



Building A Better Community



**Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council Monthly Regular Board Meeting (Virtual)
Wednesday August 24, 2022, 7:00 P.M.**

Minutes

| NAME | BOARD SEAT | Present | Absent |
|-----------------------------|---|----------------|---------------|
| Barondes, Asher | At-Large Youth Rep (2023) | | X |
| Bayliss, Shawn | Commercial or Office (2023) (arr. by 7:36 P.M.) | X | |
| Grey, Stella (Alt) for Cobb | North of Sunset District (2023) | X | |
| Evans, Ellen | Community Interest At-Large (2023) | X | |
| Garfield, DDS, Robert | Casiano Estates Association | 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 | |
| Murphy, Patricia | North of Sunset District (2023) | X | |
| Paden, Andrew | Bel Air Hills Association | | X |
| Palmer, Dan | Residents of Beverly Glen | | X |
| Prothro, Steven | Private K-6 Schools (2023) | | X |
| Ringler, Robert | Residents of Beverly Glen (notified) | | X |
| Sandler, Irene | Bel Air Crest Master Association (notified) | | X |
| Savage, Stephanie | Laurel Canyon Association (arr. by 7:36 P.M.) | X | |
| Schlesinger, Robert | Benedict Canyon Association | X | |
| Spradlin, Jason | Holmby Hills HOA (arr. by 7:36 P.M.) | X | |
| Gail Sroloff | 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 | X | |
| Wayne, Cathy | Laurel Canyon Association | X | |
| Weinberg, Steven | Franklin-Coldwater District (2023) | X | |
| Wimbish, Jon | Private 7-12 Schools (2023) | | X |
| Total: | | 24 | 9 |

President Longcore shared preliminary information on the agenda, called the meeting to order at 7:05 P.M., and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. Secretary Miner called the roll with quorum met. Members Bayliss, Spradlin & Savage arrived by 7:36 P.M., for a total of **24 present**.

1. The Agenda was approved by unanimous consent as moved by Wayne.
2. The July 27th Minutes (Attachment B), were approved by unanimous consent as moved by Greenberg. *[Approval of July 20th was deferred to the next meeting.]*
3. **General Public Comment:** Kristie Holmes noted that LAUSD is serving three meals a day.

4. **Comments of Representatives of Elected Officials & City Agencies**

Mehmet Berker, Council District 4: Mehmet thanked the Board for its contributions to the Wildlife Ordinance. He gave updates on construction at Wonderland Elementary, which continues into the next school year. Contact 213-241-1326 Theresa Akins with LAUSD for updates. For info on a virtual conference by the L.A. Office of Community Beautification, a unit of the Department of Public Works, go to www.laocb.org to RSVP. They do community cleanups & are the arbiters of the Adopt a Median program. He gave update on Council-member Raman's newest motion introduced today on law enforcement by non-sworn in officers, and noted upcoming Hollywood Bowl shows. Questions were asked and answered.

Jarrett Thompson, representing **Council District 5, Councilmember Paul Koretz** noted that we have an item on our agenda with the motion by Councilmember Koretz, regarding the Department of Animal Services. They are still working with Planning on the Hillside Construction Regulations (HCR) expansion. He hopes for updates next week. Public comment has been given for the Wildlife Ordinance; he expects to see major changes on contents, and a final vote is expected in December. He mentioned brush clearance.

Janet Turner, representing **Congressmember Ted Lieu** noted need to check passports right away if we have plans to travel, as the passport agency is deluged with last-minute requests for appointments. Of note, your passport has to be good for six months after the day you are scheduled to return. Janet provided updates on government funding projects. She welcomes us to stop by and noted that they always take phone calls.

Octaviano Rios from **DONE** thanked the board members for their feedback on readiness for in person meetings, noting that there is a link to a story map and some supporting documents provided to the Commission and public. He gave updates on the Digital Communications Policy training August 31st 6:30 and September 24th at the Congress of Neighborhoods. Register Saturday. He also noted that they are asking boards to appoint less than a majority of your board to attend the upcoming Civic U 1.0, October 6, 13th and 27th at 6:30 pm. Department training recordings are housed at [https://empowerla.org/workshops-trainings/](https://empowerla.org/workshops-trainings/empowerla.org/workshops-trainings/).

