



Minutes
Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
Planning & Land Use Committee *Virtual Meeting*
Tuesday November 12, 2024 7:00 P.M.

Name	P	A	Name	P	A
Robert Schlesinger, Chair	X		Jamie Hall, Vice Chair*	X	
Don Loze	X		Stephanie Savage	X	
Robin Greenberg	X		Nickie Miner	X	
Leslie Weisberg	X		Ellen Evans	X	
Maureen Levinson		X	Stella Grey	X	
Patricia Templeton	X		Jason Spradlin	X	
			Travis Longcore <i>ex officio</i>	X	

PLU Committee Chairman Robert Schlesinger called the meeting to order at 7:06 PM, and led all present in the flag salute. Board President Dr. Longcore called the roll with 12 present and one absent. Vice Chair Jamie Hall was handed the gavel to conduct the first part of the meeting, and left as planned, returning the gavel to Chairman Schlesinger at 8:10 PM, with 11 members present for the remainder of the meeting.

1. The November 12, 2024 Agenda was **approved** as moved by Chair Schlesinger and Dr. Longcore.
2. **Approval of Minutes:**
The October 8, 2024 Minutes (**Attachment A**) were **approved** as moved by Schlesinger/Savage.
3. **General Public Comment:** There was no General Public Comment on items not on the adopted agenda.
4. **Chair Reports:** Robert Schlesinger, Chair, had no report. Jamie Hall, Vice Chair, noted that the Neighborhood Council is within the Hollywood Community Plan area and the implementing of ordinances is on the way to the PLUM Committee. Some land will be rezoned as a result of that.

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

5. **8414 W Edwin Dr. Dir-2024-6335-DRB-SPPC-MSP**
Project Description: 2 new retaining walls / RESIDENTIAL
Applicant/Owner: The Edwin Drive Trust Co.
Representative: Arvin Shirinyans [ARCHNTECH arvin@archntech.com raphael@therhgroup.com
Lot Area: 11,284. APN: 5565040033
Previous or Pending Cases: DIR-2018-5371-DRB-SPP-MSP.
No intent to develop a larger project or Subdivision. (Attachment B)
Permanent Link with Initial Submittal Documents
<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumber/DIR-2024-6335-DRB-SPPC-MSP>

The Applicant's Representative, Arvin Shirinyans, was introduced, and spoke on the project, entitlements and requests as to the two retaining walls, which were originally from 2018. He noted that the property owner went through some lawsuits which are now settled, and they are back on the project to be built up to code and by MDRB standards. He commented that this was originally approved by this NC and later denied because it didn't have enough screening of plants in the public right of way.

He provided a Power Point Presentation, noting that the street is lower than the house, and both retaining walls are more or less visible from the street, pointing out the location of the property at a cul-de-sac. He showed the existing site plan, and that the retaining wall (RW) will go along the property line, on the side, then switch directions to the front to another RW for a total of two RWs. He showed photos of the existing conditions. He showed the location of the existing low wall at the neighbor's property and a wall built illegally that they are permitting now. He pointed out the pool area, the front yard and the corner under discussion. He related that the property slopes down after the pool and the house, and is a very steep slope.

Mr. Shirinyans showed renderings of what they were proposing, existing side yard and existing front yard. He noted that the right side is what they are proposing, the white wall, an existing RW, is staying to meet today's Department of Building and Safety standards, the second portion of the wall after a cut line will be demolished, and go directly to the front yard to meet the setback requirement from the property line... to not drain water to the neighbor's property. He pointed out that these two RWs will be screened with plantings, and they're proposing a wood fence to screen the RWs from the neighbor's property. They'll also have a 3' tall glass railing set back about 3 feet to meet standards. The screening of planting is also continued towards the front to do the same and keep the coherence from the side to the front by different plants.

Pointing to a diagram on the bottom left to show how much grading they expect to remove, the red portion which is the cut, to be able to build the new RW away from the property line to meet code. He noted that the fence is also there that will be built after the grading is done, to be able to block this condition from the neighbor's property if they don't want to see it. He shared further details of the site plan, explaining the condition in the front yard, with a little gate, steps going to the main entrance to the home; swing gates, barn gates, leading to the pool area that are 5' tall to provide coverage for pool safety.

