

Minutes
Planning & Land Use Committee Meeting (Virtual)
Tuesday May 19, 2020 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm

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. Call to Order – Committee Member Roll Call @ 1:04pm, 8 present and @ 1:37pm, 12 present.
2. Approval of the May 19, 2020 Agenda: **Moved** by Robin; **seconded** by Bob; **6 yes; 0 no; 1 abstention**; Maureen; **approved**.
3. Approval of April 21, 2020 Minutes (circulated with agenda) Deferred
4. **Public Comments:** **Jamie Hall** related that he had appeared before Board of Public Works regarding removal of seven So. Cal Black Walnut Trees, to be replaced with oaks & laurel bays. He wrote a letter pro bono; noted that walnuts produced are used by wildlife & be on lookout for out-of-kind replacements.
5. Chair Reports: Robert Schlesinger, Chair & Stephanie Savage, Vice Chair

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

6. **13850 W MULHOLLAND DR 90210** DIR-2019-3173-DRB-SPP-MSP, ENV-2019-3174-CE
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 [THE LITTLE PUMPKIN TRUST]
 Representative: DAMIAN CATALAN [DC EXPEDITING, INC.] damian@dcexpediting.com

Damian Catalan presented the project and questions were asked and answered including but not limited to:

He noted that this request will be updated to a 10-foot high “existing” retaining wall that encroaches into the Mulholland Drive right of way; built previously. It is an existing condition; not modifying existing. No additional increase into the Mulholland exclusionary.

Discussed plans for estimated 10-15 caissons. Architect, Johnny, noted they’ll be getting structural engineering soon, with exact number of caissons, with intent for wall to be covered with foliage in front.

Raised question of what they’ll do with open space portion of lot that will remain undeveloped. He noted that they have not yet communicated with the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy; no protected trees impacted by proposed development, and tree report was given to Urban Forestry and was approved. He noted that there are non-protected trees. Jamie Hall would like to see any removal of trees be replaced at 1:1 ratio with the protected species; that we want to see preservation of half of lot that is an undeveloped hillside. Stephanie noted that there will be plantings of black walnuts.

[Nickie and Leslie arrived.]

Asked about fencing around property that exists, they are not modifying fence, a front yard fence from Mulholland to property. Discussed request to possibly convert portions of existing fence to wildlife permeable type, to preserve undeveloped portion of lot, an environmental resource. He offered to present this to client when he understands it.

Asked, per discussion in December meeting minutes, he noted that they will have two large tanks to store water, with pump, to pump up to the street in the event of heavy rain.

Discussed envelope height and height of building, walls. Section 1 on sheet a.23 – shows height of 40 feet. Damian noted that was an error on the dimension. That was taken five feet out from the edge of the railing; so from plumb line top of railing make sure no more than 30 feet down to grade below. Highest point of house 28.5 / ridgeline – after last meeting he had a conversation with planner, Dominic Ortiz, who looked at the maps which showed all the prominent ridges; more updated than the specific plan documents. He determined there is no prominent ridge on or near the property, contrary to what the map in the specific plan had mentioned. He said if anyone had questions, to direct them to him to confirm. He would be below highest peak of any mountain.

He noted that the existing building height is not being increased. There was a proposal at one point to increase 2-3 feet; they’ve altered the design. New proposal is to fall below the existing height of the building. He doesn’t have data on secondary ridge. 1,282 feet to top of the roofline, elevation height to top of roof.

Asked if due to increased size in basement, has grading increased, told that grading has decreased. They do need a haul route. Discussed need for a pool; excavation for pool will drive number up. Currently it shows 2280 CY.

Asked about height and length of the retaining wall and the location. The go to the MDRB Friday; meeting with Specific Planner Friday to discuss corrections and new layout to include haul route. Committee would like to see the revised plans. Jamie will provide information on wildlife pilot program and power point slide; to send to Stephanie who will send.

Motion: To continue, pending corrected entitlement request, including haul route, accurate envelope height, right of way encroachment, and additions of permeable fencing, wildlife right of way, and caisson count. Robin **moved**; Robert **seconded**; **11 yes**; **0 no**; **0 abstentions**; **passed**.

7. 10427 W CORFU LANE 90077 ZA-2018-1641-ZAD

Project Description: CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING ON A VACANT LOT FRONTING ON A HILLSIDE SUBSTANDARD LIMITED STREET.

