to eat – area doesn’t benefit local residents
- Mixed use opportunity for retail & housing & office
- Would like to see retail & residential mix of uses
- Public market, farmers market
- Family restaurants
- No bike lanes
- More restaurants, higher end
- Fewer car dealers
- Mixed use good
- Higher height restrictions

**Olympic between Almont & Lapeer**
- Parking for residents only on residential streets
- No more car dealerships, more parking
- Needs mixed use to improve safety & desirability. Density increase required to achieve.
- Landscaping around parking places.
Participants were asked about their thoughts on the development pattern near the future subway station

“What type of development do you envision....”

• We need: affordable housing/ senior housing. Mixed use. Rescind current height limits – go up!!!! Parking, parking, parking; create a community!!!!!
• Office buildings don’t have great retail for neighborhood. Restaurants on La Cienega are targeted towards tourists. No walkable area, esp. in the evening.
• Housing – high density – with retail would be great along Wilshire. Would create a 24/7 community around convenient transit.
• NoHo – North Hollywood arts & entertainment district.
• Mixed use & Parks – restaurants.
• Mixed use just like Caruso development: luxury +/- housing, retail (anchor & mom and pop), affordable (for locals – eating establishments). Pedestrian friendly = encourage walking: no reason ground level retail & dining can’t tie Rodeo -> LACMA/ Museum Mile -> Farmers Mkt ->West Third Street -> Wilshire / La Cienega Subway Station. Encourage tech: there are now enclaves of tech in LA but we are lacking! Maker labs in downtown, biotech in East LA (soon!), digital/entertainment in Playa, older established startups in SM, advertising tech in Pasadena. With Subway, BH can be center point tying these tech centers and be tech center for eg. entertainment/ hospitality/ real estate / startups /coworking spaces/ incubators. You have to act FAST w/ any of this. Don’t wait for 2023.

“I would like to see mixed use if...”
No convenient parking on La Cienega except valet.

“I would like to see increased height/density if...”
Height/density would be great if it contributed to 24/7 living environment.

“I would not like to see increased height/density because...”
Keep Wilshire zoning consistent commercial only all the way through the City.
Wilshire Blvd. is dark enough because of tall buildings.
Additional Comments from Participants
Tab 15
Third Community Meeting Summary

June 22, 2016

Focus: La Cienega Subway Station Area
and Robertson and La Cienega Corridors
June 22, 2016 6:00 PM

33 members of the public in attendance

Brief presentation from the Mayor and staff followed by opportunity for public to visit several stations and provide input

Input built upon work completed by the Southeast Task Force, as well as a public meetings held in July and November, and will help establish vision for the Southeast Area of Beverly Hills that can inform a Community Plan.
Participants visited several stations to provide thoughts and input including:

- Visioning
- Land Use
- Ideas from the Southeast Task Force
- Amenities around Station
- Role of Technology in the Southeast
- Development along Robertson and La Cienega Corridors

A summary of the comments received at the meeting is provided in this document.
Participants were asked to complete the phrase:

The Southeast is...

• Neglected
• Eclectic!
• Lacking
• Gridlock
• Diverse
• Gateway marker
Participants were asked to complete the phrase:

**In my community I value...**

- It’s a dead zone – needs to be activated (commercial corridor)
- Yes, agree! (to above)
- Walking to amenities like doctors, shopping and entertainment
- Walkability and access (changes in land usage to allow more foot traffic)
- Walkability, variety of housing options especially new product, vibrant streets, Community serving retail
- Walkability, affordable rents
- Smarter land development, better uses, better architecture – get away from height limit
- Small houses
- The ability to park my car
- Nothing anymore! (except central location) area around Gale and Wilshire has become a Ghetto. Prices per square foot for houses in that area are lower than Culver City, Silver Lake, even Highland Park now.
- Respect from City Government (resources, attention)
- Speed enforcement
- Safe streets
Participants were asked to complete the phrase:

My Idea for the Southeast is:

- Open street level spaces to restaurants, retail, galleries
- Too many nail salons need more diverse uses (like Culver City)
- Culver City downtown
- Monthly events (outdoor movies at the park)
- Farmer’s market
- More green space, i.e. parklets
- Coffee shops
- Robertson remove Ficus trees with appropriate replacement
- Provide more social services to transients in Southeast Area
- Pedestrian cross lights are too fast especially on Wilshire
- Traffic calming on residential streets (La Cienega construction pushing trafficking into streets)
- Zoning regulations to allow parking lifts for commercial (2 stacker)
- Focused height and density at anchor/gateway location
- Create sense of community – family friendly
- Mixed use along Olympic
- Mixed use on major streets with residential/retail and office uses (Olympic/La Cienega)
- Mixed uses with businesses that are conducive to walkability/sense of community. Perhaps with housing units to mix commercial and retail (i.e.: Santa Monica Boulevard in WeHo)
Participants were asked to complete the phrase:

My Idea for the Southeast is:

(Continued)

• Highline type park on San Vicente middle divide. e.g. Around La Cienega Crescent Height area. Great for pedestrian “park”, music, push carts (see what they did for Highline and in Red Hook, NY. This will tie use into LACMA/Grove/West 3rd

• Definitely NOT affordable housing, bring back DINKS (double income no kids)/professionals who will want to support restaurants/retail, etc.

• Attract Tech: eg. Entertainment tech. We can be a bridge of Santa Monica and Playa and Hollywood/Burbank and Downtown tech -> right now we are a desert of non tech which is booming in LA -> it attracts people with great incomes willing to spend, walk and create communities

• What is happing with old Porsche space? This was first mall in LA during 20’s It’s a great place to put an anchor restaurant/retail development

• Do more local activities at La Cienega park. Putting that workout area has brought non-residents and ghetto-ized the area

• Allow egress out of Gale and Wilshire, but not ingress as traffic there has become the alternative to La Cienega. It is dangerous and devalues the street
Participants were asked complete a budget exercise to determine how they would allocate 100 dollars toward various community improvements.

This table depicts the average amount allocated to each improvement (8 individuals participated)
Participants were asked what land uses they would like to see in the Southeast

Comments:

- Underground parking
- Classes for adults at La Cienega Park
- Outdoor events but not farmers market, etc. done everywhere else. Maybe music event, crafts event, more creative ideas
- Merry-go-round (Beverly + La Cienega)
Participants were asked about which Southeast Task Force ideas they would support

Introduce trolley route between Southeast and rest of City
Create bike routes to connect Southeast to City
Hold events like film nights and arts fairs
Attract family serving restaurants
Attract neighborhood style market
Reinvigorate restaurant row
Brand the area as an arts and entertainment district
Develop parking facilities

Other comments:
• Parking should be underground
• Entertainment/events at La Cienega Park
Participants were asked which amenities they would like to see around the subway station

- Shuttle to other parts of the city
- Parking structure
- Enhanced bicycle infrastructure
- Public restrooms
- Place to grab coffee/food
- Kiss and ride
- Welcome center for visitors
- Unique community branding
- Childcare facilities
- Enhanced pedestrian amenities
- Enhanced neighborhood wayfinding and maps

Comments:
- Green area around station (right in station area)
- Shuttle like West Hollywood?
- City Hall in Metro Station
- 20/720 and 105/705 bus stops change configuration to relieve traffic/pedestrian congestion
Participants were asked about to think about the role of technology in the Southeast Area

What do you think is the role of technology in the future of the Southeast Area:

• Automated parking
• OLLI
• MOOVIT Application
• Subway station innovations
  • Apps
  • Access
  • Above/below ground tech
• Vehicle lifts for commercial property (efficiency, denser use)
• Water recycling
• Solar energy
• Autonomous mass transit should extend to Westwood, Olympic and other nearby areas
• Bus arrival/departure info in real-time

My idea for the use of technology to enhance the Southeast is...

• Virtual Reality
Participants were asked about their thoughts on new Beverly Hills Bike Share station locations

The community suggested putting stations at the following locations:

- Beverly Vista School
- Horace Mann School
- Rexford between Gregory and Olympic
- Olympic and Doheny
- Robertson and Gregory
- the future subway station
- Vicente and La Cienega
- La Cienega Park
Participants were asked about their thoughts on Robertson Boulevard

“Robertson Boulevard is...”
- A little bit of this and that...a street in search of its identity
- Neglected step child of city – East Beverly Hills
- Boring! (few places to hang out at night)

“My idea for Robertson Boulevard is...”
- More parks
- More trees
- More character with city lights, benches, etc.
- More colorful plantings
- More restaurants, lively activity
- More attractive street lights, not the modern look
- Human scaled buildings
- Robertson could be more like Larchmont
- Mixed uses (residential/retail/restaurant)
- Hi-end design interior decoration retailers should be encouraged
- If there’s additional retail there may be a need for more parking
- No more medical uses on Robertson (unless only confined to upper floors) they generate too much traffic
- Save the wonderful art deco building at Wilshire/Robertson S/W corner
- Assorted storefront perhaps with a set of design guidelines – require awnings and % of open windows
- Uniform architectural style or feel
- Consistency of architectural style
- Sidewalks clean and safe
- Amenities along street to make it feel more secure
- Maintenance in parks of people from other areas using facilities
- The north and south areas of Robertson are (and should be) very different. North more design oriented
Participants were asked about their thoughts on Robertson Boulevard

“What type of Development do you envision on Robertson Boulevard?”

