



Planning & Land Use Committee Meeting Minutes
Thursday, October 10, 2019 6:30 pm to 9:00 pm
American Jewish University
15600 Mulholland Drive, Bel Air 90077

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

Public Comment: The public is welcome to speak. Though not mandatory, the public is requested to fill out a “**Speaker Card**” to address the Board on any agenda item before the Board takes an action. When the Board considers the agenda item entitled “Public Comments,” the public has the right to comment on any matter within the Board’s jurisdiction. Public comment is limited to 3 minutes per speaker unless waived by the presiding officer. Meeting is being audio taped.

Note to all BABCNC Committee Members: Before, during and after the Planning & Land Use Meetings, Committee members are cautioned to not discuss Board business or issues.

- 1. Call to Order – Committee Member Roll Call** 6:43 pm (Marcia Hobbs arrived @ 6:54, as an Alternate. Stephanie & Wendy arrived at 7:00)

| 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 | |
| Marcia Hobbs, Alternate | X | | | | |

- 1. Approval of October 10, 2019 Agenda:** Cathy **moved** & Yves **seconded 7/0/0; passed**
- 2. Approval of September 10, 2019 Minutes** Cathy **moved** & Yves **seconded 7/0/0; passed**
- 3. Public Comment:**
Yves lives on the 9000 block of Kinglet Drive. He related that there is a problem with party houses from short-term rentals in the Bird Streets. He related a story about one happening two doors from him, and read from a letter by a neighbor, Neda Brunetti, who lives on the 9000 block of Kinglet and noted that the disturbances occurred next door to her.
- 4. Chair Report:** Robert Schlesinger & **Vice-Chair Report:** Stephanie Savage

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

- 5. Final Discussion & Possible Action** LETTER DUE by 11/15/19

1309 DAVIES ENV-2017-682-CE

BCA 900210 (1343, 1325, 1312, 1301, 1300)

UF Application remove 88 trees total. (6 Oaks, 4 Walnut). To build a 32,813 sq ft SFR in place of 9,202 sq ft exist SFR. Export 6,000 + cu yd Bd File: 170059

Permanent Link: <http://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/caseid/MjEyNTYy0>

- Bob noted that on Tuesday, the owner withdrew the application for the tree removal and for a continuation that was set for November 15th to review the application at City Hall has now been cancelled; he has withdrawn the project for now.

6. Final Discussion & Possible Action LETTER DUE Sophie Gabel-Scheinbaum

11100 Chalon ENV-2019-3327-CE

BAA 90077 ENV-2016-911-CE 15 PROTECTED TREES Review

Replacing 1:1, should be at least 1:2

Bob noted that he just Googled 11100 Chalon again for the latest status and, yes, he is trying to sell the vacant parcel with permits: <https://www.redfin.com/CA/Los-Angeles/11100-Chalon-Rd-90049/home/6829455>

Bob reported that he paid \$8 million in 2013 for the property which -- until he demolished it a few months ago -- had a beautiful historic Wallace Neff-designed home in impeccable condition. He's now trying to sell the vacant parcel plus permits for \$45 million

Project Description: CE FOR PROTECTED TREE REMOVAL IN ASSOCIATION WITH BY-RIGHT SINGLE FAMILY HOME DEVELOPMENT.

Requested Entitlement: CE FOR PROTECTED TREE REMOVAL IN ASSOCIATION WITH BY-RIGHT SINGLE FAMILY HOME DEVELOPMENT.

No Appl, no Rep. Filed/Assign: 6/05/19 Sophie Gabel-Scheinbaum

sophie.gabel-scheinbaum@lacity.org 213.482.7085

Permanent Link: <http://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/CaseId/MjI5OTY40>

- Bob reported that the owner is selling the property again. Cathy Wayne noted that he has knocked the house down already. Shawn noted that they took down a perfectly good house.

7. Final Discussion & Possible Motion Project is not returning.

1501 N Marlay Dr ZA-2017-2328-ZAD ENV-2017-2329-CE

SEE 10/01/19 PLU LETTER

May Ltr Conf'd August Conf'd No 9/24 hrng ZA NPH4/09 can'd Rep

DSPNA 90069 TBC 11/29 em 10/05 Steve resp Intro LTR 3/18/19✓

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 10' each and min horizontal distance of 3'.

13 Actions, Approvals, Plans. 9/05

Owner: Sara Schusterow, NY Appl: Paul Coleman paul@lucol.com 213.700.2297

Reassigned: Amanda Briones amanda.briones@lacity.org 213.978.1328

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

(This was presented in May 14, 2019 & then DEFERRED in June, August & September.)

- Robert said he wrote a letter that he'll distribute to committee before it goes to the NC board.

For Land Use Review

8. 13850 MULHOLLAND DR. DIR-2019-3173-DRB-SPP-MSP ENV-2019-3174-CE

Ltr Sent✓ 10/01 BCA LOT 54,902 SF.

Project Description: MULHOLLAND SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT PERMIT COMPLIANCE AND DESIGN REVIEW FOR AN ADDITION TO A RESIDENCE INCLUDING NEW RETAINING WALL ENCROACHMENT IN ROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY.

Requested Entitlement: PURSUANT TO LAMC SECTION 11.5.7, MULHOLLAND SCENIC PARKWAY SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT PERMIT COMPLIANCE (MAJOR) AND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL FOR A TWO-STORY 1,775 SQ. FT. ADDITION TO AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE, WITH A NEW 1,600 SQ. FT. BASEMENT ADDITION AND 1,600 SQ. FT. GARAGE; INCLUDES A REQUEST FOR A 10-FOOT HIGH MAX. NEW RETAINING WALL TO ENCROACH UP TO 14-FEET INTO THE MULHOLLAND DRIVE RIGHT-OF-WAY.

Applicant: William B Randolph 714.380.0280 (Company: The Little Pumpkin Trust)

Agent/Rep: Damian Catalan damian@dcexpediting.com 626.433.3898 [DC Expediting Inc]

- Robert related that they called & cancelled last minute. They have not gone before the MDRB yet.

9. **1125 LINDA FLORA DR ENV-2016-56-CE** CONFIRMED October 10 HRNG October 29th
CONF'D BAA 90049 (1125-1133) Haul Rte Approx. 4,602 cy

BAA 90049. Lot: 27,949 sqft.

Project Description: GRADING AND A HAUL ROUTE (APPROXIMATELY 4602 CU. YDS.)

Requested Entitlement: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR GRADING AND A HAUL ROUTE (APPROXIMATELY 4602 CU. YDS.) TO TIE TWO LOTS TOGETHER (21,910 SQ. FT) FOR A PROPOSED SINGLE FAMILY, TWO-STORY, DWELLING WITH A BASEMENT, AN ATTACHED 3-CAR SUBTERRANEAN GARAGE, RETAINING WALLS IN RE20-1-H ZONE.

Filed: 08/15/19 Assign/Staff: Marc Woersching

Undergoing a renovation project. Applying for a haul route. Enclosed 5 pages of the civil engineering grading plans and 8 pages of the architectural plans for review.

App: SLAM Enterprises I, Ltd

Geddes Ulinskas gulinkas@ularch.com 415-904-0483 Principal of Geddes Ulinskas Architects.

Contact: Ms. Vicky Lee vlee@ularch.com 415.904.0483

Filed: 1/08/16 Assign/Staff: 2/26/16 Victor Vallejo kit.awakuni@lacity.org 213.482-0441

Permanent Link: <http://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/CaseId/MjMxNTg30>

(The following notes are not a verbatim transcription of the entire presentation.)

Geddes Ulinskas gave a detailed description of the project pointing to large plans. Comments, questions and answers included but were not limited to:

There is an existing driveway, which will be maintained; an underground garage, it will read as a one-story building; 12-foot setback on each side; the basement is exempt, 2500 square feet; less of 40 percent of it daylight; 7500 square feet. They're not taking bonus from square footage. No variance being asked for or additional square footage. It is as-right requested within the envelope.

Cathy asked about the pool and deck and was told that all elements are on-grade, nothing is suspended. They are required to have two covered spaces and three uncovered spaces. They are maintaining existing driveway gate. They are realizing two retaining walls; one is on the north side, that starts where the house is near the property line that goes up to the driveway entrance; the second retaining wall is on the south side. It has been through building plan check and they notified the neighbors; sent out 18 letters to the neighbors; one neighbor asked them to move the condenser unit. The length of the retaining wall, 70 feet for the south RW and the north, anything over 5' feet; majority of the RW is less than 3' tall. Cathy asked, and was told there is one house on one side.

There is an arborist report; no protected trees. They're removing most of the trees; maintaining six pepper trees. They are replacing all the trees they are removing. There are no oak trees. The elevation of the house from Linda Flora reads as one story. They have a roof deck, 350 square feet; the rest of the roof is green roof, similar tray system.

Asked about how close to the neighbors is the roof deck, to which he noted it is about 40 feet from the south property line. There is a road, Orum, at least 25 feet from the neighbor. They discussed an easement road. They are at the southwest corner. Overall height is 30 foot height limit; the building is 6-7 feet below the height limit for the majority of the grade height. There is an elevator shaft that projects about 5 feet above; and about 13 feet above the house. Stairs and elevator exit in the enclosure which is allowed to be above. There is a mechanical enclosure. There is a glass guardrail and ... pallets for roof finish. There will be a sink and refrigerator on the roof.

Shawn noted that they are looking at the same things, and have looked at the haul route. They didn't know about the condenser. Bob brought it to the attention that mechanical items on the roof disturbs neighbors and animals. Geddes related that he could put it down the hill. Cathy brought up issue of lighting. Put in condition against having light as a covenant running with the property. Further discussion about lighting.

Bob brought up issue of permeable fencing and wildlife habitat corridors. Geddes believes there is an existing fence, a deer fence that runs all the way along the bottom of 1125 and continues on the bottom of 1123. The retaining walls on the site and just adjusting the grade to their steps. The deer fence is all the way along the bottom. The retaining walls are only on the sides, perpendicular.

Stephanie asked about the overall height of the house, at some points 30 and with parapets and railings. Geddes showed renderings. The basement is finished.

They have a haul route hearing on 10/29th at the Board of B&S Commissioners. Their permitted amount of grading is 3,600 cy; 3,000 allowed for this area. The number from the city is 4200. Dan Magee related information on the haul route.

Marcia and Yves related that they need to check with John Thomas Dye School. Shawn will call Rose Helman at JTD to see when they let out. Cathy added that there will be major DWP construction until November of 2020. Bob related that they should call DWP, Deborah Hong.

They sent a letter and drawings five weeks ago. Discussion was held about eliminating the roof deck. He wants to tell the owner that the PLU wants us to eliminate the roof deck, stairs and elevator shaft to the roof.

Motion: Shawn moved that the PLUC to support the project as designed along with haul route entitlements based upon removal of the roof deck, stairs and elevator shaft, and condenser and modification of haul route hours subject to the agreement of the school at JTD. **Moved** by Shawn; Yves **seconded**; **9/0/0 approved**.

10. 1551 SUMMITRIDGE DR ↑ ZA-2018-3458-ZV-ZAD

ENV-2018-3459-CE FUPsent3-04-19 T/D3-15 Salutation Ltr 1/28/19 Salutation 7/30 SFD is approx. 85% finished. BCA (all case no's: ZA-2014-0208-ZV-ZAD, ENV-2014-209-ND, ENV-2011-2442-CE. + BHO, HCR)

Project Description: Reduction height from 64' to 45' and reduction of RFA from 4,207 sf to 3,662 sf of a previously built SFD that was constructed beyond the specifications of permits; and installation of a pool, spa

Requested Entitlement: Pursuant to Section 12.24 of the LAMC, a ZAD for a SFD with a max of 45' in height in lieu of the req 30' ht (of the unpermitted SFD 65') and reduced side yards at 9'5" sf • in lieu of the required side yards. Section 12.28, a ZAA for the increase of RFA by 333 square feet for a 3,662 square-foot SFD (a reduction from the 4,207 square-foot house that was unpermitted). (Maintaining exist sideyard setbacks, ext alteration add lower raised deck w/pool.) see Findings

Appl: (Summit Ind, LLC) Mark Gaeta nymgaeta@gmail.com 917.696.6616

Agent: Oxford Const David Parker, Architect dmparchitect88@gmail.com 949.872.6616

CEQA Cons. (Steve K) Kawaratani Consulting stevekawaratani@me.com 949.209.0210

David Lara david@larastrategic.com 213.905.0287 Cell: 213.905.0287

Filed: 6/14/18 Assign/Staff: 7/13/18 Zuriel Espinosa-Salas

Permanent Link: <http://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/CaseId/MjIxODU00>

(The following notes are not a verbatim transcription of the entire presentation.)

Prior to the start of the presentation, Shawn Bayliss recused himself.

[BABCBC Board member, PLUC Alternate, Marcia Hobbs, arrived and took a seat at the table.]

Mr. Luis Rodriguez introduced himself, and noted that the building has been standing there since 2010; said that new owners are coming in after the fact to do a remodel to help mitigate issues that were previously approved to a certain height. They are requesting height variance, and side-yard reduction because the foundation was built wider than it was supposed to; it is supposed to honor 15 foot; now 10 feet side yards. Built from 42-36-32. This was done by a totally different set of owners. The previous owners abandoned the project, and it sat with the bank until new owners came and they are trying to rescue the project; trying to get it to a completion stage.

Steve Karawatani noted that it is exactly 62 feet tall from the lowest part to street level, and from the street to the roof around 12 feet.

Other things out of code: Luis noted that in essence they need further request for reduction. The lot has been a legal nonconforming lot; size 9,000+ feet; just under 10,000. He noted that regulations for the zoning is minimum 20,000. Steve noted that they are pulling it back. They are not touching the bottom, He stated that they are confirming to the hillside guidelines.

[PLU Committee members, Stephanie Savage and Wendy Morris arrived at 7:00pm.]

Steve noted that they believe they have very strong justification for the four variances; to answer Don, if any portion is denied they have a right to appeal. Don doesn't understand the ownership of the property. They would like to bring the house as close to conformance, and believe they have justifiable variance requests. He noted that this went through regular inspections, they have all of the inspection cards; the city deemed the existing structure 85% complete. Don noted that the prior hillside ordinance, the limit was 52 feet. Steve noted that they hired a new surveyor who surveyed the existing and approved plans; hired another company to do a laser shot of height, width, etc., and found that the original survey was erroneous, off by 7-9 feet. The City surveyor hasn't vetted this yet. They have a stamped survey inside the package. They found that the prior ownership team falsified everything.

Cathy is concerned that the caissons are covered, and potentially show it to be a green space as opposed to the caissons, there is metal showing there. He noted it could be anything. She is concerned that this is disguised with foliage. He related that they're not showing plants in this scenario. She wants that to be acknowledged as a request; he noted it can be a conditional approval.

Nickie asked what portion will not be to specifications of the city. Mark Gaeta noted it was originally permitted for 3,329; they found out there were items out of compliance that they didn't know about, e.g., height. He noted that this owner purchased this from him in 2018, aware that there were certain items out of compliance. They found height to be from an erroneous survey.

The original square footage was 3,329; post-purchasing laser was 4,007, per the city; per company 4400+ now 900 square feet over what was permitted. They were willing to bring it down to 3,600 from 4200. 3,329 is actual square footage permitted: the City says that that's as much as they can cut back on the floor area without taking down the sidewalls, which can't be moved without collapsing the building. City is awaiting to hear from us.

Mark Gaeta pointed out the improvement of the roof as a green-top to blend into the environment. Cathy asked if that will add height from the street. Steve noted it was his idea to have a green roof; to help with insulation, and to prevent the homes around to look down to air conditioning, etc. They're trying to replace the infrastructure on the roof with vegetation. Steve noted that they use a nursery flat, lay them into place, with drip irrigation built in, the plantings and the medium; typically using 2-3" high crop. The only individual who will walk on the roof will do so for maintenance.

They have two parking spaces; two covered. They can't provide third parking space, because if they did, they wouldn't have a front door. They are requesting this as a variance. Steve noted that there is room on the driveway to put a car in sideways. Stephanie pointed out the increased need for parking for the substandard road. They can't put in another parking space. He noted that this came as a surprise to them. Don asked Steve to relate that they conform to the five conditions of the variances. As to variance finding, he noted that it is not going to be contrary or harmful as far as the general plan and municipal code; looking at privacy, view blockage; none of that is occurring. He noted that it's barely 9,000 square feet; everybody else has 20-30. He acknowledged that they want to take a nuisance house and turn it into something attractive.

Marcia asked where is the pool, he noted that the pool is at the bottom level; he noted that it's not very usable. Discussed neighbors' location in relation to the deck. Cathy asked about screening, at the bottom of the new proposed thing with metal support foundation, which she noted is very unattractive to the neighbors, as it doesn't make the house set into the hill. Cathy and Bob mentioned need for permeable fencing and screening.

Nickie would like to see it in person. Steve related that he hosted a meeting with three of 50 neighbors who were invited. He noted that one liked what they presented. Mark Gaeta related that when they bought the home it was in disrepair; they spent money so it wouldn't fall down. They recently did brush clearance, removing everything that was not dirt. Cathy moved to approve the project with their conditions.

Public Comment was given by Attorney Jeffrey Harlan, of Ervin, Cohen & Jessup, LLP, who represents several neighbors and passed out a package of a letter with attachments for the city. He recommends that we deny the project, and noted that we don't have a full view of the history; noting that in the most current communication from the city to the applicant, the conclusion is that there are no permits... The letter goes on to say, you have a month from May 23rd to come back with corrections to your plans, verify the existing conditions. Cathy asked what the neighbors want. He related that they want to see improvement but nothing... He opined that the applicant was aware of what was there and the city's expectations. The city directed the applicant to file and submit fees for the correct entitlements within two months.

Luis related that he was told what they would have to ask and he stated that they addressed the issues, and has a letter that they have to address the project with the case process, addressed what B&S looked at, Planning accepted that, and since then, they've given revised plans and findings, and based on that submission. They don't have a hearing date.

Motion: To take no position at this point between the two interests, too many things to be resolved subject to a possible review in the future. **Moved** by Bob; **Seconded** by Yves. **8/0/0; 1 recusal:** Shawn Bayliss.

At this point, consultant, Mr. Robert B. Burke, Esquire, with the applicant, suggested we table this until we have a chance to digest and make an informed opinion. He noted that the applicant is asking that if they come up with a date of their own, they will defer until the committee has a chance to make a determination. Attorney Jeffrey Harlan, expressed continued concerned.

Substitution Motion: That this be continued until we hear that that if there is a ZA hearing, if a date is given, they agree to postpone; they won't go forward until they come back to accurate facts. **moved** by Don; **seconded** by Marcia **8/0/0; 1 recusal:** Shawn. There will be no ZA hearing until they come back.

11. 1512 Stradella ENV-2017-5038-EAF AA-2017-5037-PMLA

RDoss w/c Wed-Owner?

Project Description: PARCEL MAP TO CREATE A TOTAL OF 3 LOTS

Requested Entitlement: PURSUANT TO LAMC SECTION 17.50, A PARCEL MAP TO CREATE A TOTAL OF 3 LOTS. *Parcel Map, lot split, to create a total of 3 lots*

Appl/Owner: Mamdou Bahna msbahna@gmail.com h:310.476.2838 c:310.990.5112

Richard Doss rich@pacificcoastcivil.com 818.865.4168

De-De Poll deede@pacificcoastcivil.com (818) 865-4168

Rep: Regina Minor regina@arclanduse.com [Company: Arc Land Use & Entitlements, Inc]

Filed: 12/04/17 Assign/Staff 3/22/18 Zuriel Esponosa-Salas

Permanent Link: <http://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/CaseId/MjE3NTEEx0>

Mr. Richard Doss, Civil Engineer/Land Planner for Dr. Bahna, noted that they are proposing to split into three conforming lots; some grading will be balanced on site; plan to build two more houses. Lot sizes, RE15 zoned, conforming to the zone. There is a slope analysis of the existing home, which shows that the existing home meets the code. To access the back two lots, there will be a driveway 20 foot round wide driveway; he takes access from that driveway as well. In the eventuality of the lot split they will widen it to 28 feet; there will be a separate driveway that will parallel that down below it. Three homes take access off the private driveway. It is also a request for a private street which ends at the property line. They filed for the private street. Stephanie noted that they are eliminating retaining walls. The two lots won't be able to have any retaining walls. They won't be creating pad areas below. There is no architecture of any kind.

This property is the only one that has access to build this way. The owner suggests getting answers to questions on distances. Shawn noted that this has been on his radar for a while. The entire tract falls under CC&Rs. You have to sign off to do any kind of lot split. He noted that the city tract has a requirement, against further division unless approved by director of planning for the city of Los Angeles. The association would submit that they'd need to submit architectural planning. Bob noted that this has to go to Bel Air Association first; recommends to continue this until association vets the project.

Don Loze brought up a cumulative impact issue, noting that the general and community plans were based on the services that were available to the City. No one has ever done a current analysis of what's been built, and whether we are overbuilding the services available to the city to this area. We are taking away green-scape, building hardscape, and requiring City services to support more houses, causing more traffic along the way.

Mr. Doss noted that there is a DWP report in the package. The hearing is not being scheduled yet. Mr. Bahna related that he was approached by the expeditor about BAA, and would like to address this point with him. He is willing to comply with all the regulations and rules.

Motion: To continue project until Bel Air vets the project based on CC&Rs and whatever else they have to do, and at that point they come back to us. Marcia **moved;** Wendy **seconded;** **9/0/0. Passed.**

12. 3135 HUTTON Dr. DIR-2019-4235-DRB-SPP-MSP Ltr Sent 10/1/19

90210 BCA ENV-2019-4236-CE

Project Description: PROJECT PERMIT COMPLIANCE WITH THE MULHOLLAND SCENIC PARKWAY SPECIFIC PLAN TO ALLOW FOR THE REMODEL AND PARTIAL DEMOLITION OF 832 SQUARE FEET AND ADDITION OF 4,788 SQUARE FEET, WHICH INCLUDES A 1,778

Requested Entitlement: PROJECT PERMIT COMPLIANCE WITH THE MULHOLLAND SCENIC PARKWAY SPECIFIC PLAN TO ALLOW FOR THE REMODEL AND PARTIAL

DEMOLITION OF 832 SQUARE FEET AND ADDITION OF 4,788 SQUARE FEET, WHICH INCLUDES A 1,778 SQUARE FEET BASEMENT.

Appl/Owner: Aya / Edward Jakobovits eddyjake@yahoo.com c:310.801.9753 h:310.860.1355

Rep/Arch-Engineer : Farhad Ashofteh farhad@att.net 310.801.9753

Filed: 7/18/19 Assign/Staff: 7/26/19 Valentina Knox Jones valentina.knox.jones@lacity.org

818-374-5038 Permanent Link: <http://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/CaseId/MjMwOTI50>

- Robert related that they just went before the MDRB. Robert said he told the presenter that if they got approval from them, no need to come here.

Follow-up, Discussion & Possible Action ALL DEFERRED DUE TO TIME CONSTRAINTS

13. **LA County Superior Court case “Eldridge v. Los Angeles” – Jamie Hall** This is a legal challenge on CEQA grounds to the original Hillside Ordinance. The Statement of Decision was issued on December 5, 1994. The court determined that the City of Los Angeles was required to do "meaningful environmental review" for *each project* proposed in the Hillside Area that exports more than 1000 cubic yards of earth. The court determined categorical exemptions are not allowed.

14. **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.
No change in the Council File since 03/01/2018 when we submitted our 2nd CIS supporting the original motion. Motion Expiration Date: 11/14/2019.

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

15. **CD5 Protected Tree Ord. Amendment – 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 Planning, B&S, 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. There are 13 CISs in the council file; no change in Council File since October 2018. Motion Expiration Date: 11/22/2019.

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

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

- 16. New Packages Received: See Project Tracking List
- 17. Certified Neighborhood Council (CNC) Reporting Review of New Projects Submitted
- 18. Upcoming Hearings: See Project Tracking List (Subject to discussion & action)
- 19. Determination Letters Received: See Project Tracking List
- 20. Pending Haul Routes (Update by any PLU Committee members)
- 21. Proactive Tracking, Tasks & Projects (Update, Discussion & Possible Action)
- 22. Adjournment 9:00pm

Next PLU Committee Meeting: Tuesday November 12, 2019 @ AJU 15600 Mulholland Dr., #223

| <u>Month</u> | <u>PLU Committee Meeting 7:00 pm @ AJU Rm #223</u> | <u>Board Meeting 7:00 pm @ AJU Rm #223</u> |
|--------------|--|--|
| | | Wednesday 10/23 |
| November | Tuesday 11/12 | Wednesday 11/20 |
| December | Tuesday 12/10 | Wednesday 12/18 |

ACRONYMS:

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