



Planning & Land Use Committee Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, March 12, 2019 7:00 pm to 9:00 pm

American Jewish University

15600 Mulholland Drive, 2nd Floor, Room 223 Bel Air 90077

1. **Call to Order – Committee Member Roll Call** at 7:04 with 6 present initially; Mike, Maureen & Leslie arrived at 7:07; Nickie arrived at 7:22 for a total of 10.

Name	P	A	Name	P	A
Robert Schlesinger, Chair	X		Stephanie Savage, Vice Chair		X
Robin Greenberg	X		Nickie Miner	X	
Michael Kemp	X		Jamie Hall	X	
Don Loze		X	Jason Spradlin		X
Maureen Levinson	X		Leslie Weisberg	X	
Stephen Twining	X		Yves Mieszala	X	
Stella Grey	X				

2. **Approval of the March 12, 2019 Agenda**

Moved by Stephen; **Seconded** by abstain; **9 yes / 0 no / 0 abstentions; passed.**

3. **Approval of February 12, 2019 Minutes** (circulated with agenda)

Moved by Stephen; **Seconded** by Yves; **7 yes / 0 no / 2 abstentions; Maureen & Mike; passed.**

4. **Public Comments:** Stella Grey related that her association (DSPNA) worked with 9360 Sierra Mar Drive; their PLUM Committee approached them and worked with them successfully to have them adopt measures to mitigate construction impacts. This became part of the letter of determination of the ZA, and a path to adopting additional mitigating measures.

[Maureen, Mike and Leslie arrived at 7:07 pm.]

5. **Chair Report:** Robert Schlesinger – None

6. **Vice-Chair Report:** Stephanie Savage – Absent

Projects & Items Scheduled for Presentation, Discussion & Possible Action:

7. **454 Cuesta Way (444 Cuesta Way) • ZA-2014-914-ZAD-PA1 CONF 3/12/19**

ENV-2014-54-CE AA-2014-53-WTM Update req 11/30 ✓ BAA has File a/o 11/22 Ltr 12/29/18✓

BAA (Lot, Block, Tract) 67, None, Bel Air. RE-20-1-H Lot area 81,220 sf Initial Actions 14, Approved Plans 10. Add a single story 489.3 sf, 2 car garage to be accessed from Amapola Ln & 10 car carport w/attached single story accessory space of 140 sf to be accessed from Madrano Ln to an existing SFD previously under ZA-2014-914-ZAD.

Project Description: Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.24M, a plan approval to add a single story 489.3 square foot two-car garage to be accessed from Amapola Lane, and a 10-car carport with attached single story 140 square foot accessory space to be accessed from Madrono Ln, all in conjunction with an existing SFD previously approved under ZA-2014-914-ZAD.

Requested Entitlement: ZAD, Pursuant 12.24x28, to permit the construction of a new SFD, ALQ, detached garage, new swimming pool & other water features fronting on 3 Substandard Hillside Limited Streets. NPT 4 Pine, # Palm all removed none replaced. Grading 1,1160 cy, Exp 826 cy. Proj size 629.3 sf.

App: Andrew Kupinse, Trustee, 454 Cuesta Way Trust #2, Miami 786.709.9300

Agent: Crest R/E Caitlan Cullen caitlan@crestrealestate.com 775.690.2230 (Russo)

Filed: 10/16/18 Assign/Staff: Jeanalee Obergfell 213.978.0092

Permanent Link: <http://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/CaseId/MjI0NjA50>

Tony Russo related that he worked with the Bel Air Association who is helping them coordinate with neighbors; waiving street improvements on all three, mainly paved roadway for Cuesta Way; says no access from Amapola and Madrono; was approved; they have a lot of people who work for them, are proposing to add additional parking on site; two on Amapola and 10 on Madrono. Plan approval request is to amend conditions to allow for vehicular access; for a new RFA guardhouse on Amapola, subterranean basement; 489 square feet exempt; security office by Madrono, 140 square feet exempt; only adding 620-630 square feet; grading for proposed project 913 cut and 15 fill about 900 cy export; streets are all less than 20 foot paved. ZAD previously approved and they are going back for plan approval. Sewer connected to existing; as to fire hydrants, meant to say that they will be approved with LAFD; they have had initial meeting with them, expect them to approve.

