



Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
Planning & Land Use Committee Minutes
TreePeople Conference Room at Coldwater Canyon Park
12601 Mulholland Drive Los Angeles, CA 90210
Tuesday July 11, 2023 7:00 P.M.

Name	P	A	Name	P	A
Robert Schlesinger, Chair	X		Stephanie Savage	X	
Robin Greenberg	X		Nickie Miner (<i>virtually</i>)	X	
Don Loze		X	Jamie Hall		X
Shawn Bayliss		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	

BABCNC Board President Travis Longcore provided welcoming remarks and introduced information on the agenda as to public comment and meeting procedures. The flag salute was recited and the meeting was called to order at 7:17 pm. Dr. Longcore called the roll, and noted that we have one committee member attending online, Nickie Miner.

1. The July 11, 2023 Agenda was **approved** as moved by Stojka.
2. The June 13, 2023 Minutes (Attachment A) were **approved** unanimously as moved by Greenberg.
3. **General Public Comment:**
 PLU Committee Chair Robert Schlesinger read a statement regarding this committee’s intention to pay attention to “piecemealing” by project applicants.
4. **Chair Report** – Robert Schlesinger

Projects & Items Scheduled for Presentation, Discussion & Possible Action:

5. **2261 N Bowmont Dr. 90210 DIR-2021-9948-DRB-SPP-MSP. ENV-2021-9949-CE** (Coldwater Canyon)
Project Description: CONSTRUCTION OF APPROXIMATELY 1449 SQ FT NEW 2-STORY ADDITION OVER 669 SQ FT BASEMENT/STORAGE & 437 SQ FT BASEMENT 2-CAR GARAGE TO EXISTING 1990 SQ FT 1-STORY SFD.
 Applicant: Dr. Matthew Nejad matt@mattnejad.com
 Representative: Dr. Ifa Kashafi ikashafi@gmail.com
 Architects: Ghazal Shokoufandeh ghazal@group-s-inc.com
 Shahram Shokoufandeh shahramgroups@gmail.com
 Filed: 12/07/2021 Assign / Staff: 04/11/22 Courtney Yellen – 06/14/23 Staff: Katie Knudson

Permits: <https://www.ladbsservices2.lacity.org/OnlineServices/PermitReport/PermitResults/984911>

Address. Zimas: <http://zimas.lacity.org/map.aspx>

Permanent Link: <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/caseid/MjUzMDM50> Case Information under “Initial Submittal Documents” and on the Google Drive link below:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1P9eRqP5ktdHgv1Cz4J271AKno3GSPxM_/view?usp=drive_web

Representative, Ifa Kashefi, and Architect, Shahram Shokoufandeh, were present virtually, and provided a presentation via Zoom.

Public Comment/Questions:

Georgia Stavropoulous asked how much soil needs to be displaced and hauling plans; told 524 cy.

Barry B related that he lives next door, and noted his concerns as follows:

There is no space between properties; there is 10’ between his home and the existing structure and no landscaping between their properties.

He doesn’t know how to characterize this as an addition; thinks it is an entirely new modern home being built on a currently traditional small property. He thinks the presenters are deceptive on use of square footage of the lot, using two outlying properties... and that if you take those two out, there is nobody who builds over 15%; that to say 25% is not factual.

He noted that as recently as four months ago, there was a damaging mudslide behind the property and he thinks it is insane to put a structure of this size in the most unstable part of the street. He noted that in the 6-7 years he has lived there, they’ve had multiple mudslides, which are not being addressed in this conversation.

Chuck Shapiro concurred with the comments by the next-door neighbor. He has concern about structural integrity, fears more mudslides. He lives further up Bowmont, which he related is a very narrow street, with quite a bit of traffic, and that it will be very difficult for everyone who lives in the area.

He opined that this property doesn’t have adequate space for construction vehicles, has no place to park, and that upper Bowmont will be very difficult. He noted that Bowmont is inferior because the construction vehicles weigh over limit, the street is in bad shape and very difficult to navigate.

Georgia Stavropoulos showed photos of the landslide spoken of by the neighbor above.

Jim Saltmar related that he lives up the street from project with his wife for 23 years, and their neighborhood has been the target of rampant development that entire time. Their neighborhood was not included in the HCR until recently, making them a target of development without best practices. They’ve been through a lot. Under Amy Adelson, they have a list of guidelines for construction and, if approved, he hopes the developer would follow these guidelines; he welcomes the opportunity to sit with the property owner and builder to go through the 18 points.

Amy Adelson spoke remotely and summarized issues including concern about slope stability, impact on adjacent neighbors, property at the base of swale subject to recurrent slope failure... concern about scale and mass of the structure, particularly the east elevation that looms over Bowmont, and that it is not consistent with the character of the neighboring properties. She is concerned about construction conditions on a substandard road with multiple projects in the works. She hopes he’ll be willing to implement the safety conditions the other builders have adopted.

Scott Baker, a paid representative for the neighbor on the Southside 2251, spoke remotely, noting that he did not have time to review the plans and that it is disturbing that this is only an addition; the garage to be converted to ADU, location of addition of proposed plan is completely different than the house situated now, and most concerning, the soil displacement that the architect represents represented only 525 cy would be removed; to take this from the second floor level; there is a ramp that goes up to the 2nd floor level, and not to the street level. The initial premise is misrepresented. You don't reach their house and garage by driving up Bowmont but by driving up a ramp like most other houses on Bowmont. He noted that it is disturbing that the premise as a baseline is misrepresented. To make the house and garage accessible on the street level is probably 10 x 525 cy which is not possible. He doesn't know if the architect has been to the home, but noted that you have to visit the home to see what has been represented here tonight is not accurate. He related that as a construction lawyer this is unbelievable. He related that he has no grudge against the doctor and his mother who live in the house as long as what they build doesn't endanger others during the 3-5 years that the project will take. He explained that this is a very narrow 2-lane street; a container will not fit on Bowmont much less heavy machinery and that there is no possible way for ingress and egress. He noted that that street is not designed for this kind of modern large two-story, basically a three-story, home on a tiny street. He is very concerned about ingress and egress, the street is in terrible shape to begin with and the heavy machinery can only do damage to that. The excessive concerns are drainage, underground pipes, water system, all affected by hillside movement. While he wants to endorse Dr. Nejab's home improvement, he has many serious concerns about the proposed plan that he noted we have seen today for the first time.

He also complained that he couldn't hear us. Dr. Longcore let him know that we heard his entire testimony and that we were not discriminating; that it was not hearing us but it was hearing him. He explained that public comment was only via audio and *not* video and confirmed for the record that Mr. Baker is a paid representative for the neighbor.

Public Comment was closed & Board Discussion began. Asked, we were told that they are going for permits very soon, they're planning to start construction of the ADU is spring of next year, and the ADU will *not* be for rentals. The following list includes questions asked at the meeting & was sent to the applicants following the meeting:

Stephanie Savage:

1. Typos on applications, states 14490 sf and also 1440 sf, please clarify! MDRB application states existing SF is 2918, and states SF 1990, clarify! Application states 3618 sf of proposed RFA. ADU is 1100 sf? Neighborhood compatibility page states your project will be 4,367 sf, what is the SF?
2. How many retaining walls do you have on property (existing and proposed) and their heights?
3. Toe of Slope requirement not met, plans show 14' horizontal distance when 15' min. is required per uphill slope. (Confirm height envelope allowed for a flat roof in RE-15?)
4. Verify your grading quantity? Plans state 527 cy total, however the volume for the garage and workshop cut (alone) show an excavated volume of over 410 cy.
5. Hillside referral form signed by Dinah Garin states 20' street (and 3' req. dedication) and references vault drawing P-3976 which is for the street in front of the subject property, not the CPR. The continuous paved roadway (CPR) must be checked at road widths to the hillside boundary (Coldwater Canyon). Many segments of Cherokee are very narrow and should be confirmed. One can get a basic investigation (or licensed survey) to verify CPR width or do you need another entitlement for a ZA case for under 12.24-X,28?
6. Drawings show fence in the front yard setback to be 6', however an entitlement is needed if gate, fence or wall exceeds 3.5 'in height. The Lot is an RE-15 lot with a required FYSB of 20', (if applicant is using prevailing

no calculations were included in application. And the google earth show most fysi's from street to street exceed 5'. An average FYSB of 5' would not occur, verify!

7. Low Impact Dev. planter in the FYSB? Verify if allowed per Ordinance. (Detached ADU's can be 16'h and a 4' of side and rear yard setbacks. Your attached ADU is 26'h. Verify please the FYSB?)
8. Parking based on declared RFA appears to require (5) spaces, yet 4 are provided. (1) req. for ADU & (4) for a house over 3401 SF. See question 1, and confirm SF of proposed project.
9. Parking layout and physical site limitations. Layout is challenged as turning radius must be considered. The layout on plans will not work especially because of the tall fence in the driveway.
10. Driveway slopes (north-south) appear to be 14% grade based on provided finished elevations (and no transitions on site for over 12%). Slope from garage (east-west) to street appear to be 22% grade based on provided finished elevations, plans state both 10% and 20%. Entitlement?

Dr. Longcore:

1. Concerns with CPR less than 20' width, please verify?
2. Concerns with front yard fence height, please verify?
3. Please provide information on the large area of glazing (house doors & windows and guardrails) and how you plan to avoid bird strikes?
4. Areas of proposed artificial turf, can you consider an alternative material?

Nickie Miner asked them to confirm the street width and continuous paved roadway (CPR)?

Robin Greenberg asked when is their hearing with the MDRB?

Robert Schlesinger:

1. How many retaining walls do you have on property (existing and proposed) and their heights?
2. What are the mitigation for repair the landslide? Can you provide this information?

André Stojka:

1. What are the plans to repair the slope failure above the project on your property?
2. The house design (mass) is out of character with the majority of the neighborhood, why?

Steven Weinberg: Your proposed RFA average is closer to the (2) larger projects in your study, why did you choose the larger project size when most houses are within the 2400 sf range?

Member Savage noted that MDRB requires ADMIN review on ADUs over 801 SF and MDRB requires all onsite parking to be covered. This list of questions would provide input for the MDRB.

Public Comment: **Barry B** wanted to add that in the way photos of the properties taken – middle photo 2261 and 2265 plus the photos of his house 2265 – were taken in a way that make them appear to have green space but there is *not*. He noted that there is a 4' wide walkway on his side and another on Mr. Nejad's side with no space between the two houses. They are right up against each other.

Mr. Nejad related that he will measure 11' from his house to the wall and that it is untrue that it is only 4'. He'll take pictures of the distance between their existing homes. He reported that the survey shows it is definitely 11 feet.

Motion was made to **table** this, send a list of questions to the applicant, ask that they come back prior to going to MDRB, and, in the event that they don't return, reschedule, **moved** by Stojka, **seconded** Weinberg, and **passed**. The applicant will get a letter from us with the questions.

Dr. Longcore related that he hoped that Shahram would meet with the neighbors start a conversation around their construction guidelines.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 8:34 pm to meet again on **August 9, 2022 at 7:00 PM.**

ACRONYMS:

A – APPEAL

APC – AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

CE – CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION

DPS – DEEMED TO BE APPROVED PRIVATE STREET

DRB – DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

EAF – ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSEMENT FORM

ENV – ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE

MND – MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PM – PARCEL MAP

PMEX – PARCEL MAP EXEMPTION

TTM – TENTATIVE TRACT MAP

ZA – ZONING ADMINSTRATOR

ZAA – ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S ADJUSTMENT

ZAD – ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S DETERMINATION

ZV – ZONING VARIANCE

www.babcnc.org

(310) 479-6247x7

info@babcnc.org