



Planning & Land Use Committee Meeting MINUTES

Tuesday, August 13, 2019 6:30 pm to 9:00 pm

American Jewish University

15600 Mulholland Drive, Bel Air 90077 Room Change: 2nd Floor Board Room

[Accessible from the west side of Casiano Road. Park at lower parking (Lot 1)]

- 1. Call to Order – Committee Member Roll Call:** Robert called the meeting to order at 6:36 pm, with 7 present initially and quorum met; Yves stepped out during roll call and returned at 6:40. Stephanie, Don and Maureen arrived by 7:00 pm, at which time there were 11 present and 3 absent.

Name	P	A	Name	P	A
Robert Schlesinger, Chair	X		Stephanie Savage, Vice Chair	X	
Robin Greenberg	X		Nickie Miner	X	
Don Loze	X		Jamie Hall		X
Yves Mieszala	X		Jason Spradlin		X
Maureen Levinson	X		Leslie Weisberg		X
Stella Grey	X		Wendy Morris	X	
Shawn Bayliss	X		Cathy Wayne	X	

- 1. Approval of the August 13, 2019 Agenda:** Moved Robin; seconded Cathy; 7/0/0 passed.
- 2. Approval of July 9, 2019 Minutes:** Moved Cathy; seconded Stella; 7/0/0; passed.
- 3. Public Comments:** Stella Grey related that two to three times in her neighborhood, the Dept. of Street Services will issue a permit for closure without checking what else is going on, and they issued permits on streets where hauling was scheduled. She spoke to Emma Howard about it, who mentioned the “Streetwise” system, to communicate public street work. She would like us to express support for this mapping system. Cathy Wayne asked if we can do a letter to the council to ask and require that Departments speak to each other and consult one another.

[Stephanie arrived at 6:44 pm.]

- 4. Chair Report:** Robert Schlesinger & **Vice-Chair Report:** Stephanie Savage – **None**

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

5. 11100 CHALON – 15 protected trees – Review: Bob gave brief note on this, following which a brief discussion was held on issues pertaining to protected trees.

6. 1312 N Beverly Grove ZA-2019-63-ZAD ENV-2019-64-CE

To bring letter confirming the 2 issues agreed to. BCA Lot: 19,070.2 sf.

Project Description: CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW 2-STORY PLUS BASEMENT SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING AND NEW POOL, 5,829 SQ. FT. **Requested Entitlement:** ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S DETERMINATION PURSUANT TO LAMC SECTION 12.24.X 28 TO WAIVE REQUIRED STREET IMPROVEMENT. LOT FRONTS ON A STREET IMPROVED TO LESS THAN 20 FEET WIDE. VEHICULAR ACCESS FROM THE LOT TO THE BOUNDARY OF THE HILLSIDE AREA IS NOT ON STREETS CONTINUOUSLY IMPROVED TO A MINIMUM OF 20 FEET WIDE.

Agent/Rep: Hassan Majd hmajd@HMDGINC.com 323.643.4780

Project approved, subject to the condition that the developer improve the road along the frontage of the property to a min of 20ft and adjusting the retaining wall height so that it does not exceed 10ft in height. Also to include: fill will be in the rear-yard, screening is completed in a reasonable amount of time. LETTER to that effect.

Filed: 01/07/2019 Staff/Assign: David Solaiman-Tehrani

david.solaiman-tehrani@lacity.org 213.978.1193

Permanent Link: <http://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/CaseId/MjI2NDk40>

Matthew Roth spoke as to the agreement that was made with this committee last meeting, and Bob read from a letter by Hassan Majd.

Cal Pac Capital:

3700 Campus Drive, Suite 200,

Newport Beach, CA 92660

Bob related that he had asked them to come back because they have a hearing before the next board meeting. Bob related that there is a letter. Stephanie mentioned issue of getting a B-permit and will add language. There are two retaining walls, will be 8 feet, (originally they went back and forth from 12 to 8). Matthew will make the adjustment in the letter for two 8-foot retaining walls. The two neighbors are about 50 feet away from the property on either side.

Motion: We are accepting a revised letter from the builder ascertaining that there will be two retaining walls not to exceed eight feet, minimum of three feet apart and the developer will provide the frontage of the property to the minimum of 20 feet, with the road to be widened to 20' width (curb face to curb face) along the property frontage. A "B-permit" through Bureau of Engineering will be needed to comply with the new construction. He needs to interact with his neighbors in a positive manner. Moved Robert; seconded Cathy; 9/0/0; passed.

7. **10690 Somma Way ZA-2019-1383-ZAD ENV-2019-1384-EAF BAA Approved**

(61 trees exist, 53 being removed, not during nesting season) (Replace 1:1?) (Permeable fencing?) BAA 12/20/16 Exp 3,500 CY DENIED

Requested Entitlement: PURSUANT TO LAMC SECTION 16.50 AND 11.5.7, DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AND MULHOLLAND SCENIC PARKWAY SPECIFIC PLAN COMPLIANCE IS REQUESTED FOR THE DEMOLITION OF AN (E) SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING AND ACCESSORY BUILDINGS AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF A (N) SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES FOR A COMBINED TOTAL OF 29,811 SF. PROJECT SITE IS ZONED RE40 AND IS LOCATED IN THE BEL - AIR BEVERLY CREST COMMUNITY PLAN AREA.

Appl: Stephen Ives Dolcedo LLC, Oklahoma City 405.936.6240

Agent: Tony Russo tony@crestrealestate.com 408.655.0998

Filed 3/07/19 Assign/Staff: 3/22/19 ~~David Solaiman-Tehrani~~ (Susan Zermeno)

Tony Russo returned, stating that he thinks it is the fourth time he has presented this.

[Don Loze arrived at 6:57 pm.] Tony reviewed details, including but not limited to that this is a demo sfd; constructing two-story with basement, subterranean garage.

[Maureen Levinson arrived at 6:58 pm.]

Tony related that there is a long reason for the ZAD request, because portions of the private street are less than 20 that they front. The substandard part is 18 or 16 at its minimum. But it is a fully paved roadway. Questions were asked and answered including but not limited to: No roof top deck. As to accessory structures, there is a carriage house and a guard house as well as a guest house included within the 29,800. Tony noted that the GLA (gross living area) per building code is 24,965. He will not have a haul route. Less than a thousand CY of export. Stephanie asked where you put the dirt that is excavated.

Shawn related that the BAA Architectural Committee reviewed this further and the conditions are in the Architectural Review Committee letter that he passed around. The biggest thing they are concerned about is exposed caissons. They required green screening. Their other point is rooftop activities.

Bob asked about 53 trees being removed. Tony Russo stated that they will have to be replaced 1:1, and the trees will be spread around. See site plan. L1.0, shows where the trees are going.

Don Loze asked Tony about contact with the neighbors. Tony related that there's a developer on the corner, Robert Hirschfield, next to the project, whom they've met with and shown the plans, and that he has had no objections from anyone except for from Shawn (BAA) at one point. They don't have any positive okays. Nothing will be used for commercial purposes. He believes it is owner occupied; however, it could be spec. Per Tony, at the time of this meeting, they did not have a hearing scheduled. Regarding the Fire Department, Robert asked him to send LAFD clearance when he gets it.

Don asked if there is a schedule. They have to get permits before they can start. The construction managers are "Freeman Group" who did the dorms here at AJU. In terms of this being completed in an orderly fashion, Tony believes their reputation precedes them. Stephanie mentioned it would be good to have grading plans because it is close to a haul route.

Per Tony Russo, Susan Zermeno has taken place of David Solomon Terani, who is no longer case manager on this.

Motion: We reserve the right to give an opinion, until prior to the ZA hearing, if there are no other issues. Tony needs to provide LAFD clearance, a grading plan and site photos.

Moved Bob; seconded Cathy; 9/0/2 passed. The 2 abstentions were from Wendy & Maureen.

8. 8555 Lookout Mountain • ZA-2018-7445-ZAD-ZAA ENV-2018-7446-EAF LCA 90046

Tracking Ent 4/06/19

Project Description: CONSTRUCTION OF NEW 1,472SF SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING

Requested Entitlement: PURSUANT TO LAMC SECTION 12.24X.28, REQUEST FOR ZONING ADMINISTRATOR DETERMINATION FOR RELIEF FROM SECTION 12.21.C.10 TO SEEK WAIVER OF REQUIREMENT TO WIDEN ROADWAY TO MINIMUM 20-FOOT WIDTH; PURSUANT TO LAMC SECTION 12.28, REQUEST FOR ZONING ADMINISTRATOR ADJUSTMENT TO ALLOW FOR A 10% INCREASE OF THE MAXIMUM RFA OF 1,338SF; RELIEF FROM HEIGHT RESTRICTION TO ALLOW FOR A 10% INCREASE IN HEIGHT ON THE SW CORNER OF THE ROOF OF THE HOUSE; AND REQUEST TO COMBINE TWO, 3 X 6 FT LIGHT WELLS INTO ONE CONTINUOUS LIGHT WELL ON THE BASEMENT LEVEL.

Appl: Jason Goodell goodelljason@gmail.com 310.365.5440

Agent/Rep: Andrew Sussman sitistudio@gmail.com 818.506.3657 (architect)

Filed: 12/17/2018 Staff/Assign: Richard Reaser richard.reaser@lacity.org 213.978.1240

Jason Goodell, his wife Andrea, and their Architect/Representative, Andrew Sussman returned following last month's meeting. The presenter noted that the ZA request is the continuous paved roadway on the adjacent street. It's a through lot; Lookout Mountain complies and is a nonissue, but the fact that there's an upper lot that fronts a small street triggers a request for continuous paved roadway. There will be no parking or driveway or construction along that street, which he says he reviewed at the last meeting.

Mr. Sussman related that because it is a very narrow small lot, with conditions of slope density, they have requested, within the ZA's jurisdiction, 10% increase which comes out to 133 square feet; then as it steps up, with the irregularity of the hill, there are little spots on the structure that encroach on a setback, a small amount in height volume and length, to keep the house somewhat uniform, they've asked if they could have a little modification to not manipulate... modification would be (pointing to a tiny area that goes from 0 to 2 feet; instead of dropping the roof, they have asked to even it out.) He noted that it is about 35 feet back from the street, way back, almost beyond the other house, and certainly won't be noticeable. The height is relatively small. They're only raising the little section that follows the irregularities of the hill on one side, which they've reached out to the neighbors about, whom he stated are okay with it and that they have letters of support available. Wendy asked about the street behind, Crescent, to which they noted that they don't need access to it. Jason noted that they don't want to park, to drive up there; they don't want anything to do with Crescent Drive.

Stephanie recalled that as discussed last time, because they're excavating so much for that first floor, not counting square footage, that wall gets very high, and even with good geology, they will make them shore that, or trim it back, and it's not just that back wall; it's returning around the side. They will be affecting the foundation of those abutting properties as well. She noted that this alone is a lot. Jason Goodell noted that this is something Jamie mentioned. Stephanie noted that she saw the site a couple weeks ago when visiting a friend noticed the grading that had been done. She noted that they're not allowed to destroy the slope, or, per Cathy, the integrity of the lot. Stephanie continued that that this is bad for them, for anyone to do that, to disturb that in any way. The presenter noted that they are trimming it back 2:1, to which Stephanie responded that one cannot do that without a grading permit. Cathy noted that they have done this continuously; they have blocked the road, it has been impossible to get by; there are no flagmen, the trucks encroach upon the street, and if there was a fire or emergency up there, there would be no way to get by. Mr. Sussman responded that they are totally unaware of this; that it's the neighbor's contractor. They were just trying to help them and work with them. But they are in noncompliance.

Cathy agreed that they are in non-compliance, they are in the street; it is a narrow street; there is parking here, and it is impossible for two cars to get by. The trucks are on the curb in the street; so they are blocking a portion of the street. They are still doing it as of Saturday. Mr. Sussman noted that he needs to know this.

Cathy related additionally that with the height of the building, they are going to be blocking light from the property downhill from them. The Architect denied this, stating that they are 40 feet back. Cathy explained this further.

Cathy also wanted to discuss the Crescent Drive area, describing it as a very rocky road, and she doesn't know how they are going to join this property. She asked if they are putting a retaining wall on the back end. They responded yes. Stephanie responded no, they're doing a slope wall behind their house. They are not doing anything along the Crescent frontage. Jason noted that the city put in a massive huge concrete wall back there with iron girders, and everything, in ZIMAS on the Crescent easement; they totally fortified that entire spot.

Cathy pointed out that they are digging out a lot of the hill, and she is not sure if they have a permit to do that. Stephanie said that they don't. The presenter related that they were told that the neighbors were fully permitted, and that the neighbors are responsible for that. Stephanie disagreed, noting that they are not permitted on their property. Stephanie noted that if they had a grading permit for their property, they would have to sign a document that allows them, maybe giving him some protection, in case there was an accident. The presenters noted that they gave the neighbor permission with a caveat that they had to obtain all required permits. Cathy related that there are not any permits. They

say they will discuss it with 8351. Stephanie noted that the bigger issue for the neighborhood, is that they are on a private passing lane of the street; “you cannot park any vehicles ever in front of your house.” She asked that they provide parking and staging planning; two parking spaces, once they have their garage. They say that once they have their garage they will have four; two in the garage and two in front of it. The garage is set back from the street. Stephanie reviewed the map, pointing out the property line on the map, and asked how they can get two cars in there, and trucks.

Jason Goodell noted that their neighbor has a driveway where they can park and his garage and theirs exactly matches that; so there’s a driveway and then the garage; places where they can fit two cars and then two past that in the garage. Cathy asked, and they report that the cars are not sticking out into the street.

Mr. Sussman noted that the property line is 12.3 feet beyond the curb, relatively flat; then some of the carving out. So, in a 16’ car, they need 4 more feet, relatively flat. Their plan is to dig that out to provide for that, which will be Phase 1. That will allow them to dig more and provide two more places behind it, as they go into the hill, as they’re taking down the garage. For the workers, they’ll have five spots to park, and will provide parking area offsite, from where they can carpool in. Stephanie noted that the burden is on them to give us that information. Stephanie noted that at their property line... it shows that there is no trimming, or little, pointing to a natural grade. She noted when she was... out there, it’s right off the street, it is steep. Stephanie and Cathy Wayne both expressed that this is not meshing and they are not comfortable with understanding this and being able to park four cars. Jason Goodell asked Stephanie further about this, as to the house next door and the house above; where Charlie’s house (the house to the right) has a driveway where they can park two cars, and two cars in the garage, underneath his house. Cathy noted that they also stick out on the street. Parking was discussed in greater detail, in regards to workers and construction vehicles. Stephanie noted that in any case, they’ll be blocking the street, will need a street use permit, flagmen, it is a ordeal every single time. In addition to all that they have the issue of shoring, because they are cutting a vertical cut of dirt... She noted that they have 20 feet in some places, that they have to trim that back so it won’t collapse or they need to shore it, which is all added grading, which they have not yet calculated. Stephanie directed them to the soils report, to which Mr. Sussman noted that the report shows that the soils are very good; bedrock is pretty close to surface, and there are no adverse bedding claims, vertical cuts are up to 12 feet, and trimmed back 1:1.

Cathy Wayne related that the school is about to open and there is high volume traffic. They agreed to do the hours of haul route. They’d love to start construction as soon as school is out next June. There was discussion on the fact that they dug out the hill already... Mr. Sussman noted that they have a contract with the neighbor. The presenters claim that this issue was first brought to their attention, and that they have not seen it as it just happened the other day. The neighbor has to remove an ADU, and they are giving them access. Cathy related that they have been digging out for a month. Jason Goodell noted that they are giving the neighbors access... Yves noted that there is still illegal grading done on their property. Stephanie referred to what she thought was a building on this property, to which she was told it is not a house but rather only a wall. Jason Goodell noted that they discussed this with the grading department; however, Mr. Sussman agreed that you cannot undermine a neighbor’s property. Yves continued that they need to correct the illegal grading. The soils engineering service company is CY Geotech, Simi Valley.

Asked about the grading currently taking place on his property for his neighbor, they responded that they didn’t know that the neighbors were doing this. Cathy related to them that they need to see their property, as this has been going on now for a month.

Stephanie noted that this is a very difficult site with no parking in front of it. It’s 25 feet wide. Mr. Sussman replied they are showing us a parking plan that will provide some spots off of the street. Shawn asked, when you’re digging out several hundred cubic yards of dirt to fit that future

parking structure to fit those future cars, where are the current trucks, current haulers and current earth-moving equipment going to sit.

Stephanie noted this is going to be a bad problem for the street for a long period of time. “It is not fair to them or to you to not really look into this.” Mr. Sussman responded they will have proper permits and flagmen, etc. Cathy related that this has been taking place without their knowledge and they don’t seem to know about it, which she finds disturbing. Jason Goodell related that “we knew there was a small section cut off the parking... and now they are pulling the dirt from his backyard and pulling it out. He thinks it is a do-si-do. That it’s not right what’s happening without the permits and proper things, because it is on his property. They are trying to accommodate, to be nice, and to be neighborly because he and his wife want to live there. It’s not a spec house.

Cathy continued that with the amount of dirt already taken out from his property, they are not going to start to build until next June, and asks what will happen on the meantime on that lot, between now and June. Jason noted that it will be cut back to city regulations. Cathy asked what is going to be done to shore that up when the rains come... Lookout Mountain becomes a river. She has lived there almost her entire life and knows that with Crescent above, all that water will come down, and if there is nothing there shoring it up, they will have a problem. She would like to know what they are going to do between now and next June. Jason noted that they will do anything needed to mitigate that. Mr. Sussman noted that the hill will be trimmed 2:1, and the grading reports warrant that trimming. He noted that 2:1 you don’t need any report. If the report says 1:1 or 1-1/2, that’s what they will follow. He noted that also the fact that it’s pushed back will give them storage for any little mudflow that might come in...

Don asked, and he answered that he completed a three-year term on the Studio City Neighborhood Council and is on the PLUC for Studio City. Don asked if the community plan for this area had some kind of limit to the properties that were to be developed, noting that there are some earlier community plans that were designed so that there would be a balance for services and population up there. Don related that the last time he was up there, it looked like every nook and cranny had already been built and that it just keeps filling in. Don asked them if a further permit is valid for something that was originally planned that shouldn’t be there, noting that they may be assuming responsibility for something that they do not anticipate. The presenter noted that this is a legal lot, that two lots that will be combined, to be 5,000 square feet; 4,000 and change. Mr. Sussman related that they are falling under the Hillside Ordinance. Don extended his appreciation for their bringing this discretionary act to us. He noted that we have a lot of questions, and suggested that we continue this so we can get some answers.

Mr. Sussman reiterated that their main three issues are 1) the continuous paved roadway requirement of the upper street, 2) the extra 10% which is 200-some-odd feet and 3) the little tip, which is under the 25 feet; a small portion, an encroachment plane, a rather new ordinance, is for much larger properties. He noted that all these other things are very critical, but they fall under “Building and Safety,” grading, etc. Mr. Sussman continued that that they will create a haul route, hours of construction, and that the ZA will have 30-pages of conditions and all of these will be addressed, and that all the soils and geology issues and how it is done will be addressed, e.g., shoring, caissons, grading, and it will all be done properly.

Stephanie asked, as the lots are not yet joined, how these two really substandard lots will be joined, which will still make a substandard lot. Jason noted that the Lookout Mountain one is not as substandard, as it still has 20-feet of... Stephanie disagreed. Mr. Sussman continued that they were legal lots, cut at the time were legal, and when you go through the process, through the ZA’s 38 pages, part of it will be, by the very nature of the property being built and going over that property line, it automatically invalidates two separate lots. So, that automatically ties it, but there will be a condition in there, that the lots be tied. There will be an agreement recorded that ties those two lots.

Maureen asked about the neighbor and ADU that was illegally built, and was told that they are using their property to gain access, and in that process, they are removing dirt in order to do that. Her question is, there is no permit by B&S to remove illegally-built structures.

The presenter related that they have a permit, to grade and do all that... noted it was kind of a reverse permit. They had a structure; the neighbor asked if there was a permit and there was no permit, so they were issued an order to comply. Yves asked if this is a “demo permit”, to which Jason Goodell assumes that they have.

Maureen related that B&S doesn't inspect anything illegally built, which creates some confusion. She asked how this changes the topography of their lot, asking if they have to submit a new geological and soils report because it has now been altered, to which they replied “no” that it is their understanding and agreement that they would just be taking a small portion of the same dirt that “we were going to take out when we started construction, which we thought would be helpful, 1) for them, and allow us to do staging.” He continued that that's the first thing they're going to do is to take away some of the low area to start staging to do their caissons, and to properly remove the dirt.

He continued that “they were supposed to take out just a little bit and get a road happening for a little tractor, to haul the stuff, this ADU away, and that's it.” Maureen related that technically, “you need to get the grading permit to allow that to happen,” to which Mr. Sussman replied, “no.” He noted that they would ultimately have the owner's permission, which they did, but he is “not sure how the city would require our permit, whether they wanted the owners to co-sign or...” Stephanie noted that she doesn't think that they have a permit. Jason Goodall related that they got shut down because they didn't have a permit last year, and now they have gone through the proper channels...

Jason continued that they will deal with it, and will make sure that it's as compliant as possible, but their work on their property, “as far as we know, and we've seen the plans...”

Bob asked about unpermitted grading, with regard to what may or may not be going on with the neighbors next door. Don asked, and the presenter responded that they have a written document between him and the neighbor, and they are satisfied that they are not accepting a liability that they have that they can cover if it's their liability. Nickie noted that there are a lot of details that need to be resolved. She would move to table to next month. Jason Goodell asked for a specific list, which Stephanie will provide, to include parking, staging plan on and off the property, plans for large vehicles. Stephanie related that grading is often overlooked. Bob asked if there was public comment from members of the audience, referencing an email sent today by Marie Sheehy of Bowmont-Hazen, who was not present, and there was none.

Mr. Sussman reiterated that first and foremost are the three requests that the ZA is looking at, the continuous paved roadway, the encroachment plane and the 10% extra square footage, and that the rest will be addressed by other departments. Bob noted that we need to look at the entire project. Stephanie noted that often the grading is often overlooked, and this is one of the biggest impacts since it affects neighbors.

Motion: To continue this until a later date; we provide them with our questions at this stage; ask them to come back to a time that is convenient for us and for them, once they have all questions answered. Moved by Don. Robin seconded; 11/0/0; passed. Don reiterated that we reserve the right to come to our conclusion.

9. 1501 N Marlay Dr • ZA-2017-2328-ZAD ENV-2017-2329-CE DSPNA 90069

Requested Entitlements: PURSUANT TO LAMC SECTION 12.24.X.26, A ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S DETERMINATION TO ALLOW FOR 3 RETAINING WALLS, INCLUDING RETAINING WALLS OVER REGULAR MAXIMUM HEIGHT.

SFD 2 stry w/attached gar, in BHO Area. ZA to allow 3 ret walls ranging fr 3 ft to 23'6" in lieu of one ret wall w/max ht of 12' or 2 ret walls w/max of 10' each and min horizontal distance of 3'. 13 Actions, Approvals, Plans.

Owner: Sara Schusterow, NY

Appl: Paul Coleman paul@lucol.com 213.700.2297

~~Steven Williams steven@affordableexpediting.com 213.330.0484 Not affiliated anymore~~

Filed: 6/12/17 Assign: 7/28/17 Nuri Cho nuri.cho@lacity.org 213.978.1177

Permanent Link: <http://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/CaseId/MjE0NDc00>

Bob noted at the start of the meeting that Paul Coleman let him know that they are not ready yet. Bob returned to this item to note further that Paul Coleman said he didn't think he'd return. Bob said he would prepare a letter, based on the information we already have, send it to the ZA and he'll send him a copy. He doesn't have a ZA hearing assigned yet. **DEFERRED**

10. 9501 Gloaming Drive DIR-2019-850-DRB-SPP-MSP ENV-2019-851-CE CWC 90210

[Send Letter MDRB re confirmation and back-PLU] [Grading: where will they store 32,000 cu yds of earth on site, and where will they find room to re-compact on site?]

Project Description: DEMOLITION OF AN (E) SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING AND ACCESSORY BUILDINGS AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF A (N) TWO-STORY, SFD WITH BASEMENT, ATTACHED GARAGE, AND ACCESSORY LIVING QUARTERS FOR A COMBINED TOTAL OF 2

Requested Entitlement: PURSUANT TO LAMC SECTION 16.50 AND 11.5.7, DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AND MULHOLLAND SCENIC PARKWAY SPECIFIC PLAN COMPLIANCE IS REQUESTED FOR THE DEMOLITION OF AN (E) SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING AND ACCESSORY BUILDINGS AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF A (N) SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES FOR A COMBINED TOTAL OF 29,811 SF. PROJECT SITE IS ZONED RE40 AND IS LOCATED IN THE BEL - AIR BEVERLY CREST COMMUNITY PLAN AREA.

Appl: Bo Zarnegin mig@holdings.la 323.962.5800

Rep: Andrew Odom Andrew@crestrealestate.com 310.405.5352

Whipple Russell Architects: 323.962-5800

Filed; 2/11/19 Assign/Staff: 2/22/19 Dominick Ortiz dominick.ortiz@lacity.org 818.374.5061

<http://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/CaseId/MjI3MzA20>

Dominick Ortiz dominick.ortiz@lacity.org 818.374.5061

<http://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/CaseId/MjI3MzA20>

- Bob related that Andrew said they are not ready. They will be back. **DEFERRED**

Follow-up, Discussion & Possible Action on other Projects

11. Possible Motion: To form an ad-hoc committee to explore and advise on compliance and enforcement for home-sharing/party house activities that is currently endangering neighborhood – Stephanie Savage, Maureen Levinson & Samantha Cannon (open to board & community)

- **Public Comment** was given by Marlena Donohue (former election candidate for BABCNC), who volunteered to be a part of the PLU Committee, noting that she'd like to help in any way. BABCNC Board President, Robin Greenberg, pointed out that this committee is full and encouraged her to attend meetings.

- Both Samantha Cannon and Marlena Donohue volunteered to be a part of this ad hoc committee.

Motion: To create this committee. Moved Cathy; seconded Yves; 11/0/0 passed. Maureen will coordinate a date to meet.

12. LA County Superior Court case “Eldridge v. Los Angeles” –Hall – No report / absent.

13. **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.

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

- Don gave update, noting that once the proposed ordinance is issued there will be outreach. The bounds of the proposed pilot plan are those of our NC. Discussion was held as to what the NC wants to do and what CD4 wants to do. Don noted that this may end up with two separate plans. Bob feels that decisions have to come from HOAs. Cathy Wayne asked if we can write a letter from the NC, noting that Jamie will have LCA write a letter and the Bird Streets will have a letter. Don anticipates public hearings at end of fall. Bob has spoken with Amy Adelson who noted that Coldwater is not a part of the Hollywood Plan though they are CD4. He noted that the eastern portion of Beverly Park North is also part of CD4, which Bob has spoken with Emma about. Cathy asked if we can get letters; Stephanie to speak to Jamie, Yves to speak with Ellen, and to get Amy as a part of that so she can write a letter similar to ours.

14. **CD5 Protected Tree Ord. Amendment – Council File #03-1459-S3 –**

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

- Bob noted that BCA is having a speaker from the Dept. of Urban Forestry in September.

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

- 15. New Packages Received: See Project Tracking List
- 16. Certified Neighborhood Council (CNC) Reporting Review of New Projects Submitted
- 17. Upcoming Hearings: See Project Tracking List (Subject to discussion & action)
- 18. Determination Letters Received: See Project Tracking List
- 19. Pending Haul Routes (Update by any PLU Committee members)
- 20. Proactive Tracking, Tasks & Projects (Update, Discussion & Possible Action)
- 21. Adjournment **Moved** by Cathy W.; **seconded** Maureen; **11/0/0**, meeting adjourned at 8:47pm

Next PLU Committee Meeting: Tuesday September 10, 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 ADMINISTRATOR |
| DRB – DESIGN REVIEW BOARD | ZAA – ZONING ADMINISTRATOR’S ADJUSTMENT |
| EAF – ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSEMENT FORM | ZAD – ZONING ADMINISTRATOR’S DETERMINATION |
| ENV – ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE | ZV – ZONING VARIANCE |
| MND – MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION | |

BABCNC’s Upcoming Meetings:

<u>Month</u>	<u>PLU Committee Meeting 7:00 pm @ AJU Rm #223</u>	<u>EP Cmte 7:00 pm @ Bel Air Ridge Clubhouse 2760 Clarav</u>	<u>Board Meeting 7:00 pm @ AJU Rm #223</u>
September	Tuesday 09/10	Wednesday 09/18	Wednesday 09/25
October	Thursday 10/10 PLUC		Wednesday 10/23
November	Tuesday 11/12	November EP Meeting TBD	Wednesday 11/20
December	Tuesday 12/10		Wednesday 12/18

BABCNC Website: www.babcnc.org
 Office Telephone: (310) 479-6247 E-mail: council@babcnc.org