Reports of Officers

5. **President** – Travis Longcore noted that prior to the meeting, Bradford Cobb **nominated** Stella Grey to be his Alternate, subject to confirmation by the Board. Stella has done all the required training. There was no objection to confirming the nomination by acclamation and Ms. Grey will be the Alternate for Bradford Cobb.
 - Longcore noted, for the record at 7:36 P.M. Members Bayliss, Spradlin and Savage had arrived.
 - Longcore noted that Members Steele & Stojka notified him they'll recuse themselves from #12. He asked if there were any others recusing themselves from any agenda items, and there were none.
6. **Vice President – Operations** – Robin Greenberg gave updates on upcoming meetings.
7. **Vice President – Legislative Affairs** – Jamie Hall noted that SB1425, that would require all cities and counties to update their Open Space Element in the next five years, passed Assembly and is on its way to the Governor. The City will be compelled by the State to update its Open Space Element.
8. **Secretary** – Nickie Miner – No report

9. **Treasurer** – Vadim Levotman (**motions to be considered as one item unless requested otherwise**)
- i. **Motion:** To approve the July 2022 Monthly Expenditure Report (MER) (**Attachment C**)
– Treasurer Levotman noted that due to procedural issues, the July MER is not available - **Deferred**
 - ii. **Motion:** To authorize payment of \$900.00 for six outstanding monthly maintenance fees of \$150 each for December 2021, February, March, April, May & June 2022, for The Web Corner, charged in the last fiscal year. (**Attachment D**)
– Treasurer Levotman related that the December 2021 invoice was actually paid but the January 2022 charge was not; so the amount remains the same.
Motion to reauthorize \$900 payment for missed payments from the prior years’ budget **passed** by **23-0-0** as **moved** by Levotman.
 - iii. **Motion:** To approve the updated USPS application for a post office box with email address changes (Attachment E) – **Deferred**
 - iv. **Motion:** To approve updated Inventory Log (Attachment F) – **Tabled**

Reports of Standing Committees

Planning & Land Use
Robert Schlesinger, Chair

10. Report of the Planning & Land Use Committee

11. Two Connected Projects at 1804 and 1816 Rial Drive

ZA-2021-10493-ZAD 1812-1824 RIAL DRIVE 90077

Project Description: Applicant is requesting a Zoning Administrator’s Determination for relief from continuous pathway requirement in conjunction with the active construction of a new single-family dwelling (per LAMC Section 12.21C10(i)(3) and LAMC Section 12.24X28).

Initial Submittal Documentation: <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/search/encoded/MjUzNjA50>

See Link: [1816 Rial Ln](#)

ZA-2021-10494-ZAD 1800-1810 RIAL DRIVE 90077

Project Description: Applicant is requesting a Zoning Administrator’s Determination for relief from continuous pathway requirement in conjunction with the active construction of a new single-family dwelling (per LAMC Section 12.21C10(i)(3) and LAMC Section 12.24X28)

Initial Submittal Documentation: <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/search/encoded/MjUzNjEw0>

See Link: [1804 Rial Ln](#)

Applicant: OKZA LLC, Viktor Nikravesh

Representative: Benjamin Eshaghian [Company: Crest Real Estate]

PLU Committee Motion from the May Meeting: To approve the projects at 1804 and 1816 Rial Drive contingent upon the B-permit work to improve the streets’ frontage along the entire properties to an improved width of 20 feet with concrete curb and gutter (on both sides of the street) and a 4’ dedication onto the properties, and subsequent improvements that may be required such as lighting and electrical vaults, including requirements for lighting under MC 93.0117.

Board Motion from May Board Meeting: This was postponed to the following month to get the answers to our questions.