• Mixed use
• User friendly district
• More color and vibrancy with landscaping
• More pedestrian friendly wide sidewalks
• Parklets (without removing parking)
• Municipal swimming pool
• Look like Larchmont
• Nice restaurants – outdoor dining
• More outdoor dining!
• Motorized pole awnings that adjust with the sun and weather to provide protection
• Eateries and cafes that provide a communal setting
• Ground floor = pedestrian uses, explore possibility of having buffer zone behind the commercial zone as transitional – allow duplex/triplex or small lot buildings into 2?
  With two story height limit
• 3-story buildings would be good (a mix)
• Encourage better quality businesses
• How would you then regulate desires for rooftop decks and the noise they bring?
• Respect for residential development with commercial structures which abut
• Less salons and nail co’s
• Traffic congestion is SO BAD
• More public parking
• Dangerous for pedestrians
• Linking cities together with overall plan (e.g. WeHo and Santa Monica)
• This area is kind of like a “ghetto” it needs diversity. Need to attract type of stores like on West 3rd
• North-South transportation
• We need to remember that Robertson is the link to the 10 Freeway. We need to keep it moving fairly well so folks don’t cut through residential streets.
• Community group in area could help improve
• Work with PTA and school groups
Participants were asked about their thoughts on Robertson Boulevard

What amenities would you like to see on Robertson Boulevard
Participants were asked to write comments on pictures of Robertson Boulevard (the following is a summary)

- Dislike auto dealer and repair, not pedestrian friendly
- Too many car dealerships
- Let’s get rid of the auto repair shops. Need boutiques and restaurants and nice galleries
- Traffic and congestion
- Dislike taller buildings (want more human scale)
- Prefer similar to Beverly Drive, - restaurants, shops – also consider fact that Horace Mann is nearby
- Extend north Robertson (design, Boutique, gallery) district into Beverly Hills
- “Highline” type park on divide (middle strip) of San Vicente. It would attract pedestrians who would want restaurants, etc.
- Shops close early so can’t shop. Many businesses are not resident oriented
- Make me into Larchmont look-alike
- Need more cafés, restaurants, maybe a small grocery store
Participants were asked to write comments on pictures of Robertson Boulevard (the following is a summary)

- More trees
- Retain Ficus trees
- Neighborhood market (at Robertson south of Gregory)
- South of Charleville – preserve the charming “patio” horseshoe buildings and arcades
- Celebrate nice architecture
- Preserve this storefront (Art Deco building at Robertson and Wilshire)
- Need upgrades to building facades to make it quaint and more unified
- The mix of businesses is nice, need more interesting small shops
- Less nail salons! Prefer shops that foster neighborhood feel and fact that many families live in this area
- Maintain human scale, low density. Every effort should be made to reduce traffic congestion
- Need pedestrian crossing signs with lights to make it safer (crosswalk on Robertson south of Gregory)
- Ugh gas stations! No gas stations!
- Landscape standards for gas stations
- Reach out to LA to try to have them complement what Beverly Hills is doing in their community plan
- This area always confuses people with the Beverly Hills/LA numbers (All true north near Robertson) (Robertson at Olympic)
Participants were asked about their thoughts on La Cienega Boulevard

“What type of Development do you envision along La Cienega Boulevard?”

• Community Uses

“Tell us what a revitalized Restaurant Row means to you”

• Mixed use restaurant and offices for subway commuters
• Coffee shops/diner
• Focus on restaurants, not chains
• A mix of high-end, casual restaurants, some that open late and/or early
Participants were asked to write comments on pictures of various parts of La Cienega Boulevard

- Lose the billboard! (at La Cienega and Olympic)
- Buy and park use (referring to property at La Cienega and Olympic with billboard)
- I think it’d be great to buy Christmas tree lot. Would be a great extension of La Cienega Park. If we do mitigation we could get a deal
- Christmas tree lot – buy it for park gateway – eye sore
- We need more park space
- Need benches around tennis courts and park
- Need benches and shade (in front of La Cienega park)
- Bus stop = good needs shade
- Bring back the swimming pool at La Cienega Park
- Tennis court property needs to be maintained
- Gregory Way greenery is sad, not like Beverly Hills
- Redevelop public space, renovate/update (referring to area in front of tennis courts)
- Place Beverly Hills monument (where sign for La Cienega Park is located)
- This is good for safety, need more on La Cienega (referring to the median on La Cienega near park)
Participants were asked to write comments on pictures of various parts of La Cienega Boulevard

- More pedestrian crossings at San Vicente/Wilshire
- Need more safety measures at Wilshire and La Cienega
- Longer crossing times and Wilshire/La Cienega, flashing lights, cameras, no rights on red
- Lights illuminating pilasters do not work – not maintained
- Make this a park not parking – parking lot is an eye sore, make it a swimming area/park (referring to parking lot adjacent to Starbucks on La Cienega).
- Median plantings were poorly chosen, neglected, ultimately removed.
- No gateway marker on the median (recently, a sign was added on the East side of La Cienega, an improvement but not good enough)
- Dislike monument at La Cienega and San Vicente
- No problem with more height if they build enough parking for patrons/employees and additional public parking
- I don’t like permit parking, it stifles business
Participants were asked to write comments on pictures of various parts of La Cienega Boulevard

- Theater district!
- More vibrant commercial corridors
- More like Larchmont – cafes, and restaurants on both sides of street, feels like a village
- Add median (La Cienega south of Wilshire)
- Crosswalk here (La Cienega south of Wilshire)
- Crosswalks on every corner
- Crosswalk timing is too short – not safe
- Pedestrian infrastructure needed (La Cienega north of Wilshire)
- More park space
- More special architecture on La Cienega
- Modern design elements
- Christmas lights in area
Participants were asked to write comments on pictures of various parts of La Cienega

- Encourage windows on the street
- Like the windows (on restaurants)
- Modernize building (referring to restaurant on La Cienega)
- Village-like atmosphere (façade rhythms)
- 1st building once exiting the subway – an opportunity for better design and uses (coffee shop, restaurant)
- Public atriums inside buildings (a La New York)
- No high rises (no new ones) they cause congestion
- We need an organic market, a health food market that can walk to
- Healthy grocery store near La Cienega/Wilshire because you could get there without a car
- Public Space (referring to parking lot on La Cienega south of Clifton)
- City Hall outpost
- Want traffic calming on residential streets (Waze has made cut through traffic worse)
- City shuttle to Expo
Participants were asked about their thoughts on the development pattern near the future subway station

“What type of development do you envision....”

- Large buildings, mixed uses, parks
- Downtown Culver City
- La Cienega Highway is not pedestrian friendly, At Gregory Way is dangerous crossing
- La Cienega South of Wilshire is underdeveloped, Revitalize, more Larchmont village
- Place to eat before a show
- Large buildings
- Mixed use-office, residential, retail
- Enhanced walkability with ground floor retail and better pedestrian experience
- Where there are taller buildings on La Cienega (or any other street) there need to be setbacks and tiering to minimize negative impacts on adjacent properties, residential

“I would like to see mixed use if...”

- The architectural styles could be regulated so that the final product promotes a vital street life and creates an active street/streetscape. The mixed use buildings constructed in LA for the most part are cold, cheap looking and ugly. They allow them to remove set backs and landscaping they should have. Buildings should have variety, articulation and good architecture.

“I would like to see increased height/density if...”

- No high rises – mid rises – if it was significantly tiered back away from adjacent residences

“I would not like to see increased height/density because...”

- Not interested in significant height on La Cienega – looking for more of a village feel
- Two stories is better, three too much, one is the best
Participants were invited to draw on a map of the City with their comments and ideas (the following is a summary):

- Sad corridors to walk around
- This block of Wilshire run down (no parking?), no places for daytime lunch or coffee (Around Doheny)
- Red light running/speeding/dangerous left turns (On Wilshire east of Robertson)
- Need traffic mitigation (La Cienega park)
- Kosher restaurants
- Needs a great market and restaurants and small boutique
- Have an evening walking group now, so by the time the subway comes people will be comfortable with those distances
- Could use a run path, just have to get people there safely “linear park” up San Vicente
- “Highline” as gateway at Wilshire and San Vicente. (Recreational use space) Use the trolley space, does need to be elevated
- Density will go up! People will walk to subway
- Gale drive has become a Ghetto, alleviate by preventing ingress to streets (at least south of Gale)
Participants were invited to draw on a map of the City with their comments and ideas (the following is a summary):