He shared elevations, one showing 22 feet on the existing RW to remain and to be underpinned to bedrock. He related that it will have a gray smooth stucco look to match the rest of the property and the neighbors' property. It cannot be over 6' and the same for the wood fence. The glass railing will be set back from the wall, and at maximum 3'6" as well. The planting and screening... in the front, in the corner, the highest portion is 8' with 3'6" of glass railing to create that blockage to the backyard. The screening and planting continues all the way from the rear corner of the lot to the entrance of the home (pointing).

He showed three sets of section cuts representing how the entrance will be built as to staircases, the low walls which are counted as planter walls, and the fencing and the gate. The portion for the retaining wall shows the caissons embedded in the bedrock. They have a couple conditions showing the general section area as far as the entrance staircase, the gate and how they work all together. He showed three sets of sections, representing site sections with the conditions before the work was done, the current condition after the work was done that needs to be corrected and what they are proposing for after approval. He described the sections in three series, the first three, and second three and third three. He noted that before any work was done, there used to be a low neighbor's wall, they had a pool area fencing with the property line in the middle; the condition now with some work done without permit, the wall built way too close to the property line with a one-foot setback they are proposing to demolish; to do necessary grading in that area and offer a new RW built with caissons to hold up the pool and keep the neighbor's property as safe as possible. A concrete swale is proposed to direct drainage to the streets. The same condition is represented in two other sections, showing before, already cutting through pool area in this condition, the dash line is the demo and RW to hold back the pool and direct drainage to the front, noting that this is continued after the pool as well.

He noted that they have the geology report, certificate of occupancy for the previous addition, and the pool, and the material board, for the fence and barn doors leading to the pool area, in redwood; glass railing is non-reflective to match MDRB standards, and silver-grey smooth stucco for portions of the wall above the ground. The RW has a smooth concrete finish, with some black paint in some areas. He also showed detailed landscape architectural drawings, showing screenings on both sides of the RWs... noting that the condition continues along the side property line, enters the corner and to the entrance of the home. They're using 8-9 types of plants, all details listed.

Member Hall asked about the litigation between the neighbor and client. Mr. Shirinyans noted that there was a long hold since 2018, and now they are getting the ball rolling again. Asked if the neighbor has signed off on everything, Mr. Shirinyans replied yes, the neighbor has agreed to it a year ago, and he had started working on this 5-6 months ago.

Member Savage asked a question, and related that she won't be able to vote on the project. She had looked to see if he had applied for permits, saw the permits in 2018, noting they said a total of three (3) RWs, which exceed the number of allowable RWs, and asked if they've asked for an additional planning case. She also asked, because of the heights of the walls, would he be considering a covenant agreement to make sure that the screening of the walls, planting requirements, spacing, will be maintained for a specific period of time. He responded that he is sure that the owner would be fine with the signing of a covenant, and that they have two RWs, one the continuation of the old wall and another one in the front. She noted that she gets that their permits will change. He agreed.

Member Templeton asked about the landscaping for the MDRB, regarding three trees by the house and trees by the fence, noting that some plants are highly flammable, and violate State and City Fire Code per **Chapter 49 Requirements for Wildland Urban Interface Fire Areas - 2023 City Of Los Angeles Fire Code** <https://codes.iccsafe.org/content/CACLAFC2023P1/chapter-49-requirements-for-wildland-urban-interface-fire-areas> Discussion was held on this, to which Mr. Shirinyans said they'll address them as well as the groupings of shrubs. Member Hall noted that there may need to be a further evaluation if the proposed landscaping concurs with the current regulations which has created some conflict between certain landscaping standards between the proposal and the regulations. Mr. Shirinyans provided his response to this issue, and noted that the project shall comply with fire code. He asked if the main issue is between amount of plants and screening, to which Hall noted that we are soliciting committee feedback now, and that Member Templeton just wants to make sure all planting complies with Fire Code.

Member Savage noted that the Department of Planning only requires that you have vines to screen retaining walls at a space of 8 feet on center, an easier solution than entering shrubs that could be flammable. Member Hall noted that they have to meet the terms of a settlement agreement, to which Savage added that this could impact the abutting property owner's fire insurance. So they should be informed. Hall noted that they are a party to that and have entered into an agreement.

Dr. Longcore related that the recommendation the committee could make would be to ensure that the LAFD makes any necessary evaluation and approval of the landscape design, because the whole Fire Code piece that he wasn't aware of) that's a possibility to ensure that this gets the right eyes on it, and there is some overkill in that code in terms of safety; some things in there are not scientifically supported, now made part of the Fire Code without being totally supported by the scientific community. So he would make a recommendation that the Landscape Plan be evaluated and approved by the LAFD.

