



Building A Better Community



**Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council  
Planning & Land Use Committee Meeting  
Tuesday October 10, 2023 7:00 P.M.**

Minutes

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

BABCNC Board President, Travis Longcore, Ph.D., provided welcoming remarks at 7:00 PM, provided meeting procedure information, and called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM. He called the roll and quorum was met to include Members Grey & Miner who were present virtually. Following the flag salute, Member Loze arrived. Members & Stojka arrived at 7:07 PM, with 13 present.

1. The October 10, 2023 agenda was **approved** as moved by Levinson and Savage.
2. The September 12, 2023 meeting minutes (**Attachment A**) were **approved** by unanimous consent, as written, and as moved by Levinson and Savage.
3. **General Public Comment:** Ellen Evans noted that she circulated an email that the two reports that we were awaiting for the last year and a half on short-term rental enforcement are out and available, and expect to be heard in the next couple of weeks. *[At 7:07 PM, Stojka & Weinberg arrived.]*
4. **Chair Reports:** None.

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

5. **64 N BEVERLY PARK DIR-2023-4380-DRB-SPP-MSP-HCA ENV-2023-4381-EAF**  
 90210 Lot Area 122,702 sf. Site is undeveloped or unimproved.  
*Filed 06/27/2023 Assigned/Staff: 07/14/2023 Katie Knudson*  
**Project Description:** Vacant Lot, **Proposed Use:** New 23,390 sf SFD 23,390 sf, Associated Garage, and Accessory Living Quarters (“ALQ”) on existing vacant residential lot.  
 RE40-1-H-HCR. Pool and/or hot tub. Trees 46, 2 protected  
 Grading or Cut 5156 cy, Grading or Fill: 1,690 Total 6,846; Retaining Walls: Yes Max Ht 10’0” (number?)  
 Foot print: 11.57 sf. Paving Hardscape 34.68%; Exp: 3,467 / No Import  
 Cross streets: Beverly Park & Beverly Park Ln.

Applicant: Vinod Gupta [agupta@tgc.us.com](mailto:agupta@tgc.us.com) 805.279.3762

Representative: Jordan Beroukhim [Jordan@BeroukhimCo.com](mailto:Jordan@BeroukhimCo.com) Co.: Beroukhim & Company LLC

Architect: Karissa Kizer Co: Harrison Design [kkizer@harrisonsdesign.com](mailto:kkizer@harrisonsdesign.com) 310.888.8747

Permanent Link: <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/caseid/MjY4Mzky0>

Mr. Amir Gupta, owner of the project, introduced himself, and members of his project team including Ms. Karissa Kizer, the Architect, and Project Representative, Mr. Jordan Beroukhim who introduced themselves.

Mr. Beroukhim provided a Power Point Presentation on this project in Beverly Park, with some comments including that the land area is just shy of three acres, an existent vacant residential lot, and one of three homes in the gated community that are undeveloped. He went over the various discretionary approvals requested for the 2-story SFD and attached ALQ, etc., and are here because of their proximity to Mulholland, located within the MDRB. The last request is a Mulholland Specific Plan review. They are proposing a retaining wall maximum height of 10 feet.

He related details of the project, and showed a site plan, including the home and ALQ, as well as landscape plan, noting that they are keeping 14 onsite trees and are planting 96 new trees. He noted that it is set back nicely from all property lines, with a lot of trees and shrubbery to beautify and provide privacy. Main house elevations with and without color were explained, site photos/visibility study with 9 photos of referenced points provided, and note that the project is *not* visible from Mulholland Drive / Scenic Overlook.

A more in-depth landscape and tree planting plan was provided, noting a lot of sycamore, and proposing 8 oak trees. Having been asked to provide a construction plan for vehicles, they provided a proposed construction parking plan and noted that all will be taking place onsite. They have at least 28 parking spots (a conservative number). They hope a ground breaking in June 2024, with an 18- to 24-month construction schedule.

Committee questions were asked and answered, including but not limited to issues such as fire hazards, and protected trees, to which the Architect noted that there are two protected trees onsite, with some larger trees coming down, having gone through Urban Forestry. The architect, Ms. Kizer, and Mr. Gupta noted that they are working well with neighbors, HOA, and there is a home under construction next to them.

Asked about types of fences, as it is a vacant lot, as to height, we were told that the lot was already fenced on all sides and future fences are pulled back from the street based on the HOA, and height-wise, will be 16' with proposed hedging & permeable fencing.

