



Catherine Palmer &lt;council@babnc.org&gt;

---

**Fwd: BABCNC PLU and the Bel Air Glen Gating Proposal**

---

**Travis Longcore** <tlongcore@babnc.org>  
To: plu@babnc.org

Tue, Aug 9, 2022 at 4:48 PM

Please see attached comment for the meeting upcoming in a few minutes.

This will be posted to the website after the meeting.

**Travis Longcore, Ph.D. | President****Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council | City of Los Angeles**📞 (310) 247-9719 🌐 [babnc.org](http://babnc.org) ✉ [tlongcore@babnc.org](mailto:tlongcore@babnc.org)[Join our mailing list](#)

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "David E. Van Iderstine" <[davidvaniderstine@sbcglobal.net](mailto:davidvaniderstine@sbcglobal.net)>  
**Subject:** BABCNC PLU and the Bel Air Glen Gating Proposal  
**Date:** August 9, 2022 at 4:43:39 PM PDT  
**To:** Travis Longcore <[tlongcore@babnc.org](mailto:tlongcore@babnc.org)>, Robin Greenberg <[robin@robingreenberg.com](mailto:robin@robingreenberg.com)>

Good afternoon.

I hope to be able to attend this afternoon's meeting, but wanted to commit my opposition to the Bel Air Glen "settlement" proposal to writing in case I am not able to, and in order that it may become part of the record.

The Bel Air Glen (BAG) board's last-minute "settlement" proposal is inadequate and should be rejected by the Planning & Land Use (PLU) Committee, which should proceed to submit its report to the full BABCNC recommending a vote of disapproval on the BAG board's proposal to privatize Nicada and Woodwardia and then install gates.

To summarize the proposal: BAG will ask the city for permission to install two no-right-turns-during-rush-hour signs, one at Briarwood and northbound Beverly Glen, the other at Nicada and northbound Beverly Glen. If the city fails to approve the request and issue implementing permits within six months, BAG gets to proceed with its gating application, at which point the BABCNC is required to support gating and all further opposition from neighboring Bel Air Ridge (BAR) "or others" must cease.

If the no-turn signs are installed, BAG will undertake a one-week cut-through traffic study. If **any** cut-through traffic is noted in this study that BAG will commission, BAG gets to proceed with gating, which BABCNC is then required to support, and opposition from BAR "or others" must cease.

Even while all this is going on, BAG is permitted to continue to pursue its privatization and gating application.

This is an unworkable proposal and does not constitute a good-faith effort to resolve this dispute.

I offer the following points:

1. There is no evidence that the City will approve and issue permits for these signs within a mere six months. No authority is cited that the City has any time limitation on its obligation to act on such proposals. Hence, BAG wins.
2. Even if the signs are installed, there is no evidence they will end 100 percent of cut-through traffic. Because 100 percent effectiveness is the bar BAG says the signs would have to clear for them to abandon gating, BAG wins.
3. Why the signs cannot and will not be 100 percent effective: Apart from illegitimate, "stranger" cut-through traffic disregarding the signs, other "innocent" vehicles would be observed to enter and exit within the arbitrary 15-minute time limit BAG purports to set and will be counted as cut-through. These would include delivery vehicles, school and work carpools and simple wrong-way traffic. These would include residents stopping off at home to pick up a spouse or child to go straight to dinner or a movie. There is no mechanism provided -- and indeed, none can be in a free society -- for verification of the identity and purpose of vehicles transiting through these communities. They will be counted as cut-through traffic and, again, BAG wins.
4. Who watches the watchers? BAG's desired result in its proposed traffic study is obvious: there must be cut-through traffic so they can have their gates. But who will monitor those conducting the study to assure its integrity?
5. Not a substantive point, but the breathtaking arrogance of the BAG board to presume to assert what BABCNC, BAR, dissenting BAG residents and others in the neighborhood must do -- submit and be silent -- if unreasonable conditions BAG has arbitrarily put forth is nothing short of astonishing.

In sum, please reject the BAG board's "Proposed Modification." The PLU should proceed to submit its negative report. This street privatization and gating proposal should be stopped, once and for all.

David E. Van Iderstine