

Attachment "B"



Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council Regular Monthly Board Meeting (Virtual) Wednesday July 27, 2022, 7:00 P.M. **Draft Minutes**

NAME	BOARD SEAT	Present	Absent
Barondes, Asher	At-Large Youth Rep (2023)	X	
Bayliss, Shawn	Commercial or Office Enterprise Districts (2023)		X
Cobb, Bradford	North of Sunset District (2023)	X	
Evans, Ellen	Community Interest At-Large (2023)		X
Garfield, DDS, Robert	Casiano Estates Association (arr. 7:31 pm)	X	
Goodman, MD, Mark	Bel-Air District (2023)		X
Hall, Jamie	Laurel Canyon Association	X	
Holmes, Kristie	Public Educational Institutions (2023)		X
Kadin, David Scott	Benedict Canyon Association	X	
Greenberg, Robin	Faith-Based Institutions (2023) (06-22-2022)	X	
Kwan, Robert (Bobby)	Laurel Canyon Association		X
Levotman, Vadim	Doheny-Sunset Plaza Neighborhood Assn.	X	
Longcore, Travis	Custodian of Open Space (2023)	X	
Loze, Donald	Benedict Canyon Association	X	
Mann, Mindy Rothstein	At-Large Traditional Stakeholder (2023)	X	
Miner, Nickie	Benedict Canyon Association	X	
Grey, Stella (Alt)	North of Sunset District (2023)	X	
Paden, Andrew	Bel Air Hills Association (arr. 7:24 pm)	X	
Palmer, Dan	Residents of Beverly Glen	X	
Prothro, Steven	Private K-6 Schools (2023)	X	
Ringler, Robert	Residents of Beverly Glen (left 7:50 pm)	X	
Sandler, Irene	Bel Air Crest Master Association	X	
Savage, Stephanie	Laurel Canyon Association	X	
Schlesinger, Robert	Benedict Canyon Association	X	
Spradlin, Jason	Holmby Hills HOA		X
Levinson, Maureen (Alt)	At-Large Traditional Stakeholder (2023)	X	
Steele, Tim	Bel Air Glen District (2023)	X	
Stojka, André	Bel Air Ridge HOA	X	
Tanner, Blair	Bel-Air Association		X
Templeton, Patricia	Bel Air Hills Association (left 7:20 pm)	X	
Wayne, Cathy	Laurel Canyon Association	X	
Weinberg, Steven	Franklin-Coldwater District (2023)	X	
Wimbish, Jon	Private 7-12 Schools (2023)		X
Total:		25 / 23	8

President Longcore called the meeting to order at 7:03 P.M., led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, and called roll, with quorum met. Two members left by 7:50 P.M., with 23 members present.

1. The agenda was approved as moved by Secretary Miner.
2. A motion to approve the May 25 & June 22 Minutes (Attachments A & B) was approved as moved by Wayne, with 3 abstentions from Members Mann, Levinson & Templeton.
3. There was no comment from the public on topics not on the adopted agenda.
4. **Comments of Representatives of Elected Officials & City Agencies**
Vishesh Anand, West Area Representative for Mayor Garcetti, was not present.

Mehmet Berker, Council District 4 Representative gave update that 1) he and Mashael Majid are going over comments on the Wildlife Ordinance; 2) resurfacing is planned for streets between Sunset Plaza, Rising Glen and Doheny Drive among others; 3) a northbound left-turn arrow at Kirkwood and Laurel Canyon is going in Friday, and 4) they have two more months for their Project Room Key site for folks 60 and over, who, without that extension would be out on the street tomorrow.

5) Mehmet noted that he has received comments on the “sidewalk repair program” for tree removals from 1508 to 1532 Crescent Heights, result of “access requests” made by members of the mobility/disability community for accessibility in our public right of way. Of six Ficus trees, five will definitely *not* be retained and the 6th tree at the gas station, on private property, has a potential “meandering” solution; however, though Urban Forestry had a few meetings with Chevron reps, they haven’t allowed for that. Mehmet would like to follow-up with Chevron. Mehmet noted that there had been trees slated for removal on Cherokee that were then not removed. The Chief Forester explained to some folks in emails that they’ve gone through a variety of options which were not feasible and they’ve had three site visits between them and the BOE but there is nowhere to go out. Lanes on Crescent Heights are narrow with nowhere to go on the other side because the parkways are narrow, 2’ maybe, but Cherokee 4’ or wider with nowhere to meander onto private properties. Other options were not feasible. He noted that it is a really sad and unfortunate. They are getting 2:1. A recent posting mentioned tree species. They are hoping to get some planted on Selma which has wide parkways and no trees. All six tree wells would get replacement trees but not Ficuses.

Questions were asked and answered. Member Cobb was advocating for these Ficus trees and thanking Mehmet for his efforts. Cobb noted that we understand the problem of the five trees next to homes with completely busted sidewalks, but he finds it unacceptable to allow the gas station owner to say you can’t meander into the property and believes that there has to be a way around that for the 6th tree. He noted that replacing 2:1 is wonderful but the trees may not be at North Crescent Heights. He suggested that the median mentioned as a place to perhaps do landscaping, could have proper landscaping at the entrance to Laurel Canyon with a proper beautification effort that could provide some shade if done properly. Cobb asked who is in charge of that. Mehmet noted that he needs to connect with the District Engineer to talk about sight-lines on Crescent Heights to see if they want more trees on the medians and if they say okay, there is a question of getting something in. He acknowledged Cobb’s point about landscaping, and noted that the easiest way would be looking at the Adopt-a-Median program, one entity working with Office of Community Beautification which runs that program, to propose a landscaping plan and sign an MOU for maintenance.

[Patricia Templeton left at approximately 7:20 pm.]

Mehmet noted that the easiest way would be to have a member of the mobility/disability community or someone representing them by proxy submit a request through the sidewalk repair program: www.safesidewalks.lacity.org which can also be done under 311. The second way would be for CD4 to look for funding with Bureau of Street Services (BSS).

Jamie Hall expressed appreciation of the left-turn signal at Kirkwood & Laurel Canyon, and pointed need for upgrading the very unsafe crosswalk at that intersection. Hall doesn't know how to keep those trees on Crescent Heights and fix sidewalks unless you get rid of the sidewalks, one of which goes around an unused parking lot. Mehmet noted the problem is the need for access. Hall asked about the replacement species planned, to which Mehmet noted Ginkos and Coast Live Oaks, the latter mostly for Selma. Mehmet noted that we can give comment at the Board hearing when it is set.

Jarrett Thompson, Council District 5 Representative: President Longcore related that Jarrett had a death in the family and had apologized that he couldn't make it tonight.

Rachel Sherrell, Supervisor Kuehl's Representative was not present; however, her written report is posted on our website, under Supporting Documents for this evening's meeting.

Janet Turner, Congressman Lieu's Representative was not present.

Octaviano Rios from DONE thanked us for our many thoughtful responses to the survey on in-person meeting readiness. His updates included:

- (1) There will be **two sessions to train NCs on the Digital Communications Policy** which takes effect October 4th. We have a choice of two: tomorrow July 28th or August 31st 6:30-8:00pm. The link will be sent; it can also be found in the Monthly Profile and in a separate email that will be sent.
- (2) **DONE's webpage with recorded trainings** <https://empowerla.org/workshops-trainings/> on on-boarding for new board members, on the Brown Act & NCs, on CISs, and on hosting candidate workshops. He would encourage stakeholders especially those planning on running for the Board for a better perspective on the roles and responsibilities of Board members.
- (3) **Saturday Sept. 24th Congress of Neighborhoods.** <https://www.neighborhoodcongress.la/> for information & registration on workshops.
- (4) Funding workshops for financial officers August 9th 2-4pm.

Reports of Officers

5. President – Travis Longcore

- (1) Return to in-person/hybrid meetings in 2024: President Longcore asked Octaviano if he knew the earliest date for in-person or hybrid meetings, to which Octaviano noted he did not, there is still a lot of readiness that needs to take place. President Longcore noted that we have gotten so much more engagement on Zoom and that he hopes the State will allow us to maintain some of this flexibility.
- (2) Longcore asked Board members to send headshots & bios for the website, if not done.

[Dr. Robert Garfield arrived at 7:31pm.]

