

Attachment "A"



**Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
Planning & Land Use Committee Meeting (Virtual)
 Tuesday March 8, 2022 5:00 P.M.**

Draft Minutes for Committee Approval

Name	P	A	Name	P	A
Robert Schlesinger, PLU Chair	X		Stephanie Savage, PLU Vice Chair	X	
Robin Greenberg	X		Nickie Miner	X	
Don Loze	X		Jamie Hall	X	
Shawn Bayliss		X	Jason Spradlin	X	
André Stojka	X		Ellen Evans	X	
Cathy Wayne	X		Wendy Morris	X	
Maureen Levinson	X		Leslie Weisberg	X	
Stella Grey	X		Travis Longcore, BABCNC President	X	

Chair Schlesinger to order at 5:08pm after the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag had been recited, and Vice Chair Savage called the roll with 14 present; Member Levinson arrived shortly thereafter for a total of 15 present.

1. Approval of the March 8, 2022 Agenda was moved by Stojka, seconded, and approved by unanimous consent.
2. Approval of Minutes February 8, 2022 Minutes (Attachment A) was moved by Savage, seconded, and approved by all but Member Morris, who abstained.
3. There was no general public comment on items not on the adopted agenda.
4. **Chair Reports** – Chair Robert Schlesinger had no report. Vice Chair Stephanie Savage reported that we are revising what we send out to representatives, consolidating it into a form with a check list.

Items Scheduled for Discussion & Possible Action:

5. **DIR-2021-9298-DRB-SPP-MSP, 5 Beverly Ridge Terrace**
Project Description: 10330 square foot addition to (E) SFD, including landscaping, planting, new retaining wall & driveway; grading of 3040 CY cut, 2732 CY fill; 308 CY export.
Applicant: Carmen Unanue
Representatives: Permits Unlimited permitsunlimited@gmail.com
 Marc Welch [Welch Design Studio] marc@welchdesignstudio.com
Attachment – See Link: <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/search/encoded/MjUyMzQz0>

Mr. Marc Welch was welcomed to present the project. The owners Jose Guggenheim and his wife, Mimi Unanue were also present. Mr. Guggenheim introduced the project, which is on a three-acre property, with existing residence of 10,774 square feet (maximum allowable build of 33,769), proposing addition to the existing house of 10,330 square feet for a total residence and proposed addition of 21,104 feet, far below 33,769. He reports that they have presented this to Bel Air Ridge HOA and have their approval. He noted that they opted to build below-ground rather than next to the existing house, wanting the least visual impact to the existing house, which was possible because of the topography.

Mr. Guggenheim continued that the proposed addition includes a second retaining wall which is allowed and code compliant which will be used to fill behind the wall using the dirt from the excavation of the addition. There will be no haul route. He discussed the dual purpose of the retaining wall: 1) to protect the property from further erosion, having a report from GeoSoils, which noted erosion of the property..., and 2) because they have joined Franklin Canyon with no structures between them and the canyon so fires can come straight up to their house.

Mr. Marc Welch shared renderings on screen, and answered questions as to protected trees, wildlife and fencing, Mr. Welch noted that they have submitted to the MDRB, as they are in the outer Mulholland corridor. Member Hall explained that though the Planning Department has eliminated the public hearing requirement for the outer corridor, it would be beneficial for them to request and have a hearing for the MDRB. They have looked into solar panels, however, have no specific area for the solar panels. As to height, they noted that everything added is below-ground level. They are getting tanks to catch rain water to water the lawn. The route for construction vehicles was discussed.

Motion to approve this project was moved by Miner and seconded. **Amendment** was moved by Member Hall that any new fencing be wildlife permeable and that the applicant request a public hearing before the Mulholland Design Review Board and seconded. Member Miner accepted the amendment, which was seconded, and the motion was approved as amended by 13 yeses, 0 noes and two abstentions from Members Morris and Longcore.