Dr. Longcore was concerned that the 3'6" glass railing will end up killing birds and as a personal recommendation asked that the owners consider a product like "FeatherFriendly" for the prevention of bird collisions, so it doesn't turn into an invisible barrier to birds. www.Featherfriendly.com (the issue would be reflectivity.)

Member Loze wondered what information was not included, since the last discussions that would affect our decision. He responded the only things included were presented only two retaining walls and its proper screening. He pointed out what they had done incorrectly previously was the white portion, that they had a dispute with the neighbor and what they are doing now is the correct way of doing it... Member Loze also asked and was told there was a haul route that is no longer in existence, to which the presenter replied, "no, there was no haul route," and asked if there are cuts, where does the dirt go. Mr. Shirinyans noted that there is only 77 cubic yards (CY) and they're using 88 CY of it & only exporting 19 CY.

Public Comment: "CJ" noted that he is the neighbor in question, having been before us several times on this matter six or seven years ago, protesting *the applicant's* plans at that time, because he lied and omitted information during that process and he unfortunately now finds himself before us again for the same reasons. He noted that there are not two RWs, but are three (3) RWs, and along Edwin is the low RW that was built and a high RW behind it and a RW in between the two. He opined that the reason Rafael Berry has omitted that middle RW from his plans is because it does not qualify for the Hillside Ordinance, that would make three RWs stacked on top of another which is not allowed, and the highest and middle RWs are less than two feet apart. He related that he is speaking on one fact: He has seen the permit pulled for these RWs and they are filled with errors. The first error is that the wall that is 62' across the frontage along Edwin Drive is only 4' high; however, it is between 4'6" and 5' along its entire length. The other permit is for a wall between 120 feet long and is no more than 4'6" high. He noted that these walls have already built. He noted that this is an order to comply. He noted that their dimensions are pretty well suited in fact. The front wall is 4'6" tall, pretty much the entire length; the middle wall is about the same height. That middle wall is less than 2' from the tallest wall; and the tallest wall which abuts their property, and provides their grade in the back yard, the lowest height of that wall is 5' and the highest point is 9' which is completely different from the permit they have pulled. He noted that of the 120 foot long wall, 65 feet runs along his property line; that wall is between 9' and 5' from grade, from the middle RW all along its length. At the top of that wall there is no fence, no gate, and for the last 8 years, their pool has been accessible by walking from CJ's property, the neighbors' property, and from the street, noting that there is no enclosure for the pool.

CJ noted that all he is asking for is that the permit that was pulled reflect the accurate measurements for the walls that exist now, and right now there are three walls: 4'6" and about 62 feet; the other 4'6" tall and runs about 64 feet, and the other runs 120 feet and is 5' tall at its lowest point and 9' at its highest point; so the permit that they have pulled is factually incorrect. If they are going to pull a permit for existing RWs, it needs to reflect the accurate measurements of the walls as they exist.

[Mr. Shirinyans interjected that they are demolishing the two RWs in the front and are offering a new one... noting that the RW along CJ's property line is also being demolished and will be along his property line as well. CJ noted that the wall is 3" from his property line... and Mr. Shirinyans differed on the distance of the wall from each of their properties.]

Member Hall discontinued the back and forth and returned the floor to CJ, to continue his public comment. CJ continued that he (*the applicant*) had engineers, but nothing he has heard anyone say addresses what he has done on his property or the fact that it has taken him eight years to even begin to address this.

CJ reiterated that he just wants that the wall on his property are to the same standards put him himself to get the wall on his property to compliance, and as long as the compliance is met, he is fine with it; all he wants is that everything is done above board.

Hall asked, if it was represented to the committee that the Arvin's client entered into a settlement agreement with the neighbor, to which CJ, that neighbor, noted that this is *not* at all what he has agreed to. Member Weisberg would like pictures of CJ's perspective.

Mr. Shirinyans provided a rebuttal that the reason they were here was because Rafael Berry is willing to comply with all of today's standards and codes as to safety, of development and of aesthetics; they'll be demolishing walls that were built unlawfully and are proposing a very professional construction, which will be permitted and built to today's codes... He showed us the site conditions in three sections, clearly showing that the existing wall that was built unlawfully will be demolished; the only portion that will be the closest to CJ's property will be the rear portion, of which he noted that there is no other way to go around it to keep the pool there, which is going to be underpinned. They'll end up with at least 3'7" distance from CJ's property line. And at the front of the property they'll have an 11' distance... They're offering a swale for drainage issues... In the meantime, they're willing to work with him to come to a conclusion that keeps everyone happy.

Committee deliberation was held. Member Hall expressed surprise that the neighbor disagreed, as at least one party believes that there has been a breach of the settlement agreement, and acknowledged that this is a tricky situation. Member Weisberg would push this forward by a month or two, so the two parties can have an outside conversation and the applicant can come back before us, along with CJ. She noted that CJ said he objected to the fact that the neighbor was not protecting the pool area, a safety issue, but it looks to Member Weisberg like the applicant is trying to make sure the property is well enclosed. She noted that this is not an arbitration body, but suggested that we push this forward. Member Spradlin and Chair Schlesinger seconded that recommendation.

Member Hall would send them away with some homework items, that overall we all think they probably need to get a mediator and 1) consult with LAFD regarding the landscaping to determine its compliance with the fire code, and 2) as Dr. Longcore suggested, that they look at the glass railing and look at the FeatherFriendly product = two concrete homework assignments. Member Templeton added to not only consult with LAFD but be sure this complies with the City Fire Code.

Member Grey asked what has been done, e.g., the glass partition installed and landscaping, to which Mr. Shirinyans responded that only thing they have now is a retaining wall presented in the dashed lines, super close to CJ's property line, represented as 1' by the survey. They will double check to make sure it is correct noting that everything they are proposing currently is on paper.

Motion: to continue this item for two months with the two homework assignments, previously stated, passed with none opposed, and two abstentions from Longcore and Savage, as moved by Schlesinger and Miner.

Member Hall seriously encouraged the parties to consider a mediator. Member Miner commented on the need for safety for the pool, that the pool should be fenced in for safety for animals, children, etc. CJ agreed that this is a big deal that has been going on for eight years now.

[Member Hall left at 8:10pm, with 11 Committee Members remaining.]

6. **3191 N TOPPINGTOWN DR LA 90210 DIR-2024-4993-MSP-DRB-SPPC ENV-2024-4994-CE.**
Project Permit Compliance/Design Review Filed 08/23/2024 Staff Assigned Claudia Rodriguez
Lot 20, Block None, TR 24946. APN-4385005043. Lot Area 73,454 sq ft. Appl., Owner of Record Michelle Farhadi michellefarhadi@yahoo.com 310.508.5300 Farhadi Family Trust; Rep: Susana Juarez / Nathan Mendelsohn [NS Designs] 323-384-6316 nathan@nsdesignsonline.com Project Description: Construction of a new 439 sq. ft. Recreation Room with top deck in conjunction with an existing 7,784 sq. ft. with a new residential floor area of 8, 223 sq. ft. **Permanent Link with Initial Submittal Documents:**
<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumbers/DIR-2024-4993-MSP-DRB-SPPC>
(This project was continued from the October 8th meeting.) (Attachment C)

Nathan presented his project via screen share on this Zoom call, and noted that this is an addition to the 2021 house expansion, which addition to the house was over 900 square feet. He noted that the plan, approved by

an HOA and being installed is now in its current state in an impervious area with zero landscaping changes. The Rec room follows all height and zoning regulations, pointing to the rec room and existing retaining wall. The wall was permitted in 2021, and they're going to connect the rec room to the wall. The rec room will have a roof deck for enjoyment to watch tennis games below (pointing). In the original DIR for the house, a bathroom was proposed back there but only 120 square feet; now they are proposing a 434 square foot Rec room. He pointed out the seating areas, tennis court, and outdoor BBQ area against the retaining wall (RW) as well as a fire pit, ground, gas. He showed elevations with stairs coming up; noted that there will be a glass railing on top, showing the relationship of the wall to the hillside, and some renderings, noting as to the one with the overhang, which is not existing. He showed images of how it looks currently.

Questions were asked and answered. Member Loze made a general statement that this entire project in Deep Canyon was something that the Benedict Canyon Association (BCA) resisted since it was proposed; many compromises were made, and wasn't built the way it was supposed to be. He thinks it is important that the HOA has some sense of approval... He related that Deep Canyon was never conceived to be what it has now become with regards to traffic and additional services, and that many things are taken for granted that were never part of the initial approval of the project, which we need to be very careful about. He noted that we are getting to an area where we don't have enough water and has power outages because of too many houses.

As to building a private tennis court on the property, considered flatwork, Templeton raised a concern about noise from the tennis court to the neighbors, to which Nathan noted that there is only one neighbor, and they could include that in the letter. He doesn't think the owner would be against a covenant to prohibit smoking. No amplification systems planned. Loze noted that the HOA has seen this project and approved it. The rooftop deck was also discussed.

Motion to approve this project subject to receiving a letter from the neighbor that they have no objections to it, and subject to a covenant that there be no smoking on the roof deck, and with signs posted to that effect, as well as no lighting of the tennis court passed by 5 yeases from Loze, Grey, Evans, Templeton and Greenberg, 3 noes from Weisberg, Spradlin and Miner, two abstentions from Longcore and Schlesinger and one recusal from Savage, as moved by Member Templeton and seconded by Member Loze.

7. **1701 N Coldwater Canyon Drive ZA-2023-202-F-CU1-HCA**

Filed 01/11/2023; accepted for review 06/24/2024, assigned 09/05/2024; Staff Assigned Jaime Espinoza
Hearing Date: 10/31/2024 09:00 AM

Applicant: Fernando & Nadina Szew Family Trust Representative: John Parker [Pacific Crest Consultants]

Project Description: Demo of existing SFD and construction of new SFD with basement, attached garage, ADU, pool, spa, retaining walls, over-in-height perimeter fence, ~~with haul route.~~

[There is no longer any need for a haul route since project design was changed.]

Permanent Link with Initial Submittal Documents: (Applications, Findings, Plans & Vicinity Map)

<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumbr/ZA-2023-202-F-CU1-HCA>

(This project was continued from the October 8th meeting.)

Chris Parker began the presentation noting that the Project Description is the demolition of an existing SFD and construction of new SFD with basement, attached garage, ADU, pool, spa, retaining walls, and over-in-height perimeter fence (no longer with the haul route.) Chris responded to a list of questions prepared by Member Savage following the last PLU meeting in October.

- Please confirm lot coverage for structures over 6' high for the entire project.
 - Lot coverage 25.2 well below 40% allowed.
- Please confirm ZA case (ZA-2023-202-F-CU1-HCA) stating "Demo of existing SFD and construction of new SFD with basement, attached garage, ADU, pool, spa, retaining walls, over-in-height perimeter fence,

with haul route" . Note this entitlement description does not include the reduced parking entitlement, per the meeting discussion.

- Confirming there will be no haul route; the basement removed.

- Please verify the entitlement request for the significant reduction in parking for a large house. Code would require (6) spaces - including ADU, yet the project plans only (3) spaces provided. No findings provided in in the DCP online project plans, if you have information please update. And if the owner has explored vehicle lifts for parking solutions to meet the BHO requirements?
 - The code requires 6 parking spaces one for the ADU and 5 for the house. Because one of the streets is substandard limited, they are required to provide an additional parking space for every __ feet of floor area. So if they could lose Monte Cielo coverage... but what they are asking for is relief for the additional three spaces required if fronting a substandard hillside street. He noted there is a plethora of parking spaces in this neighborhood.
- In the PLU meeting, you mentioned the haul route was not needed. The Civil drawing C2.3 says otherwise. Please verify the haul route is not needed, since the project plans on the DCP case show significant basement cut. Please verify any revisions to grading and CY, exempt & nonexempt.
 - He noted that that's the old exhibit, filed 18 months ago, and verified no haul route needed.
- Please verify 8' over height fence construction. Drawings show flat top rail and no points on the top rail. Confirm no sharp points/finials on top fence. Will the hedge be removed or cut to an 8' height? Or will they be planting a new hedge or leaving it just an 8' iron fence?
 - He acknowledged that the drawings were not that good. It is a wrought iron fence, they are confirming again an 8' max, and want an 8' hedge, the client is committed to up to 8' hedge.
- Please verify total RFA exempt & nonexempt.
 - 5,494 square feet of RFA; not having a basement so not exempt; and verify parking space.
- Please verify the ADU will be used for housing not a gym and provide curb cuts dimensions for ADU parking DCP online project plans do not provide curb cut information. Please verify that it will not be used as an entertainment or recreation space (in addition to not being used as a gym). The first plans said party kitchen, the new plan for a normal ADU with a bedroom, a normal kitchen, a living space and bathroom for residential purposes.