Discussion was held on whether they had a site plan review, and it was noted that they had vested prior to HCR. They are proposing 3500 cy export, there will be a future haul route hearing and for further direction.

Member Loze asked if they'd come back to us to discuss the haul route, to which Mr. Beroukhim proposed to take haul route recommendations now and come to the B&S Commission hearing, to which Member Loze explained the benefit of providing input prior to the Commission hearing. Mr. Gupta would like to talk to the HOA about what other projects do.

Member Levinson would like the Review Board to look closely at combustibility of the trees, and examine the landscaping. Member Weinberg asked about the ALQ, and was told that there was no intention to rent it out; it would probably be a home office. Loze asked for a commitment to come back, call Chair Schlesinger, and let the committee have a chance to provide input on the route before they lock it down with DOT. Member Grey noted that we will have an opportunity to weigh in on the haul route at the hearing. The need to ensure that fire safety issues are being addressed was stressed and they were encouraged to look at Fire Safety rules including not having flammable vegetation or a wood fence within five feet of the structure.

Dr. Longcore suggested *not* making recommendations to go to DRB at this time and asked if one of the presenters could get back to us before the haul route review for community input, in which case we would delay any input on the project as a whole, as it did not seem that there was a lot other than fire safety issues. We would request that when the presenters are at the point of haul route, that they come back and see us for input. They can go to DRB, saying no objection from the neighborhood except we'll talk to them about the haul route, the issue we want to have input on. Mr. Gupta asked that we accommodate his schedule, which Chair Schlesinger assured he would. It was noted that we have no comment for the DRB but request the applicant return to discuss the haul route.

**Motion** to table this **passed** as **moved** by Weisberg. Member Savage noted that there is a tab in NavigateLA for haul routes for the area.

6. **9595 W LIME ORCHARD ROAD DIR-2023-4312-DRB-SPP-MSP-HCA ENV-2023-4313-EAF**

Lot Area 40,315.4

Filed 06/26/2023 / Assigned 07/05/2023 & Staff: Katie Knudson

**Project Description:** Demolition of existing SFD. A new 8,912 sf. SFD with attached 525 sf. 2-car garage & new ADU, retaining wall, a new pool, deck and *removal of 1 native tree* (CA Juniper). 1,352 cy of cut and 140 cy of fill *for export of 1,212 cy of dirt*. Trees on site 44. Sensitive Uses: Franklin Cyn Park Mountains Recreation directly west.

Applicant/Property Owner: Lindsey Anne Branca

Reps: Chris J Parker [Chris@PCCLA.com](mailto:Chris@PCCLA.com) Chloe Parker [Chloe@PCCLA.com](mailto:Chloe@PCCLA.com) 818-591-9309

Permanent Link: <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/caseid/MjY4MzIx0>

Project Representative Chris Parker from Pacific Crest Consultants introduced Design Architects Brian Papa and Jonny Steen of Frances Mildred, LLC, and Landscape Architect Michael Fiore, ASLA, Fiore Landscape Design as well as Victor, Project Assistant from Pacific Crest Consultants.

Chris opened the Power Point Presentation with bullet points on the project description, including but not limited to that this involves the demolition of an existing SFD in the Hidden Valley Neighborhood, a gated community in Benedict Canyon, a new 9,100+ sf. SFD with attached garage, an 769 ADU, and one retaining wall and pool, 482 cy of fill, and 992 cy export. **Leaving all protected trees and shrubs in place.** The project is in the hillside area, under Hillside Ordinance, is just east of Franklin Canyon Park, and is visible from Mulholland as one of the trees fell; you might be able to see a roof, and it is down slope. He related key facts as to MDRB, including that they are not near any prominent ridge, and that the project is near parklands, next door to Franklin Park. They met today with Garrett from the MRCA, who was happy with the layout and with building heights within requirements of the Mulholland Specific Plan and Hillside Ordinance. Chris noted that there are a lot of very large homes in the neighborhood. He showed pictures of existing conditions, noting the home will be demolished and the area improved. As to neighborhood compatibility, they are *not* proposing being the biggest house in the neighborhood and do not have the biggest lot coverage. The project fits within the neighborhood character.