They have met with Shawn Bayliss, BAA three times, and are working out an agreement with them to address neighbors' concerns and their concerns; they have a rough agreement in place; may be adding a fence; to be determined if over in height along Madrono. They may want it taller. Finalizing terms with him.

Shawn mentioned that he would speak to Bob today. Maureen spoke with Shawn BAA about this; said they're currently in discussion with planning and Tony Russo; think they want to make it happen; problem is a lot of employees of the residents, that they think this would solve the problem. Since there is no hearing date and they are still discussing, may want to postpone.

Tony related that he just wanted to bring this before us. Stephen asked about 12 parking spaces. Two will be off Amapola in a garage; 10 off of Madrono, hardscaped. Maureen noted that there are issues with Amapola and Madrono with this house; that it is causing a problem with parking for all employees and that this may be a way to solve it. Maureen, according to the BAA, relaying message from Shawn Bayliss, that they are reaching out to the residents, it would solve a problem if they did that but that Shawn wants to go through Planning. House fronts Madrono, Amapola and Cuesta is the primary access.

Motion: To continue to April; **moved** by Maureen; **seconded** by Stephen; **9 yes / 0 no / 0 abstentions; passed.**

8. 1663 Summitridge Dr. ZA-2018-5569-ZAD ENV-2018-5570-CE

BCA AA-2018-3485-COC Lot Area 24,879.7 SFD, Prop Addition to SFD

Project Description: Zoning Administrators Determination for reduced road width of 16'-0" in lieu of 20'-0"

Requested Entitlement: Pursuant To LAMC 12.24 X.28, a ZAD for reduced road width of 16'-0" In lieu of 20'-0" The proposed addition does not affect vehicular traffic as the addition is near the rear of the site. The prop addition stays w/in the side yard setback, and is in conformance of all design, height and area requirements of zoning RE20-1-H-HCR. Location maps, plans & arch renderings.

Owner: Grant King

Agent/Rep: Colby Mayes colby@mayesoffice.com 310.578.8488

Filed: 9/24/18 Assign/Staff: 11/19/18 David Solaiman Tehrani david.solaiman-tehrani@lacity.org

213.978.1193 Permanent Link: <http://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/CaseId/MjI0MTIw0>

Not present. Per Bob, they will return in April.

9. 1376 ANGELO DR. • ZA-2018-1151-ZAD ENV-2018-1152-EAF

BCA Access ZAD Determ 3/02/18 Haul Route? 12/06/18 Send Full Info 12/21/18

BCA 9708 Lot 68,195 sf site is undeveloped – unimproved. Waive improved street less than 20 ft wide. 4 story SFD, Garage 8 cars. SFD propose 22,000 sf

Project Description: Construction of a new SFD. Requested Entitlement: Pursuant LAMC 12.24,x.28, request for relief from improving a sub-standard street in the Beverly-Crest Hillside Area.

Owner/App: Khouroush Nazarian samnazarianprop@aol.com

Alex Nazarian 310.405.1797 atearcon@aol.com

(Sam Nazarian Properties LLC) Alex Nazarian V.P. [<atearcon@aol.com>](mailto:atearcon@aol.com)

[This item was continued from last month's PLU Committee meeting, pending reports on overall heights, wildlife report, arborist report, LAFD sign off, etc., as well as BCA. Hearing was scheduled for the beginning of March downtown. Don and Robert asked them to extend this 30 days, as there are numerous projects on Angelo Drive, concerned about cumulative impact.]

[Nickie arrived at 7:22 pm for a total of 10.]

