



Catherine Palmer <council@babcnc.org>

Re: OPPOSITION TO BEL AIR GLEN PROPOSED GATING (Project: VAC-E1401394)

Travis Longcore <tlongcore@babcnc.org>

Fri, Dec 10, 2021 at 10:09 PM

To: Anne Staudhammer <anne.staudhammer@gmail.com>

Cc: Robert Schlesinger <rschlesinger@babcnc.org>, paul.koretz@lacity.org, Jarrett Thompson <jarrett.thompson@lacity.org>, joan.pelico@lacity.org, plu@babcnc.org, BABCNC Board <board@babcnc.org>

Dear Ms. Staudhammer,

BABCNC is in receipt of your email and will consider it as it advises the City on this proposal.

Sincerely,
Travis Longcore



Travis Longcore, Ph.D. | President

Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council

📞 (310) 247-9719 🌐 babcnc.org ✉️ tlongcore@babcnc.org

[Agendas and Minutes](#)

On Dec 10, 2021, at 8:10 AM, Anne Staudhammer
<anne.staudhammer@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council President Longcore:

I understand that the Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council will be considering Bel Air Glen's proposed vacation and gating project. I write

in strong opposition to the proposal, which will negatively affect virtually all residents on and north of Briarwood Drive and west and east of Beverly Glen in Los Angeles 90077, as well as all residents of Beverly Glen and those who use it as a thoroughfare. I am a homeowner in the Bel Air Ridge (BAR) community who will be adversely impacted by this proposed gating.

I live in BAR on the west side of Beverly Glen, a stakeholder group that Bel Air Glen (BAG) does not seem to recognize. BAG's plan will adversely affect us on the west side for a number of reasons:

As a member of the BAR HOA, I have an ownership interest in BAR common areas east of Beverly Glen. The proposed vacation will impede my access to my property. Moreover, the gating will limit my access to the BAR facilities located on the east side of Beverly Glen, including our fitness center, pool and tennis courts, and also will influence my access to BAR neighbors and friends who live on the east side of Beverly Glen. Currently we have multiple access points to these areas, but under the current plan we would be limited to access through Briarwood. This will mean a longer route (in time and distance) for me to reach the BAR facilities and neighborhood friends from my home and will add a potentially dangerous left turn on Briarwood to my travel.

And even if we on the west side were given electronic access to BAG's gates, we would have to pass through multiple of them to get our facilities and the rest of our community. This would not only cause inconvenience but disrupt BAR as a community.

There is no doubt in my mind that BAG's plan will negatively impact traffic both on Beverly Glen and on the west side of BAR. Despite BAG's claims, it seems inconceivable that cars having to pass through a gate at the corner of Beverly Glen and Angelo Drive would not cause additional back up on Beverly Glen, particularly during rush hour, which already presents very serious and aggravating commute problem for us. Cars trying to enter who do not have passes (tradespeople, Amazon and delivery drivers, workers, friends and relatives) will cause even more backup, both at the main gate proposed at Nicada and Woodwardia as well as at Angelo, as the backup is likely to even be worse if gates are not staffed, which I understand is the plan. And what happens when inevitable equipment malfunctions occur at unmanned stations?

Inevitable additional back up on Beverly Glen.

These back-ups on Beverly Glen, of course, affect not only BAR and BAG but all Beverly Glen residents, as well as those in other parts of the city who travel via Beverly Glen. Drivers seeking to avoid backups on Beverly Glen are likely to try our neighboring canyons, causing additional traffic and inconvenience to our neighbors in Bel Air Hills and Benedict Canyon.

In addition to negatively impacting and causing additional back up on Beverly Glen, I also have no doubt that BAG's plan will push more rush hour traffic onto Nicada to Mulholland (and often Nicada through Bottlebrush to Nicada) thru-way. This too is already a traffic nightmare

during the afternoon-evening rush hour. I appreciate BAG's concern for traffic and safety, but their solution will come at the expense of additional traffic and safety concerns for BAR's and other families on the west side of Beverly Glen.

I also am concerned that BAG's proposal has proceeded this far because of inaccuracies and omissions in its application that otherwise would have raised red flags. Section II of BAG's Environmental Assessment Form contains a number of incorrect answers:

Question #3: "Could the project result in annoyance to community residents." BAG responded "no," but the answer clearly, "yes." Not only BAR residents have expressed their concerns, but some in BAG as well.

Question #6: "Could the project cause increased traffic congestion through a residential neighborhood, or cause increased street parking or loading? Could the project cause increased congestion in the use of other facilities ...?" The answer given was "no," but should be "yes." I've addressed the traffic congestion problem in part above. It is also the case that BAG's plan will cause excess traffic for BAR's Angelo and Briarwood properties. This will occur because under BAG's plan, non-East BAR residents and service providers will only be able to enter BAR through Briarwood. Moreover, when drivers looking for a throughway are stopped at the south Angelo gate, they would be forced to make a U turn on a narrow residential street and return to Beverly Glen, effectively doubling the amount of excess traffic on the south portion of Angelo and Briarwood through BAR.

Question #8: "Could existing ambient noise levels be increased by the project." Again, the answer given was "no," but should be "yes."

Conceding that BAG residents will quickly pass through the gates with electronic access, those without such access will need to queue at the gate, waiting for it to be opened. This would include traditionally noisy delivery vehicles (Amazon, UPS, FedEx, USPS, etc.), household employees, construction vehicles, etc., all of which make significant noise and have tailpipe emissions.

Question #11: "Could the project change or affect the continued use or enjoyment of a natural, ecological, recreational or scenic area or resource?" BAG responded "no," but the answer should really be "yes."

The northernmost two proposed gates are in the outer corridor of the "Mulholland Scenic Parkway." Prohibiting public access to existing city sidewalks in the Mulholland Scenic Parkway should not be allowed.

Question #26: "Could the project generate a controversy or result in public objections?" As with Question #3 above, the answer given was "no," but certainly you've heard outcry and objections from many of us. The answer is clearly "yes."

I sympathize with BAG's efforts to decrease traffic through its neighborhood, but I object to the plan because it will increase traffic and congestion for BAR and negatively impact our 377-home community. Other adjacent neighbors also will be affected. We are all stakeholders in the decision on this matter.

I urge the Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council to consider the impact on stakeholders and to oppose the proposed vacation.

Sincerely,

Anne Staudhammer
[2745 Bottlebrush Drive](#)
[Los Angeles, CA 90077](#)

Cc: BABCNC Planning and Land Use Chair Robert Schlesinger
Council Member Paul Koretz
Field Representative Jarrett Thompson
Chief of Staff Joan Pelico