6. **ZA-2020-6626 ZAD, ENV-2020-6627-CE 9839 [9837] Easton Drive 90210**

Project Description: Demolish (E) SFD and construct a 7,257 SF SFD with attached garage and remodel existing garage. Request relief from public improvements for sub-standard hillside street and CPR (per LAMC Section 12.21C10(i)(3) and LAMC Section 12.24X28)

Applicant: William Driscoll, Jr. wnd2@aol.com

Representatives: Vladimir Elmanovich [VEA-Architects] vladimir@vea-architects.com

Ken Sampson [bdsconstruction] info@bdsconstruct.com

Attachment – See Link: planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/search/encoded/MjQxNzcy0

Mr. Vladimir Elmanovich, architect of the project, introduced himself, along with Mr. Sergey Lipsky, Project Manager, and noted that the applicant, Mr. William Driscoll, was overseas and was not able to join us due to not able to get a connection. Mr. Driscoll's name did appear on the Zoom call but was unable to be promoted to Panelist and was unable to communicate with the committee due to technical issues on his end. Mr. Ken Sampson was also present.

Mr. Elmanovich screen-shared the presentation regarding the lot at 9837 Easton Drive, about 10 homes east of Benedict Canyon, and on the north side of Easton. The property is approximately 26,000 feet, currently has existing garage and an existing residence built on the slope beyond the garage. He noted that the goal is to be able to build a new residence on the lot. He provided images of the proposed design. They would keep the existing garage on the lower right hand corner and the new residence would be built around it. The rendering was minus some of the trees to show the building. He then showed an image from the arborist, of where trees are located on the property.

Questions were asked and answered regarding the trees on the property, which will and will not be removed. Mr. Elmanovich noted that their arborist put together a plan showing all the trees that are in the tree replacement plan. He will send the tree report and full biology report. As to fencing, Mr. Elmanovich noted that they have received approval for grading soils report, and were required to put in a debris fence. As to soil removal, Mr. Elmanovich reported that there will be 880 CY of export, total cut of 1208 yards and 531 fill. The only entitlement requested is with regards to the continuous paved roadway requirement. They'll improve in front of their property.

Asked if he interacted with neighbors on Easton Drive, Mr. Sampson noted that he did not but the owner did and that they are in the process of working on the letters to the neighbors. He noted that the immediate neighbors are aware of the project; they are trying to create a neighborhood process and community outreach. They did not need a haul route and will do solar on the roof. As to fencing, he noted that there is not fencing at the rear other than mandated; it is more of a mud fence to hold everything in place in the heavy rain. There will be fencing on the left and right sides. He noted that at the front of the street, the house setback, 100-120 feet of frontage, but they have 15-minimum to as much as a 20-foot setback for parking and are trying to work on having numerous trucks in place. He would be happy to have a golf cart for parking on Benedict if they have to. The existing garage can be used as storage until the end.

Vice Chair Savage noted that she had a list of 11 things for the representatives as we don't have enough information on many topics. She offered a critical note, that when you have an existing home and remove the existing home, the accessory building no longer has nonconforming rights; it must be removed. Once you remove that existing home, the garage is out. It is in a nonconforming location, also in the dedication space for BOE's required review. She noted that looking at their landscape plan, BOE requires 10' of dedication from property line; all their structure: the driveway, the stairs to the house, nonconforming existing garage; none of this is conforming to the codes. She noted that there is more to ask for, more than that the road is quite substandard; and there are also the telephone poles, not addressed on any drawing. She noted that we need more information, and she would be happy to continue this.

As to parking, given that it is substandard hillside street, Member Grey would include in recommendation that the applicant provide off-street parking and shuttle workers to the project site, and out of respect to neighbors, that they rent a parking lot and shuttle workers, which he noted.

Member Longcore noted that the findings to be made have to address the compatibility with the neighborhood in order to develop on a substandard street, and that this structure is out of character with the street as a whole. He noted that it is quite an aggressive structure for this context, which raises the question of whether you allow the rules to be bent in order to develop on this substandard street. He'd argue that the public benefit or compatibility with the neighborhood isn't there to make that finding at this size and impact.

Member Longcore noted that this is an area with California Walnut and Coast Live Oak co-occurring naturally together; and though the trees planted by the owner are excluded from the tree protection ordinance, they are not excluded from having an environmental assessment as to whether or not this is a sensitive natural community, because they would be losing a habitat area by developing this much footprint that needs to be mitigated in an area not in tree planting... He saw what is on their plan to make up for the tree that will be cut down. Member Longcore noted that for a habitat area, they want to mitigate an area, like recording an easement over the back half of the property to make sure it is maintained as open space in perpetuity. He thinks you cannot make the CEQA findings that this is exempt, citing the presence of rare species, e.g., the California Walnut, and that should be recognized as a significant impact which means he shouldn't be able to exempt this from CEQA review as a single family home.