Judith Cukier returned after meeting here last month to address 4-5 concerns: 1) amount of retaining walls; 2) height; 3) tree report; 4) wildlife report. (The project they propose is 18,000 square feet.) Retaining walls: Judith related that they did two things; that the previous drawings were misleading; they met with Plan Checker who corrected them saying every time they have a deck inside the property on piles or whatever structure that it supporting it, wall behind it is not technically a retaining wall; none of those supporting for the deck become a retaining wall. Same with the turnaround at the entry: they have a private street along Angelo; at the end are proposing a turnaround; that turnaround max 6' above grade; not filled, so not another wall. About Height: Overall, went to Plan Checker, said they were told that it is a way of determining grade plane for overall height. Next, they presented tree report; and said that the only protected tree she believes is an oak. Highlighted in yellow; not in the footprint; not in the work area; won't be removed. She reportedly has a statement that says there are no concerns as to wildlife species; they have some space for animals to cross. No fences proposed. Davies and Cielo Drive to where the hose starts will have no fences. She doesn't know but thinks there are two trees, in the report, in the turnaround area. She doesn't know if they will replace at 1:1, but Jamie related that we require that. Some of the land will be hard to access. They don't know how many caissons; think maybe 20. There is an area at the widest part that they could have a pad. She said they spoke with neighbors on the private street, Angelo Drive, who were supportive. The property owner is at the end of the cul de sac.

Robert noted that the problem is that there are four to five projects in the area; Davies is a substandard street; he couldn't get through let alone emergency or other vehicles. They say they would only take dirt from the bottom up, they'll take the dirt down 10 yard vehicles, Cielo to Davies. They would park it on the bottom and take the dirt down. Maureen related that she met with them at the BAA property 1166 Bellagio. Asked about the status of another property; they weren't able to comply. Robert and Maureen are not convinced how they are going to take the dirt down there. They would bring the dirt down by Bobcat. They are open to take our recommendation to take it from the top. They are going to hire a contractor.

Jamie thinks the project is way too big; he'd like to see the undeveloped portion of the property kept that way, normal with a B restriction or other; that can remain available for animals and locally protected species. He would like condition of approval to keep the undeveloped area in an undeveloped state, and any fencing be "wildlife permeable" that allows animals to traverse back and forth; design fences to allow little critters to get access to their habitat: 2) requirement for wildlife permeable fencing. Other thing is screening the retaining walls. There is a screening requirement. No enforcement mechanism in the city to make sure it is put back. One way is to put together a façade on the walls that looks more rustic in nature; something more aesthetically pleasing, and replacement of nonprotected trees that provide environmental services as well, at a 1:1 ratio. Mr. Nazarian accepts recommendations as to trees, wildlife permeable fencing, to leave undeveloped land in an undeveloped state.

As to retaining walls, Judith will list the options. Jamie will lay out the options for them to choose to design the wall to have some sort of screening built in.

Michael asked, and the private drive provides access to property and ends with a fire turnaround area. They expect there to be about 20 caissons. Maureen would like to see outreach to all adjacent property owners, including letters. No one responded, per Judith. They have a covenant. Maureen would like more community outreach such as knocking on doors, telling them about the building, what to expect, good and bad; make them aware and provide accountability, who do they call? There has to be some response. Leave contact information.

Stella asked, for a project this size, should you have a construction plan, to make sure you do not store the equipment and how you excavate soil out of the property; how you unload deliveries, etc.. Bring your contractor here. This did go before BCA, per Bob. Bob related that we need to discuss method of hauling out the soil with their contractor. 1) He is in an overlay zone, make sure he understands; 2) how is he getting the earth out of there? He will be there on the job. Bob related that it makes it difficult without knowing who the contractor is. Jamie noted that all of the bird street conditions should be appropriate. Jamie related that some of the conditions, regarding hauling include: don't do it on red flag days. Jamie has a list that we ask construction to comply with. Stella noted that 428 vs. 4,000 CY are inconsistent numbers. No neighbors were present. Robert related that BCA will write a letter and include the HCR regulations for the contractor to sign off on reading this, to include Jamie's recommendations.

Jamie would like to provide them all the conditions, including hauling conditions, and have them come back to explain outstanding questions. And BCA will take a formal position. Jamie continued that we need to feel confident that the neighbors are involved in the process; that they need to make sure the neighbors are aware of this process. We ask the applicants to notify the residents. Jamie noted that BTC notifies neighbors of City hearings, but not us. We're asking you to knock on doors, discuss their project with them and invite them to the April meeting, at which time there will be a decision; in the interim, confirm the grading numbers, confirm the appropriate neighbors and invite them, and we'll wait. Bob will send a copy of the HCR.

