



Draft Minutes

**Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
Planning & Land Use Committee Meeting (Virtual)
 Tuesday February 21, 2023 5:00 P.M.**

Name	P	A	Name	P	A
Robert Schlesinger, Chair	X		Stephanie Savage	X	
Robin Greenberg	X		Nickie Miner	X	
Don Loze	X		Jamie Hall	X	
Shawn Bayliss (<i>left at agenda #6</i>)	X		Jason Spradlin		X
André Stojka	X		Ellen Evans	X	
Steven Weinberg	X		Cathy Wayne	X	
Maureen Levinson		X	Leslie Weisberg		X
Stella Grey		X	Travis Longcore <i>ex officio</i>	X	

Chair Schlesinger called the meeting to order at 5:00pm, related preliminary information on the agenda, and led the Flag Salute. Board Secretary Miner called the roll, and Member Hall arrived a few minutes later, for a total of **12 present & 4 absent**. Member Bayliss noted that he would recuse himself from #6 due to conflict.

1. The agenda was **approved** as moved by Member Stojka.
2. Approval of the January 10, 2023 Minutes (**Attachment A**) was **deferred** to next month.
3. **General Public Comment:** BABCNC welcomes comment from the public on any topic within the Committee's jurisdiction but not on the adopted agenda. General Public Comment is limited to one (1) minute per speaker, unless waived by the presiding officer.

Lionel Mares noted that he has attended the Metro's Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project hearings, and asked that the Neighborhood Council support the heavy rail option for the West Valley and the Westside, including UCLA and UCLA Health Center, to decrease congestion on the 405 Freeway.

4. **Chair Report** – Robert Schlesinger noted that Nithya Raman and Katy Yaroslavsky wrote a very intense letter on ADUs in the hillsides. He explained that on agenda #6, Groverton Place, he included note of the earlier project which had been withdrawn and replaced by the current project. Chair Schlesinger noted that he sent out an email that the Beverly Hills Planning Commission is having a special on ADUs in Beverly Hills.

5. **2424 N BRIARCREST ROAD 90210 DIR-2022-9281-DRB-SPP-HCA ENV-2022-9282-CE**

Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan (MSPSP) Lot Area. 40,498.00 sf.

Present Use Vacant Undeveloped

Proposed Use / Project Description: Construct (N) 2 story SFD (7029 sf) w/accessory structure (garage), pool and grading. 5,760 sf hardscape, a 460 sf LID planter, outdoor pool, (N) acc structure with driveway (garage, 646.79 sf) and grading (545 cy of export) Max height 25 ft. FAR 17.35%

Applicant: Paul & Lisa Fitzpatrick Alto Cedro LLC Torrance 424.421.9429 paul@pfihotels.com

Representative: Permits Unlimited Janaye Callaghan 805.367.6914. permitsunlimited@gmail.com

Architects: Gerhard Heusch, Heusch LLC 310.748.7000 gheusch@me.com & Pablo Guerri pguerri@heusch.com

Permanent Link: <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/caseid/MjYzNjMy0>

And <https://wetransfer.com/downloads/2934fbc29b48fddb14f21346fafa83520230216230017/805cb6>

Mr. Pablo Guerri, Architect from the firm Gerhard Heusch LLC, introduced himself and thanked the Committee for hearing this project. He provided an overview of the project, sharing his screen, with floor plans in the background. He noted that they are proposing new construction 7,000 square feet single family residence with a three-car garage and a

pool on a very steep lot. The lot is slightly visible of Mulholland, lies within the outer corridor, subject to the Baseline Hillside Ordinance, approximately 40,000 square feet; the proposal has a FAR of 17% and a lot coverage of 21% of the entire lot. He noted that the main challenge was to strike the correct balance between the house and the site, from a design perspective, which they tackled working closely with MDRB, following their guidelines... and also from a construction perspective, trying to minimize impacts of the new house.

The premise was to try to do as little excavation as possible, trying to reach a pad area, their lower deck. This is a two-story house. The idea was to try to tackle or reach or create a pad from which to stage the project without compromising the neighborhood, or as little as possible; a challenge on this lot; this is the main goal to do there. They have 600 CY of cut and 100 CY of fill. The idea is to try to reach this pad area when they do the lower deck concrete and take on the project from there. The rest is to keep the project as low and as close to the ground as they could, staying below the envelope heights of the Mulholland guidelines and restrictions for a lot like this.

In term of the design, they are trying to break up the mass as much as they could; to create different levels, breaking up the roof; to blend with the natural topography of the elongated lot, and minimizing impacts both visually and in terms of the time of construction. As to the design or other, they are showing how they are trying to do as little intervention as possible on the site; pointing out the pad area; the idea is to secure ground by doing piles as soon as they can, stabilizing the road and creating the pad area from which to continue building the house.

Landscape is a low-intervention project; trying to keep as much as possible; not touching any protected trees; projecting a slim and clean profile towards the street; everything they are removing will be replaced. They submitted Bio report and Tree report. As to the neighborhood, the client is currently developing a house across the street, which they've managed successfully without complaints from neighbors, and have the support of some on this project as well. Mr. Guerri noted that they know it is a substandard street, always complicated, but in this case a private street, a cul-de-sac, where they have 9 properties along the street; one is vacant, some are for rentals, and there are many families that the client has reached out to and shared the project... He'd like the opportunity to enhance and develop the project further to bring value to the neighborhood. Following his presentation, the floor was opened to the board for questions.

Member Evans asked what exactly the discretionary approval is here. Mr. Guerri noted that it is a Mulholland Design Review Board (MDRB), currently under revision. They haven't had the meeting with MDRB. They are working with Olga Ayala on this project, addressing all of their concerns, but haven't had the opportunity to present it to the board. Member Evans asked about the street width, which she believes looks like it may be a less than 20' across in some places, from the Google view. He noted that this is mostly 20 feet wide and they are aware of this concern, which is why they are eager to stage the project from the site ASAP; where they will need to put some equipment on the street. It will never be more than one lane, they'll need traffic control for no more than two or three months at the beginning of the project. He noted that it is 20 feet in most places, pointing out the width of the street, at their lot and where the street ends on the Zimas plan, and they have eight lots after theirs.

Member Evans noted that she appreciates the biological report and preservation of so many trees, and noted that the biological report says they recommend vegetation clearing be done in the fall, while in their plan it says in the spring. He noted that the rough construction scale is meant to be about the length of the construction but not a real start date, as that hasn't been decided. He noted that they can accommodate to make it happen according to the biological report; he overlooked that when preparing it; it was just a tentative date; the start date is not really fixed and that can be addressed.

Member Savage noted that she had some things to confirm, including that the road width looks sometimes much less than 20 feet. She noted that we had another project down the street at the intersection with a ZA case, and their survey shows much less than 20 feet on Alto Cedro and Briarcrest. She would recommend confirming that because that would mean having another entitlement. Mr. Guerri responded that it has been surveyed and at his portion it is 20 feet. Member Savage noted it is not just their frontage but getting to the property too.

Member Savage noted, as to grading, if less than that, by-right is reduced. The grading doesn't mention piles, and the piles will be many and deep... both for pile day-lighting and for substantial fill on the property which may also require additional shoring piles; and there is also mention of remedial grading in the grade improvement letter. She noted that some of these are exempt... yet they need to be considered when they give the total number, because right now they just have 500 for building cut and there is much more than that for the project, which relates to impact and to the neighbors,

etc. Also, she noted that it appears that there is room for three cars on site and asked where the additional two car spaces are based on their square footage. She noted that we also want proof of the neighbors being contacted. If they are doing any road improvements that would be worth noting, particularly if frontage is less than 20 feet.