Member Longcore noted that the third issue is that they have a series of glass bannisters and a lot of glass on the structure that is going to kill birds, especially where using the bannisters instead of something else at the edge of the balcony, as birds try to fly through that and it kills them. He asked, from a design perspective, that they educate themselves about more friendly ways to achieve architectural goals without auxiliary impacts in a sensitive wildlife habitat in the hills. These should be addressed before making finding that this would be worthy of variance or determination that you can build on a substandard street.

Further questions were asked and answered, including but not limited to the open deck and its lighting, as well as sound reverberating through the canyons while entertaining. He was told that the deck is the lower part, and there is no kitchen but there is a pool and a spa. It is the backyard of the residence. They will add the proper lighting.

It was noted that this is two or three times larger than some of the houses on Easton and BCA hasn't yet reviewed the project. Committee members expressed concern about getting trucks up there for construction, on a blind curve on Easton and if they have communicated with the neighbors. Mr. Elmanovich claimed that the size of the home is not unique in that the house on the corner of Easton and Benedict is substantially larger.

Mr. Sampson noted that they didn't ask for any variance, and believes the neighbors would prefer to have one house rather than two. Vice Chair Savage agreed but noted that there are so many things we cannot go over tonight. She would be providing a list for the representatives to return an answer, and requested that the representatives reach out to the neighbors and BCA.

Motion to continue the project to next month and if they do not return at the later date we will write a letter to the ZA, and we will give them a complete list with code sections to cite to be of help to him was moved by Savage and seconded. Mr. Elmanovich noted that there is no date set for the hearing yet. The motion to postpone to next month passed by 14 yeases, 0 noes and one abstention from Member Hall.

7. **Update regarding ZA-2020-2307-ZAD - 8560 Ridpath:** Continued to March, now terminated by DCP we still provide them information but they may or may not come back.
8. **Update from Task Force - Members - Schlesinger, Spradlin, Miner, Greenberg and Stojka Regarding 2830 Woodwardia Drive PS-1435-MSP ENV-2020-2854-CE** (January 2022 Agenda)
Project Description: Proposed vacation of public portions of Nicada, Woodwardia and Angelo Drive into private-only access along with improvements, entry/exit improvements.

Member Greenberg noted that Member Stojka is not on this task force. They've had several meetings and will get together again at least one more time with BAG. They'll ask BAR if they can come back. The task force has gotten BAR & BAG together who were talking peacefully. The committee's goal was to get everybody together to talk and discuss concerns and let them tell us how they think. It is progressing. Member Spradlin noted that there will be two or three more meetings, the task force will write a report and send it to the board. There was no public comment.

9. **Discussion & Possible Motion** to propose a task force between the PLU Committee and the Environmental Ad Hoc Committee to provide targets to achieve zero-carbon building and include a review of recent construction projects and their Title-24 requirements. Vice Chair Savage noted that this is a group effort, outreach with City Council. She would like to develop a task force to make building less dependent on fossil fuels. Subjects that the committee would address would include the two council files below. See Attachments below for Council File #22-0151 & Council File #21-1463
There were no volunteers and no action was taken on these this evening.

a) Council File# 22-0151 “Residential and Commercial Building Construction / Zero-Carbon Emissions / Climate Equity LA Series / Building Decarbonization” *Not discussed and no action was taken*

https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2022/22-0151_misc_2-9-22.pdf

<https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=22-0151>

b) Council File # 21-1463 “Community Assemblies / Climate Emergency Mobilization Office / Building Decarbonization / L.A.s Green New Deal” *Not discussed and no action was taken*

Motion: https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2021/21-1463_misc_12-8-21.pdf

Council File: <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=21-1463>

10. Motion to adjourn was moved by Wayne, seconded and meeting adjourned at 6:34pm, to **return on April 12, 2022.**

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 ADMINSTRATOR

ZAA – ZONING ADMINISTRATOR’S ADJUSTMENT

ZAD – ZONING ADMINISTRATOR’S DETERMINATION

ZV – ZONING VARIANCE

www.babcnc.org

info@babenc.org