Moved by Jamie; **Seconded** by Maureen; **9 yes / 0 no / 0 abstentions; passed.**

10. 2545 Bowmont Dr • DIR-2018-328-DRB-SPP-MSP ENV-2018-329-CE MSPinApril✓

(2380, 2358, 2360 Gloaming) Jannette Pedilla-Flores, Architect, August Confirmed 7/31

(Parcel-1) CWC Construction on a vacant lot of a 30-foot high, 14,490-square-foot, 2-story SFD. Location is lot 2 to be created from a proposed lot line adjustment. Design Review and project permit compliance, pursuant to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan, to allow the construction on a vacant lot of a 30-foot high, 8,592.6-square-foot, 2-story SFD and attached 6-car garage and basement. (Location is lot 2 to be created from a proposed lot line adjustment)

Appl: Nick Keros (2545 Bowmont, LLC) **310.612.5300 T/C CB?**

Architect: Liz liz@ir-arch.com 818./488.9435

Ignacio Rodriguez Ignacio@ir-arch.com 818.488.9435 George

Rep: Jaime Massey jaimemassey@gmail.com 818.517.1842

Filed: 1/19/18 Assign/Staff: 2/28/18 Courtney Schoenwald courtney.schoenwald@lacity.org 818.374.9904

MDRB Staff: Alycia Witzling alycia.witzling@lacity.org 818-374-5044.

Permanent Link: <http://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/CaseId/MjE4NDI20>

Jorge, project manager, was the only presenter this evening. Bob asked, and it is a triple lot split; three parcels; however, the only parcel discussed tonight is parcel #1. They will be individually graded; they're handling this as three separate properties. Jorge noted that the lot line adjustment has been approved. Lot one single family residence is 2 stories, 3,500 sf above-ground, basement, 4,400+ 570 square foot garage; lot 41,000 sq foot. Developer wants to minimize impact on the site; does not require a haul route.

He recapped that we met a year ago on this project and returned in November. We are now looking at new plans, being placed on upcoming agenda to go before the MSP Board who had an issue with height on some walls on exterior deck, which were reduced to 10 footer and 6 footer. The height building 25' has sloped roofs, is a modern design, three bedrooms, small office over the garage. They are not removing any trees. Working with Santa Monica, drafting a plan that the owner will accept.

Bob asked about access, and told they will all be Bowmont; they're fronting on Gloaming but access is on Bowmont. Nickie asked about the terrain and size, to which we were told it is hillside and a standard street. Nickie asked how much extra stress this will be putting on Bowmont. The house is 8,300 feet. MDRB asked them to downsize lot 2 and lot three; 2 will be 10,000 and 3 will be a little bit smaller. There is now an existing single family house, with access from Bowmont. They will have a common entrance.

No trees are being removed at all. A portion of it is in an undeveloped state and a large area will remain because SMMC wanted them to grant a B-Restriction which he says the owner will do. They made a plan and are awaiting approval. Jamie asked if they could use wildlife permeable fencing.

Jamie related that the walls, part of the structure, are still walls in that they have a visual impact, and asked if they would be willing to do something to make them look not so massive. The presenter thinks that the client may be able to agree to vines, and noted that he is proposing medium-sized trees, not oaks. We don't want invasive species; 75% will be on preferred list from Mulholland.

They have Categorical Exemption. The city is looking at this as three projects. They were all presented at the same time to MDRB. Jamie noted that what they are doing is the definition of "piece-mealing" by saying that they are looking at the projects separately as they have to be looked at holistically. He mentioned need for a barrier for cars to go over the driveway.

Public Comment:

Amy Adelson related that she is part of the **Bowmont-Hazan Neighborhood Association**, representing over 135 neighbors, and we have 15-20 people. On 11/07, two dozen appeared at the MDRB.

She noted that this is subdivided into three lots. At that time they were going to have three massive homes; she presented photos. She noted that the owner prefaced remarks to the MDRB that this was his land and he could build what he wanted; however, that the MDRB ensures limits on what he can build. They sent him away to reduce the scale and to notify the neighborhood council (NC). She noted that they said that the NC had no issue with the plans. She noted that their long-term goal is the same: to grade all three lots & stagger construction over years, leading to opportunities for piece-mealing; that they are proposing to build homes out of scale with the neighborhood. She expressed alarm by the oversized but also that this is on a substandard road where residents can get trapped. They want the developer to minimize this and to address public safety issue.

