

**MINUTES**  
**Virtual Planning & Land Use Committee Meeting**  
**Tuesday May 11, 2021 5:00 pm – 7:00 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	
André Stojka		X			

1. Call to Order – Committee Member Roll Call 5:03 PM 12 committee members present; *six attendees*
2. Approval of the May 11, 2021 Agenda: **Moved** by Stephanie/Cathy; **12-0-0 approved**
3. Approval of April 13, 2021 PLU Minutes (**Attachment A**) **Moved** by Stephanie/Maureen; **12-0-0 approved**
4. Public Comments: On any topic not on adopted agenda within Committee’s jurisdiction.
5. Chair Reports: Robert Schlesinger, Chair, & Stephanie Savage, Vice Chair

Stephanie noted that we were supposed to have more projects this meeting but had last-minute cancellations. It is our policy that, in the event these projects continue to not return, we will write a letter to complete the process and will send the letter. Bob noted that letters are based on facts of the City and would go for board approval prior to sending.

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

6. **DIR-2021-2902-BSA 8201 Bellgave Place 90069**  
**Project Description:** APPEAL OF A DETERMINATION FROM LA DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY, PER APPEAL REPORT NUMBER DBS-210010-DCP. \*  
**Applicant:** [MOONRAKER CAPITAL, LLC]  
**Representative:** TONY RUSSO [CREST REAL ESTATE] [tony@crestrealestate.com](mailto:tony@crestrealestate.com)  
Appellant: Vic Armstrong (8211 Bellgave) [vic@stuntsincorporated.co.uk](mailto:vic@stuntsincorporated.co.uk)  
Appellant Representative: Carl Lisberger [CLisberger@manatt.com](mailto:CLisberger@manatt.com)  
Victor De La Cruz [Vdelacruz@manatt.com](mailto:Vdelacruz@manatt.com)  
\*Appeal of building permits for 8201 Bellgave. Large residential project under construction. Appeal includes project violation of applicable floor area, height, and setback limits, among other violations.  
<https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/search/encoded/MjQ2MTYyO>

Stephanie introduced the appellant’s representative, Mr. Carl Lisberger, who presented the information he forwarded to the committee about this appeal. Mr. Lisberger related that he represents Vic Armstrong and Steve, next door neighbor of the project which has been under construction for several years. He noted that the project is at the end of a cul-de-sac and has a number of important violations of municipal code and entitlements, an example of overbuilt, illegal, and very large single-family home projects being built in the hillsides, causing safety issues and significant neighborhood impacts in terms of construction. He noted that there is an issue of projects like this sucking off city resources, processing and seeking endless

amendments for approvals not done appropriately in the first place as well as physical resources, e.g., shortages such as lumber, and that the houses being built in the hillside areas are thousands of feet larger than legally permitted.

He noted that they had appealed all of the project building permits; however, B&S denied the appeals and it is now before the Zoning Administrator. They issued a number of supplemental permits, some in direct response to their appeal, which he feels is not the way the process works. He discussed four violations, 1) violations to the maximum floor area: ZAD says Max RFA 7,444 sf; currently project is 8196 sf. 2) It was never eligible for the FAR bonus on multiple independent bases including project's slope analysis 61%; Independent Slope Analysis 54%; and Permitted Grading 574 cy. Independent analysis shows Actual Grading of 1,495 cy; 3) massively violates height, and, 4) encroaches into the rear setback.

Mr. Lisberger referred to the attached deck that is very much part of the building, and discussed massive piles and that the deck is part of the building. He related that LADBS is saying it is built on and measured from grade. He believes that the code is clear: you have to go to the bottom of the pile-ons, and if done so, this height is exceeded by at least a dozen feet.

As to Item #4, encroachment into the rear setback, he noted that there is no sense that the deck or pool are on grade. He noted that the deck and pool nearly fill the setback area. He requested support of the PLU Committee and the neighborhood council. A response to their appeal is due on June 28<sup>th</sup>.

Lara Leitner, Attorney with Tony Russo and Jason Somers of Crest Realty, noted that this has been ongoing for about two years. She stated that they have had support from the architectural committee in the community and that the City has approved all permits, including supplemental permits. She acknowledged that the city denied the appeals; however, reported that she has not seen a copy of the appeal. She is concerned that this is due June 28<sup>th</sup> and they haven't seen a copy.