Ben Eshaghian was invited to address questions from their last presentation, to which he noted he wasn’t aware that there were any questions but that he is still working with the City to finalize a biological review, and preparing for the hearing. Dr. Longcore asked Mr. Eshaghian to confirm if this is a ZAD that needs to meet all of the findings for the determinations that any other would for the entire project, not just the street portion, to which Mr. Eshaghian noted he could not confirm that but he believes that this is only for the relief being sought concerning the widening of the road not about the height of the free-standing decks. Mr. Eshaghian confirmed that the determination the ZA will make is only about the street and not about the structures themselves and noted that the structures were already permitted and built, speaking about the portions that have been built.

Motion: Member Bayliss **moved** to adopt the recommendation of the PLU Committee with requests which includes improvement along the property line and introduction of curb and gutter. Dr. Longcore clarified that the motion include compliance with MC93.0117 with regard to lighting on the structure itself as opposed to street lighting, which Bayliss agreed include in the motion.

Member Templeton asked for a brief summary on what this is about for those who were not aware of it. Mr. Eshaghian provided background on the project, noting that it started in 2010 and had gone back and forth between multiple owners; their owner purchased it in the past few years and in 2019 discovered a pinch point along where Rial Lane starts and there is one pinch point less than 20 feet, which they believe is someone's private property which may have been an illegal construction... He noted that the present request is for the relief to not have to extend that portion of the roadway to 20 feet. He noted that they paid for the dedication in front of both properties to meet the 20-foot requirement in front of both of the project developments.

The above motion was **seconded** by Member Wayne.

Member Savage related that there was a question about the back decks and their connection to the buildings that we wanted clarification on that as it may have impact with connection to new codes. Mr. Eshaghian responded that he believed we had some email correspondence following the previous meeting and that the present circumstances of the decks is that they were built with code present at the time of construction. He believes he clarified that with the City and that they were permitted to be built the way they are. Savage asked further, if the house and the multipurpose large deck in the back were separate and are now being connected, to which he agreed that they are separate structures.

Savage asked if there is no bridge connecting the house to the deck. Longcore noted that that is incorrect, he has seen it and they are connected. Mr. Eshaghian noted that they are connected. Savage asked if this has an impact on the overall height or how the height is measured from the low point of the decks to the house to be completed. Mr. Eshaghian did not know what the building code is that pertains to this currently, and noted that they will have to bring everything up to code following Plan Check, if required. He said he could not speak to what the height requirements are currently.

Savage noted that perhaps there should be some condition in the motion or in addition to the motion that we get some validation that it doesn't exceed the overall height, because they were being connected. She recalled they would be connecting a bridge from the deck to the house that may have an impact on the new house. Mr. Eshaghian related that he had just corresponded with his team whom he said confirmed it won't exceed any height requirements, and should be compliant with code and the BHO. There was a question of the height as it is.

Savage moved to amend the main motion to state that the project should comply with the BHO's height limit based on the zone that it is in, and if it exceeds that limit it needs to get an entitlement. **Seconded** by Schlesinger. No discussion. The amendment was restated that the height should comply with the BHO and if not will need to seek an entitlement.

A motion to postpone to September was made by Stojka, **seconded** by Schlesinger, for further vetting by the committee and returning in September. Templeton asked that we not just postpone this but have more additional information. The amendment **passed** by unanimous consent to postpone to next month, to be accompanied by full description of the height, if it complies with the BHO, looking at the structure itself in addition to the road issues.

12. 2830 Woodwardia Drive PS-1435-MSP ENV-2020-2854-CE

Project Description: Proposed vacation of public portions of Nicada, Woodwardia and Angelo Drive into private-only access along with improvements entry/exit improvements.

Applicant: Bel Air Glen Homeowners Association Representative: Margaret Akerblom, Fernando Villa [Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallor & Natsis, LLP] makerblom@allenmatkins.com, fvilla@allenmatkins.com
<https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/search/encoded/MjM3NzE20>

PLU Committee Motion: Recommend to the Board to recommend that the application for the vacation be denied (passed by 4 yeses, 1 no, and 5 abstentions).