Virginia Kahn related that she lives next door and that she has a trust issue with developer. She noted that a tree fell down on her property; there is a home being used as short-term rental. This sits on the head of a pin in terms of topography. The road is substandard. Now they're proposing to use this entrance and exit to do three different projects. She asks, how are they going to do that? She opposes this according to safety issues. The street is 20 feet; she doesn't know the size of the driveway which is gated; says that construction vehicles will have to come up Coldwater Canyon; doesn't think is safe for those drivers. They bought the property years ago to have the quiet of the canyon, and that is gone.

Peter McCoy related that he has similar concerns; at 2431 Bowmont for 47 years; noted that a lot of the neighbors have been there a long time. He related that he is a general contractor and is concerned that their grading quantities are fictitious; the driveway 100 feet down; these house all take three years. He would guess that it's more than what's on paper, not taking into consideration the slopes and that they will need shoring piles. He knows they'll have to move the dirt to the other two lots. He'd hoped there would be no cross lot storage of spoils; noting that we are not in the Hillside Ordinance. They are in the Hillside Ordinance but not part of the overlay.

Ben Silverman a resident for 42 years is concerned about public safety and access of emergency vehicles from Bowmont and Loma Vista to the end of Bowmont, noting that the beginning of the driveway for this proposal is effectively one lane; parking permitted on one side. He said that there is only one way out, back down, there is a 270-degree blind turn on a street that may be 18-foot wide, to the intersection of Hazen and Bowmont to Loma Vista; unless there's a turn around on the property and a requirement that it be built first and utilized, there will be long periods of time when Fire, Police, Ambulance, can't get to the neighbors. Trash trucks drive up & turn around in front of the driveway that they want to build. They go through the private gate; city services have access. Sometimes they will back up. They go both ways on Bowmont to pick up trash. He opined that it is too large a project with larger impact which goes into public safety.

Jamie responded that this is not the kind of project where we put blinders on in terms of design; the MDRB has a compatibility component. This is separate from discretionary items. We get to look at the totality of the project. Asked why they can't do some of the work from Gloaming.

Elizabeth Waybill related that they won't take time, but it is very terrifying. For the record, additional public comment cards expressing opposition to this were submitted by **Elliot & Alana Megdal**, residents on Hazen and **Jim Saltmar**, resident on Bowmont. Additional individuals in opposition to the project were present who did not sign their names, totaling approximately 15-20 people.

Meg Greenfield, Planning Deputy, from CD4, public safety is a huge concern, especially with wildfires being more common now. She noted that public safety is not within the MDRB, whose purview is design, which she feels needs to be fixed, but feels it is important to mention at these meetings, because they can be put in as conditions, e.g. that the owner and representative sitting down with the neighbors come up with a construction plan. Lady in the audience wearing a purple sweater related that their greatest concern is that if this goes forward, once approved, there is no oversight. Her property is just above theirs.

Jorge related that they will provide for their driveway turnaround; and that the idea is to park all vehicles on site. Bob brought up that there will be an access problem to which Jorge reported that they have a large property. Jamie asked what were the changes that the MDRB asked for, to which Jorge noted that they liked lot one, but asked them to bring the scale down of the other two. Jamie asked if they'd put together a hillside construction parking and staging plan on paper, to be vetted to become part of the approval which will be an attachment to the letter of determination. Jorge said he will discuss this with the owner.

Michael Kemp added that as they are anticipating all three houses, it is common to build a master building plan; a construction plan, a circulation plan and a master development plan. He asked how they will develop this parcel. Jorge will bring this question up to the owner. Michael recommended that we (Bob) send a letter to MDRB and let them know we are in the process of reviewing this project.

Stephen asked how the garbage gets picked up. Leslie asked where the fire hydrants are: There will be one at the fire truck turnaround, just above where lot two is. The radius from the fire hydrant is less than 300 feet. Bob noted that he will remain in contact with Jorge, and will hold this in abeyance until he has his plans and knows when the new plans are done for lot one.

