



**Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council Special Board Meeting (Virtual)**  
**Wednesday July 20, 2022, 7:00 P.M.**  
**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	X	
Goodman, MD, Mark	Bel-Air District (2023)		X
Hall, Jamie	Laurel Canyon Association	X	
Holmes, Ph.D., Kristie	Public Educational Institutions (2023)	X	
Kadin, David Scott	Benedict Canyon Association		X
Robin Greenberg	Faith-Based Institutions (2023) (06-22-2022)	X	
Kwan, Robert (Bobby)	Laurel Canyon Association	X	
Levotman, Vadim	Doheny-Sunset Plaza Neighborhood Assn.	X	
Longcore, Ph.D., 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	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
Sroloff, Gail	At-Large Traditional Stakeholder (2023)		X
Steele, Ph.D., Timothy	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	
<b>Total:</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>9</b>

President Longcore called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm, introduced the instructions on the agenda as to public comment and AB361 updates. Following the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, the roll was called and quorum was met.

1. The agenda was approved as moved by VP of Operations Greenberg.
2. **General Public Comment: Steven Borden** asked us to, at some point, address term limits. **Alison MacCracken** asked if we notify members of a new ordinance, have associations notify members, and if there a record of outreach.
3. **Wildlife District Ordinance**  
**Discussion and Motion:** To submit a comment letter to the Department of City Planning on the draft Wildlife Ordinance (Attachment A).

This motion was recommended by the Planning and Land Use Committee at its July 12, 2022 meeting on a vote of 10 ayes and 3 abstentions. For background, meeting minutes from the Planning and Land Use Subcommittee on the Proposed Wildlife District can be found at [this link](#). Minutes from the Ad Hoc Committee on Environmental Issues can be found at [this link](#). The draft ordinance can be read [here](#), and a fact sheet from the Dept. of City Planning [here](#).

President Longcore introduced this item and asked if there were any recusals tonight.

The above motion was moved by Member Evans/Committee and was seconded.

Dr. Longcore explained procedures, that there would be one public comment period, as we have had extensive public comments with written comments and oral comments in the minutes posted on the website. He would recognize Member Evans to give a presentation, to be followed by public comment, board deliberation, and Roberts Rules on debate.  
*[Member Weinberg arrived prior to the start of this presentation.]*

Ellen Evans, Chairwoman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Wildlife District, provided a presentation on the ordinance to include what is in the ordinance, how it got there, and the necessity for the ordinance. After her introduction, she addressed where we are in the process, and how the NC may be a productive participant, noting that the strategy was to make productive comment on the ordinance, which is yet imperfect. She addressed how we got here, having had 11 subcommittee meetings, averaging two hours each, going through the ordinance sentence by sentence, and that the Environmental Committee also had three (sic) [four per Mann] meetings. Evans noted that the ordinance isn't very precise in how it attempts to protect habitat and connectivity. The letter asks for very real modifications and has ongoing questions about the ordinance. She noted that application of the ordinance is unclear in parts, and there's a widespread desire to know more about scientific bases for some regulations.

**Public Comment:** **Alison MacCracken** opined that the ordinance was written very poorly, and that it doesn't reflect the original objective that Councilmember Paul Koretz said it would. She believes that there is a public safety issue, potential for disease, does nothing to protect wildlife, is a major burden to homeowners and is a property taking that it will be tied up in court for many years and thinks until the Planning Department comes and answers our questions, we should not move forward with any kind of ordinance at this time.

**Marian Dodge, Chair of the Hillside Federation,** noted the Federation's unanimous support of the development of the wildlife ordinance, which they have been following since 2018. She noted that the City created a biodiversity team, with representatives from various City departments to work together to increase biodiversity. She cited the Singapore Index used to monitor the progress of biodiversity conservation efforts and noted that Los Angeles is one of the few areas in the world with a Mediterranean climate and that this city has been identified as a biodiversity hotspot. She noted that many species here exist nowhere else in the world and that loss of habitat and connectivity is the primary cause of extinction of species. She opined that we have a moral and ethical responsibility to make every effort to preserve habitat and improve connectivity, and that the Wildlife Ordinance is an excellent way for the City to preserve its unique biodiversity. She noted that nature enriches and sustains communities, and the Hillside Federation urges support for the Wildlife Ordinance.

**Helene DesRuisseaux** related that after reading comments in our meeting minutes, she strongly recommends that the ridgeline provisions be removed from the Wildlife Ordinance, and feels that this is a complicated ill-conceived and ill-written ordinance that should be delayed significantly so the community could have time to provide input to the wildlife portion and separately to the ridgeline portion.

**Alison Choi** noted that some neighbors who would be most impacted by the ordinance haven't had the time to read the most recent iteration of the ordinance, absorb it and get the science behind it. She is requesting more time to make sure this is done right. She agreed that if this gets turned down, it will have a chilling effect on future potential ordinances. She noted that there were a couple of examples of specific information she hoped someone who has it would share. One of her big concerns is about insurability because of dead tree removal restrictions; that may or may not apply to individual property owners, depending on square footage or acreage; however, to open land, she believes allowing dead & fallen trees to dry out creates fire hazards. She would like to know if she will have fire insurance if this ordinance is put into effect, and would like questions like these answered before we have discussion on the validity of the ordinance.

**Pat & Jay:** Pat noted that she has attended all the subcommittee meetings, and that they did listen to her concerns. She reiterated some of her concerns, as often mentioned in prior meetings. She agrees with those opposed to the Wildlife Ordinance. She described herself as an environmentalist who is leaving her money to environmental nature groups. She has concerns about effects of limits that would be put upon her, such as residential floor area (RFA) attributed to slope bands greater than 60% and envelope height at 25' given her particular lot and sized home. She wants to be able to rebuild her two story, 4,518 square foot house. She agrees with comments that the ridgeline is for aesthetics and not for wildlife, because the owl loves to sit on her balcony railing, and look down for animals at night.

**Shirin Javid** seconded comments of Alison MacCracken, in opposition to this ordinance, for reasons including 1) height limit, reduced from 35 or 36 to 25, 2) including garage and other stuff in the footprint that doesn't make sense to her, but significantly, 3) she is a family person, has pets, and does not want a bobcat or coyotes or other animals like that to enter her property. She noted as it is now, she is afraid to walk outside on Bel Air Road when light is dimming because of coyotes. She is afraid to take her dog for a walk for fear of coyotes. She is concerned that if she has to remove and lower her fences they can come into our houses. She noted that 40 years ago, they bought a house here, and moved to an urban area, not a wilderness, a highly-populated area and noted that it doesn't make sense to put us under so much pressure with an ordinance that is not very beneficial.

**Nanaz Benyamini** expressed opposition to the ordinance noting concern about the response in the letter, that though well thought out and well written, she want to work with the City and not say the ordinance should be struck down but has concerns in regards to things such as changes to the plants and the windows. She asked what replacing windows has to do with preserving wildlife if she has to replace her house. She noted that this is extremely tedious and burdensome, made worse by COVID. She is completely opposed to the ordinance and would like the committee to reconsider some concessions it seems to be making in the letter.

**Diana Nicole** noted that she is on the Board of the Sunshine Hill Residents Association, in which area they believe the Wildlife Ordinance will be applied. She noted that the association voted unanimously to support the ordinance and submitted a written report to Planning as nature is important to them and it is being destroyed by overdevelopment, speculation real estate, and affluent blight. She noted that this ordinance supports humane coexistence with urban wildlife, our unique biodiversity, our quality of life and property interests. She and the Association Board thank this Board for taking review of this very seriously and noted that unfortunately many opponents are intellectually dishonest. She noted that Council passed the Wildlife Ordinance seven years ago and we are losing our wildlife; asked that we support the ordinance so we can implement it to save our wildlife.

**Chris Templeton** related that he disagreed with Ellen's comment that to oppose the ordinance is to oppose the idea of the ordinance. He opined that there is no question that there is a disproportionate impact to certain homeowners, it significantly impacts their privacy rights, ability to modify their homes, and impacts the value of their homes. He finds the ordinance deceptive, because while it purports to be protecting wildlife, there is not one shred of evidence that any of the particular provisions they are proposing has that effect. He concludes that what they are doing is putting the cart before the horse. in his opinion.

**Debbie Reinberg** noted that Alison said a lot of what she has to say. She would have this council ask each HOA and the residents to see what they want, if they are for or against the ordinance. She read the draft letter which she noted is well written that ends up saying we are basically for the ordinance and thinks it is a moral obligation to oppose if the majority of residents oppose the ordinance. She noted the City mentioned that this is a pilot study, which she presumes should have an analysis on how it is working and impacting the homeowners. She concluded that this ordinance is way too oppressive for homeowners.

**Mitchell Guzik** noted that he is a board member of DSPNA and supports what Ellen put forward, supports the wildlife as well of understanding about the impacts of the ridgelines. He is more concerned about the City being able to monitor and fund this, thinks we should have an economic impact study to see what it will take to do so, and to enforce it. He noted that other programs that the City has put forth have not been enforced, e.g., the Airbnb rules, moving trash cans; in theory, he thinks this is a great idea, that we all want to do things to protect our environment, but he is concerned that we need see an economic impact study to see the cost, and as an alternative start with a much smaller pilot area.

**Steven Borden** noted that thousands of us who are opposed to this are not opposed to a wildlife ordinance or protecting wildlife, just opposed to this one in this form. He noted that on page 3 of the letter, we need to – since we are qualifying that environmental groups are in favor of this, the lying about the residents opposed should say residents, scientists and economists are opposed. He noted that Ellen's comments about inclusiveness of public comments during the committees is not how we feel, that they have not been integrated; that in most cases, hundreds of residents are unsatisfied with the inclusion of their comments,

noting it often feels like check the box we are listened to but we are not really heard and the comments were not meaningfully integrated. He noted on page 4, it says the ordinance will restrict development, which is the very purpose but the purpose should be to protect wildlife; so that needs to be changed. He concluded the purpose of this is not to restrict development, which he thinks the committee feels it is, but it is not what Paul Koretz intended.

**Judy Feigon** noted that she is a resident of Beverly Glen and has a hillside property and really cares about the wildlife and her native landscape; she was surprised to find herself concerned about this ordinance. One concern she has is that not only small lots will have a disproportion impact but lots like hers with a small house and large lot... If she wants to double the size of her house she will have to go through major planning. She noted that the ridiculous trash enclosures stood out to her and that she has never known an animal to get into trash cans. She asked why our area was chosen as the pilot instead of an area adjacent to existing wildlife corridors, and questions the requirement to replace one tree with two trees with no consideration of what's on the property.

**Steve Twining** related that he thinks this ordinance is phenomenal, and appreciates all the help the BABCNC has put in to study this ordinance. He is an emeritus of the BABCNC, was president for five years and is an emeritus of the Hillside Federation. He noted that they strongly support this ordinance, and opined that Mr. Borden is wrong. He explained that this is a combination of two ordinances, the Ridgeline Ordinance and the Wildlife Ordinance, both of which have been in the hopper for over 20 years. He noted that we have way too much development in our community, the traffic is overwhelming, and that as regards 1400 Linda Flora, which eliminated wildlife crossing because he lives below it; the house was never built and the retaining walls have been there for 12 years. He strongly supports the ordinance.

**Chuck Maginnis** thanked the board members for volunteering. He noted that he opposes the ordinance, and thinks the ridgeline ordinance is tucked in under the wildlife ordinance. He doesn't see the 25' foot height limit mentioned in the letter, noting it was discussed, as it was the largest investment people have worked for in their life, which he believes will be dramatically reduced. He opined that anybody affected by the ordinance where they stand to lose a ton of money in terms of property value, with all the different restrictions going into this. He noted that it would be hard for him to think of how they would be pro-wildlife, and that it is obvious from the slide show with CLAW and different pictures which very supportive of wildlife on our website.

*[Robert Ringler left the meeting at 7:51pm.]*

**Shelley Billik** noted that she bought her first home 20 years ago. She supports the ordinance and protecting nature which belongs to all of us.

**Adele Slaughter** noted that she is on the Studio City NC Sustainability Committee, and deeply supports the ordinance. She related, anecdotally, that she plays tennis on Cedar Brook right below where Hadid destroyed the mountain, and noted if this ordinance were to go into effect, that would not happen. She believes that the people who are opposing it are those who want to build huge mansions. She noted that as a pilot study it may have some problems that we will correct but need to move forward and find a way to protect wildlife.

**Kate Naples** noted that she is not convinced; she lives near the massive Gehry project going up; she has concerns like Julie about trash; thinks it is an added burden; it will be difficult for the mechanized trucks. She has heard of one person who has had trouble with trashcans.

She is not a fan of mansions and noted that we have homeless problem. She noted that this is the biggest financial investment of most peoples' lives.

**Siobhan** noted that she is all for wildlife, and that they have a bear problem in La Canada-Flintridge not here. She agrees with Mrs. MacCracken that nobody in her neighborhood knows about this, and that she herself had not been notified until two weeks ago, when she heard about this from a flyer from a neighbor. She doesn't think people have been properly notified. She is concerned for those with an old house if burned down would not be able to build back to what it. She all for the wildlife but would like to iron out the details that would affect long-term residents in Bel Air and Laurel Canyon area, where he has a home as well.

**Katherine Pakradouni** introduced herself as the CD4 Representative on the Community Forest Advisory Committee (CFAC) and expressed supports of our letter, which she feels is well balanced, addressed a lot of aspects in support of the ordinance and some concerns and critiques about engaging the Neighborhood Council. She noted that she is a native plant horticulturist who is developing plants for the Liberty Canyon Wildlife Crossing, and noted that this ordinance is near and dear to her, it is very timely, and very much hopes you will support the letter. She noted to Dr. Tim Steele, if he taught poetry at Cal State LA, she was one of his students.

**Elaine Kohn**, related, to all the people who don't understand who is opposing this, that she has lived in Laurel Canyon for 40+ years, has never developed anything and doesn't intend to develop anything and she opposes the ordinance. She noted that she is very interested in wildlife and protecting wildlife but doesn't see how a maze of little open spaces between 27,000 parcels of land will protect wildlife. She thinks it will be an invitation to unhoused people and people with other ill intent. She doesn't understand how the letter that says a major problem can be solved by using a biologically based rather than a resource land-use based approach, which she noted would be a major change in this ordinance, and on the other hand supports the ordinance.

**Jenny Mangelsdorf** thanked us for our work in support of this ordinance. She has grown up in the hills, lived here more than 60 years, and the person who said that thousands and then said hundreds of people are against it, she knows a lot of people in the hills including people on the other side of the 405 who would love to be part of this pilot. She commented that we please save their neighborhood; this will only increase property values. People move to the hills to have nature and not a concrete jungle, which it has become.

**Honey Nikfar** noted that she opposes the ordinance for several reasons, noting that she hears about mega mansions and celebrities making properties on the hills, and instead of holding those of us with 1, 2 or 3,000 square feet accountable for the mega mansions which the city has authorized, why not limit mega mansions and punish them, not the homeowners living there for years and years. She sees restrictions as very unreasonable. She doesn't see why windows have anything to do with wildlife. She reads through the cracks of this ordinance and feels we are pushing it through for all the wrong reasons and she strongly opposes it.

**Nancye Ferguson** thanked us for our work, noting that she has listened to every comment at multiple meetings. She noted that she belongs to a community border-lining Laurel Canyon and Sunset Plaza, where there are more people concerned about wildlife than she has known anywhere but also many homeowners hurting about his ordinance; she thinks there is confusion and people need to know what is going on. She thinks someone like herself could

be impacted by this, in terms of property value, or her architectural home that could not be replicated. She has lived in her house for 29 years, which is filled with glass, and has not had one bird fly into her window. She sees deer in her backyard. She stands with Alison MacCracken and with homeowners that we need something about wildlife but that take care of the people who live; deal with big development but keep the people here small and in the community.

**Georg Grant** noted that he has attended all the meetings and seconded support for Alison MacCracken and the hard work she has put in. He noted that as a homeowner here in Bel Air for many years, he supports wildlife, but the way the ordinance is drafted, he doesn't find it workable or useful the way it is drafted. He thinks the letter needs to go into why a biologically based approach is better and different, especially considering wildlife and the homeowners and the proposed ordinance. It needs to be clearer in the letter.

*[The Public Comment Period was closed at 8:06pm.]*

The Chair noted that the motion is on the floor; he reviewed Roberts Rules of Order and asked the Board to consider whether to consider the letter as a whole or by section/by paragraph or en seriatim, after which there would be a vote on the motion as a whole as amended through that process.

**Motion:** Vice President of Legislative Affairs Hall supports comment on the letter as a whole, noting that we would be doing this until midnight if we do it through 20 sections; everyone has had an ample opportunity to review the letter, and he feels we should go with the first options. The motion was seconded. It was not a debatable motion. The motion **carried** by 14 yeses from Members Steele, Evans, Wayne, Weinberg, Roth-Mann, Hall, Stojka, Holmes, Murphy, Kwan, Tanner, Greenberg and Miner, 0 noes, and 2 abstentions from Member Loze and Dr. Longcore.

A good deal of board discussion was held. The Chair was asked and provided information on opportunities for further comment in the process, to which he noted that the letter would go to City Planning, then City Planning Commissioners when there may be revision and a staff report which we could comment on; then to City Planning, and if City Planning Commission approves, to City Council. There are at least several more steps as the bill becomes a law.

Member Loze suggested that on page 7, next to last line, the words previously "disturbed" should be stricken and the words previously "developed" or "built upon" should be included. On page 8 as to 100,000 square feet he believes there should be a cap on that, noting that Malibu has a 25,000 cap. He'd put a limit on what the purpose is about, and a limit of 25,000 square feet.

**Amending Motion:** To amend the letter by, on page 7, changing language, from "previously disturbed" to "previously developed," and on page 8 to affirmatively suggest a total development foot print of 25,000 square feet was moved by Loze and seconded by Weinberg. Longcore described context for the two-part amendment as a point of information, and Board comments were provided. Templeton spoke against and Hall spoke for the amendment. Wayne called the question; however, Paden and Templeton wanted to continue debate, where there were two votes to continue, which was far less than a third; therefore, a vote taken.

The **amendment passed** with 12 yeses from Members Loze, Mann, Hall, Wayne, Weinberg, Steele, Sandler, Evans, Miner, Greenberg, Garfield, Kwan, 7 noes from Members Murphy, Templeton, Cobb, Bayliss, Paden, Tanner, Levotman, and 2 abstentions from Members Stojka and the Chair. The amendments would be added to the letter.

Further discussion was held, in which Ad Hoc Committee Chair Evans responded to concerns of Member Levotman, noting that they are addressed in the letter, asking if he had ways that he would want the letter amended. She noted that DSPNA has been putting out information on the ordinance, anybody in the DSPNA North of Sunset area should have known about this. Evans noted that she liked the comment that we should add why a biologically-based approach is different from the land use-based approach, and if there is a pilot there should be some required analysis at some point.

**Motion:** To flesh out the part about biologically-based approach and add in some required analysis so they can assess how the ordinance is doing was **moved** by Evans. Evans noted, as to concerns she heard about trashcans, that this is a pilot program, and if it doesn't make sense in our area, it may make sense in other areas that do have bears, for example.

**Motion reworded by Dr. Longcore:** To add additional detail on the difference between the land-use-based approach and the biological approach and request that there be analysis on the effectiveness of the ordinance **moved** by Evans; **seconded** by Cathy Wayne. Evans agrees with the phrase that there should be periodic assessment of the effectiveness.

Member Templeton noted that there needs to be guidelines in the ordinance on how they are going to study it once it is done as right now there is nothing in the ordinance about the study part. Evans **restated the motion** to include that they should say how they are going to study as well in the ordinance.

There was support and no objection to the amendment. Member Templeton supports changing to biologically based rather than zoning based and asked Longcore to explain the difference. Member Stojka also asked for the difference between the two approaches to which Dr. Longcore provided a summary noting that the current draft of the ordinance maps some of the wildlife resources based on a land-use designation, which is publicly-owned open space as opposed to the actual attributes of the land itself. One of the classifications are open space parcels. He noted that we refer to this as referring to the land use, it is zoned as open space; whereas a different approach would be to define your parcels based on the actual cover of the parcels, meaning what is growing there. By land cover, it means oak woodland, chaparral, etc., whereas "land use" only says it is open space, because you can have a parcel that is zoned as open space that is adjacent to current development that is completely weed whacked to nubs every year; yet that is defined as an open space... He noted that there is a parcel like that up the street for him, which is biologically speaking a buffer of the habitat, by focusing on land use, instead of land cover, you sometimes place more value on parcels that don't necessarily have a special high value to them, and you also ignore parcels that are not publicly owned open space that are incredibly valuable to wildlife. Those private parcels are not mapped as being wildlife resources right now because unless there is a stream, e.g., a water resource.

No one spoke against the amendment. The motion had no opposition and that amendment will be added to the letter.

The Board then returned to the main motion.

Member Templeton noted that she appreciates all the work that the people on the committee did, but thinks this is bad law because it fails to take into account some of the most important things. She noted that the PAWS study, the sole study, does not recommend these regulations and the recommendations in the PAWS study are not in this ordinance. She noted that the ridgeline ordinance has no wildlife nexus to the ridgelines. She feels that we need to demand a good



wildlife ordinance backed by science with due consideration of all the people that will be affected. She wants the letter to say we can't support it if you can't show us that you've taken the homeowners under consideration and loosen the restrictions that have no scientific basis or benefit to wildlife.

Member Paden noted that he agreed with a lot of what Patricia said. He does biology work and deals with safety concerns on the job. He noted, by analogy, when talking about implementing a wildlife policy, we need to take into consideration the human aspect of things. He sees a disconnect with the plant list published in this Wildlife Ordinance, specifically where some plants listed are promoted as fire proof or fire resistant.

Dr. Longcore believes that the draft letter suggests that the Fire Department should be consulted about the plant list; Evans noted that this should be added.

Hall noted that we had a motion as amended. He strongly supports the motion and again wanted to reiterate, and appreciates Mindy telling us that there were actually four environmental meetings, and we talk about respecting committee work. He noted that we carefully crafted each of the suggested revisions in this 11-page letter to be respectful of what we were hearing, to identify what we heard was the problem and create a balanced approach, and that the City doesn't do CEQA review anymore for the overwhelming projects in our area, as mentioned by Andrew. Hall noted that the Berkley case seized upon that project – so we have zero environmental review which highlights the importance of this ordinance. He wants everyone to acknowledge that. Hall likes that significant trees are finally protected as there was literally nothing from removing a significant tree if it's not a native tree on the protective tree list. He noted that many of the trees in our communities are not protective trees. He noted that finally we have a provision in this ordinance that would require that trees be replaced at a 2:1 ratio. People cut them down because they don't like them.

Hall noted, as regards basements, that we know how many developers have abused the basement exemption and that there is a direct correlation between the size of the home and the loss of habitat. He noted that we have seen tons of abuse with people who build these houses that cascade down the hillsides, and this is something we have been complaining about for years. The cut and fill under the footprint of the home is no longer exempted from grading calculations. The reason why they do is because there are these loopholes. This ordinance removes some of the loopholes to slightly reduce the size of the home to create a more appropriate balance.

The displacement and loss of habitat is causing major harm to wildlife. This is not an ordinance about wildlife it is about flora and fauna. Wildlife needs trees, waters, things with four legs.

Hall continued, if you read the ordinance, it can be a little bit confusing on that topic. Our letter requests the city to rewrite the ordinance to clarify that. Also, we kept hearing from lots of people who kept saying that they wanted to rebuild 100% of the value, currently it is only 75% people were saying that is not a risk that they could tolerate, and the committee recommended that people could rebuild their home of 100% of replacement value. The letter also request a process for de minimis for site plan review if the intersection with the resource buffer is plainly minor and site plan review would serve no purpose and be a burden to the homeowner.

Hall also stated that the letter contained recommendations to strengthen the ordinance. Native woodlands are one of the most important resources for wildlife, and yet they are not included as protected wildlife habitat. The City could use the habitat maps from the National Park Service to map sensitive woodlands and protect them. It would be irresponsible for us to not offer these

improvements on the ordinance. Please respect the committee's work. It was 15 committee hearings, one PLU committee meeting and we must respond to that.

Miner thanked Hall and the committees. She noted that people have been voicing their negative opinions and we have heard good opinions. It is a step forward that we need to take and we need to be relieved for the good things that will come of it. Some people have been concerned about the value of their properties and homes, and have heard a lot people concerned about overbuilding and loss of wildlife, it is a step in the right direction. It is a better idea to go forward with it and take a step backward and it's not going to work. We all have large financial investments in the hills. She noted that it is a different type of environmental/geography altogether. Our purpose in being in the hills is to be stewards of the hills. She thinks Hall mentioned everything the way we need to see it; take our opportunity to do something. Our letter is a letter of encouragement; contains a lot that the committee wanted to change. Nothing is perfect to begin with; it is a pilot study; no point of stopping it and dismissing it. It is a negative way of handling our whole existence. Everyone did a remarkable job.

Greenberg called the question. A vote was taken on the motion and **14 members voted yes:** Wayne, Cobb, Hall, Steele, Murphy, Weinstein, Roth, Loze, Greenberg, Kwan, Levotman, Sandler, Miner and Garfield; **5 members voted to continue to debate:** Templeton, Evans, Loze, Paden & Stojka. The Chair abstained.

**Vote on the motion as amended with the two amendments, to send the letter passed by 15 yeses, 4 noes, and 1 abstention.**

President Longcore gave closing comments, including but not limited to that it is possible that we will look at revisions on this, and thanked us for the incredibly hard work done on this, particularly Ad Hoc Committee Chairs Evans and Mann. The meeting adjourned at 9:35 P.M.

[www.babcnc.org](http://www.babcnc.org)  
(310) 479-6247x7  
[info@babcnc.org](mailto:info@babcnc.org)