• Mid-block crosswalks along Wilshire (near Saban/Coffee Bean)
• Minimum parking requirements are too high
• Integrate underground parking
• Olympic Corridor – 300 block nearby have gone permit parking
• Provide parking access of 300 block south Maple, Palm, Oakhurst, that is non permit parking only due to old Beverly Hills Ford that is no longer there
• Don’t want Metro parking on all the surrounding streets
• Greenway is neglected at Gregory Way not Beverly Hills quality. Please fix it up!
• Keep the unique character of old Beverly Hills, not like LA
• Old streetlights, benches, signage, street markers, trees for shade
• More proactive tree maintenance along Robertson
• Activity here! (La Cienega Park) exercise classes!
• I don’t walk around Olympic because no daytime uses
• New buildings must go to “five star” and be approachable from front and back, more inviting
• Better retail, mixed use (Robertson)
• It’s a drive-through commercial corridor, makes sense to have 4-5 story mixed use
Additional Comments from Participants

Robertson south of Clifton

THANKS FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO SHARE THOUGHTS.
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STAFF REPORT

Meeting Date: May 16, 2017
To: Honorable Mayor & City Council
From: Huma Ahmed, Community Outreach Manager
Subject: Recommendation from the Beverly Hills Conference and Visitors Bureau, Rodeo Drive Committee and Beverly Hills Chamber of Commerce Regarding a Proposed Summer Program in August 2017

INTRODUCTION
This item provides a recommendation from the CVB/Marketing Liaison Committee (Mayor Bosse and Councilmember Wunderlich) regarding a proposal from the City's partner organizations for a special summer marketing program in August 2017.

This request was submitted to the Committee through the Beverly Hills Conference and Visitors Bureau ("CVB") the Rodeo Drive Committee ("RDC") and Beverly Hills Chamber of Commerce ("Chamber"). The proposal includes a request for carryover funding to be allocated into their work plans for FY 2017/18. As developed, it would be a collaborative project between the City and its local partnering business organizations.

DISCUSSION
On April 6, 2017, the City's leading hoteliers and retailers requested an urgent meeting with the CVB/Marketing Liaison Committee to discuss market conditions in Beverly Hills. The discussion highlighted regional and national issues affecting the business community.

Attending representatives shared that an immediate strategic marketing campaign was needed in order to compete with other regional businesses in the Los Angeles area. This program is an attempt to create an energetic vibe and active interest for visitors and the Beverly Hills community.

On May 10, 2017, a presentation was provided to the CVB/Marketing Liaison Committee. The proposal outlined a series of experiences that would be available throughout the "golden triangle" including Rodeo Drive. This program is designed to provide activities every Thursday, Friday and Saturday evening for the month of August.
Additionally, local businesses are being invited to stay open later, and provide in-store incentives (Attachment 1). This summer marketing program also supports the Mayor's B.O.L.D. (Businesses Open Later Days) initiative and an established Council Priority for this year.

The program includes events and ‘experiences’ that would create excitement and energy in the area as a way to attract people to stay, shop and dine in Beverly Hills.

The recommendations include (Attachment 2):

- **Sidewalk Stamps/Pavement Art:** impermanent and semi-permanent chalk based artwork on sidewalks to promote Beverly Hills businesses throughout the business triangle.

- **Style Sessions:** Social media influencers to be invited as guest stylists for in-store events.

- **Incentives:** Cross promotions to drive business to the restaurants, discounts on parking after hours, and ridesharing discounts (promotions with Uber/Lyft, etc.).

- **Summer Ride and Drive:** Mercedes-Benz of Beverly Hills to provide test drives of luxury vehicles within pre-designated locations in the business district. Other local dealerships will also be invited to participate.

- **Celebrity DJ’s and Summer Nights Playlist:** The City will install the holiday speakers throughout the business triangle for summer night music. The playlists would vary by night and be incorporated with the Concerts on Cañon. Celebrity DJ’s will be present on designated evenings.

- **Beverly Hills Mobile Carts and Drinks (non-alcoholic):** to feature Beverly Hills branded carts featuring specialty non-alcoholic drinks, desserts and café tables and chairs. A complete street closure of Rodeo Drive is proposed for the first night of the program which is tentatively proposed for Thursday, August 3, 2017.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

**City Costs for Summer Program**

In reviewing the City’s budget for FY 2016/17, it was determined that the City may contribute carry-over funding from this fiscal year to FY 2017/18 to assist with program funding. Additionally, the City’s in-kind costs would include a one-evening street closure of Rodeo Drive with an estimated cost of $27,534.

The total estimated costs for the Beverly Hills summer program initiative (Attachment 3) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotions/Incentives</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity DJ</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branded food and drink carts; chairs and tables</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Stamps/Pavement Art</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fireworks – First Night Only</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create Concepts – Design Work</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style Sessions – Digital Influencers</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banners</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcards</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Signage</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$791,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City/Partner Funding for this program would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference and Visitors Bureau - from FY 16/17 work plan</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodeo Drive Committee - from FY 16/17 work plan</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$275,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City funding - estimated savings in FY 16/17 Tourism and Marketing budget to carryover to FY 17/18</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Optional) City funding - estimated savings in FY 16/17 Business Development budget to carryover to FY 17/18</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$525,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total available funding: **$800,000**

Additionally, the Rodeo Drive Committee estimates their retailers total in-kind contribution will be approximately $1,950,000 for the 13 nights of summer programming.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff seeks City Council direction and possible approval for the following carryovers:
- Authorization of $375,000 from the FY 16/17 Tourism & Marketing budget
- Authorization for $150,000 (optional) from the Business Development budget to be encumbered for funding the FY 17/18 for the Summer Program

Mahdi Aluzri
Approved By
Attachment 1
Dear (retailer name),

As you may be aware, competition for shoppers is heating up in the immediate vicinity surrounding Beverly Hills. Westfield Century City and The Beverly Center are investing millions of dollars in Westside shopping experiences within a 2-mile radius of Rodeo Drive designed to provide their customers with late night shopping, gourmet dining and name entertainment. Investments such as these are chipping away at our market share as both tourists and locals alike look for unique experiences to entertain them in the later hours of the day.

Of particular concern to us, is the feedback that we continue to receive from all of our Four and Five Star hotels. They have stated that during the summer months - our busiest time of year for visitors - they must direct their guests to neighboring competitors as there is no shopping or activities available in the early evening hours in Beverly Hills. In August, nearly 20% of our hotels’ business originates from middle-eastern countries who generally prefer to shop in the late afternoon, into the evening. They also embrace nightlife. These guests pay top dollar for their accommodations, many rooms start at $800-$1,000 per night in the summer, travel on private jets and come with their entire family. Our hotels are at or near full occupancy in the summer. We have a captive audience of our target demographic at these hotels and we cannot afford to continue to lose their business to other local destinations because our boutiques close at 6:00 or 7:00 pm.

Because of these "early" closures, Beverly Hills has long been perceived as the place where there is nothing to do in the evening. We have begun to change this perception with the multitude of dining establishments available on Canon Drive. But just having a place to eat is not enough. We need to add shopping and entertainment to the equation to permanently shift the perception, protect our market share and set us up for success in the years to come.

To start this change in culture, we would ask that for the month of August, your Beverly Hills location remain open until 8:00 pm on Thursday, Friday and Saturday evenings. To build awareness and to complement the new extended hours, the City of Beverly Hills will be funding:

A robust marketing campaign of events, promotions, digital partnerships and promotion to create buzz and excitement on our streets and to help us become more of an evening destination for hotel guests, Beverly Hills and Los Angeles County residents as well as those of nearby markets who can drive to the city for the weekend. Hotels have agreed to promote shopping on their in-room entertainment devices and through their house car drivers, sales and concierge staff as well as in their social media channels.

We want to reiterate that this is a city-wide initiative. We are banding together to become a stronger, united city presence and to attract customers BEFORE they get used to going to Century City for their luxury shopping. We need your 100% participation for this to work! As a condition of the city funding activities, we will need a firm commitment from the retailers on Rodeo Drive to remain open on Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays in August until 8:00 pm. We already have commitments from Burberry, Chanel, Dior, Louis Vuitton, Patek Philippe, Rolex, Tom Ford and Valentino.
We hope you will partner with us to continue making Beverly Hills a unique and vibrant destination that cannot be rivaled anywhere else in the world. Please email me at lbosse@beverlyhills.org or call 310-285-1013 by Thursday, May 25 if you are able to participate with later hours every Thursday through Saturday in August. If you have any questions, please contact Cara Kleinhaut or Marissa Wallis at RDC@AGEN-C.Com or call 310-855-9595.

Please help us save our shoppers from leaving Beverly Hills!

All the best,

Mayor Lili Bosse

Noel Hernandez
AKA
Sandy Murphy
The Beverly Hilton
Ben Trodd
Beverly Wilshire,
A Four Seasons Hotel

Adam Sydenham
Luxe Rodeo Drive Hotel
Todd Orlich
Montage Beverly Hills
Offer Nissenbaum
The Peninsula Beverly Hills

Rich Oken
Sixty Beverly Hills
Alex Novo
Viceroy L’Ermitage
Luc Delafosse
The Waldorf Astoria Beverly Hills
Attachment 2
STRATEGY

In partnership with the Beverly Hills Conference and Visitors Bureau, we will create an ongoing commerce-driven seasonal campaign that will consistently attract luxury consumers (local and tourists) to Beverly Hills. This will support an established City Council priority, Mayor Lili Bosse’s B.O.L.D. program.

GOALS

- Change the culture in the evenings in Beverly Hills to create a vibe, excitement and energy throughout the city.

- Develop programming that drives digital and press amplification for Beverly Hills as an evening destination.

- Deliver ROI to Rodeo Drive retailers who will be investing into the summer experience programs to keep stores open later.
**PROPOSED SCHEDULE | SUMMER PROGRAM | AUGUST 2017**

**TIMING: THURSDAY - SATURDAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK 1 - AUGUST 3 - 5 (LAUNCH WEEK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, August 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• #BHBites Carts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Live DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fireworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rodeo Drive street closure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Friday, August 4**                 |
| • #BHBites Carts                    |
| • Live DJ                           |
| • Ride and Drive with Mercedes-Benz of Beverly Hills |

| **Saturday, August 5**               |
| • #BHBites Carts                    |
| • Live DJ                           |
| • In-Store Style Sessions           |

Proposed schedule equals 13 Nights of Programming throughout the entire month of August.
PROPOSED SCHEDULE CONTINUED | SUMMER PROGRAM | AUGUST 2017
TIMING: THURSDAY - SATURDAY

WEEK 2 | AUGUST 10 - 12
---
Thursday, August 10
- Summer Nights Playlist

Friday, August 11
- Ride and Drive with Mercedes-Benz of Beverly Hills
- Summer Nights Playlist

Saturday, August 12
- Live DJ
- #BHBites Carts

WEEK 3 | AUGUST 17 - 19
---
Thursday, August 17
- Summer Nights Playlist

Friday, August 18
- Ride and Drive with Mercedes-Benz of Beverly Hills
- Summer Nights Playlist

Saturday, August 19
- Live DJ
- #BHBites Carts

WEEK 4 | AUGUST 24 - 26
---
Thursday, August 24
- In-Store Style Sessions
- Summer Nights Playlist

Friday, August 25
- Ride and Drive with Mercedes-Benz of Beverly Hills
- Summer Nights Playlist

Saturday, August 26
- Live DJ
- #BHBites Carts

WEEK 5 | AUGUST 31
---
Thursday, August 31
- Summer Nights Playlist
"When you add something for people to see, hear, taste and do at the forefront of your messaging, you are creating a positive memory that is much more powerful than an ad alone. It becomes a moment in time that participants will enthusiastically remember and talk about. And, it's a heart-felt connection to your brand that will make consumers more receptive to your messaging every time they see your ads in the future." - Saul Colt, AD Age
SUMMER PROGRAMMING | #ONLYONRODEO SIDEWALK STAMPS/PAVEMENT ART

Stamps to include different quotes from each designer/creative director & #OnlyOnRodeo hashtag, outside of Rodeo Drive members boutiques, providing fun “shoe-fie” photo moments.

PRESS & DIGITAL

- Each Sidewalk Stamp to be pushed on digital platforms
- Pitch angles: What’s New on Beverly Hills, Couture Sidewalk Stamps give millennials digital photo tour of Rodeo Drive

"I don't design clothes, I design dreams.
Ralph Lauren"
SUMMER PROGRAMMING | STYLE SESSIONS (IN-STORE TASTEMAKER EVENTS WITH MEDIA BUY)

Partner with two top tier luxury digital influencers as guest stylists for in-store events to drive millennial luxury consumers and brand loyalists to the stores through digital amplification.

Invite VIPs, influencers, qualified consumers for ongoing meet & greets and to receive styling tips, talk trends, etc.

Potential Digital Influencer Partners:
- MargoAndMe (348K followers)
- Chriselle Lim (881K followers)
- Sazan Hendrix (782K followers)
- Marianna Hewitt (707K followers)
- HelloFashionBlog (881K followers)

DAY: THURSDAY | LOCATION: IN-STORE OF RODEO DRIVE RETAILERS
Partner with Mercedes-Benz of Beverly Hills for test drives of latest model luxury Mercedes vehicles with the pick up point on Rodeo Drive. A brand ambassador from Mercedes of Beverly Hills will accompany on a pre approved route in the BH area. This opportunity will be extended to other luxury car dealerships.

The purpose of this partnership is to coincide with the summer programming, bringing more experience to Rodeo Drive, while targeting VIP clientele, influencers, specific summer tourist groups and auto enthusiasts.

**PRESS & DIGITAL**

- Partner with key influencers and press to promote overall experience on Rodeo Drive via video + photos taken in Mercedes on Rodeo

- Pitch Angles: Test Drive Your Dream Car
  #OnlyOnRodeo, Luxury Lifestyle on Rodeo Drive.
Beverly Hills to partner with guest DJs for summer extended hours, creating a lively and entertaining scene that drives traffic to the city.

Sample Guest DJ Targets include:
- Mia Moretti
- DJ Reprise
- Chelsea Leyland
- Harley Viera Newton
- Michelle Pesce
- DJ Alexandra Richards

In addition we recommend a featured Beverly Hills Summer Nights playlist piped on key evenings throughout the summer, adding ambience and amplifying the overall experience for qualified buyers and tourists.
SUMMER PROGRAMMING | BEST OF BEVERLY HILLS BITES CART
DAY: SATURDAY | LOCATION: RODEO DRIVE/200 BLOCK

#BHBitesCart featuring coffee and small treats will wheel around the City during the extended summer hours for the entire month of August, driving foot traffic to the street and into the stores.

PRESS & DIGITAL

- The hashtag #BHBitesCart along with fun Beverly Hills branding will encourage patrons to snap a pic and post increasing the City's digital footprint.
Attachment 3
## Business Open Late Days Budget - City Liaisons Presentation 5/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Executed by</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outreach to stores</td>
<td>Stores to stay open until 8pm Thur - Sat. Potential in-store events tbd.</td>
<td>N/C</td>
<td>Chamber, RDC, CVB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach to hotels and restaurants</td>
<td>See restaurant promotion below</td>
<td>N/C</td>
<td>CVB/Chamber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking meters</td>
<td>Mobile Bites on Rodeo</td>
<td>N/C</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers</td>
<td>Hang speakers along Rodeo and Beverly Dr.</td>
<td>To play concerts on Canon on Thursdays, playlist on Friday and DJ on Saturdays</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/discounted parking</td>
<td>Guests would receive free parking up until 9pm Thursday - Saturday</td>
<td>N/C</td>
<td>City/Two Rodeo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion w/ Lyft</td>
<td>Come between 6 and 8 pm on Thursday, Fri or Sat in August and receive $5 off</td>
<td>First 2000 people</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>CVB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion with Restaurants</td>
<td>Free glass of wine/appetizer/dessert, etc. when you show your shopping receipt of $50 or more from after 6pm at a Beverly Hills restaurant</td>
<td>N/C</td>
<td>CVB/Chamber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>Personal appearance every Sat (curated BH playlist to be created and available on Spotify or Pandora)</td>
<td>Influencers w/ Social Media. Includes equipment rental and setup/tear down ($35K per appearance)</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>AGENC</td>
<td>CVB/RDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills Mobile Bites</td>
<td>Beverly Hills Food Truck</td>
<td></td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>AGENC</td>
<td>CVB/RDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tables and Chairs</td>
<td>Sidewalk placement with BH Mobile Bites (13 nights)</td>
<td>$5,000 per set up</td>
<td>AGENC</td>
<td>RDC/CVB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercedes Test Drives</td>
<td>To be sponsored</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>RDC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot prints/stamps</td>
<td>Along Rodeo Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>AGENC</td>
<td>RDC/Chamber/CVB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireworks First Night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Concepts</td>
<td>Yes Design Group (CVB)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>YDG</td>
<td>CVB w/ RDC and City approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>Local and Drive Market and Where Magazine</td>
<td>Includes production</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>GP GENERATE/YDG</td>
<td>CVB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Influencers</td>
<td>Select influencers will be paid to post and appear in-store for meet and greets</td>
<td>$25,000/influencer - three stores at a time</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>AGENC</td>
<td>RDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banners</td>
<td>Golden Triangle</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>YDG/AAA</td>
<td>CVB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcard</td>
<td>Local LAC/BH Resident</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>YDG/Modern PC</td>
<td>CVB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Posters/Signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>YDG</td>
<td>CVB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel in-room media</td>
<td>Promote on TV's</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tbd</td>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>City, CVB, Hotel and RDC distribution</td>
<td>In addition to influencer content</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press</td>
<td>Press release</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>CVB/RDC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour Operator Outreach</td>
<td>Tour Bus Parking at Trolley stop on Rodeo on open late evenings</td>
<td>eblast</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>CVB/City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENC Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tbd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Installation</td>
<td>Movable Screens</td>
<td></td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>AGENC</td>
<td>RDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food from Local Restaurants</td>
<td>Tasting area</td>
<td>Event Company to handle set up and tear down x 4</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>AGENC</td>
<td>RDC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**                                     | $816,500-$1,501,500                                                        |                                                                       |                         |              |                            |

Contribution by RDC = $2,000/night x 13 x 75 stores = $1,950,000