Jorge has an appointment with MDRB April 12th. Bob will write Alan Kishbaugh before that date. Michael added that we want to see the plan which shows the fire hydrant, calculations for the export. It says 995, he'd like to see calculations. We'd like a complete staging plan. We need a comprehensive plan for how this is going to work for all three parcels, and to also see a comprehensive plan in effect with the neighbors on how to stage the vehicles, traverse the roads coming and going so these people have access to their homes, and where the fire hydrants are going to be. Bob noted that the contractor needs to be familiar with the overlay. He will widen the private driveway to 20 feet. **The item is continued**

Follow-up, Discussion & Possible Action on other Projects:

11. Update on Ridgeline Ordinance – Loze

Council File #11-1441-S1

PLUM Committee Report relative to the feasibility of updating the Ridgeline Ordinance was approved at City Council on November 22, 2017 and finalized on November 27, 2017. There is no change in the Council File since 03/01/2018 when we submitted our 2nd CIS supporting the original motion. Council file contains one CIS by Glassell Park NC and two by BABCNC. Motion Expiration Date: 11/14/2019.

<https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=11-1441-S1>

- Bob related that Don had spoken with Jonathan Hershey, and that it seems to be bogged down; Bob said he needs to speak to Joan Pelico, noting that in the meantime, ridgelines are being savaged.

12. Update on CD5 Protected Tree Ordinance Amendment – Levinson Council File #03-1459-S3

On November 22, 2017, Councilmembers Koretz and Bonin introduced a City Council motion to strengthen the Protected Tree Ordinance. It instructed the Urban Forestry Division to convene and consult with stakeholder groups and report back within 75 days with recommendations on such issues as reducing tree losses during development and broadening the tree categories and species protected under the Ordinance. To date, UFD has not taken action to convene the stakeholder meetings. Motion Expiration Date: 11/22/2019.

<https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=03-1459-S3>

Maureen related that per Urban Forestry’s notification system, if removal for three or more trees, UFD provides 3-day notice to the affected Council District and the affected Neighborhood Council.

Jamie related that the notice he received for Angelo was the first he ever got and opined that we should start as a NC to ask, what is our role? Would we ask the applicants to present to us? Jamie thinks we should, as a pre-meeting before they go to the BPW. He thinks that we are not asking the right questions and that it is not happening now at UFD. He recommends that when we get these notices, that we agendize them and ask the applicant to come here. Jamie suggested that we could ask them to come here and ask them to not cut down the trees until after the hearing. Bob volunteered.

Maureen related that we need to make it clear to the applicants that it is an expectation that they notify the neighbors. Michael added that we do have a sheet that we send to the applicant. Need to put on the top that you must reach out to neighbors and bring proof of that or you will be continued. We need to create a form for neighbor notification.

Current Case Updates by PLUC Members on pending projects: See Project Tracking List

- 13. New Packages Received: See Project Tracking List
- 14. Certified Neighborhood Council (CNC) Reporting Review of New Projects Submitted
- 15. Upcoming Hearings: See Project Tracking List (Subject to discussion & action)
- 16. Determination Letters Received: See Project Tracking List
- 17. Pending Haul Routes (Update by any PLU Committee members)
- 18. Proactive Tracking, Tasks & Projects (Update, Discussion & Possible Action)
- 19. Adjournment

Next BABCNC PLU Committee Meeting: Tuesday April 9, 2019 @ AJU 15600 Mulholland Dr., #223

ACRONYMS:

- | | |
|--|--|
| A – APPEAL | PM – PARCEL MAP |
| APC – AREA PLANNING COMMISSION | PMEX – PARCEL MAP EXEMPTION |
| CE – CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION | TTM – TENTATIVE TRACT MAP |
| DPS – DEEMED TO BE APPROVED PRIVATE STREET | ZA – ZONING ADMINSTRATOR |
| DRB – DESIGN REVIEW BOARD | ZAA – ZONING ADMINISTRATOR’S ADJUSMENT |
| EAF – ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSEMENT FORM | ZAD – ZONING ADMINISTRATOR’S DETERMINATION |
| ENV – ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE | ZV – ZONING VARIANCE |
| MND – MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION | |