



**Draft Minutes**

Attachment "B"

**Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council  
Planning & Land Use Committee Meeting (Virtual)  
Tuesday February 13, 2024 7:00 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	X		Jason Spradlin		X
André Stojka		X	Ellen Evans	X	
Steven Weinberg	X		Patricia Templeton	X	
Maureen Levinson	X		Leslie Weisberg	X	
Stella Grey	X		Travis Longcore <i>ex officio</i>	X	

**Call to Order, Flag Salute & Roll Call:** Chair Schlesinger called the meeting to order at 7:05pm, provided welcoming comments and information on procedures. Member Hall left at 7:51pm.

**1. Approval of the February 13, 2024 Agenda**

**2. Approval of Minutes: (Attachment A)**

**Motion** to approve the January 9, 2024 Minutes was **moved** by Savage and **seconded** by Levinson.

**3. General Public Comment:** There was no comment from the public on topics not on the agenda.

**4. Chair Report:** Robert Schlesinger had no report.

**5. Vice-Chair Report:** Jamie Hall reported that the public comment period on the proposed change to noise thresholds has been extended to February 19<sup>th</sup>, and encouraged anyone interested to weigh in before that date.

**6. 60 N BEVERLY PARK 90210 DIR-2023-7148-DRB-SPP-MSP ENV-2023-7149-EAF**

Filed: 10/25/23 Assign/Staff: 11/13/2023 Katie Knudson

**Project Description:** Const: 4,498 sf of additions to an existing 10,849 sf SFD and the construction of a new 1,335 sf guest house.

**Applicant:** [Hacienda Estates LLC] **Representative:** Chloe Parker [Pacific Crest Consultants] 818.591.9309

**Permanent Link:** <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/caseid/MjcxMjc40>

Chris Parker of Pacific Crest Consultants provided a Power Point Presentation on the project, and was accompanied by architects, Adam Sosin & Michael Poirier, to answer questions. Chris related that the request is only for Mulholland Design Review Board approvals, Specific Plan Project Compliance, specifically Mulholland Specific Plan; no zoning deviations or requests and no haul routes. (Hearing is in late April.) Chris provided a brief overview of the project and noted that they do *not* need to do a site plan review (SPR) as their RFA is less than required in the Hillside Construction Regulations Overlay for SPR. Questions were asked and answered, with some comments being that as to type of remodel, it is not close to 50% of the existing and is a standard remodel; all exterior remains existing. **Motion** to approve the project **passed** by **11 yeses, 0 noes** and **3 abstentions** from Dr. Longcore, Schlesinger and Savage, as **moved** by Miner and Loze.

**7. 9926 W BEVERLY GROVE DR 90210 ZA-2023-3405-ZAD ENV-2023-3406-EAF**

***Applicant Returned from December 12, 2023 PLU Meeting to answer questions: Attachment “B”***

Filed: 5/18/23 / Assign/Staff: 7/07/23 Esther Serrato. 213-978-1121

Hearing: No; Appealed: No; On Hold: Yes

Project Description: A Zoning Administrators Determination to allow for the major remodel of an (E) single family dwelling on a substandard hillside street of less than 20' and haul route for 3,913 cubic yards of grading. (*Total grading cut and fill*) (*Total export 2673.*)

Applicant: Gregory Dean, 9926 Beverly Grove LLC

Rep: Benjamin Eshaghian (Crest Real Estate). 310-994-6657

Permanent Link: <https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/encoded/MjY3Mzc10>

Steven Somers with Crest Real Estate returned, following the December 12, 2023 PLU meeting, on behalf of the Applicant. He was accompanied by Ben Eshaghian of Crest Real Estate. He noted that this is a ZAD request to waive the requirement for a continuous paved roadway (CPR) for a major remodel and addition along with an attached ADU. Steven provided a Power Point general project overview/recap of the project, and addressed the list of our previously-provided questions.

Some of Steven’s comments included that the project is mostly new; it is LAFD compliant. He pointed to the backwards L-shape of the property, a motor court at the main level and drive to subterranean parking. He discussed a B-Permit plan for widening along the frontage, showed two photos for CPR elsewhere along the street and noted that the applicant is widening a 51’ section of roadway with 6” of widening needed by shifting the curb back slightly. He opined that is more difficult to widen because of street lights, power poles and steep slopes on either side of the roadway. He discussed construction staging and parking, noting that the majority of home, guest house will be demoed, creating a pad area. They’ll build the uppermost wall that will create an area for 8-car parking onsite, which will be there for the majority of the project, then the retaining wall that is part of the basement to provide flat space in that area for staging. They have a material storage location there as well.

Regarding building height, he noted that they are *not* requesting deviations from code re anything except for the ZAD as well as a haul route requested. Asked, he noted that the overall height of the building on elevation view exceeded 30 feet allowed, and that it condenses multiple planes of the building. He answered questions regarding neighbor outreach including but not limited to that he has one signed letter of support from 1261 Tower Road, to the east, and also 1261 regarding sewer – there is a sewer easement, and below to Del Rasto, so doesn’t need be pumped to the street. Regarding case precedence, he noted that there have been many ZADs approved for waiver of CPR.

Asked for clarification on the export, amounting to 700 truck trips up and down, into some twisty roads, Steven related that there will be 2,673 CY export with 10-CY hauling trucks, so he expects about 267 trucks in total. Committee concerns included but were not limited to that the applicant’s representative has not notified anyone along that haul route that they will have trucks, as to the period of time, and the actual route. Steven noted that there have been several large projects constructed successfully. Committee member related, in regard to the roads, these are paths and not roads, and expressed concerns not only about the haul route and grading but how anyone would approve construction trucks with materials coming up and overwhelming those narrow streets with saturated soil from the storm and where emergency vehicles won’t be able to get up there as they cannot pass, where two cars can barely get by. It was noted that it would be a good idea for trucks to be off the road as much as possible. Asked if the owner next door can stage there, and note that the law about ADUs was for the City to expand housing, to which Steven noted, as to staging, in terms of the garage there, there will be opportunity to stage, and room for storage and onsite parking, with the vast majority of staging to occur on the property.

Asked whether this is a remodel or new construction, as the State law on the requirement for the CPR now applies only to new construction. He was asked also to haul route about impermeable surfaces and about drainage, to which Steven noted that they have an LID Plan with overflow going to existing storm drain, downslope. As to the landscape plan, he'll double check whether they are following State law, e.g., not planting trees where drip-line at maturity won't be closer than 10 feet to the house, from the new State Fire Code. He noted they will have to comply with the requirement. It was noted that the law is expected to go into effect when encoded, as to the requirement that any newly planted trees the drip line can't be closer than 10 feet, at the widest part of the canopy. A member noted, that the easement to the street below where all the water could drain only applies if that street has curb and gutter all the way down to deposit that water.

A good deal of discussion was held as to whether this is a new construction vs. a remodel. Asked, the closest fire hydrant to the property is – he noted that they will have to add a hydrant, a requirement with the LAFD. She noted that that needs to be part of any part of a motion as well as the B-Permit, there is a need to improve the street, which is for basic safety issues, like the road improvement he is suggesting and the fire hydrant he would be required to have, to which he would agree. She added that bonding would be appropriate, a follow up and like a covenant agreement that commits the client to the situation. She noted also that the people who have to comply with Title 24, the only ones who sign off on it are the consultant and the designer and there is no enforcement. She noted that that is a separate issue, and there basic safety regulations should be must-haves to go into a motion. He noted that with respect to the B-Permit process, once approved, they bond the work after Plan Check. They can't do the work on the building.

Asked, total grading is 3,913 cubic yards and total export is 2673. He was asked about the temporary fence, and the pool, as well as smaller trucks. Asked if he thinks he may need to apply for any other variances, to which Steven responded that having looked through the documents, nothing else is needed. It was also noted that we don't want to see any over height gate, fence or wall in a year or two, to which Steven responded that where they would put that is in the side-yard setback, where there could be a 6' gate. Asked if what makes this a major remodel is that this is only a 20-square foot area that he is keeping and everything else gets demolished.

Asked, as to the people along the haul route being informed, and of the neighbors listed, only one gave a response; others were not there or other. Committee member feels that these people ought to understand what is going to go up, the 17,000 sq. feet of construction, to which Steven responded that the haul route doesn't require notifying everyone along the path and he has focused on the people on the private street; he had mentioned the directly adjacent neighbor. He also reported that the majority of homes along the windy part of the path before getting to Benedict are aware of it.

**Motion** to recommend the **project be denied**, as it is inconsistent with the other houses in the neighborhood and that the access from other than its own less-than-20-foot roadway causes a safety hazard to other people on the road **passed** by 3 yeases from Miner, Loze and Savage, 0 noes, and 9 abstentions from Members Greenberg, Bayliss, Weinberg, Levinson, Grey, Evans, Templeton, Weisberg and Longcore, as moved by Loze and Miner.

**8. 680 N SARBONNE ROAD 90077 ZA-2023-6746-F ENV-2023-6747-CE**

Filed: 10/10/23 Assigned/Staff 10/16/23 Michelle Singh

Project Description: Construction, Use and Maintenance of a 8'-0" Max Pedestrian Gate.

Applicant: Anastasia Walley [Company: 680 Sarbonne Road, LLC]

Representative: Benjamin Eshaghian (Crest Real Estate)

Permanent Links: <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/caseid/MjcwODU20>

<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/encoded/MjcwODU10>

Steven Somer from Crest Real Estate gave an overview with a Power Point Presentation, noting that this is an over height fence; the plans were also submitted to BAA for review, and that they are here for the front yard hedges and gates. The hedges are directly on the street that are over height within the Public Right of Way (PROW). His project is to remove those and push the project back to the property line..., planting three street trees along the frontage and a plaster wall up to 8 feet in height with powder-coated metal gates (pointing) and

for driveways and for the pedestrian entry. He noted that travertine stone tile will be utilized and looking at the site plan, discussed low plantings in the street frontage, and that at the property line there is an 8' tall wall and driveway gate and pedestrian gate and three street trees will be added... providing relief for the street frontage that currently exists.

He discussed an area to the left (pointing) of an easement that shares with the other property, with a portion of the front wall that continues (pointing) and there will be a separate application under that property though it is one project, being reviewed together environmentally.

Further looking at the site plan for the property, he noted that there is quite a bit of precedence along street frontage, as to over height fences. Questions were asked and answered. He noted that the house is by right and required a haul route and that that the only thing they are here for is the over height fence.

Asked why they didn't ask for the 8' wall when the original application was put in, noting that this is now piece-mealing an 8' wall, and asked about the neighbor and address directly across the street, where there is the cement tunnel in the PROW that ends in his property. He believes there is no entry way or tunnel in the PROW below the property. He explained reasons for the wall being a combination of aesthetics and security. He was asked about the renderings showing vines on the wall, to which he responded as to the intent for creeping vine. Asked what they do with the very mature hedges that will be taken out, Steven noted that sometimes contractors move them to other projects. They are waiting for comments from Bel Air Association.

It was noted that the road is approximately 26' curb to curb and the set back from curb to property line is about 7ish, and it was felt that it is preferable to have a setback if they have to have people parking on the street... we've seen other properties with higher fences built on the property line than this but prefer it to have creeping fig entirely but also have the space in the ROW for people to use, and maybe nudge the wall just inside the property instead of being right on the property... so they don't have issues with structure in the ROW, which isn't allowed, depending on how the wall is built they may have it set it slightly inward.

Steven responded that the foundation for the wall will have to come down inwards to the property... rather than out towards the street. He discussed the details of this, including that the driveway for the property runs parallel to the wall behind and that there is actually no parking along the frontage of the property. He responded as to the creeping fig, he thinks it is a beautiful aesthetic, and agrees the greenery along the wall is important but the creeping fig can be beautiful.

**Motion** to recommend approval of the project as it is was **moved** by Member Weinberg, and **seconded** by Member Miner. The motion **passed** by **7 yeases** from Members Greenberg, Loze, Bayliss, Weinberg, Savage, Miner, Weisberg; **2 noes** from Members Evans and Grey, and **4 abstentions** from Dr. Longcore, Chair Schlesinger, and Members Levinson and Templeton (Members Hall was no longer present)

**9. 1391-1403 N TOWER GROVE DR ZA-2023-5864-ZAD-HCA ENV-2023-5865-EAF**

Lot 11,301.4 sq ft. - 1401 15,896.2 sq ft.

Filed: 08/25/23 Assign/Staff: 9/05/23. Esteban Martorell

Project Description: New 11,505 Sq Ft Single Family Residence with Basement

Applicant: [Company: ST SKY LLC]

Representative: Isaac Lemus (Crest Real Estate) 310.994.6657

Permanent Link: <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/caseid/MjY5OTI10>

Isaac shared his initial outreach on the project with a Power Point Presentation, noting that as to location, the project spans four different lots, at the intersection of Tower Grove Drive and Seabright Drive. There is an existing wall along their property line, and they are at a turnaround space, before it continues down to Beverly Estate Drive, and down to Benedict Canyon, and outside of the hillside area.

He related the project description, and noted that is on a lot that spans four lots, continuous, owned by the same owner and there is a 1,942 CY haul route. He reviewed the site plan, in detail, as to the floor plan, property frontage and down Beverly Estate Drive to Benedict Canyon. He pointed out the area they need to confirm the 20-foot roadway. There are two requests: 1) they're looking at the property frontage, the area below 20' is only an area (in orange). They are working on the B-permit process, to bring the CPR to 20' noting that the goal is to have the entire roadway for their frontage improved to 20 feet where feasible, but if determined by the City that the power pole has to be there (pointing), and they can wrap around to avoid power pole relocation, that covers the frontage part of their property.

Part II has to do with the CPR, which he discussed in detail. He noted that they did a survey of the street widths to determine where the pinch points are less than 20 feet, and studied why the two areas the below 20' requirement (pointing to A & B) were not improved. He noted infeasibility to have these areas improved. He discussed neighborhood compatibility, sharing that they have a mix of sizes and styles and shared numbers as to the compatibility of size and FAR.