Brian Papa and Jonny Steen, Architectural Designers for the project, noted that this is a special site as to the proximity to the parkland. Mr. Papa continued the slide show presentation, showing the plans, noting the concept description of the building, to *not* increase the profile, and build the house into the profiles of the site and contours of the site, to minimize the visual impact from the parkland side. Mr. Papa referenced plans to use natural materials, native plantings, and landform shapes to create the house as emerging from the ground. The roof plan/site plan illustrates the broken down massing of the house. They are seeking to remediate some conditions on the site, and plan to extend the kidney shaped pool, pulling the pool back from the property line. Their proposed massing is to position the house more at the apex of the site... and support existing flat pad. He showed plans and explained the inside of the house, the ADU, carport and gym area, as well as the retaining wall structure which resolves noncompliant slope issues... He reviewed exterior renderings.

The Landscaper, Michael Fiore, spoke about taking cues from parkland and native chaparral; proposing 100% native plants, taken great strides to protect all protected trees, working with an arborist. He noted that they discussed with Garrett at MRCA keeping open fencing for wildlife movement. They are *not* proposing hedges, and will only use native. The property is *not* visible from the park in its current formation and thinks the same for the new structure. For decking around the pool, they'll use natural materials, fire resistant framing and decking.

There was no public comment.

Board questions and were asked and answered including but not limited to issues of reflection off the big window when the sun sets in the west, to which it was noted that there are a lot of trees on that side, and Chris noted that they are not allowed to have bright lights by the MDRB. They do *not* have a date with the MDRB yet. It is owner-user.

*[Stephanie Savage recused herself.]*

Member Grey noted that on the main permit, she does not see the signed clearance for protected trees. Chris noted that Urban Forestry is currently reviewing their arborist report which he stated shows that they have fenced every protected tree... and he was surprised they did not include that as one of the clearances. He noted that the Mulholland staff requires them to have the tree report reviewed prior to public hearing. Chris noted that he would be happy to tell his client to request the clearance if it is a condition of support. Chris clarified that Member Grey discovered that UF is not one of the departments on the list.

Loze asked, and Dr. Longcore noted that they are here for us to advise the MDRB, and for no other discretion. Miner was asked if she had questions, but did not respond on Zoom. Schlesinger asked and Chris noted that they are not on a ridgeline. Evans asked, and they are removing four trees and planting 10 new native trees; ball park five plus or minus. Asked if they are doing fire hardening. Weinberg applauded the manner in which they integrated the home into the nature. Further questions were asked and answered including if the hikers will have a view of the property. Dozens of trees block the view. Questions were asked as to lighting and staging; they don't have a staging plan in place, the existing flat pad will be predominantly their staging location, to start driving the initial piles.

Committee member asked that the staging plan be part of any motion. Miner asked about the average size of homes in the area, to which it was noted that this is smaller than several other homes in the area and is *not* the biggest or second biggest. As to the MDRB's neighborhood compatibility study, there are about 20 homes in the Hidden Valley, he thinks he'd be closer to average if checking all neighbors. They filed well before the Wildlife Ordinance. Asked about affecting wildlife, that's why they had a conversation with Garrett of MRCA. Grey asked, and was told that demo hasn't started. She doesn't see a demo permit. They are doing what they can do without a demo permit, until project is approved.

Dr. Longcore noted that the design is guaranteed to kill birds, despite 25% darkening, the reflective nature off glass. There are two elements: The house with big panes of glass, and there appeared to be glass railings, because birds look through that and do not see it as a barrier. Dr. Longcore offered to provide any resources on this to him, noting it is not covered in the ordinance.

**Motion** to include **to support** with recommendations to request Urban Forestry tree clearance and staging plan be developed for construction was **approved unanimously**, with **one recusal**, as **moved** by Evans.

7. **13442 W JAVA DR. ZA-2023-5467-ZAD-DRB-SPP-MSP-HCA ENV-2023-5468-EAF**  
[Please note: This project was previously approved under case numbers DIR-2017-1654-DRB-SPP-MSP, ZA-2017-1743-ZAD, and ENV-2017-1744-CE, however entitlements must be renewed as they have expired.]