- 6. Vice President – Operations,** Robin Greenberg, reported on upcoming meetings. President Longcore noted that we have yet to decide if we will have a PLU meeting in August, as we have no projects.
- 7. Vice President – Legislative Affairs,** Jamie Hall, noted we've been focused on drafting comments on the Wildlife Ordinance. He is proud of the work we all did thus far, though it is not done yet.
- 8. Secretary –** Nickie Miner requested that the NC take up the cause of the Monarch butterfly; otherwise had no report.
- 9. Treasurer** Vadim Levotman reported that we are at the start of the new Fiscal Year, and he will inform us when the rollover funds are moved into our account.

Motion to approve the June 2022 Monthly Expenditure Report (MER) (Attachment C) **passed** by 22 yeses, 0 noes, 1 abstention from Grey, 1 ineligible by Barondes, as moved by Levotman.

10. Reauthorization of Neighborhood Purposes Grant

Motion to approve a Neighborhood Purpose Grant in the amount of \$2,300 to fund partial CAD design permit fees (drawings) for proposed traffic calming measures on Beverly Glen, submitted by the Les River Memorial Center, with primary contact, Beverly Glen Stakeholder, Graham Green (**Attachment D**) **passed** by 22 yeases, 0 noes, 1 abstention from Grey, and 1 ineligible by Barondes, as **moved** by Levotman. Treasurer Levotman noted that the NC approved this grant during the last FY but it was not processed and needed to be reauthorized in the current FY to process.

Reports of Standing Committees

Planning & Land Use
Robert Schlesinger, Chair

11. Report of the Planning & Land Use Committee

12. ENV-2022-1536-EAF 1423 Oriole Drive 90069

Project Description: Haul route for export of 2100 CY to connect Accessory structure to SFD (per LAMC)

Applicant: Yosef Simsoly [1423 Oriole LLC]

Representatives: Alexander VanGalen [Crest Real Estate]

<https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/search/encoded/MjU1NjIx0>

Chair Schlesinger brought a motion from the PLU Committee. The applicant's rep was present.

PLU Motion to **approve** the haul route and include an acknowledgement in the letter that the haul route may need to be expanded because of stockpiling limitations, to connect a garage to a house, **passed** by unanimous consent of all 24 present and voting, as **moved** by Schlesinger and Committee.

13. ZA-2022-898-F 1635 Ferrari Drive 90210

Project Description: A Zoning Administrators Adjustment to allow for a 5' high aluminum fencing in front of the home with 5' high driveway gate (relief Per LAMC 12.22 C 20(f)).

Applicant: Paul Wylie [Wystein Opportunity Fund LLC]

Representatives: Cindy Hampton [Wystein Opportunity Fund LLC]

<https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/search/encoded/MjU0OTYx0>

Chair Schlesinger brought a motion from the PLU Committee. There were no representatives present.

PLU Motion to **approve** the project as designed with the 5' high fence and gate, **passed** by unanimous consent of all 24 present and voting, as **moved** by Schlesinger and Committee.

14. ZA-2022-760-ZAA, 1150 La Collina Drive 90069

Project Description: A Zoning Administrators Adjustment to allow the addition of two concrete pilasters and wrought iron gate and fence above 8' in height (relief Per LAMC 12.21 C.1(g)).

Applicant: Ronald Haft

Representatives: Cason Hall [Kimberlina Whettam and Associates] cason@kwhettam.com

<https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/search/encoded/MjU0ODE20>

Chair Schlesinger brought a motion from the PLU Committee.

PLU Motion to **object** to the application on the grounds it failed to meet the findings (*particularly finding #2*) that is a burden to public health and safety to the community.

President Longcore noted that we will have a short presentation, public hearing and return to the board. Ms. Whettam was accompanied by Ms. Cason Hall, Mr. Haft and his attorney. Ms. Whettam thanked everyone for their time, the PLUM Committee and neighbors, and requested an extension to come back to our August 24th board meeting as they need additional time to work out some solutions on this. They would like to continue this to next month.

[Robert Ringler left at 7:50 pm.]

Chair Schlesinger noted that DSPNA's PLUC has issued an invitation for the La Collina project to be presented. Ms. Whettam noted that they received DSPNA's request and would be happy to present with their committee, and that they'd like more time to coordinate with the neighbors and to come back to the August 24th Board meeting.