He pointed out that there are similar conditions with power poles going up against the boundaries on the right and some slopes on the left, traveling southward of the property where they are not able to hit the 20-foot mark. He discussed neighborhood compatibility, had done a compatibility study and provided data on that of 10 most surrounding homes, varying in size and style. He also related information on precedent within a 500-square foot area and where the city has approved infeasibility, pointing out several properties. Building permits were previously approved in the 90s, and there is a flat pad. Preliminary work was done for a previous home that was halted. They can utilize a lot of the topography, and thinks there is less environmental impact. No protective trees will be impacted by their project but they are going through environmental review.

Questions were asked and answered including but not limited to the question of as to the CPR issue for new development, whether the Fire Safe Regulations allow construction of a new structure without 20' CPR and that issue that this house has a lot of glass and glass railings that will be hazardous to birds. Committee member asked about power poles, noting they are not sure that they need to be considered permanent fixtures, and in the interest of fire safety, lines could be moved underground; so, we are not sure what we need to do to find infeasibility, if the power poles are not necessarily an obstacle. Asked further whether the property owner objects to burying power lines which seems to be a solution. Isaac related that he hasn't had the discussion with the owner, recognizes it is possible but as to overall feasibility, we'd be talking about at least half a dozen power poles that if we were to move, would have a ripple effect for all power poles in question including those outside the PROW... Committee member related that she has experience in burying power lines, and they can be buried.

Steven Somers with Crest Real Estate, responded to the issues on burying power lines, noting that it needs to be made clear that any time you bury a power line you can affect the service to those other houses in the neighborhood and need signatures from neighbors before proceeding; panels have to be upgraded, and some locations are noncompliant, etc. Member noted that she is not convinced it is infeasible, and would like it to be investigated before we hear this again.

Committee member commented regarding the CPR, the ratio of the entire length and the two segments that are 19ish feet is not as egregious as many others she has seen, and to relocate three or more power poles seems a big ask. She thinks the frontage is a different issue and there is one power pole they would have to relocate... it would be better for all to improve the entire frontage. She agrees, as to the house, there are things to be looked at closely, e.g., glazing, and bird strikes. Isaac agreed that they could take a further look into moving power poles. He noted that the owner wants improving access along the property. They will look at the glazing to be sure it is in compliance. He would agree that we can add that as a condition of approval. Steven Somers noted that that bird safe glazing is not required from the current code, and doesn't know if it is something that they would commit to at this time. The issue was raised in case the client cares, as they know it is not required.

Committee member noted that if it does apply, it will be definitely new construction; so it is their first order of business to check it out, if the State says absolutely no new construction if not a 20-foot CPR, there is nothing we could do about it. She asked how many levels are there and how many are considered basements and not levels. Isaac noted that there are three levels to the home, the lower level is basement, which he believes is roughly 4,000 square feet. Question was held on the various levels, of which Isaac noted that part of the reason for the levels is because of the BHO, so that at any given point it is not more than three stories, requested for the project design. She understands the unintended consequences of the BHO. He will look at the lowest to highest point, and report back at next visit. He discussed the envelope height. She noted that if the Wildlife Ordinance passes, then that is 45 feet altogether and asked how far out are they from finishing plans on this? He noted that they have submitted to LA City Planning and LADBS. She noted that she thinks the State fire code is probably their biggest issue...

A committee member noted that this house looks like a quintessential party house, and asked, in one of the plans, there is a notation that calls for a bar and concessions, and asked what they are. Isaac responded it is typical for these homes to have a wet bar for wine storage and/or bar, and is sort of an extension of the entertainment space... a continuous theme for that area. She wanted to raise the issue that this looks like a perfect party house that once built will become a nuisance. She doesn't want to make it any easier to build this house that will be a nuisance. Other committee member agreed that it looks like a vacation rental, a mini-hotel, meant to be rented out short term. She wanted to talk about infeasibility, which has to be measured at the scale of the whole project: if the whole project has things that are very expensive to do, and seems infeasible from a budget standpoint, then his request for the CPR being infeasible has to be in line with what obstacles the project is already surmounting.

**Motion** to postpone this project and return to a time certain to next month, requesting they come back with some additional information regarding the possibility of underground issues, either single power pole along street frontage, as well as more information about the house itself, as there seems to be more questions, as to overall height and envelope height, at sections, off of the natural grade from the lower surface. There is a need for research on the power poles and information about the house. **Moved** by Member Savage and **seconded** by Member Evans, and **passed** by **12 yeases** from Dr. Longcore, Members Weisberg, Templeton, Evans, Miner, Savage, Grey, Weinberg, Bayliss, Loze, Greenberg, and Levinson, **0 noes & 1 abstention** from Schlesinger.

**Adjournment**: The meeting adjourned at 10:00 pm to March 12, 2024 at 7:00 PM.