[Dr. Steele and Mr. Stojka had recused themselves and were moved to the Virtual Attendee Room.]

Mr. Fernando Villa and Mr. Ken Linzer would be followed by Bel Air Ridge representatives, each having 15 minutes, followed by public hearing of one minute each, and when done, come back to the Board for Board questions. President Longcore would be recognizing them to answer further questions according to his discretion.

Mr. Villa gave the floor to **Mr. Linzer** to give introductory comments on behalf of the project prior to his presentation. Mr. Linzer gave background on this, noting that they have been working on this for six years with various professionals with the goal to build upon that which the PLU Committee and its Task Force began. He noted as he looks back on his childhood and requests the NC not oppose their application. He thanked the PLUC members and the Task Force members, whom he noted worked extremely well to attempt to harmonize the two sides, his community who has had to deal with cut through traffic rerouting. He noted that the task force was unable to bridge the divide between the two communities. He ended by saying they believe that the lives and safety of their community residents will be in peril if the application is opposed by the NC, and that a no vote threatens lives.

Mr. Villa provided the Board a Power Point presentation entitled Bel Air Glen Street Vacation and Gating Project. Some comments that will include vacating and privatizing the remaining public street segments, as many of the streets have already been privatized, and they propose to install gates at Angelo north and south entry points along with the westerly entry at Nicada. He provided information on why they feel this is needed, the background of their efforts communicating this to their community and what other options they could take. He described the state of the art technology that the gating would be operating under as well as designs.

Following his presentation, Mr. Villa asked the neighborhood council to *not* take a position on the project and to *not* oppose it. He additionally referenced the committee's concerns about liability if anything happened to a community member highlighted various concerns, noting that LAFD and LAPD said no such dangers would occur. He posited that an EIR is not required and that no significant environmental impact will occur.

Mr. Fred Gaines with the Law Offices of Gaines & Stacey representing the Bel Air Ridge noted that Alvin Galstian may be joining while Amir Navab is unable to be present this evening. He recommended that the board oppose the proposal.

He noted that there have been at least 9 meetings and after presenting mitigations for Bel Air Glen (BAG) to consider, they have all been rejected, in terms of street narrowing, speed bumps and other proposals, BAG said they didn't want to do that, only want to move forward with their gating project. He noted that the law requires the city make the finding that the street being vacated is not necessary for present or prospective public use.

How did the application get this far? He provided a list of reasons to oppose and refuted the position of the applicant. He noted that this is not a minor street vacation, all the mitigations need to be fully studied, and noting that they are asking you to exempt them from the rules, which would

not be in the best interest to do that. He noted that the 5 abstentions at the PLUC were from the veiled threat of liability. He noted that we have no liability, in the actions we take in good faith as members of the NC. And noting the desperation exhibited by the BAG in using those veiled threats. He asked that the NC recommend the city oppose the application.

Mr. Galstian thanked the council, including Jason and company, for trying to bridge the gap, noting that we unfortunately didn't get to the resolution we would have liked. He stated that the applicant's proposal was disingenuous. He requests the council reject the applicant's proposal.

The floor was opened to public comment at 8:38 PM.

Sandy Moshi was called, and later gave public comment below.

Jana Levy lives on Nicada is against having their community gated, noting this is the most dangerous street. If their community was gated she noted her community would have more traffic than they have now.

Gary Engler lives on Upper Woodwardia, one of the more affected areas as to traffic and safety. He noted that at the last meeting at the PLUC, one of the members who recused himself today was very forceful in his opinion against the vacation. He expressed concern about a committee member who recused himself has had undue influence. He doesn't understand why that member didn't recuse himself at the last meeting, PLUC.

Dan Platt: All the risks to them, all they will do, but the sound was deafening when talking about the issues on this side that would be created. He asked what if the same thing would happen on his side. He would like to know why you are completely ignoring the damage and pain that this will cause your neighbors.