As to water, Ms. Savage noted that their contribution for the house is 8,800 square feet, the planter is pretty small for what will be needed there, and asked where does that drain, and are we sure it won't drain onto other properties? She asked about 8' gate(s) in the street and noted that another project we did here in 2019 at 2411 Briarcrest was an abutting property to this and they struggled with the height for a two-story house (she thinks an accessory structure) and they needed three entitlements... because it was a really steep site. She is concerned, noting that they are looking at the same slope essentially. She'll list these things for him, and gave him an opportunity to respond.

Mr. Guerri noted that the civil calculations were done by their civil engineer and are in the plans; he'll look into this, as it is part of what is to be done for construction. He is surprised it is not addressed that way and they definitely have piles that should be reflected if not. Regarding parking lots, he noted they have the three covered ones on the detached garage and two parking lots outside, with the backup aisle to get out; they are parallel, that are in their setback on the property. He agreed with Member Savage that they are in the dedication. He answered her questions about the LID planters, pointing out the planters where they drain the runoff from roofs, also addressed on the civil calculations, 400 or 500 square feet of LID planters. Member Savage asked him where the water drains, and he was not able to confirm but noted that it is addressed. He noted that the civil plans have been submitted and he would be happy to clarify that. In terms of proof of contact, he has provided one letter of support and today received an email confirmation from one of the neighbors at the end of the street; he'll send the scanned letter with signature.

Member Hall focused his comments on the biological, noting that he likes that the reports are getting better. He would like him to direct his comment to the biologist: Section 4.3 of the report entitled Wildlife, the 4th paragraph talks about habitat linkages and wildlife corridors, and acknowledges that there are planning significant areas by LA County but does not acknowledge, recognize or evaluate the SMMC Habitat Linkage Map; outlines parcels with habitat value, and specifically where there are known wildlife corridors. Hall noted that while it is a good study, the author apparently did not know this map existed and did not evaluate this project against that map. Hall noted that there is a wildlife corridor running through the property, and feels that the report is fundamentally flawed. It concludes that there is no potential habitat connectivity issues that this project would interfere with. Member Hall asked that the biologist re-do and supplement this with the map, that has been adopted by the State agency. He will provide the link to the map.

Hall asked that the biologist needs to also look at the Natural Resource Protection Plan and re-evaluate his conclusion and update the report. He'd like the biologist to also address the mountain lion analysis in that same section, with regard to predictions of puma suitability. Member Hall noted that if there is one thing that P22 taught us is that our knowledge and expectations about where this species lives is growing, and habitat is provided for on practically every vacant parcel on the Santa Monica Mountains. Hall thinks that the one paragraph habitat evaluation needs to be revisited, noting that the Hollywood Community Plan has a statement that says if deer frequent a property that is a telltale sign of mountain lion habitat. Member Hall asked that he speak to his biologist about this.

Member Hall asked how many significant non-protected trees are being removed, Mr. Guerri noted that he will reach out and comment on this. He pointed out the trees that are being removed, some of which were planted by the client before, that are not significant, and that the trees in the front were small and not significant. There are 24 trees to be replaced, at 1:1 ratio, he believes. He is replacing the trees on site.

Member Hall let him know that it would be great if they be replaced with native species with a commitment to maintain them for at least three years. Mr. Guerri noted that the landscape designer has been addressing these issues, and that they haven't had any complaints regarding other projects in the area. Hall noted the point is that he wants him to design appropriate mitigation as to the wildlife, e.g., if you put up fencing, that will impede wildlife connectivity. Hall would also like information on fencing downslope. Mr. Guerri noted that they are aware of the Wildlife Corridor, working with LADBS on this, and are considering for both of the side setbacks to keep them as clear as possible. Dr. Longcore noted that Mr. Guerri's comments do not address the connectivity issue, running north and south, asking why a client would want to spend the money to fence an entire undeveloped steep hillside, to which Mr. Guerri noted that he understands and can revise that; they're not touching/developing 80% of the land and are not planning to do that.

Dr. Longcore noted from a biological impact perspective, there are a number of things that are borderline when it comes to potentially having biological impacts that exceed what they should be doing. Dr. Longcore noted that the arborist has the wrong species on the walnuts. They are not Black Walnuts; they are Southern California Black Walnuts; they have Juglans Nigra and they are actually Juglans Californica. Dr. Longcore noted that they properly identified that they are protected but incorrectly identified them. The trees that are *in* black are native species that are protected, Toyon, Coast Live Oak, Southern California Black Walnut, and there is one Toyon in the foot of the project area that will be removed but isn't big enough to reach the protected status. He noted that two trees along the red line (pointing) in black, is cutting it close to impacting those... something like that would normally be considered an encroachment and would need some sort of a mitigation.

Dr. Longcore noted that the bigger picture is whether or not the land area on the hill slope, what is the vegetation classification for that, because if it is a combination of oaks and walnuts, natively, and that is the dominant species there, it turns into a sensitive natural community that needs to be recognized and protected. Dr. Longcore acknowledged that the actual footprint is mostly what is planted and they are leaving most of the land undeveloped but it is probably too steep to develop but he would say if you want to avoid opening a can of worms of impacting that hill slope and natural resources, it would absolutely be imperative to *not* fence the entire property... He encouraged them to not fence the whole thing, keep it within 10 feet of their farthest down caissons or where it needs to be to protect the structure.

He also asked them to commit to *not* lighting that hillside either, so no flood lights, anything lighting on those decks are put at the edges and facing inward, rather than on the hillside as that would impact the wildlife species. Mr. Guerri thanked Dr. Longcore for the information on fencing and lighting, and said that downhill there would be no landscape lighting at all, which has been addressed, is part of Mulholland regulations... and in the landscape lighting plans.

Motion to continue the project, and provide a list of questions, requests for clarification and comments that will be prepared by Members Savage, Hall, Schlesinger, Evans, Miner & Longcore to be answered by the client prior to the next meeting. The motion was **approved unanimously** as **moved** by Member Savage and **seconded** by Member Wayne.

Robert Schlesinger asked about the caissons and opined that there would be much more than what they are proposing for export. Mr. Guerri related that he would need to connect with the team on this. Member Miner noted with so many caissons going so deep, it is an additional cumulative effect on the hillside. Member Hall invited the biologist to come with him to the next meeting. Mr. Guerri was asked by Chair Schlesinger and said he will contact Ms. Palmer to let her know when he is able to return. Member Greenberg wanted asked to see the picture of the property across the street with the concrete block wall, asking if this has been accepted by the community, to which Mr. Guerri noted has been approved, a small portion to the garage entrance to the property.

6. [5:57 PM] 146 N GROVERTON PL 90077 ZA-2021-9880-ZV-ZAA ENV-2021-9881-CE

Project Description: New, two-story, single-family residence, with basement and attached garage.

Project Description: Zoning Administrators Adjustment reduction for side yard setback (5.48') to relocating stairwell access, yard gate, deck & pilaster; zone variance for 30' flagpole & non-conf. retaining wall.

Applicant: John Joliet [John P. Joliet Co TR - John]

Representative: Stacey Brenner – Brenner Consulting Group stacey@brennerconsultinggroup.com

Rochelle Hernandez rochelle@brennerconsultinggroup.com

Permanent Link: <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/caseid/MjYzMzk40>

Dropbox file for applicable project-related documents, per the NC checklist:

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/neuautjuqv7g3karji32g/h?dl=0&rlkey=tjenonsi6amm81038udglij73>

[146 N GROVERTON PL 90077 ZA-2021-9880-ZV-ZAA ENV-2021-9881-CE 12/22/2021

THIS WAS PREVIOUSLY WITHDRAWN and retired ©1/22 Total Area 19,639 sf.

Project Description: Zoning Administrators Adjustment reduction for side yard setback (5.48') to relocating stairwell access, yard gate, deck & pilaster; zone variance for 30' flagpole & non-conf. retaining wall.

Filed: 12/22/2021 Applicant/Owner: John P Joliet Co TR – John Family Trust.]

[Member Bayliss signed out of the meeting, recusing himself from this project.]

Ms. Stacey Brenner introduced herself as the presenter, noting that she was accompanied by the property owner, John P. Joliet. She noted that the permits for the actual building structure have already been issued and they are not here for the

building structure but for some accessory reliefs from code. She noted that they filed for a ZA case last year and at the time, the property owner, with construction costs and the economy, who was negotiating with an adjacent neighbor as to a staircase with access down the retaining wall down the neighbor's property, were not sure if they would work out but ultimately did, but due to the uncertainty of life they withdrew the case. Ms. Brenner noted that since that time, he has decided to move forward and they are here now, with almost the same relief in discretionary requests. She noted that there are slight differences between the original application and this one. The primary difference is the front yard over-in-height gate and the front yard inside hedges for which they are requesting relief for over-in-height in parity with the rest of the neighborhood, which is why they are here with two slight differences.

One other item, Ms. Brenner noted, was that this property is "irregularly shaped," making for interesting side yards and yards. She noted that the project team consists of the owner, John and Muriel Joliet, the expeditor, Brenner Consulting Group, the architect, KAA Design and the Civil Engineer, AMEC, Inc.

Ms. Brenner noted that they are asking relief from codes as follows:

- 1) Importantly, due to the size and irregularly shaped topography (pointing to the screen to the area) they are asking for reduction of 12-foot side yard setback so a portion of the building, only be 46 square feet of the building, will be encroaching into the side yard setback; the relief of that would be to reduce the side yard setback to approximately 6 feet 5 inches.
- 2) The following is being done just in case, through Plan Check: There may be some pilasters that will extend into the side-yard setback as well, and if they consider those structures or not; so it is a little grey whether they need this entitlement but filed for it in case LADBS says they need it.
- 3) Relief for a 30-foot flagpole at the rear of property that no neighbor or adjoining property owner will be able to view.
- 4) Relocating the side yard originally on the adjacent property owner's property, bringing it onto the property owner's property: They want relief from code because they will be touching the retaining wall, which is pre-existing, that does not meet current code. Stabilizing that will be a benefit; will be into two walls because they'll be cutting into the existing wall, and as a result of them touching that preexisting retaining wall, it exceeds in height of 12 feet.
- 4) Over-height hedges in front yard, which they will increase to 6' as well as a new property gate, which they will increase to 6'.

Ms. Brenner noted that the aerial view of the location shows it is right off Sunset Boulevard. She noted that because of demo permits, building permits, retaining wall permits and ADU permit, that were all issued, there was a notification sent for the property at 106 North Groverton, who has been notified of this project.

She noted that the property owner has made a presentation at the Bel Air Country Club, the largest land owner adjacent to him, and to the Bel-Air Association... all of whom have indicated that they will support this effort, primarily because it won't be impactful to anybody; no one will see what's going on with these requests; it will be on site, and the hedges and gate in front is in parity with the rest neighborhood and projects of the area.

She provided a site plan of the property, noting that the clouded areas are areas indicated for the relief of code, provided based on the approved set of plans. She explained that currently the project is vacant, an irregularly shaped lot, approximately 19,626 square feet. The proposed project includes a new two-story SFR with basement, attached garage and backfill compaction of an existing pool to replace it. It will be 8,116 square feet gross, net square footage 7,385 square feet; ADU 731 sf, will be a new pool. The basement exempted per BHO would be 3,381 square feet; so the total if you were to add total basement and total gross square footage would be approx. 11,497 square feet for total permitted project. Building height is 36' they have approximately 891 CY of export; grading is about 2,040 with 560 CY of exempt grading, for a total of 1,481. She showed various renderings, looking west; pointing out over-height gate and hedges off to the side. She pointed out an east view, from 15-20 feet up, pointing out the staircase off to the side. She noted elevations, and pointed out the area for relief of the 46 square feet, that would encroach into the side-yard setback and pointed out some existing site photos, that show existing over-in-height hedges along the front yard... She noted the landscape plan, and noted that code changed, and they no longer require the radius map.

She mentioned the Planning Department changes in official noticing requirements for hearings, to be submitted just before the hearings; as to neighbors' notifications, and reiterated they have already had preliminary indications of support from Bel Air Country Club, adjacent neighbors to the north and the adjacent neighbor to the south; they do not know of any opposition. That concluded her presentation.

Questions were asked and answered, with Member Savage asking if they got an AQMD permit along with Demo permit, to which Ms. Brenner confirmed that they had. Savage noted that CY in grading showed approximately 1100 for the basement cut and asked if they will be restoring that on site, to avoid a haul route, to which Ms. Brenner noted that she doesn't know where the re-compaction will go yet. She can get that information to her. Savage asked if the neighbors of abutting properties are in support, other than the Country Club and neighborhood association, to which Ms. Brenner noted that, per preliminary indications, they are supportive of this effort. Savage asked about the rear yard setback in the triangle wedge, as to why the rear yard is not paralleling the front, to which Ms. Brenner explained that they went to the City because they thought the same, and the way they assessed where the side yards were, they determined where they side yards were, which she noted they did early in the process.

Chair Schlesinger asked Ms. Brenner what the ADU will be used for, to which Ms. Brenner noted it is primarily for a guesthouse. The Jolietts have three children who are heading to college. She noted that it is intended to act more like an extension of a pool house, like a granny flat, for someone to come visit the homeowners. She denied that this is a house to bring other folks in to live with them; but is primarily for their own residents and their family.

Member Evans asked what the required findings are for these determinations. Ms. Brenner noted that she provided them in their package from last week but will re-send them directly to her if needed.

Member Miner asked to see what was on this property prior to this project, to which Ms. Brenner noted that it is hard to see because the hedges are so large, but the owner related that it was a ranch-style home, clapboard-siding, built in the 1920s (noting the poor shape of the home at the time) and thinks the size of the home was roughly 4,000 one level, with a California basement with HVAC equipment, etc.

Member Evans related that she cannot find what the required findings are and how this project meets them. Ms. Brenner was able to pull up a copy of the findings, which she offered to email her. Member Loze asked, as to the side yard encroachment, if there is any discussion with the LAFD on their point of view. Ms. Brenner related, as to side yard access, to get building permits, one of the clearance items was to go through LAFD hydrant, access, fire sprinklers, were all cleared, and noted that they would not have received the building permits without clearance from them.

Motion to support the project if no opposition from the abutting property owners was **approved** by all but three abstentions from Members Evans, Schlesinger and Longcore as **moved** by Members Savage and Wayne.

7. **1436 N BELLA DR 90210 ZA-2022-3836-ZAD ENV-2022-3837-EAF**

Lot Area: 167,720.7 sq ft.

Project Description: Demo of existing SFD, excavation & construction of new 3-story SFD w/basement, pool & spa structures and site improvements. Project includes haul route to export 9,000 cy.

Action Requested: Zoning Administrator Determination to allow relief from a continuous paved road of a SFD at 1436 N. Bella Drive. To Demo a SFD 4.800 sf, built in 1953.

Applicant: Falcon Lair Holdings, LLC westphal@cfolic.com 484-660-1460.

Reps: Crest Real Estate tony@crestrealestate.com and Isaac Lemus isaac@crestrealestate.com 408.655.0998.

Permanent Link: <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/caseid/MjU3OTk40> click on "Initial Submittal Documents" Please also see the Crest Dropbox below for additional information

https://www.dropbox.com/sh/g353rsqck5k3y2m/AAA-Iy7_Wsy-UmhpO-H7mAMja?dl=0

Mr. Isaac Lemus noted that he was here to provide some short updates on the project since last seen last month. He noted as to their request for relief from continuous paved roadway... the portion in question is the section in front of Bella Drive for the request of a ZAD. He noted that they spoke to the client who is more than willing to do improvements on Bella Drive. Street Improvements: He noted it will be difficult if not impossible to widen Bella Drive given the extreme topography and path of Bella Drive, but can alleviate in other ways, working with BOE & Civil Engineering team to make improvements, e.g., street resurfacing, improving guard rails, cleaning sloughage, getting an A permit... a lengthy of process with BOE; he hopes to have more information at March meeting.

Haul Route Management: As to concerns about trucks loading and unloading, they are adding conditions to their haul route, to ensure safety to all involved, ... still determining what to include in the plan, e.g., flagmen, confirming that any loading occurs on site, to make sure they are not blocking access and overall safety of Bella Drive, and looking at hours and truck sizes to make sure it is accommodating of the site. They expect to have more details at the March meeting.

Neighborhood Outreach: They contacted 1435 Bella and 1440 Bella, both of whom are aware and interested in the improvements suggested, with one willing to contribute most likely, once they get the A permit in hand. He noted that there are required notifications to be sent out before the hearings. He noted that if there is anyone along Bella Drive and Cielo Drive who wants to be kept up to date on their improvements, they'll be happy to include them in their progress report. They haven't got a date for hearing. This was a brief progress update not a full in-depth review.

Member Savage asked who their contact person is at BOE, which he did not have. He noted that they are in the process of creating the submittal plans. He will let her know. She also asked for the staff planner's name for the project, whom he noted is Kevin.fulton@lacity.org

Member Savage noted that an A permit is not a B permit and thinks it doesn't make sense; the A permit doesn't ensure the safety of those who live on that street or in that house, and encouraged a B Permit. She doesn't believe it is infeasible to have piles to support the road width for the house, to make a safety improvement on such a terrible street. Member Hall asked if the improvements would be made pre- or post-construction, to which Mr. Lemus noted that their current plan was to have it done after construction but would be interested in hearing other ideas.

Chair Schlesinger asked about the two half-walls going up Cielo that are 14 feet wide, two sets of two, and asked how they'll negotiate even a 10' truck; noting that a dump truck is 10-12 feet wide, and will barely get through those two sets of walls. He asked how they will accommodate the neighbors trying to get in and out of their homes, to which Mr. Lemus noted he will look into this. Schlesinger noted they are talking 900+ trucks. Schlesinger asked if there is another way to access the property from lower Cielo and bypass most of the mid-or-upper Cielo, to which Mr. Lemus responded unfortunately not... Schlesinger related that he meant to create a temporary not permanent access.

Member Loze related that he thinks until the applicant has some answers about safety features and schedule performance and a program to resolve the issues, it is too early to take a position except to reject the project; therefore, if they want to continue, he'd suggest we continue the project.

Motion to continue the project was **moved** by Member Loze and **seconded** by Member Miner. Mr. Lemus noted that he will return in March. The motion to continue this project **passed** by unanimous consent.

Good of the Order: Dr. Longcore noted that BONC is having a meeting at the end of February to resolve that the emergency will go on another 30 days, which will give us March online, and start in-person meetings in April. 2) He noted that tomorrow evening we have a Meet the Candidates starting at 6:30 pm prior to our 7:00 pm meeting. If you want to advocate for SB411 (Portantino), Contact State Senator & Representative

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:40 pm, as moved by Stojka and Miner, to return on **March 14, 2022**

ACRONYMS:

A – APPEAL	PM – PARCEL MAP
APC – AREA PLANNING COMMISSION	PMEX – PARCEL MAP EXEMPTION
CE – CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION	TTM – TENTATIVE TRACT MAP
DPS – DEEMED TO BE APPROVED PRIVATE STREET	ZA – ZONING ADMINISTRATOR
DRB – DESIGN REVIEW BOARD	ZAA – ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S ADJUSTMENT
EAF – ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSEMENT FORM	ZAD – ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S DETERMINATION
ENV – ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE	ZV – ZONING VARIANCE
MND – MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION	

www.babcnc.org
(310) 479-6247x7
info@babcnc.org