Filed 08/09/2023 / Assigned Date: 08/16/2023 Staff Assigned: Katie Knudson

**New Project Description:** Construction of a new 8,455 sqft 2-story Single Family Dwelling on two vacant lots with a max height of 25', with garage, 1 replacement retaining wall, new pool and water features, associate grading, landscaping, hardscapes and decks. Project requires a Mulholland Design Review Board (MDRB) approval due to location within specific plan, a Zoning Administrators Determination to allow for a Continuous Paved Roadway & street frontage of less than 20', & Haul Route for export of 2,310 CY of earth.  
**Applicant/Property Owner:** The Aubrey Trust

**Rep:** Beth Cowan Project Management [bcowan@bcprojectmanagement.com](mailto:bcowan@bcprojectmanagement.com) 818.205.9595

**Entitlement Consult:** Isaac Lemus [isaac@crestrelastate.com](mailto:isaac@crestrelastate.com) 775.690.2230

**Permanent Link:** <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/caseid/MjY5NTEw0>

Project Representative, Isaac Lemus, noted that he was presenting on behalf of the owner, and that he is a registered lobbyist. He noted the lead project designer, Russell Schubin, was present on Zoom. Isaac shared a digital link, in which he noted there is a lot of information shared. The project location is between Benedict Canyon Drive and Coldwater Canyon Dr., right off of Mulholland; currently a combination of two vacant two lots. Calls for construction as noted above under New Project Description. He reviewed the discretionary requirements also noted above, including an MDRB approval as well as a ZAD for CPR and street frontage of less than 20 feet, and, lastly, a haul route, for the export of 2310 cy including bulking and fluff.

Isaac related the history of this project, which was previously approved by the City in 2017 and entitlements expired. He noted that it is now 400 square feet smaller than the last time we saw this; otherwise, is pretty much the exact same. Looking at the site plan, accessing off Java Drive, one home was built in 1952; there was a mudslide in the early 2000s, and the home was ordered to be demolished; it has been vacant since 2002.

They are keeping topography, not changing... on existing flat pad. He showed the plans for the home, garage, a creative suite, studio, office and gym, then outdoor rec facilities, and decks. Further interior plans were explained. He then showed the landscape plan, followed by renderings, including various elevations. He noted that from Mulholland, it is visible from Mulholland, and MDRB requires multiple levels of scrutiny to meet all of the MDRBs regulations. He discussed how the project blends into the existing conditions, noting the ratio of other homes to lot sizes, their project would be 15.8% and as to visuals, he showed pictures of the existing development on Java, and their goals in comparison to that.

He noted in terms of precedent that across the street at 13411 Java Drive, same conditions, and requests by the City and MDRB as well as ZAD request for CPR were all approved in the past. They are also abiding by all MDRB requirements, listing them all, in addition to specific plants, fire code and retardant, and materials for Mulholland, in terms of design and overall aesthetic ideas and values. They are requesting NC support. He noted that as there was that mudslide in the early 2000s with demo of the prior home in 2002, there is need for approval of a soils report.

Following his presentation, the floor was opened to the committee, for Q&A. Asked about the CPR, he noted that there are a couple of pinch points; as to width 16' most conservative, along their frontage it is 18 feet. Ellen asked about the 11' wide, he noted that the street doesn't exist but is a paper street. The 11 feet are on Firth, but he noted that trucks would not use Firth. He noted that access to the property would be on Java Drive, which is a lot larger, 18'. They wouldn't have to go through smaller residential streets.

Discussion was held on the need to have 20', to which Dr. Longcore explained that the State says you cannot build unless you have 20 feet. The State says you can get an exemption if you have the same practical effect, e.g., of 20' width, for the State, that you have evacuation in both ingress and egress. Dr. Longcore asked in what way they have the same practical effects, as a 20' road way. Isaac answered that he would need the ZAD, and noted that they are preparing a hammerhead turnaround.

Dr. Longcore questioned how the hammerhead turnaround provides the same practical effect of 20 feet CPR that allows for ingress and egress for fire department, noting that the hammerheads do not address ingress and egress at the same time. Longcore repeatedly related that the State has a new regulation, and asked several times why this achieves the same practical effect. After review of the map, Dr. Longcore noted that there are two directions, and in this specific incident we have two routes and should be able to approve it based on that along with the hammerhead; however, asked why they can't widen it. Isaac noted that if they went through a B permit process because of the slope of the property and the slope up Java Drive, it would be a lengthy process and they wanted to avoid cutting off access for a lengthy period of time.

Templeton pointed out trash cans on pick up day, with cars parked on one side, and could see issues with a fire engine trying to come down one way and people trying to get out, where people would be trapped, and could be problematic from a fire standpoint. Further discussion was held on road widths, and pinch points.

Evans asked about outreach to neighbors, noting that we heard this in 2017 at which time we rejected it. He noted that in addition to the initial outreach, letters, and formally here, when they are ready for a hearing there is mandatory outreach before MDRB hearing is scheduled. Asked, they have no letters of opposition. Asked about the previous mudslide, there was remediation with the placement of a retaining wall and that is the retaining wall that they will replace; it has been two decades. He noted that when the soils report was reviewed, it was recommended to create a new retaining wall to accommodate the extra pressure of a home being built.

Asked as to glass and lighting, affecting wildlife habitat, Isaac responded there are additional MDRB requirements as to windows. He would take a condition about bird-saving remedies for glass windows, and would comply with MDRB requirements for lighting. Further discussion was held on overall square footage of the project. Member Loze expressed concern as to the great amount of truck trips on that road, and not having it wide enough in a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, (HFHSZ).

**Comment** was given by Robby Sutton, via Zoom, assuring that any comments will be addressed, their client is a very responsible family man, and they want to work with us to make sure it is good for everyone.

Asked, there is a fire hydrant off the driveway. Isaac explained the haul route approval process.

Leslie **moved** to deny based upon the width of the road, ~~the inconsistency of the size of the house in relation to surrounding homes~~, the windows which are inconsistent with benefitting wildlife, the planting plans which are inconsistent with concerns about wildfires in the areas was **moved** by Weisberg, **seconded** by Levinson. Member Weinberg had *recused* himself from voting, noting that he has a client on that street.

**Amendment** to remove the size of the house from the motion, agreed to by the mover. Requested alleviation of the frontage and the rest of the CPR. The **motion as amended passed** with **two abstentions** from Longcore and Schlesinger and **one recusal** from Weinstein.

8. **Discussion regarding HCR Additions (Attachment B)** Chair Schlesinger opened the discussion, wishing to go through his attachment with 28 questions, question by question, to which Member Evans recommended talking about issue areas and problems to solve, e.g., say please solve this particular ingress and egress problem created by haul routes; here are our few suggestions, so group things to have an understanding why they are important. Member Templeton asked for a copy of the original HCR document from Bel-Air Association (BAA) for reference.

Chair Schlesinger and Member Loze provided background on this, with Member Loze noting that with the passage of time, it is now appropriate to provide amendments to our current HCR for uniformity and items that haven't been picked up but are now picked up.

Dr. Longcore noted that we have a laundry list now. We sent a letter with a very long list that hasn't gone anywhere and doesn't want to send another letter with a laundry list. He feels that if we want to achieve change to the HCRs, we have to present it as palatable to the council offices, and simplified, as Evans suggested. We need a focused letter that says these are what are left, these are the categories, these are solutions, and not a laundry list.

Member Evans noted that here we are six years later and in her neighborhood they still have an issue with ingress and egress items, and thinks the next revision should address that. Say, what are we going to do about these issues on narrow roads during construction? We believe now is the time for the count to address this. Figure it out.

Loze believes that we are entitled to a sit down with the Council District person and Land Use person, with our list, and that we have a duty to educate CM Yaroslavsky.

Dr. Longcore responded that we have two Councilmembers that we can appeal to, and we won't get those sit-down meetings until we convince their staff that we have a convincing argument that they'd be willing to set up that meeting. He noted that this is a great focus but we need somebody to write it up, maybe it is one person from North of Sunset area, maybe Steven and Bob or Don together, saying this is our life-safety focus, and it is urgent, and here are the issues down to a page and a half, this is our priority, we want to work on them first. Then take this to Mashel and Dylan and say can we have a meeting on this.

Longcore thinks what we need to resolve here is who is going to write that.

At this point, Chair Schlesinger read his attachment, requesting the Board to require CM Yaroslavsky to incorporate the attached 28 items (*which Schlesinger noted will change*) into the HCRs that initially passed in March 24, 2017... CF16-1472-S1 as amended... It was noted that the motion was not on the agenda, only discussion. Templeton restated what she understood Longcore to say that would get more traction, while Schlesinger wanted everyone to see what the issues were.

Dr. Longcore suggested that if we agree that the strategy, this is a life-safety issue, these are the danger problems, these are the solutions, a page and a half. If someone writes it for the board meeting, we can put it on the agenda this month and then start doing the outreach to the Council offices. He thinks that this is a better strategy. We won't pass a motion tonight. Ellen will do the first draft of a letter and then we will exercise our judgment and put it on our agenda.

**Good of the Order:** None.

The meeting adjourned at 9:51 pm as moved by Loze and Stojka.

**Next Meeting:** November 7<sup>th</sup>, at 7:00 PM (*a week earlier due to Thanksgiving*).