Ms. Leitner noted that the allegations were visited by the City and they have a determination letter saying they did not error in issuing these permits. She refuted that this house is a massive house. She noted that everything has been done by right except for the 20-foot roadway requirement. No basement. She concluded that there is no merit to continue with challenging the project in its third year.

Mr. Somers from Crest Realty reported that he had only received notice of this last evening and did not have more of a presentation. He related that they were advised on the original design not to build a basement. It has A+ views in LA, they are under maximum RFA with no bonus for a day-lighted basement. They could have done a 4000- to 5000-square-foot basement. The ZAD was the only discretionary item they went for. The Hillside Referral Form stated that this project was on a standard roadway more than 20 feet all the way down to Sunset. It's a fully improved tract community where their street frontage is on a standard street. Down on Crescent there is a pinch point within the public right of way less than 20. They self-reported to go for a ZAD to waive this. They have architectural board supporting project from Day 1 and have met with the neighbors from day 1 on the project. He describes some items as misleading.

Committee questions were taken beginning with Shawn Bayliss who asked the presenter to speak to height, and per Jason Somers, it is under the current BHO. He also asked about other items that were deficient. The applicant's representative gave comments as to a deck on the south side of the property that was lowered in about a 10-15' area; he noted that the pool room is physically separated; the deck area was demolished and lowered. In the project that they submitted, the square footage stated 7944 and with the additions of counting thickness of walls, counting portions of covered areas, the plan never changed. The increase of square footage that was counted did change. The ZA & Planning deemed it was in conformance, it was the exact same design just a different calculation on RFA.

Asked, the owner is Bellgave LLC and Clive Roberson is the managing person. Shawn noted that it seems like there is a lot going on regarding the rear yard setback. There were four points brought up by the

appellant. Ms. Leitner noted that the LADBS determination letter goes into detail on these points. She will circulate it. Cathy Wayne asked about the size of the “usable lot,” to which Mr. Somers noted it is half an acre. Tony Russo noted that we are typically consulted to have time to prepare and he doesn’t have the appeal that Carl Lisberger submitted. They will try to get us information that more clearly establishes the responses Carl has brought up.

Cathy noted that if the RA is 7944 and there is a certain slope, they should have the lot size used to approve that. Mr. Somers noted that the lot size is just north of 23,000 square feet. He doesn’t have the slope information in front of him. He related that you have to note what B&S and Planning have stated in regard to street widening only and the slope band 20% bonus that is above the square footage.

Cathy asked them to supply the letters in writing supporting this project from all the neighbors. Ms. Leitner will get the approvals, and noted that there are two neighbors in opposition; they haven’t had other complaints. She related that what is required is architectural design committee approval, which they got; Crescent Estates has provided this, as required in writing. The two adjacent neighbors are opposed.

Tony Russo pulled lot size which he related is 23,497 square feet. Max floor size is 6,757 and with bonus is 8,108, as shown on all permits, city as accurate.

Stephanie sees 12 supplemental permits, five (5) are change of ownership. She believes that sup permits can only increase by 5%. They describe grading increase, etc. She asked if they are exceeding 5% any place. Stephanie related that we did review this project in 2017 and recalled slope failure or needing a wall below. She drives by often and sees how tall it is. She wonders about overall height requirements under codes. She asked if they have building height verification, to which Mr. Somers responded, yes, they did. She asked for access to the written document on this. Tony noted that they took a closer look, reaffirmed that this project in no way deviated from code.

Nickie asked who are the people comprising the architectural design review board and who deems that the board conclusion is the acceptable view point for this project? Ms. Leitner responded that there are covenants, restrictions, a document that applies to any construction in the community, and that those CC&Rs establish the architectural design committee. They originally had four members who evaluated the project in regard to CC&Rs, and those four members were presented the project and ultimately approved it. Mr. Somers noted that they live within the community of about 29 homes, on fully wide and improved streets. The members have lived there for many years.

Nickie asked for the boundaries, to which Mr. Somers related that if you go to the top of Crescent Heights, it goes from narrow to wide standard size street, then dies at a cul de sac at the end. It is very clear. It has a sign. Nickie noted the divergent views of the project and would like to know what each side would like and be willing to give to appease the people who are against it. Mr. Somers noted that they are not sure what the appellants are looking for.

Mr. Lisberger related that they are looking for a project that complies with the code. The divergence has to do with developers who are trying to build as much as they can, and their legal counsel making as good arguments as able; but the code is the code and approval is approval. He noted that occasionally B&S makes mistakes. That is what they say is happening here: way too big, way too tall. If they can explain how they get around the way the height is measured, how they can exceed the maximum measured from the bottom of the pile, not the basement that’s not there.

Don noted that the last speaker addressed his question: Does Mr. Somers or Russo or Ms. Leitner have anything to overcome the assertions made in the four points tonight? Tony says we haven’t had a chance to come up with an answer. Don thinks that we are reviewing facts that are not denied yet. There is an architectural review committee that reviews the perception but has no power to eliminate the requirements of the code, being addressed by the appellants. We have had discussion but have not addressed anything contrary to the four points. We are wasting time to continue this discussion. Either we come to a conclusion that we support the appellant or defer. But we are not settling anything here tonight.

Ms. Leitner noted that the City has already outlined these issues in a 6-page document plus 30 pages of evidence to support, and these exact issues have been raised and the city has addressed all of them. She would be glad to send it. Mr. Lisberger noted that they have until the 28<sup>th</sup> of June to respond to their appeal. Mr. Russo noted that in the interest of us responding, he requests that Carl or Lara send the appeal to this committee. Stephanie suggested having a special meeting once we get the information.

Jamie request that if they come back, he is interested in the height matter, what was in the zoning manual about how you measure height, and that needs to be addressed specifically. He doesn't need to hear that B&S has issued a determination. The issue is whether they erred and made the right decision, even on the first round of appeal. He would like a focused discussion on the four points that were raised. It is an important issue because they are seeing a lot of situations where sloppy work is being done from DBS. It's not just honest mistakes. This is a case we need to look carefully, as it is emblematic of a larger problem. He'd like a focused discussion on the specific appeal points raised only.

Nickie finds it odd that the proponents doesn't have information tonight. Nickie **moved** that we do not approve the project as it stands and that we support the appeal. Cathy **seconded**. Jamie would not support this motion; he would continue this matter, noting that it is not ripe. Jason Spradlin and Bob support Jamie's position. Nickie amended motion to read that we continue the matter. Cathy **seconded**.

**Motion:** To continue the item and ask both parties to be prepared to have a focused discussion on the four appeal points raised by Mr. Lisberger. **11-0-0 passed**. Jamie noted that we will have a special meeting and will notify them all. Mr. Russo asked Mr. Lisberger to email the appeal ASAP.

*[Stella left with 11 committee members remaining.]*

#### **7. ZA-2020-7359-ZAA-ZAD 1826 Crisler Way 90046**

**Project Description:** PURSUANT TO LAMC 12.24 X.28 AND 12.28, A ZONING ADMINISTRATORS DETERMINATION / ZONING ADMINISTRATORS ADJUSTMENT FOR A NEW 1,660 SF SFD WITH AN ATTACHED 2-CAR GARAGE ON AN EXISTING VACANT LOT

**Applicant:** TAKESHI FURUKAWA

**Representative:** SIMON STOREY [simon@anonymousarchitects.com](mailto:simon@anonymousarchitects.com)  
<https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/search/encoded/MjQyNTU20>

Mr. Storey provided background information, details about the design and planning of the project. Some comments include that this is a new SFD home with two bedrooms; proposing off-street parking for two cars, two-car garage. The owner will be the occupier, a small family. They bought the land because they love the neighborhood and the views; he is not a developer. The house will be spread out over two main levels, a garage and a basement below. It is a challenging hillside. They chose to build the project into the hillside as much as possible. The idea of terracing the building down reduces the presence of the house. They like to think they're doing something modest. Terracing preserves the view lines and means that the only visible component of the house from the street will be the two-car garage. The height is only 14'6". They're trying to reduce earth work as much as possible in the sensitive neighborhood, limiting grading to hopefully no more than 60 cubic yards for the entire project, which translates to about six trucks worth of dirt removal. They also have a lot of built, so a lot of dirt will remain on site.

He discussed the building height max of 33' above the natural grade, using the envelope method. The height above the street is only 14'6". The site has been examined and tested by a licensed California geologist. As part of the ZAD, they've provided a lot of reports, including noise management and hydrology. The traffic management plan has been approved by DOT and other reports are with Planning for review. They are here because of the narrowness, street width is below 20 feet; requires two requests, one to waive improvements from the house to the boundaries of the hillside area, and the street in front of their house is currently at minimum of 13-1/2' and max of 19-1/2 feet and they are proposing to widen that to 20 feet across the entire frontage of their lot. That is currently being designed by a civil engineer and will be submitted to BOE and will be part of the ZAD; they are not requesting a waiver on that. Per the slope

band analysis, he noted that they only have about 1500 square feet RFA, and are requesting 10% on top of that, an extra 150 square feet for a total of 1660 square feet.