Caller with number ending in 288: Resident on Woodwardia Drive, has lived here for years. He was unloading his child on his own driveway. The traffic was congested. A driver made a U-turn into his driveway and he believes that driver would have run over his child if he wasn't there. He believes in safety and that this is a 100% safety and traffic issue. He concluded that if you want to prevent loss of lives and injuries, you will vote to approve this.

Leslie Gallin noted that the cut through traffic is coming up Beverly Glen to the Valley, not to cut through Nicada to go to Bel Air Ridge. She would like people to stop saying that they don't care about what goes on the other side. She noted that she has very narrow streets and has issue with Nicada and Winwood. They are asking for two and a half streets out of the 10 that are already private. She noted that comments are coming in from Bel Air Ridge from far away on Bottlebrush. She hopes we take no position.

Joanne Parrent: Has lived in Bel Air Glen for 20 years and is opposed to this project. She noted that there was no discussion of the plan and costs; the board pushed this forward without the agreement of Bel Air Ridge (BAR) who was and continues to oppose this. The problem of traffic and child safety is not the way it was prior to COVID. She feels safe in this community, and that the proposal is an absurd waste of money.

Carla Koehler lives in East Beverly Glen. This is the first time she has seen the project. She thinks the traffic will not flow well for cars, particularly from the north there is no area to turn around. She thinks having gates will endanger people trying to turn Beverly Glen from North South Briarwood or Angelo Drive.

Michelle. Member of BAG noting that gated communities are not new to Bel Air. They have gone through all the avenues. She supports the gating to protect her family and pets.

Maryam Q. There is a blind corner at Woodwardia and Angelo, definitely.

Ferril Dieter. Gave public comment.

Steve Lee: Resident of BAG, Summer Holly Circle, supports privatization of the streets under consideration.

Kyle Ray: BAG resident, they have cut through traffic on his tiny street. He doesn't think cut through is the right word. Sometimes on Angelo there is a complete disregard for stop signs, as well as Woodwardia. Safety hazard. Asks the board to take a non-position on this issue.

Jason Whitt lives in BAG and completely in favor of the gate. It will not take Nicada and is a red herring. Fred Gaines made untruthful comments. He would ask the board to take on conflict of interest. There was obvious bias to vote to oppose. At the end of the call that the board member is a resident of BAR, who put himself on the task force... they did not recuse themselves from but did not.

Caller with number ending in 475 he lives next to the last caller, at the intersection of Woodwardia and Angelo, and depending on the day you have people speeding through. He noted he is elderly and handicapped. One day he was crossing the street with his dog, and went across the street to throw out garbage, and when he walked back he was one foot from a car speeding through the stop sign at Woodwardia and Angelo. It is either like that or the cars are back down and he is cut off from getting out of his garage. He is 100% in favor of the gate.

Kate Hodgman: She is with 90% of BAG who support the project; feels for safety concerns in BAR. The attorney for BAR made claims not based on fact.

Mike Kearin: Police Chaplin. these are residential streets. The only solution to getting speeding cars off our streets is to get the cars off our streets. We need to keep the traffic on Beverly Glen and not take our side streets and endanger the citizens.

Rick Bisetti: Concurs with Steve Lee, Mike Kearin and others who support the project. The most important thing is safety.

Talar. Safety is the issue.

Greg & Lois Good: She and her family members have almost been hit a few times. They were undecided and then convinced by the information they were given. They are very much in favor of the gate.

Lorena Costino lives in BAG and strongly supports the project two kinds/teens, who get off the bus at Nicada & BG, and at least five or six schools have bus stops there and kids walk home from school. She is concerned for the kids and for BAR. She hopes they follow suit and do the same thing. Those who say they raised kids who were fine, she noted that that was before WAZE.

Brenda Feigen lives on Hollow Glen Circle: There has been virtually no cut through traffic since COVID. This is an exaggeration by a bunch of people who are lying about what's going on how. There is a large number of us from BG who are opposed she tried to get a microphone and Ken Linzer wrenched it away from her, which she noted took six months to recover from. If this goes through on BG there will be many gated communities. It will be a very difficult place to live.

Danielle Cohen lives on Claray at BAR. She thinks it is a pity that BAG has not tried to mitigate before discussing and going for gates that will impact us. On days there is a lot of traffic, people cross Claray, take Basil and cross back again to Nicada. It would be nice if you tried to find a police officer giving tickets. On St. Pierre Road and BG there is no right turn unless you are a resident. This has worked for them. She thinks you should at least try that before impacting the neighborhood.

Steve Paul his family has lived at BAR at Nicada and Mulholland, the last house on the left side. He and his wife have nearly gotten hit. He thinks he would oppose this even if he was on the other side of Beverly Glen. He is very much against the project. Feels for all of us, as it is a common challenge.

Susan L has lived here for 27 years, she created the video for her gating committee. She has plenty of unedited video that proves that people even post COVID race up Woodwardia. She gave an example of a woman trying to get out of her driveway on Woodwardia, finally was able to get out of the driveway and someone swung around onto Woodwardia face to face nearly missing a head on collision. It is a very serious problem. She explained that this is truly a problem.

Amin Joseph resident on Woodwardia with his wife and two small children. He hears the back and forth and says since he has lived here in this neighborhood, this traffic, and he picks his daughter up from pre-school, he is able to watch the traffic daily and it is a problem just getting his daughter out of the car when driving into the driveway. The drivers are reckless when they drive through Woodwardia and Angelo. He asked that we take this to be heard. We are dealing with a traffic pattern unique to them on this side.

Husband of Amy, resident BAR, lives on Angelo, and is vehemently against the gate proposal. The problems that the proposal would create would continue in perpetuity. Going south on BG, major inconvenience to the members of BAR and their guests. He noted that they love their neighbors but would at least like to try to impose prophylactic measures before gating. He noted that his community cannot gate due to the public park in the neighborhood.

Fernando Villa gave additional testimony regarding Mr. Gaines's comments. He said there was no threat of law suit of any member of the public. It was a committee member stated concern. At the time the objection false statement to say we lied on the application form. There was a statement that the BAR residents serious traffic concern. They would support traffic measures for BAR.

David Van Iderstine Resident of BAG resident. Sent a letter today. He noted that the wonderful legal arguments made by BAR council. The question is will you make more people happy or unhappy. He pointed out there were significant issues that the traffic would have to go to Nicada. There is no way to safely put an entry gate at Angelo.

Sandie Moshi noted that so many in her neighborhood are opposed this is a way to get higher real estate value. If she had to wait for a gate, God help her, it is hard enough as it is. It is ludicrous to her that they are not trying to do signs, the gate, and the cameras. Approving this would be a horrible injustice to their HOA which is much larger.

Joan Herman noted that we disagree, both sides tit for tat. She questions if there is a traffic problem currently, even based on the pre-covid study, and it is only between the hours of 4-6. At worst case, a problem that amounts It is only going through Woodwardia, 5 days a week, 4-6 to create a problem for the rest of the neighborhoods.

Mr. Fred Gaines raised one issue not raised. He noted that he could understand if he was on the board, he hopes we look at this as a policy issue. If one neighborhood is allowed that ... What you

want to do as a policy. We are not giving away city streets unless all other measures have been taken, a full environmental impact report, and don't think you should do it unless you can garner support from those outside your community.

To make a motion he believes that there is a fair argument that the project will have a sufficient impact on the environment and it requires an EIR review.

The public hearing was closed.

The Board then discussed the matter. Bob Schlesinger thinks an EIR review is required. There will be a serious impact with the environment. We are sitting here with two associations that can't agree on anything, and one association that hasn't divulged any costs as to what the residents are saying. The procedure will have an impact on the environment. **Schlesinger moved** that the Board take a position that the project is not categorically exempt and requires an EIR. The motion was seconded.

Loze then moved to substitute a new motion for Schlesinger's motion, that the Board recommend denial of the street vacation application, as recommended by the PLU Committee. Miner seconded the motion. Longcore then explained that a motion to substitute replaces one motion with another and the vote was whether to act on Loze's motion or Schlesinger's original motion. The motion to substitute passed with unanimous consent and Board discussion of the substitute motion continued.

Miner made statements about the project. If traffic is really the issue, as the ad hoc committee tried to get both sides together to see what they could do... and the other things mentioned, they were going to do a traffic study for a week and whatever the results are they would put forward the gate. Again, they talked about steps to take that were not taken, and whatever is they want the gates, and that's that. What's missing is a door by door education that every single person in the BG area wants to have this. Has every resident been apprised of what's involved? They have been working on the gate for six years. Have they gone to each and every resident? It seems a lot of people within BG are opposed to this, and if a street is privatized everybody has to want it. There are so many things with holes in it... these people want it. We all want a lot of things. We can't do these things without understanding the consequences. What about the things the city won't take care of things any more, e.g., garbage pickup. She wanted a thorough investigation of each and every person that they know about and says yes or no. That area has little side streets with cul de sacs. It's just the main streets with the racing. It is easy for kids to play on side streets with cul de sacs. She would deny these gates.

Member Sroloff noted that they did not address any emergency access; how they would assess the homeowners to privatize the streets; figure out an assessment to pay for it. She noted that BAA is looking into it and it is not that simple. She supports the PLUC motion.

Member Templeton would like facts: 1) Will they be responsible for street maintenance. 2) She would like them to put up where the gates are again, and asked, if you are not buzzed in, not a homeowner, how difficult will it be for them to turn around, how much traffic backed up on Beverly Glen? 3) Many neighborhoods have the same issue, some more severely than this. She noted that the City tends to be hostile to gating and street vacations. Why do they think they would be able to get this? 4) Why not try the mitigations? 5) & 6) if those who maintain the streets that are going to be vacated how? What is the turnaround areas, if they can't go through? What makes this different than any other place in the city where gates are not allowed? Why not do mitigations first?

Fernando Villa answered the questions. If the City were to approve the street vacation, they would have to provide financial information for the wherewithal to manage them. Villa showed his screen designs of turnarounds, which designs they are still working on. He couldn't answer the question of why this project is different from others that have been denied, noting that each gate and entry point was a result of their engineers working with the city engineers. Asked, why not mitigations first, Mr. Villa responded that they

looked carefully at mitigations and looked at traffic signs... looked at speed bumps, decided that those two in combination or alone would not be effective. The signs to stop right hand traffic during peak hours... Speed bumps discussed with the city under hillside requirements too steep. They understand that the BAR has put in place speed bumps and signs that have not stopped traffic.

Longcore shared a map and photos of Angelo Drive on Google Earth and asked if Mr. Villa would acknowledge that the gate between the two communities at the boundary line and at that point there is one lane of traffic each direction and parking on either side of the street, so any turnaround area would require the loss of parking in the Bel Air Ridge portion of the roadway. **Mr. Villa** was unaware that there was currently parking where the gate was proposed and said that if the City has concerns they would have to address that. They would have to put together a design that makes sense.

Templeton had two more questions: Why didn't they try the mitigations? And the City of LA is very hostile to gating and street vacations; why is this project different to the others? Why would yours be approved? **Villa** responded that he already answered the question that the community has found that the speed bumps and signs are not effective and that the most effective solutions would be gating. He noted that they went to two city agencies, the CD5 office, and were told to go to BOE and spoke with Edward Yi or Yee. He noted that that agency said they'd be willing to support gating of their community.

Templeton asked BAR about the traffic calming measures, responded to by **Fred Gaines**, and he noted that speed humps and narrowing with bollards are helpful; but don't solve all the problems. He cannot do better with what we have dealt with in the last four years. Questions that we have all had to make, the answer maybe we'll get to this later. He noted that the CD office has *not* said they support it. This is not well thought out. We have had hearings and no answers. This is *not* a project to be supported. BAG has rejected what BAR has tried.