Requested Entitlement: REQUEST FOR RELIEF FROM PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS FOR SUBSTANDARD HILLSIDE STREET.

Applicant: Kenneth Sampson info@bdsconstruct.com

Representative: Rudy Alegre rudyalegre@hotmail.com

Stephanie related that the Planning website said they would have hearing this a.m. but Staff planner said it has been postponed for the second time. Information and additional questions were given to applicant three weeks ago, at which time he offered to attend this meeting. Last in-person meeting was in March. We will make a more comprehensive list for applicant or keep as is and give list to ZA as list of our concerns.

Public Comment:

Dan & Tensie Palmer introduced themselves as adjacent property owners. Dan noted that a notice last week said May 21st Thur. at 9:00 am there's to be a hearing; it was also mailed to him; however, the meeting scheduled for today wasn't posted. The Palmers noted:

- At last visit, the adjacent neighbors to the east, North Beverly Glen, seven neighbors lots abutting his lot, had not been notified for any tentative construction for a project; should have been noticed; had no clue.
- He has looked at submitted plans, asked Plan Checker to send pdfs: a) Page A6.1 shows parking area to have a 5' retaining wall on a downhill slope but site plan using gridlines indicates an 18' high retaining wall. Hopes you can ask for a revised east elevation page or clarification on how 5' retaining wall for area that needs 18.
- Asks if separate permit for pool; does that mean haul route would be divided up?

Stephanie noted that total grading needs to be included in the haul route. Cathy related that she has looked at the plans and the comments attached; is concerned about pull on water and electrical infrastructure of the area, since it is such a large property and most properties in the area are a lot smaller than this one; that it states that the water is to be redirected away from that property but doesn't say to where. There are a number of properties below it and this needs to be addressed. She asked, is the roof going to be developed into a roof deck at some point/ She expressed concern about lighting to the neighbors and long-distance lighting, noting that it is a very rural street and to add excessive light tends to overwhelm the area. They didn't give us a staging plan for parking; this was one of the 7 questions asked, no information provided, and is part of the outstanding questions. The applicant said in March there would be some road improvement. There is a question about where the water goes.

In the event that they do not return, committee discussed that it is worth writing a letter to the ZA. We will give them more questions. We now know neighbors abutting were not notified. Give them what we learned today, copy the staff planner.

Motion: To deny the project due to outstanding questions from the March meeting (tree removal plan, parking and staging plan, road improvement plan, sewer improvement plan, plan for PV system on roof, verification of retaining wall height(s). Added concerns due to neighboring/abutting properties without notification; has the applicant applied for a haul route & over height retaining walls. Questions from the committee included electrical service/infrastructure, how does the water drain from the site, roof deck and proposed lighting, does the project comply with title 24 with no PV system on the roof.

Jason **moved**; **seconded** by Cathy; **10 yes**; **0 no**; **0 abstentions**; Jamie & Robert stepped out of the room.

Follow-up, Discussion & Possible Action on Other Projects

8. **Discussion & Possible Motion:** To modify the Hillside Construction Regulations (HCR) **Deferred**

9. **Discussion & Possible Motion:** To recommend that the BABCNC write a letter to support the CEQA Appeal filed by Laurel Canyon Association for 8144 and 8148 Gould. **Moved** by Stephanie; **seconded** by Robert. Jamie returned **12 yes; 0 no; 0 abstentions; passed.**

10. **Added Discussion:** Encourage leaders to not disband use of teleconferencing but retain this additional option to participate in the public process; reach out to State Senators and Assembly members to adapt this to the 21st Century. Wendy and Jamie would like to have an Ad-hoc committee to influence changes, put together an action plan to be an effective advocate.

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

11. New Packages Received: See Project Tracking List
12. Certified Neighborhood Council (CNC) Reporting Review of New Projects Submitted
13. Upcoming Hearings: See Project Tracking List (Subject to discussion & action)
14. Determination Letters Received: See Project Tracking List
15. Pending Haul Routes (Update by any PLU Committee members)
16. Proactive Tracking, Tasks & Projects (Update, Discussion & Possible Action)
17. Adjournment Stephanie moved; seconded and meeting adjourned at 2:35 pm.

Next PLU Meeting: TBD

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 ASSESSMENT FORM	ZAD – ZONING ADMINISTRATOR’S DETERMINATION
ENV – ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE	ZV – ZONING VARIANCE
MND – MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION	

www.babcnc.org
Office (310) 479-6247
council@babcnc.org