He shared his screen to show the view from the street. Max height 14-1/2 feet; proposed to do heavy planting which should hide the building. The rendering from the other direction shows building terracing and notching into the hillside. They are trying to have it blend through the environment with use of plants. The concept of the house is to be exposed to nature as much as possible so they have interior courtyards and planting on the terraces as well. They hope it will blend as much as possible using natural materials. For the exterior, any concrete will be left natural; no bright colors, e.g., no white.

Regarding staging, the street improvements will widen the street, showing on the screen, the 20 foot roadway will be along the boundary (pointing). After that 20' is widened there will be at least two additional parking spaces for the public at that location. He has tried parking there and noted that it is very tight so that will be a welcome addition. There will be two parking spaces offsite plus some guest parking in front; should be enough space for at least for two cars and street parking for at least two cars as well.

**Public Comment:**

**Aiden O'Brien:** He has lived here for 40 years and is President of the Kirkwood Bowl Foundation whose goal is to maintain quality of life. He noted that this is a community that has been wildly abused over the last 15 years and is deeply traumatized. His community is suspicious of development, is not against development but needs sensitivity. People need to understand the cumulative impacts to Kirkwood Bowl, e.g., the number of proposed projects, the water main breaks, the hillside collapses, the gas main breaks, etc. He noted that every time a project goes on, no matter how good the intentions are, massive damage is done and the City is utterly unable to control the developers and spend a fortune correcting the problems. He noted that there all kinds of other issues. As to request for additional 10% in allowable RFA, he noted that we cannot take more construction as there are already nine (9) applications of projects on Crisler Drive, none of which have yet been green lighted. There is a huge safety risk to Marmont Lane directly underneath that has to be addressed. He appreciates Simon's sensitivity to the neighborhood and noted that this is not happening for a very long time. He related that Grand View is the highest risk in LA, recalling the 1979 fire; plus, there is no parking and he cannot get fire insurance. The level of inconvenience to the neighborhood is appalling.

**Billy Brown:** He related that cosmetically the house does look nice but unfortunately the area the clients have chosen has become a battle of our existence and quality of life, and in conflict with the city, allowing building without doing their responsibility to maintain infrastructure. He referred to power outages, water main breaks, gas line ruptures. He mentioned the widening. He is adjacent to the site, and he thinks that would create more issues. With the views it is a magnet for riffraff, lookie loos, midnight drinking, etc. The reason why Kirkwood is a no parking at any time zone. That small section that he proposed only invites more trouble for the area that would certainly be abused mainly by people who don't live here. He mentioned emergency vehicles, that the area is a tinder box, that people still smoke in the street in violation of posted signs. He concluded that this specific area has many more challenges than proposal has addressed. An environmental impact should be mandatory, an MND should be mandatory, not to speak of abundance of wildlife under siege. He would need to see a lot more before he could give his support.

Nickie asked how many caissons would be necessary to support the structure as those streets are very fragile, and that Grandview is very narrow and old to Crisler Way, which is also a very dangerous street. She noted that the land we are talking about is a precipice with sheer drops off of very narrow streets.

Jamie Hall related as to 1) The ZAA for 10% increase of RFA: One of the findings, which is a high burden to demonstrate from code, is to show that strict adherence to the zoning regulations makes compliance impractical or infeasible. There is a paragraph justification. None explain why impractical or infeasible. Only says that the 10% allowing for an additional 150 square feet. He cannot support that entitlement because the finding cannot be made for that. He has always encouraged this board to look at the findings to see if justifiable. 2) Using CEQA Class 32 Urban Infill Exemption, not using Class 3, because this will be a fifth home. The biological report has completely ignored that the mountain lion is an endangered species, and is

defective on its face. This project site has value to endangered species, specifically the mountain lion. You'll see deer there. This site has value as threatened species. The tree report is out of date, done in 2020. Protected tree report has been amended, to add Toyon and Mexican elderberry. He noted that the cumulative impacts alone is another exception. You can't use class 32 exemption if you have cumulative projects. Re Construction, there are all sorts of construction vehicles in the VHFSZ where there was a big fire in 1979. He cannot support this project is defective and urges the committee to vote no.