Mann agreed with **Miner's** and **Templeton's** point and is opposed to the gate; feels for the issues of traffic, safety, and why they'd like to be able to gate. **Mann** noted that the issues are not unique to them to the canyons and the entire city is having a problem with increased traffic. She noted that we cannot gate every single street. She feels the communities have to come together in better ways. She is opposed. As to what works or doesn't work, using signs that don't work unless you have enforcement people ignore them, there is a street on Beverly Glen where they put in signs for no right turn from 4-7 or going up the street. She noted that it took a while, and people do pay attention to it. They look at the sign and don't make those turns. It may take a little while.

Dr. Kristie Holmes asked if this is a solution to WAZE, even if those were covered, and there was a good turn around, how are we to scale this and doesn't think it is an equitable solution, making it harder on people who can't afford. She doesn't see the scalability being practical here.

Don Loze returned to the motion which he noted is to support the decision that was made by the PLUC after hours of going through everything that was said tonight and further background beyond that, to help them come to a conclusion that it was significant enough to deny the application. He thinks the Chair has been very generous to let people re-review and represent the issues. The question is if you want to support the PLUC, and if any objection to calling the question.

The Chair noted that a 2/3rds is needed vote to stop debate. There were **14 yeses** from Members Spradlin, Evans, Wayne, Holmes, Bayliss, Levotman, Weinstein, Kwan, Schlesinger, Loze, Grey, Mann, Garfield and Miner, and **3 noes** from Members Grey, Templeton and Sroloff. The motion passed.

The main motion carried by **15 yeses** and **1 no** (Wayne) and **2 abstentions** (Levotman, Longcore). There were **2 recusals** (Steele and Stojka).

13. **Report of the Bylaws, Rules, and Elections Committee** was deferred.
14. **Report of the Emergency Preparedness Committee** was deferred.
15. **Report of the Outreach Committee** was deferred.
16. **Report of the Traffic Committee** was deferred.
17. **Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety** was deferred.
18. **Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Home Sharing & Party House Ordinances** was deferred.
19. **Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Environment** was deferred.

New Business [10:18 PM]

20. Scope of Ad Hoc Committee on Environmental Issues

Motion: To add to animal welfare and in particular treatment of animals at City shelters to the scope and duties of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Environmental Issues. (Recommended unanimously by the Executive Committee) was moved by Wayne/Miner and **approved** by unanimous consent.

21. Animal Treatment at City Shelters

Motion: To support Council person Koretz's motion of August 16, 2022 (CF 22-0943) in which it is moved that the City Council instruct the Department of Animal Services, the CAO, the SLA and any other relevant departments and stakeholders to determine the budgetary needs for the department to fully staff seven animal shelters and all programmatic and departmental administrative needs and report back to the City Council in 60 days with the information, including responses on the following issues:

- Determine the percentage of the City's annual General Fund expenditures necessary to accomplish full staffing and expanded shelter operational hours
 - Explore additional funding options such as a parcel tax, sales tax or other means of augmenting General Fund monies to achieve these goals
 - Options for utilizing general obligation bonds instead of general funds to improve DAS facilities built with G.O. Bonds, such as Proposition F funds used to construct the facilities in 2000
 - Possibility of supplanting budgeted general fund monies for the DAS with funds received from a proposed parcel tax
 - Eligible uses of funds (construction, capital improvement, ongoing staffing, administrative, etc.) pursuant to the various proposition types that the City Council could approve to be placed on a future ballot
 - Structure of a possible oversight committee including proposed members and the level and nature of oversight
- Moved by Wayne/Miner.

Members Stojka and Steele were promoted back into the meeting.

Motion to table was **approved** by the majority, as moved by Evans.

President Longcore thanked everyone for their participation and adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:20 PM to September 28, 2022.