Questions were asked and answered. The ADU will *not* be rented. Savage noted that she assembled the questions from the group. She contributed to #3, but still doesn't get about parking, it will be the new pool, and will be so valued. He admitted that the project requires six, but will only have three onsite. Asked if this is part of the entitlement ask, he noted that the two entitlement asks are the fence and parking. Member Savage noted that she'd love to see those findings, which he said they did submit and would will ask the staffer. He'll send the findings after the hearing.

Chris shared some exhibits on the PP, pointing out that they removed the Monte Cielo address as this is LA; Coldwater Canyon is Los Angeles; Monte Cielo is presenting parking headaches.

Two requests:

- 1) an over height fence, from 6-8 feet, never exceeds 8', also a hedge that never exceeds 8'. The wrought iron on 18"-30" brick wall never exceeds 8'. Total height will be at most 8', direct plumb line to existing of finished grade, whichever is worse.
- 2) The ZAD is to grant parking relief, to provide 2 parking spaces for the house and 1 for ADU, instead of the extra three spaces they'd need because of the FAR. The site plan has been updated with the newer plans; (it used to be with basement, and no longer says that; that has been corrected and we are looking at the latest plans, apologizing for the confusion last month.)

Justification for over-height fence is that it is a safety issue, heavily trafficked. It is across the street from the City of Beverly Hills (BH), and is in the news regarding follow-home thieves, break-ins, BH seems to be a beacon of that type of crime. BH allows for the over height elements; his clients who live next to BH are the only ones not allowed to have over height fences for safety. He noted that the wrought iron fences will see through to the hedges... It will look pretty; will have hedges. He pointed out that there are other over height elements in the immediate neighborhood, and this exhibit puts that into context. His client is the blue property (pointing); every star represents over height elements already there, in the three red boxes are the three cases that he cited in the PP.

As regards parking, he noted that he had talked about it already but it's only because one of the three streets is substandard, Monte Cielo. Coldwater Canyon is not substandard, has plenty of street parking around the property. Lafontaine is also a standard street, that doesn't require the additional parking; only Monte Cielo requires it. They're doing a 15' dedication which pushes their front yard deeper into the property. Also, of how they front three streets... he has extended areas where he is not allowed to have parking (explaining). They also, because of the way the property slopes, there is a retaining wall, from 2.2" to 2-1/2" along Monte Cielo. They're already carving out pedestrian gates, the driveway gate, and there is sloping and there is already a RW holding up the dirt.

As regards fairness, he noted that the client's property at the bottom; the areas that are where his client's neighbors currently park, his client is *not* allowed to propose parking anymore. Formerly possible parking has been removed because of zoning. They're stuck having to set everything further back, having only one street cut on Monte Cielo, having to create the garage; near Monte Cielo, they are cutting into the narrow part of the whole lot, and there's not a lot of room to do more. He pointed out the parking along Coldwater and Lafontaine and below in BH, allowed on the street; however, not on Monte Cielo but his client has multiple streets that it fronts where parking is allowed.

Questions were asked and answered. They are exporting about 900 CY. They are demoing everything and flattening to create a better pad area, so in the flattening of the large lot, they're generating about 900 CY that they don't want to put elsewhere on the property so they're getting rid of it. There is also a pool... Member Loze noted that despite there being no haul route doesn't mean there won't be any hauling, which Chris agreed with, and agreed that 900 is not an insignificant amount. They haven't cemented the direction of the trucks, though he thinks it will go to the Eagle Rock Landfill. Member Templeton asked about the new configuration of the ADU to show it's not a party house; it is 799 square feet. Member Savage mentioned that they had a ZA hearing on 31st, and that he's coming back to chime in. She noted that they left the case open so we can respond and he'll come back for the Board meeting. He couldn't reschedule the ZA hearing after 18 months to wait for a ZA hearing but they kept the case file open for our input. Member Templeton raised the issue of the flammability of plants to make sure they complied with the updated City Fire Code. He'll make sure his partner is aware of that.

Motion to **approve** the project **passed** by Members Spradlin, Greenberg, Grey, Weisberg, Miner, Templeton, Loze and Evans, **1 no** by Savage and **2 abstentions** from Longcore and Schlesinger, as **moved** by Member Weisberg and **seconded** by Member Spradlin.

Good of the Order: Templeton announced that the Planning Department has released the latest draft of the Wildlife Ordinance, for which their next hearing is on the same day as our December board meeting at 7:00pm.

The meeting adjourned at 9:11 PM to return on December 10, 2024 at 7:00 PM.