The applicant, Mr. Ron Haft, introduced himself, noting that the neighbors have asked for three things, which he is willing to do: 1) the ability to cross his property; he is willing to give them access through his property with a code or clicker. It is a dead-end street; 2) there was a request to have a better turnaround; there is a turnaround now. He is prepared to move the gate back so cars can stack as well as turnaround; 3) to have stacking so he can move the gate and accommodate them, so a gate doesn't interfere with their enjoyment of the rest of this private street. Mr. Haft noted that he open to other ideas and would be happy to host a meeting, noting that he has been trying to connect with the neighbors by text, emails, FedEx, and knocking on doors to get together as neighbors but hasn't been able to do that. He is happy to host at his home or anywhere they want it to be.

Ms. Whettam provided background overall, noting that Mr. Haft owns residential properties at 1120, 1150, 1200 and 1212 La Collina, a deemed approved private street. There is a gate at the south of the street that unfortunately is not always in operating condition, and remains open frequently. With that, Mr. Haft would like to put a gate at the southerly entrance to his property at 1150 La Collina, and this gate will provide access for 1150, 1200 and 1212, which he owns, and as well for 1230 La Collina, which is the only other resident the street who has a legal easement to use the street to gain access to their home, and they are in support of the project. She continued that there are neighbors to the south of the gate, who would not need this gate for access to their homes, but have raised some concerns, and the concerns relate to their ability to walk on the street and regarding the fire department turnaround and potential impacts with cuing. Mr. Haft has gone back to his architect to look at a design option to shift the gate further north to allow a little cuing area and to create a turnaround area.

Cason Hall showed the revised drawing, pointing to a turnaround area a little larger than a parking spot. Ms. Whettam noted that the existing pilasters will remain. They were to add additional pilasters further north with the gate which would allow for some more cuing area and Mr. Haft is willing to share the gate codes for those residents to the south so if they wanted to walk along the street, to the gate, at 1230 and 1220, they could walk further north and turn around and come back. Ms. Whettam noted that these are the mitigations they would like to work on with the DSPNA and the neighbors. She noted that they have only been in contact with the neighbors' attorneys this week.

Ms. Hall showed images of the actual gate, and then photographs of the area; she began with the proposed gate and fence design, and the two existing gates, the existing gate at the entrance of La Collina and Doheny, an existing 14' wide gate that the owner has had issues with, and the other gate at to the north that serves only one homeowner beyond, and she showed some over-in-height fences and gates leading up to the proposed gate.

Ms. Whettam responded to the comments from the community include the feeling that a previous entitlement required a hammerhead turnaround further north on the property and she explained that there was a 2009 entitlement 2009-23A-ZV-ZAA-ZAD which was approved with conditions 11 and 12 requiring a hammerhead turnaround. She noted that that case was never effectuated and the case has since expired and the conditions associated with that case are no longer applicable to the project. That was a much larger project... that never went anywhere, during the recession.

She noted that in 2018, the applicant returned with a much smaller addition to one of the existing accessory structures the case was approved, case #2018-392- ZAD and through that case, the FD did not require a hammerhead or turnaround. She noted that they have a stamped and approved site plan from the 2018 case... she pointed out the FD approval, and pointed to the existing driveway entrance and existing turnaround that does not meet standard FD requirements. There was no hammerhead or

hydrant required by the FD for this project; there is no outstanding requirement for a turnaround for the subject site. She noted that Mr. Haft is willing which would add an area on his property to the south of the gate that would in effect create a point for anybody to turn around... pull right in, back up and return if they weren't able to gain access through the gate. The whole point is to stop vehicles further away. Ms. Whettam asked Mr. Haft to share his experience of some of his security concerns, where people had to be arrested and removed from his property. He noted that lower gate is not a community gate and at any time, depending on who owns that gate, they could chose o open or close it. He noted that they do not own a neighborhood association that protects all of them.

He noted that they have had break-ins, Tik-Tokers, a gentleman who stayed at his house overnight that broke in, and they are concerned about security but he wants to be a good neighbor. He noted that they are not opposed to their neighbors continuing their walks on his property, but they just want to be able to control the ability to have safety and hope that asking them to use a clicker or a code is not too much, "so we have peace of mind." He hopes the committee can help balance the interests so they feel they are being taken care of and that he can have some security.

Mr. Haft's legal counsel, Dennis Roy, added that as long as the continuance is being granted, he noted that they've done extensive research on title, and determined the various property rights affecting this property and rights of easement and access, and "we have determined that there is no right of access across this property." He noted that Mr. Haft is trying to be a good neighbor, trying to smooth the waters, and get this done. He noted that the road is already gated across the top, at the Badger property, and it is already gated across the bottom, at the bottom of the road, and Mr. Haft is just asking to be treated in the same way as the other property who has secured their property, doing it in a way that is consistent with property rights, does not violate or infringe on any existing rights, and in fact offers additional concessions to create harmony. He'd like to discuss this with the opponents in the interim and come back and discuss the merits if necessary at a later time.

Public Comment on this item:

Ricky Rand noted that there are five families with them now, as it is harder for some of the elderly to get on Zoom altogether, and they are all in opposition. Ricky Rand noted that he has been living on La Collina for almost 30 years. He thinks that having the gate would be a safety issue for emergency services, noting that he can barely get through some of the areas on the street with his four-door sedan. He noted that bothers him that Mr. Haft would have you believe that La Collina Drive is his property. He noted this is the street he was lived on since he was born, there are six families present now all in opposition to the gate. He noted that the gate that Mr. Haft won't show you is his already existing 20-foot gate and fence around his home, which he describes as basically a fortress, already as it exists, behind a massive gate on Doheny. He feels that this is nothing but a vanity project for him. With the current gate that already exists, it is closed 99% of the time unless people come in, like guests... Most of the guests that come through are for him. Ricky Rand noted that the gate stays closed most of the time and the street is the safest street he has ever seen. He would be interested in seeing the police reports of these Tic-Tokers breaking in, because he doesn't believe it and noted that none of the people *at his home* does. He noted that it is a very narrow street and it would be a nightmare living here for the people who are mostly elderly; adding a gate would not only be unsafe and block off more than half of their private street, that his family and other families have enjoyed for nearly a century. He feels it would be sad to block off half of this private street.

Lee Taicher spoke in opposition, noting that he lives at the northernmost house next to where the gate is proposed. He is 100% against it. He has lived here a decade. No one has tried to get in his house for 10 years... it is a safe street because they have a gate at the entrance on Old Doheny Road, and Mr. Haft has a very large and important gate at his house. He noted that if we put in another gate on this little street, which is 18 feet wide, we'd have more gates than the White House, which he described as ridiculous. He doesn't want cars backing up in front of his house, which will happen

because there is a lot of traffic, noting that most of the traffic goes to Mr. Haft's house. He is 100% against it and thinks all the neighbors are 100% against it.

Patricia Storm spoke in opposition, noting that she and her husband have lived there for 12 years, never had any problem, are the second house in from the gate right off Old Doheny. They are 100% against this idea, as it would make it very difficult for them and the other residents, mostly elderly. She thinks it seems totally impractical. She noted that there is a big gate protecting the whole road, and Mr. Haft has a big gate before his property and has gates all around his property. She noted that she and her husband are totally against it and thinks it will create a big problem on the street.

Richard Rand who spoke in opposition, noting that he has been on this street since he was a child, and is 72 now. He noted that the people who spoke are elderly, 90, late 80s, etc. He noted that he was born in this neighborhood and knows it very well; there has always been access, uninhibited, from the gate on Doheny Road that blocks anyone from coming in, to the top, past Mr. Haft's house, which has its own gates, his own fences... in addition there are security cameras at the entrance gate on Doheny as it meets La Collina Drive, 24/7 with backup. Everyone who comes in has their license plates recorded. The place is like a secure compound. He doesn't understand what Mr. Haft is talking about. There have been no instances for the eight homeowners who object are against this extraordinary new unnecessary gate. He noted that there is privacy and security with the cameras there that are working all the time... He noted that there is a health and safety issue; they have had people who have died on the street, with ambulance and fire issues; life-and-death, a five-minute delay occurs if an ambulance could not turn around quick enough or get by and someone could die. He noted that the private street has been in existence for 100 years. He objects. He noted that in the room there is **Judy** who lives on the street, who doesn't want to speak but also objects. He noted that we have that in writing.

Alice Anderson: She has lived there for most of her life, and requests that there be no continuance and a vote held today. She noted that everyone fully objects to this gate. She thinks we should know that this is not a homeowners request for a residential or vehicular gate on their property line, as lot of the findings have shown but is rather a gate across a private street, that approved before 1961 and used by all the residents. She noted that within the Municipal Code of the City, a private easement for road purposes is granted to all the owners of property contiguous or adjacent, which intersections with public streets like La Collina does. She explained all their homes have easement access throughout the entirety of the street. The other gate mentioned on Mr. Badger's property to the north is off of La Collina Drive itself, which was the only reason it was permitted. She noted that Mr. Haft has also filed for this exact same application that passed in 2013, that was actually two feet lower at the time, but it was the exact same application. It failed to meet permit application clearance for a number of reasons including hydrant and access approval and construction within an easement. She noted that all of the homeowners disagree with this happening on their street, and that there are significant public health issues as has been noted, and it also sets a precedent that you can create and gate across a private street not within your own home, and within your property line, but across a street easement that everyone else has access to.

Bob Anderson: Owner on La Collina as well, has lived on the street for 10 years, strongly objects to the gate being built and disagrees that this is his property. They all have access to the private street. He thinks there is no need for a continuance here, and noted that they have been speaking with the team for weeks, they were given no warning of the application; learned about it through a posting on the street. There was no attempt to communicate with neighbors before this, only have started to communicate with them when they posed strong resistance. He noted that there is no scenario where we want a gate up the hill slightly, or other solutions discussed. He noted that they have communicated this directly, signed written letters with attorney to his attorney and to him, so they know. They have had to hire their own lawyer, and extending this another month is costly to them as neighbors, e.g., stress, and a dollar cost. Haft has a large team, and in order for them to compete, the

neighbors have had to put in spend money responding to his legal team's documents towards them. He is against it and thinks no need for continuance.

Public hearing was closed and the floor was opened to the board for questions.

Following extensive discussion, Member Hall asked about continuing this, noting that DSPNA says they want to meet with them. He feels we have an obligation to encourage people to resolve disputes, and compromise if that can be achieved; that there are parties who would like additional time; that we need to try to give opportunity for that to occur. [The ZA hearing was heard and **the case file is opened through August 29th.**]

Motion: To postpone to the item to the next board meeting, moved by Hall, seconded by Weinberg. Following discussion, roll call vote was taken, and **the motion to postpone has failed.**

The Main Motion to **object** to the application on the grounds it failed to meet the findings (particularly finding #2), that is a burden to public health and safety to the community, **passed** with 13 yeses, 1 no, and 8 abstentions.

[Vice President Jamie Hall left the meeting at 8:51 pm.]

Bylaws, Rules & Elections Committee
Cathy Wayne, Chair

15. Report of the Bylaws, Rules, and Elections Committee

16. 2023 Election Information Worksheet

A **motion** to approve submission of the 2023 Neighborhood Council Election Information Worksheet (**Attachment E**) was moved by Wayne/Committee. **Public Comment:** Steven Borden asked about seats available for the next elections and the candidate filing process, to which Longcore noted that the City will provide outreach on elections. The motion **passed** by all 22 present and voting.

[Attention was next turned to agenda #23 under "Old Business."]

Items #17 through #22 were deferred due to time constraints.

Emergency Preparedness Committee
Vadim Levotman, Chair

17. Report of the Emergency Preparedness Committee

Outreach Committee
André Stojka, Chair

18. Report of the Outreach Committee

Traffic Committee
Irene Sandler, Chair

19. Report of the Traffic Committee

Reports of Ad Hoc Committees

Ad Hoc Committee on Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety
Stella Grey, Chair

20. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety

Ad Hoc Committee on Home Sharing & Party House Ordinances

Ellen Evans, Chair

21. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Home Sharing & Party House Ordinances

Ad Hoc Committee on the Environment

Mindy Mann, Chair

22. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Environment

Old Business

23. Interpretation of Cumulative Number of Retaining Walls

Motion: To support a letter to the City Attorney's office regarding Interpretation of the Cumulative Number of Retaining Walls per Retaining Walls Ordinance No. 176445 (**Attachment F**)

Member Loze introduced the letter, noting that this issue was raised in association with a discretionary matter on Bel Air Road, the question being how many retaining walls are allowed under the Retaining Wall Ordinance (RWO). He noted that while we've never seen it before, the applicant's representative called attention to a policy that Building and Safety (B&S) was handling, saying that in accordance with a memo that had been published that we'd never seen, if a retaining wall received a permit before the RWO was passed, that would not be counted against the number of retaining walls under the ordinance. Member Loze felt that this seemed to fly in the face of the intent of the ordinance, that the ordinance and staff report describe what exceptions are to be made to the RWO but fails to express what this memo that has been handed out describes, and that therefore, we feel it is appropriate to challenge this opinion written by this B&S Department, apparently in conjunction with someone from the City Attorney. He noted that there is a careful analysis in Exhibit "F" of the Retaining Wall Ordinance which had an enormous amount of public hearing and comment and significant study by staff, and since the issue expressed is absolutely contrary to what the Board has been handing out, we want to have it challenged and reversed, and notice sent out to the Departments and anybody else in the public, so they'll know about it in the future.

Motion that the presentation be sent to the Mayor and copies to Building, Planning, and CD4 & CD5, who worked very hard on the Retaining Wall Ordinance moved by Loze/Grey. Dr. Longcore summarized this motion that we believe that B&S has undermined the intent of the ordinance and improperly excluded existing retaining walls, and the letter would reflect that.

Adopted by unanimous consent by all 23 present and voting.

New Business

24. Treatment of Animals at City Shelters

Motion: To send a letter to the Mayor, Chair of Personnel and Animal Welfare Committee, and Board of Animal Services Commissioners expressing great concern about the treatment of animals in shelters as [reported in the Los Angeles Times](#) and requesting immediate action to provide adequate staff, volunteer support, and protections for whistleblowers within the Department of Animal Services (**Attachment G**) so moved by Miner/Steele.

Motion to Amend the Letter to include Linda Whitford's suggestions, as read aloud by Linda to say: "City shelter volunteers (Claudio Kusnier and "Jean") who were indefinitely "suspended" after speaking to the media must be immediately reinstated. Terminating highly skilled volunteers of longstanding who run shelter programs such as dog playgroups, train other volunteers, and walk the more challenging dogs materially and seriously harms the shelters' animals. The City's leadership should also immediately consult with shelter volunteers on how to effectively include them in discussions on solutions to the shelter system's problems. One option that could be

considered is the formation of a volunteers' "Animal Services Advisory Committee," with representatives elected by the volunteers from each of the City's shelters." The amendment was moved by Miner/Wayne.

Discussion was held, with Member Sandler raising the question of the definition of "abuse," noting that the structures are falling apart, washing machines are broken, volunteers are taking home laundry, and the abuse goes pretty far. Member Wayne noted that she supports the letter and suggested forming an ad-hoc committee for animal rights/abuses, or whatever it be called.

There was no opposition to Member Miner's amendment, which passed.

Vote on main motion as amended passed with no objection to unanimous consent (by approximately 22 members present and voting).

Dr. Longcore noted next we need to ask what we do and how we engage further. Robin will transmit this to WRAC. He noted if there is a desire for an ad-hoc committee, it would need to be a finite committee or have a little task group of board members to do this. He'd like to wait to agendaize this for next month so we could discuss at the Exec Committee.

25. Code Amendments to Ban Camping Near Libraries (WRAC)

Motion: BABCNC strongly supports the motion in Council File 20-1376-S3 (Buscaino) for an ordinance amending LAMC Sections 41.18 and 56.01 to prohibit sitting, lying, sleeping, and storing personal property in or upon any street, sidewalk or other public-right-of-way within 500 ft. of a library.

Council File:

<https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=20-1376-S3>

Background: <https://westsidecouncils.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Background-Camping-Motion-Libraries-WRAC-1.pdf>

Moved by Wayne/Miner; **passed by unanimous consent** (by 22 members present and voting).

[Vice President Jamie Hall had returned at this point.]

26. Election of Officers

Officers will be elected to a 1-year term by a majority vote of the Board.

President: C. Wayne nominated Travis Longcore, who accepted and was approved by acclamation.

VP Legislative Affairs: Nomination of Jamie Hall who accepted and was approved by acclamation.

VP Operations: Nomination of Robin Greenberg who accepted and was approved by acclamation.

Treasurer: Nomination of Vadim Levotman who accepted and was approved by acclamation.

Secretary: Nomination of Nickie Miner who accepted and was approved by acclamation.

The officers have been reelected for one year.

Good of the Order

Brief comments of Board Members on items not on the agenda.

Maureen Levinson asked if there is any money to find out the wish list from the local animal shelter to get washing machines.

President Longcore thanked us all for sticking it out this evening.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:20 pm to return on August 24, 2022.