Stephanie related that she has looked over the project. They had construction staging, which was helpful, but we like to look for construction parking for staging. Typically other applicants have presented remote locations, so information like that would be helpful.

2) Stephanie is glad that they are looking for getting a B permit to widen the road, since an A permit would not suffice. Widening the road is always a responsible thing to do when it needs it. But we would have confidence if we had more information on that road and what you are proposing. She sent them information on the other projects on Crisler, some of whom also want to improve the road. They look at where the water goes, which is critical to their project. They are down and any water coming down; water is collected from their roof, it is going down; there is no storm drain easement or anything behind the property. That's a question about the concentrated water and where it goes. That is something engineering looks at when looking at the road.

3) Stephanie noted that there is a lot of limitation; there may be requirements for retaining walls front yard setback and five foot front yard setback. She believes you cannot build anything in that dedication and asked or are you just going to widen and not dedicate? Elevations overall height appears to be 50 feet, highest to lowest point of the building, is of concern. Envelope of overall height. The retaining walls: Some in the front yard, some in the right of way, some are downslope that appear to be taller than allowed. May be an additional entitlement?

Simon noted, as to Nickie's comments, he sympathizes as well; this is challenging. Most of our work is in the hillside area often in very limited streets, and substandard. Number of piles: Mostly on 12 piles which will be at the very bottom, and a couple of additional rows on top, 12-18 piles total.

Jamie noted that they didn't produce the Biology report or any issues with that report. Simon noted that he can refer back to the consultant. They rely on advice of outside experts. He has no comment as to wildlife, e.g., mountain lions. The biology report will be reviewed by the city and he thinks it will go back to for updates. As to the tree report, they rely on the outside expertise of consultants, and are aware that Toyons and elderberry became protected very recently and he expects the city will require an update.

The houses on Crisler he finds not to be active at all; plans are old and possibly abandoned. He expects the road costs will be so high the developer may never go ahead with that. Jamie related that the City recirculated the MND in 2020; it is not a dead project. He'll look at that again. Their project fronts almost entirely onto Grandview and they consider themselves part of the Grandview street frontage. The title to the property has a Grandview address, which they are hoping to change to Grandview. He doesn't feel they belong with the bucket of projects on Crisler. They are just proposing SFD.

Simon responded to Nickie, noting that this is a 3-4 person household; how they choose to raise their children is their call. One of their solutions for a flat area for kids to play is to provide a lot of deck space.

RE Stephanie's question, dedication, setbacks, improvements, B-permit is still in process, they are doing their very best with the site plan to present the most likely scenario 80-90% accurately; will change as they go through Plan Check, Planning, BOE. Some of her questions will be answered over time.

RE retaining walls, he noted that they are in compliance with the Retaining Wall Ordinance. No RWs over 10 feet. The renderings are not produced by us, their purpose is purely for artistic idea of what we are designing. They don't have retaining walls over 3-1/2 feet at the front yard setback.

RE drainage, streets looping and water runoff, he is assuming that BOE and the civil engineer will provide a street profile that won't let water pile up, he'll raise this street profiling with the civil engineer, noting that the street work will be to fix any potential problems.

RE neighbor talking about people parking in that area, they could talk to BOE about going with 20-foot widening or posting no-parking signs, to keep that portion of Grandview completely free of any vehicles.

RE remote parking, it hasn't been included yet, but hillside traffic management plan will be worked on and he asked for our patience for that.

Maureen asked if there is a fire truck turn around on Crisler, and where is it and the fire hydrants? He believes FH is 130-140 feet down the street, north of them, and he doesn't have information on the fire truck turnaround.

Nickie asked for the diameter of caissons and piles and how deep to dig to secure them? About the driveway to the garage, what is the footage between the curve and the garage door? Simon related that he doesn't have the exact diameter of the piles, thinks 24-25-30ish feet. He noted that the geology here is very good. He doesn't have that information at this moment.

Nickie asked for the distance between the first part of the house on the hill and the street below, to which he noted that he doesn't have an exact number but thinks at least 500 feet to Woods Drive, the street below. She asked where would the staging be for this project? Simon acknowledged that it will be a challenge; however, they did submit a staging plan to create a level area at the top of the lot, as one of the first scopes of work as soon as level, to use the entire front yard flat ground to stage on. In addition, one of the first portions of the building that gets build will be the garage. Nickie brought up the fire hazard issue. Bob and Stephanie would have them return to bring more information. Simon noted that there is no hearing scheduled and that he would be more than happy to have a very concise list to respond to.

