



Planning & Land Use Committee Meeting Minutes
Tuesday December 10, 2019 7:00 pm to 9:00 pm
American Jewish University
15600 Mulholland Drive, Room #223 Bel Air 90077

Call to Order – Committee Member Roll Call 7:07pm

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. **Approve December 10, 2019 Agenda** Moved Nickie; seconded Cathy; 11/0/0; approved
2. **Approve November 12, 2019 Minutes** Moved Stephanie; seconded Cathy; 9/0/2; passed.
3. **Public Comments:** On any topic not on adopted agenda within Committee’s jurisdiction.
4. **Chair Report:** Robert Schlesinger & **Vice-Chair Report:** Stephanie Savage

Bob noted that he and Stephanie have worked on a policy change with regard to how many times a project can cancel, especially at the last minute. He gave an example letter, which would say that this letter served that the BABCNC won’t be tracking project unless you call us.

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

5. 1551 N SUMMITRIDGE DR 90210 ZA-2018-3458-ZV-ZAD, ENV-2018-3459-CE

THE 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 PURSUANT TO SECTION 12.24 OF THE LAMC A ZONING ADMINISTRATOR’S DETERMINATION FOR A SFD WITH A MAXIMUM OF 45’ IN HEIGHT IN LIEU OF THE REQUIRED 30’ (HEIGHT OF THE UNPERMITTED SFD IS 65’) AND REDUCED SIDE YARDS AT 9’5” IN LIEU OF THE REQUIRED SIDE YARDS. SECTION 12.28, A ZONING ADMINISTRATOR’S ADJUSTMENT 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).

Applicant: MARK GAETA [SUMMIT INDUSTRIES LLC] nymgaeta@gmail.com
 Representative: Steve Kawaratani (Kawaratani Consulting) stevekawaratani@me.com

They cancelled and requested continuance to January’s meeting.

6. 830 N SARBONNE ROAD 90077 PS-1445

PROPOSED PRIVATE STREET TO SERVE THREE PROPERTIES WITH EXISTING ACCESS (ONE HAS ACCESS FROM THE PUBLIC STREET) WITH A SPECIAL REQUEST TO GATE ACCESS TO SUCH PRIVATE STREET PURSUANT TO LAMC SECTION 18.

Representative: Amy Studarus (Pacific Crest Consultants) amy@pccla.com

Presenter, Mr. Chris Parker from Pacific Crest Consultants was accompanied by Ms. Amy Studarus. Chris related that the client's project is comprised of addresses 830, 888 and 900 Sarbonne. The project starts with a private street... end of a cul-de-sac. The property owners have asked to file the private street case. They are multiple-acre properties size wise. Discussed private easement, shared driveways with these properties, a proposed gate, and on the public side of the gate, a proposed guard house, with a large turnaround, the latter of which is the public benefit that the private street provides for the community. Part of the construction involved is creating a turnaround, the area for the proposed guard house and the gate.

[Leslie arrived at 7:18 pm for a total of 12 committee members present.]

The zoning requests are tied to the construction. The proposed guardhouse is officially an accessory structure, and they are asking for relief for an accessory structure at the front part of the property. They are supposed to be at least 55 feet from the property line. The other request is for over-in-height fence for the security gate. Because of the easements, the current driveway, considered side-yard at the edge of the easements, they are proposing an 8-foot gate across the street; only allowed to be 6 feet. New driveway is being provided for 830 Sarbonne, an elevated private driveway for ingress and egress to 830 Sarbonne, which currently has access on Sarbonne which is tight and unsafe. The homeowner, having lived there for a while, wanted to add that. The ramp is now located in side-yard setbacks and is elevated more than 6'; however, you're looking down to the ramp. Chris noted that 760 Lausanne looks down at it and Peter, the father, lives there and supports the project. They are here to answer questions and ask for our support. They believe it will improve the safety of this neighborhood and reports having the neighbors' support. Questions asked and answered included but were not limited to the following:

- Maureen asked, and was told by Amy that they do have the support of 900.
- The homeowners will pay for the guardhouse.
- The private street would create a community and they will have to pay for it; 830 Sarbonne, which is improving its driveway, 888 and 900 Sarbonne. 760 Lausanne is involved.
- The guardhouse is small, 90 square feet with a bathroom.
- Nickie asked about cutting down trees. Chris noted that they're cutting down a couple. One Oak tree is being removed and being replaced by four. It is a small one that is growing out of a pine tree. Some pine trees will be removed. Urban Forestry requires them to replace the oak tree. Chris noted that if we want them to replace the non-native species, they would do it. The lots are multiple acres each. He noted that Urban Forestry looked at the properties involved and the street leading down beyond the private street; their arborist said one tree will be impacted, they will replace it.
- Stephanie asked about the size of the street, it goes down to 18.5 at points, per Amy, and they have the room to make the improvements. The easements will be wider. Stephanie noted that often people use these turn-arounds for parking, and asked if they could mark it as "no parking." Chris noted that there is some space designated for parking. He could have this area distinguished as "no parking."
- Maureen asked if they spoke to 777 Sarbonne, noting that at the hammerhead trucks go up in their cul-de-sac area and he will be impacted. Chris said he will tell them about Maureen's concern. Cathy asked how elevated is the driveway.
- Shawn noted that BAA hasn't had them present yet. Shawn noted that he has been stuck on that road, a dead-end private street. Shawn would ask that it be conditionally approved.
- Don asked if it violates any CCRs, to which Shawn noted that he doesn't think that there are any that preclude a gating system; he'll check.
- Asked, Amy noted that there are a few fire hydrants, including on the property at 888 by their house at the end which services 900 Sarbonne. They'll review if any need for another hydrant.

Motion: To conditionally approve the request subject to the following conditions: That applicants meet with BAA to review the project, to have "no parking" signs at the turnaround or something that delineates "no parking" at the turnaround, as well as verification that there are no violations of CC&Rs

Moved by Shawn; **seconded** by Maureen; **12/0/0**; **approved unanimously.**

7. 13850 W MULHOLLAND DR 90210 DIR-2019-3173-DRB-SPP-MSP, ENV-2019-3174-CE 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. 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 [THE LITTLE PUMPKIN TRUST]

Representative: DAMIAN CATALAN [DC EXPEDITING, INC.] Damian@dcexpediting.com

Expedito, Damian Catalan, was accompanied by Architect Johnny Sonson. Questions were asked and answered, including but not limited to the following:

- Damian noted that they had to update the application (which now matches the agenda which is correct) from 8 feet to 10 feet. He noted that they would like to reduce that for grading reasons, to reduce the height to protect the hillside. They'd like to bring it back to 8 feet. The 14 feet is encroachment to the right of way, into an existing driveway, follows a retaining wall to downslope... the existing height of the retaining wall is 8 feet high. Details of the retaining wall were further discussed.
- He noted that they have an arborist's report submitted to Urban Forestry who are in review of it. There is one tree involved. Parking for construction will be provided onsite. There is plenty of driveway.
- They have submitted for MDRB, and are dealing with Dominic Cruz at Planning, who gave him some items, including asking them to update the application and design changes. They meet tomorrow at 8:00 to re-submit the project at City Planning.
- **They have not been given a hearing date.**
- Shawn asked if caissons are exposed. Mr. Sonson noted that they plan to put a mesh screen with vines to hide the caissons. They are permeable. As much as possible they want to screen the piles.
- There is a pool.
- There is 201 cy of export.
- Downslope of the project is additional residential.
- They have to cut a portion of the hillside to make way for the addition.
- The closest neighbor from the addition is 50 feet east.
- There have been permits for the original residence and subsequent permits over the years, the oldest dated back to 1955.
- Asked about safety, Damian noted that they have licensed professionals working on the project, e.g., soils, structural engineers, etc.
- Leslie and Shawn asked; it is a through lot, touching Mulholland and Damian believes does not go all the way to Deep Canyon, but pretty close. Shawn noted that the property under them looks vacant.
- Don asked how it impacts the view site across the street, to which he said it is not impacted; you cannot see through to the property line. You'd see a bit of a driveway entry, a mailbox and then trees.
- Stephanie asked about overall height; 36 feet to the top of the deck. She asked, toe of the caisson to the top of the guardrail limit is 36 feet. He said that over the years, instead of carving one enormous structure, extending over the side of the hill, they tiered it, which helps to limit the height.
- Nickie asked about the location of the elevator shaft, which is off the existing main house kitchen that brings you down to the basement level. The elevator is inside.
- Stephanie asked and was told that this is under the new BHO. She thinks that it would exceed the height limit. Damian said they have to take a look at this, that they had to modify... based on the meeting and current requirements. Stephanie noted that it would be an additional entitlement request.
- Shawn asked, regarding the basement, how much of the addition is 60% of the exterior wall covered by dirt, with no more than 3-foot of the upper portion being exposed, to which Mr. Sonson said it is less than that. Damian said that they are counting it towards the FAR.

- They have catch basins for the rain in the plans with specifications for the basin.
- Cathy and Shawn questioned Damian as to the size of the addition with regard to basement. Cathy noted that it doesn't appear that the basement is below ground. Damian noted it is not completely underground and that it will be included within the FAR. Measurements discussed, whether it would actually be a 3,300 square foot addition, to which he noted that they are calling it a basement; to which Shawn noted and he agreed that in some places it would be a lower deck and some places a basement. Per Cathy, the actual addition is 3,400 square feet instead of 1,700, which he agreed with.
- Damian said that they have permits from the years. Codes came into effect after the structures were built.
- Don asked about parking construction vehicles: Damian noted that they were proposing to relocate the existing driveway but it turned out that there was too much slope to deal with and it was not technically feasible. They looked at an option to put the driveway east which wasn't feasible. Don noted that it is not safe to exit the driveway.
- Stephanie asked for the plan with regard to rain barrels. He noted that they'll be required to do a sump-pump. There will be a covenant agreement that runs with the property.
- Shawn asked regarding the 14-foot permit. It will be through an R-permit.
- Leslie would like clarification as to the basement, the RFA and the height, and to see photographs of the existing house, the hill beneath the existing house, as to structures beneath, and to make sure that there has been communication with the neighbors so they could come before us, as well as the plan for construction vehicles. Damian noted that they can show it on a plan.
- Asked by Shawn, Damian noted that the garage is a significant amount of square footage, to house vehicles, to keep the cars safe from the elements.

Motion: To continue the project to get additional information, to verify overall height, verify the basement and house RFA and if the basement complies, to get photographs of the existing house, the hill beneath the existing house, as to structures beneath, and to get the plan for construction vehicles; and to make sure that there has been communication with the abutting neighbors so they could come before us **moved** by Stephanie, **seconded** by Leslie; **12/0/0; passed.**

8. 2693 N CARMAR DR 90046 DIR-2019-6621-DRB-SPP-MSP, ENV-2019-6622-CE REMODEL AND ADDITION TO AN EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING AND CARPORT EXTENSION PURSUANT TO LAMC SECTIONS 11.5.7 AND 16.50, PROJECT PERMIT COMPLIANCE WITH DESIGN REVIEW FOR THE REMODEL OF AN EXISTING 2,931 SQUARE-FOOT SINGLE STORY SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING, A 373 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION, AND THE EXTENSION OF AN EXISTING CARPORT INCREASING THE CARPORT SQUARE FOOTAGE TO 544 SQUARE FEET TO COVER TWO EXISTING PARKING SPACES.

Applicant: BRANDON CREED [BRANDON DAVID CREED LIVING TRUST] tom.creed@gmail.com
 Representative: ROBERT THIBODEAU [DU ARCHITECTS] robert@duarchitects.com

Architect Robert Thibodeau of DU Architects presented. He was accompanied by Sandra from DU Architects and Mr. Tom Creed, father of the applicant. Comments, questions and answers included but were not limited to the following: Robert explained that they have an existing L-shaped house which faces Carmar; there were originally three structures; two have been aligned together.

- The carport has an existing breezeway which is one structure; access is on Carmar. Gate and door face existing carport; no actual front door of the house. There is a permitted rec room.
- They propose to link the three structures together, building in between the carport, rec room and what was the entry of the house. The rec room will be master suite... The pool room will remain a pool.
- This is not a historic house but is a Buff, Smith and Hensmen house that is in disrepair. They're keeping the Buff, Smith and Hensmen portion of it. Doors and windows are being retooled; the house is restored.
- They're trying to push the carport closer to the street with adequate setback, so house will go from two- to four-bedroom. Where there are three bedrooms now there will be four.
- Most changes are cosmetic. They're extending the 4x10s, replicating details.
- They are not taking any trees out.
- The driveway gets widened slightly; they are trying to lower the driveway which is short but steep.
- As to the level of the carport, they wanted to slide it halfway forwards, driveway won't be quite as steep

- They will redo steps.
- They are on the other side of the dog park. He has a downhill neighbor.
- They're adding a hallway and bathroom.
- Leslie asked about staging and if they've notified the neighbors. He noted that they did a renovation of the interior for over a year and that the neighbors know them well.

Motion: To approve the project **Moved** by Stephanie, **seconded** by Maureen; **12/0/0**; **approved**.

Follow-up, Discussion & Possible Action on other Projects

9. LA County Superior Court case “*Eldridge v. Los Angeles*” – Deferred

10. Ridgeline Ordinance – Loze

Council File #11-1441-S1

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

Don gave update noting that the Ridgeline Ordinance file was reinstated last week, approved subject to Rule 15 of the Council, and that we are very close to seeing something to go public for public discussions. Don noted that the management of the department pulled their team off to work on a citywide ordinance on vacation houses, which is going to the Planning Commission on the 19th. When that's resolved we may get this on track. Each neighborhood will have to work with the Council Office and Planning Department. We are getting a pilot program for our NC, and if it works it may go citywide. Don hopes that within the year we'll go down to council.

11. CD5 Protected Tree Ordinance Amendment – Council File #03-1459-S3

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

Robin noted that the motion proposed in the council file for the departments to provide recommendations for strengthening the Protected Tree Ordinance was approved at committee level (*Public Works and Gang Reduction Committee*).

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

12. New Packages Received: See Project Tracking List
13. Certified Neighborhood Council (CNC) Reporting Review of New Projects Submitted
14. Upcoming Hearings: See Project Tracking List (Subject to discussion & action)
15. Determination Letters Received: See Project Tracking List
16. Pending Haul Routes (Update by any PLU Committee members)
17. Proactive Tracking, Tasks & Projects (Update, Discussion & Possible Action)
18. Adjournment Shawn moved and Cathy seconded and the meeting adjourned at 8:55pm

Next PLU Meeting: Tuesday January 14, 2020 @ AJU 15600 Mulholland Dr., Room: “The Boardroom.”
The Boardroom is on the 2nd floor, past the elevator & down the entire length of the corridor.

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