**Motion:** To continue the project and provide a list of the specific information; **moved** by Stephanie/Bob **11-0-0 passed.**

**8. An Update on the Ridgeline Ordinance.** See link below For "DRAFT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT NOT FOR REPRODUCTION OR DISTRIBUTION ORDINANCE NO. An ordinance amending Sections 12.03, 12.04, 12.32, and 13.21 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) in order to create a "RP" Ridgeline Protection supplemental use district that establishes regulations restricting the location and height of structures and grading requirements within proximity of identified ridgelines [https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/8f170d4b-d841-4ac5-bfbd-0eed656b326f/Ridgeline\\_Protection\\_Ordinance.pdf](https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/8f170d4b-d841-4ac5-bfbd-0eed656b326f/Ridgeline_Protection_Ordinance.pdf)

Don noted release of pilot program and that Planning is collecting questions from the public so they can have a formal public hearing in around June. A staff report will be sent to the Planning Commission. We don't know the progress of the SUD committee in charge of the boundaries and how it all works, and incorporating what we have asked for, modifications or improvements in the HCR. He credits Tony Tucci and CLAW that the wildlife corridor has been released and he hopes that each of these which are mutually independent will find their way into the public approval process. We won't know for a couple of weeks...

**9. An Update on the "Retreat in Benedict Canyon." The project is identified as 9712 Oak Pass Road.** <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/search/encoded/MjE5Njk10> Bob noted that this is currently in scoping as for EIR, and hasn't been a determination yet; it's moving along slowly until it gets out of scoping they won't know more. There haven't been any public hearings about it. A lot of us will have questions.

**Issues regarding the Mulholland Design Review Board Specific Plan.** See attachment  
Bob noted that it is a done deal. The Mayor has asked Vince Bertoni to eliminate the outer corridor of the MDRB. If they can do that they can get rid of every design review board in the city. He has spoken to Marian Dodge.

Jamie noted, as reported at the last board meeting, that the city has denied the appeals that were filed; it is a non-appealable decision and that triggered a 90-day statute of limitations challenging the decision. The Hillside Fed has authorized litigation. Nothing has been filed yet. But it's a blow, a severe disappointment, especially from elected decision makers and Vince Bertoni who represented himself as committed to environmental protection. Jamie noted that this is an information item. We can always ask the City Council to seek a reconsideration; adopt a resolution, telling the Planning Director to resolve that the interpretation is incorrect and move that Bertoni reconsider the action, if they want to do it. Our role is to encourage our elected decision makers to take the action he has described and engage in a pressure campaign. We need someone to pick up the charge and make that their mission. They can still appeal to the area Planning Commission. A lot of changes were made at the DRB level and improvements that occurred as a result of the public hearing process. The failing is that the staff doesn't have the ground-level information necessary to fully evaluate these projects. There is value in having public hearings.

Maureen wonders if this is the trend, e.g., SB9 and SB10 removing planning decisions with everything dictated by the state. It seems we are not going to have PLU meetings. Stephanie/Jamie noted threshold exempt from the public hearing requirement if you can't be seen. Cathy questions how the Mayor can appoint somebody who is not elected to determine our future in our housing. She isn't sure how this is legal and if there is not something within the charter that says that this isn't legal. We are being screwed and it's as though we are giving up. There must be something in the charter that says the citizens have some right in this. Until people start to stand up for LA, it will be destroyed. Don related that our charge is to advise our councilman, create a letter describing what we'd like to have done for direction.

**10. Updates by PLUC Members on Pending Projects:** None

- a) New Packages Received
- b) Certified Neighborhood Council (CNC) Reporting Review of New Projects Submitted
- c) Upcoming Hearings
- d) Determination Letters Received
- e) Pending Haul Routes (Update by any PLU Committee members)
- f) Proactive Tracking, Tasks & Projects

**11. Adjournment:** Moved by Cathy/Maureen; adjourned at 7:15pm.

Next PLU Meeting: Tuesday 06/08/2021 @ 5:00pm

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 ADJUSTMENT
EAF – ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSEMENT FORM	ZAD – ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S DETERMINATION
ENV – ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE	ZV – ZONING VARIANCE
MND – MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION	