



**Draft Minutes**  
**Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council**  
**Planning & Land Use Committee “Virtual” Meeting**  
**Tuesday May 13, 2025 7:00 P.M.**

Name	P	A	Name	P	A
Robert Schlesinger, Chair	X		Jamie Hall, Vice Chair	X	
Robin Greenberg (excused)		X	Stephanie Savage	X	
Nickie Miner (excused)		X	Leslie Weisberg	X	
Patricia Templeton (arr. 7:08 P.M.)	X		Ellen Evans (excused)		X
Maureen Levinson	X		Stella Grey (7:06 P.M. - 9:22 P.M.)	X	
Jason Spradlin	X		Travis Longcore <i>ex officio</i>	X	

At 7:03 PM, Presiding Officer, Vice-Chair Jamie Hall, called the meeting to order, and called the roll, with quorum met.

1. The May 13, 2025 Agenda was **approved 8-0-0**, as moved by Chair Schlesinger.

*[Member Grey arrived at 7:06 P.M.]*

2. Motion to approve the March 11, 2025 Meeting Minutes (Attachment A) **passed 8-0-0** as moved by Chair Schlesinger.
3. **General Public Comment:** There was no comment from the public on topics within the Committee’s jurisdiction but not on the adopted agenda.

*[Member Templeton at 7:08 P.M.]*

4. **Chair Reports:** None by Chair Schlesinger or Vice-Chair Hall

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

5. **10327 Tupelo Lane Case #: ZA-2023-1289-ZAA-ZAD-HCA**

**Updated Project Description:**

Project proposes the construction use and maintenance of a new, 1,997 sq. ft. (per RFA), two story, single-family dwelling with an occupy-able rooftop deck, with pool and spa, all over a basement garage on a Substandard Hillside Limited Street. Project also includes an approximately 56’ extension of the paved roadway of Tupelo Lane to the west edge of the lot with a new 14’ driveway with 2’ gutter in public right of way.

**Entitlements Requested:**

- A Zoning Administrator’s Determination to allow relief from a street width of 20’ along the frontage of the property for the construction of a single-family dwelling.
- A Zoning Administrator’s Determination to allow relief from a Continuous Paved Roadway of 20’ in width from the driveway apron of the property to the boundary of the hillside for the construction of a single-family dwelling.
- Haul Route for export of 1,551 CY of soil.

**Applicant:** Katherine Kelly [kmkell09@gmail.com](mailto:kmkell09@gmail.com) **Representatives:** Jimmy Toetz [jimmy@crestrealestate.com](mailto:jimmy@crestrealestate.com) and Tony Russo [Crest Real Estate] **Assigned Staff:** Ariel Jones

**Updated Plan Set:**

Tony Russo of Crest Real Estate noted that Jimmy Toetz would be giving the initial presentation. Architect Cory Walker was also available to answer questions.

Jimmy Toetz presented the proposed project and the above-listed requested entitlements with the addition of a request for two retaining walls as well as the haul route mentioned above. He described the location and showed site plans. He described comparable neighboring properties. He noted that the site is undeveloped and they are proposing site access improvements. He noted that there are protected trees on site, three (3) protected oak trees and two (2) protected shrubs, all considered and designed around and will be maintained; five (5) other trees onsite, only two of them are non-protected and considered significant and will all need to be removed and replaced at 1:1 ratio. They designed the house around the protected trees.

As to fire access, he noted that they met with LAFD who determined that no new hydrant will be required as they are within 300 feet of an existing hydrant, and they are working with them to finalize fire access and turnaround requirements, before permits can be issued. The project owner has been working with MRCA to dedicate a portion of the rear of the lot to expand and connect existing MRCA sites to expand that network for conservation.

Jimmy noted that the owner has done outreach in good faith with the neighbors and wants to minimize the negative impacts that the construction and haul route will create, and has spoken with the owners of 10347 10340 and 10362 Tupelo, and a Mr. Rahul Datir. They looked at precedence for the area, noting that two other structures on Tupelo have had been granted relief for CPR and road width. He spoke briefly on the four additional structures which also got relief from the ZA, and two if constructed today, would be making the same requests for relief of CPR.

He discussed the grading and export and went over the above requests, along with details of the comparable properties. He noted that they prepared a Hillside Construction Management Plan, which was approved and reviewed by DOT. This concluded the presentation. Cory, architect, provided clarification on the easement running through the lot being a private roadway easement. Vice-Chair Hall asked about the paper street, whether to seek remediation and asked about the third retaining wall. Tony noted it will be part of the B-permit process. Most of the trapezoidal concrete lined ditch, is on city property but in service of managing drainage. He doesn't think it will require permits.

Vice-Chair Hall opened the floor to questions. Stephanie related her 10 items (listed below).

Dr. Longcore commented on changes in allowable vegetation around structures, from the state, and as to glass, if they could look into and investigate bird-friendly approaches to reduce collisions that would be appreciated by him and the MRCA. He can provide the information as he has done previously. Templeton asked 1) how wide is Tupelo now, some portions look barely wide enough for a single car. His Hillside referral form says zero because it's undeveloped. Hall related that it is very narrow; 8-9 feet wide. 2) As to Improving streets, they are extending the driveway; improvement is in relation to how drainage comes from the water course drainage path, sediment will connect and flow down the street; they're putting in a swale. Currently, one home ventures just before the paper street portion, and that home is encroaching into the paper street (pointing to the only other home with access off Tupelo.) As to cars, Jimmy noted that they were required to prepare a staging plan. Six stages of construction ensuring that workers park offsite and materials can lay onsite. They will go through the phases, beginning with creating level pad and storing dirt further into the site. They are starting to do the grading to create the walls... they have the flat area where they are able to finish grading and start construction of the basement. The workers will be parking offsite outside the area and be shuttled there. Tony added that LADOT has the traffic management requirements for less than 20 foot CPR, approved by LADOT.

Hall noted that this project is effectively a dead-end street, confirmed by Tony. Hal is concerned about compliance with the new state fire safe regulations, pertaining to development of a where no structure exists, noting that you need to get approval from the state Fire Marshall, need to look at if the road is 8'. He noted that the city is ignoring the rules. Tony responded that this project was permitted before January first. There are provisions that grant local authority over some of the provisions. He knows that there is a disagreement between State and City, etc. They do intend to meet with LAFD again to see if they have any additional changes that they'd like them to consider since January.

Hall noted that if we were going to use the City's regulations there has to be a finding of impracticality or infeasibility. He understands about the encroachments along Tupelo, but not the whole of it. Asked if they have given thought to improving portions of Tupelo, Tony could look into it but would not get to 20 feet no matter what. If during B-permit process and review of LAFD that would go hand in hand with it, where they get a couple extra feet, it should be considered. Jamie noted that that weaves into the local control. Localities are allowed to make exceptions when there are improvements with the practical effect and that the city isn't talking about that.

**Public Comment:** Scott Moore complimented Tony and this BABCNC PLU Committee.

**Motion** to continue, was moved by Stephanie who offered to provide the applicant with a list of requested items that we'd like them to report back on. The motion was seconded by Bob. (No hearing date as of yet.)

Items would include an MRCA plan agreement, to verify retaining walls, appears to be 5; confirm all wall heights, driveway slope and any drawing you are planning to present to BOE or LAFD to get the road done; bird-safe glazing; existing protected tree distance verification, Title 24; provide drawings; staging DOT plans, which she didn't see before presented tonight. Resend those, and where planned location during constructions; report back from the city whether they have to adhere to the State FireSafe Regulations; explanation as to why improving portions of Tupelo Lane would be impractical or infeasible or determine if feasible; assessment of widening other portions of Tupelo Lane; bird friendly glass; double check fire safety in landscape. Jamie will give Tony a copy of the Zone Zero regulations.

The following list was sent to Jimmy Toetz:

BABCNC-PLU Committee requests continuation for more information including:

- 1) Provide any planned conditions for MRCA / wildlife access for the proposed development on Tupelo.
- 2) Provide heights of retaining walls for every floor level of the tall (4) story house including toe of slope wall. Please include roadway elevations, and every floor level elevation.
- 3) Provide any planned road improvement and fire truck access and LAFD requirements for access, including required driveway slope less than 20% grade (and show transitions, if possible).
- 4) Provide any information on bird safe glazing for the proposed project.
- 5) Provide protected tree distances (including canopy) verification.
- 6) Provide Title 24 report that would show the proposed glazing would be allowed under current regulations. If you have not completed any title 24 report; please advise on how this amount of glazing would be allowed.
- 7) Provide any planned required B permit information (even preliminary BOE drawings) for the 56' of driveway, including slopes percentages (and show transitions, if possible).
- 8) Provide a construction parking and staging plan for the phases of the project (foundation & framing; and trades for finish work).
- 9) Provide information on the minimums for State of California Fire Safe regulations and include the required discretionary entitlement findings for "impractical or infeasible" for improvement of continuous paved roadway (CPR) on this Street (Tupelo).

The motion **passed unanimously 9-0-0.**

#### **6. 8414 W Edwin Dr. Dir-2024-6335-DRB-SPPC-MSP**

**Project Description:** 2 new retaining walls / RESIDENTIAL

**Applicant:** Raphael Berry, The Edwin Drive Trust Co. [raphael@therhbgroup.com](mailto:raphael@therhbgroup.com)

**Representative:** Arvin Shirinyans [ARCHNTECH [arvin@archntech.com](mailto:arvin@archntech.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.

**Planning Department's Permanent Link - Click on "Initial Submittal Documents" upper right side of page**

**<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumber/DIR-2024-6335-DRB-SPPC-MSP>**

**Applicant's set of documents from the 02/11/2025 PLU meeting:**

**<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/624zmpvshpsewrgeqrs5g/8414-Edwin-Dr-FULL-SET-2-10-2025.pdf?rlkey=xe9e3cb1zcb7tpdefq4sbzel&st=afhpsbz9&dl=0>**

[The PLU Committee previously heard this on November 12, 2024 & February 11, 2025.]

Scott Moore introduced himself, noting that they met with soils analysis, with the architects, and came up with a more creative plan that didn't involve the neighbor; what is presented is a new plan that will allow all the access to be maintained strictly on this site.

Arvin Shirinyans noted that there is not much change on the nature of the project; the new site plan and a couple of sections explaining that they will be basically underpinning the existing RWs, not visible... and are addressing the retaining walls on their property only. They are offering this solution to keep the project scope as is, as to what is visible from the street and PROW, working with soil engineers. He showed a power point presentation, discussed underpinning the existing retaining walls which will not be seen and will require access from Mr. Berry's property only. He stated that the pool permit should not be an issue.

Questions were asked and answered including issues of changes to the landscaping, particularly as to plant materials that are highly flammable and that LAFD Fire Code Section 49 is now the law. Scott asked if it only applies to the new planting. Dr. Longcore explained that it has been adopted by the city and is state law; it applies to the entire landscape; however, it will be changing because of this new amber resistant zone, Zone Zero, to be put in place by the end of this year and invited Arvin to send him an email and he'll send a link to the code. Scott noted that 1) he has a wall, and no longer needs access to the neighbor's property, and 2) they resolved bird glass issue. 3) He asked, with this new rule, does he have to plant new species to which Dr. Longcore noted that if it's part of the project we'll look at it, if not, just be aware of it. Scott was mainly concerned about getting his plan into compliance with regard to the wall. Vice-Chair Hall related that this is just an advisory body.

**Public Comment: Casper Martin** (aka CJ) gave public comment in protest of the project. Some of his comments included that since Scott Moore has had this listing, every serious interested party has contacted him, and told him that they've been informed by Scott Moore that CJ has signed off on the settlement agreement, which they have not, and the lie that this committee has already signed off on it. He stated that he has since told Scott to stop telling prospective buyers that they've signed off on it. He stated that he has filed complaints with Christies International and the Real Estate Board. He believes everyone whom the Berry's hire lie, as he is selling the house and just wants to tell the prospective buyer. He noted that they remain opposed to the project and that the new "underpinning" is news to him. He feels that these are deeply untrustworthy people, he has been going through this for 9 years, and it has not been brought into compliance; though the wall he built illegally is compliant on his side. Scott rebutted Casper.

Vice-Chair Hall interjected that we would not have comment to either side at this point; we are a neighborhood council. People file applications for permits with the Department of City Planning and we review those applications to determine whether or not the findings can be made and whether or not we have an opinion on the impacts to the community. We provide and advise... There have been a lot of personal issues that have come up. He wants to stay focused on what our charge is. We need to provide advice to the Mulholland Design Review Board as to whether or not they should approve this application.

Member Weisberg stated that it doesn't look like these two sides will ever come together; there can be no continuances. From where she sits, the proposal doesn't require the agreement of the two neighbors. She doesn't know and perhaps Stephanie can speak to this, whether the underpinning of the existing wall will solve the problem. Stephanie stated that she cannot speak to this. She asked Member Grey. Member Weisberg doesn't feel qualified to make any determine about the plan to underpin the wall.

Further discussion was held on the possibility of providing opinions with regard to new landscaping that is not compliant, maybe not take a position on this, say we reviewed it and offer our opinions on the proposed landscaping. Templeton added to say we have concerns that the landscaping plan they have provided doesn't comply it doesn't comply with Chapter 49, and those that do comply now, will have to be ripped out, when fire-resistant vegetation is required by Chapter 49, and spacing. (4902.1 fire resistant vegetation and 4906.) This is current law.

**Motion:** That we say as long as the MDRB and the city are fine with the retaining wall, we have no comment on it but we are concerned that the landscaping plan violates Section 49, was moved by Templeton, and seconded by Schlesinger. **Friendly amendment** by Dr. Longcore: Rather say we have concerns and would like this to continue to be checked. They have clearly done things that has a goal compliance. The amended motion was on the floor, and Dr. Longcore clarified that we are *not* taking a position on the adequacy of the retaining wall fix; this is what we can offer guidance on

and leave it at that. We will draft something before the board.

The **motion** to recommend that the BABCNC offers no opinion on the proposed repair to legalize the retaining wall, and recommends thorough review of the landscape plan to ensure compliance with City of Los Angeles Fire Code (Chapter 49) **passed 7-0-1**; with the **one abstention** from Dr. Longcore and **one recusal** from Savage.

7. **8665-8675 W. Appian Way ZA-2023-7650-ZAD-ZAA-WDI ENV-2023-7651-EAF [Hearing: 05/20/25 09:30 AM]**  
**Proposed Project:** Construction of SFD on a lot fronting a Subst. Street with a roadway width that is less than the 20 feet required, waiver of improvements, permit/maintain 26 retaining walls, w/ max. height of 7'-10"  
**Applicant:** Kendall Cornell [cornellkendall@gmail.com](mailto:cornellkendall@gmail.com) **Representatives:** Larry Mondragon [dragon@cfa-la.com](mailto:dragon@cfa-la.com) [Craig Fry & Associates, LLC]; Daniel Vergara, Architect [danivergl@gmail.com](mailto:danivergl@gmail.com)  
**Assigned Staff:** Dylan Lawrence  
**Planning Department's Permanent Link - Click on "Initial Submittal Documents" upper right side of page**  
**<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumbr/ZA-2023-7650-ZAD-ZAA-WDI>**  
**"Updated Findings Report" for project details including entitlement requests:**  
**<https://www.babcnc.org/assets/documents/16/meeting681c1004b55d2.pdf>**

Mr. Mondragon provided a presentation, on the project following which questions were asked and answered and committee deliberation was held.

**Motion** to recommend **approval contingent on** the following conditions and the landscape plans:

1. Widening of Appian Way along the portion of the property proposed to be developed. The PLU Committee explained that this provided a benefit to the general public and emergency personnel because it increased the ability of cars to pass one another. The Applicant indicated a willingness to do this and said they would explore using "Grasscrete."
2. Improvement to the Asphalt Berm on Appian Way along the entire frontage of the property.
3. Provide a survey verifying the distance of the nearest fire hydrant and the width of the roadway at the fire hydrant area.
4. Preparation and review of proposed construction parking and staging plan for various phases of development. This is requested due to the substandard nature of the roadway, the location of the project in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and the extremely limited parking in the area.
5. Revisions to the proposed landscape plan to ensure compliance with existing fire regulations (Chapter 49 of the California Fire Code). The applicant should also review the proposed "Zone Zero" regulations and (to the extent feasible) design the landscape plans to ensure compliance with these proposed regulations.
6. Agreement with the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority ("MRCA") to place a deed restriction over a portion of the undeveloped property. The project is located within Habitat Block No. 54 and there is an existing wildlife corridor that runs through the property. In order to appropriately mitigate adverse impacts to wildlife movement, a deed restriction should be placed on the property.

The motion was **moved** by Savage and **seconded** by Templeton. Motion **passed 8-0-1** with Dr. Longcore abstaining.

It was noted that the PLU Committee's support is **entirely contingent on these items being provided.**

As the project was to have a City Planning hearing after a PLU meeting but before the full BABCNC Board had met, the adopted practice has been to send a letter stating the Committee's position for consideration, requesting that the record for the decision in this matter be extended 30 days after the hearing so that the Board can consider the item and its position be registered.

8. **2254 Stradella ZA-2024-6267-ZV-HCA**  
**Project Description:** Demolition of (E) SFD and construction of 2-story 7,494 sf. SFD with basement and attached garage, detached ALQ, retaining walls, and grading.



Applicant: Ebrahim Arshadnia [2254 Stradella Partnership LLC]

Representative: Shapour Shajirat [DCC, Inc.] [shapour@ladcc.com](mailto:shapour@ladcc.com)

Assigned Staff: Esteban Martorell

**Planning Department's Permanent Link - Click on "Initial Submittal Documents" upper right side of page**  
<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumbers/ZA-2024-6267-ZV-HCA>

**Additional Attachment from the Applicant:**

[https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1OE\\_UMtjkLkzLPTff1XbBH7AoOJYdB6Kz?usp=mail](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1OE_UMtjkLkzLPTff1XbBH7AoOJYdB6Kz?usp=mail)

Sean Nguyen presented the project in lieu of Shapour Shajirat this evening.

*[At 9:22 Member Grey left the meeting.]*

Following a brief presentation, questions were asked and answered, including but not limited to that they haven't been to BAHA to which Member Templeton believes they came to them re setbacks. She asked, as to the other home approved in 2017 to do the same thing, were there any restrictions on whether or not they could develop on the agricultural parcel? He replied, no restrictions, which Templeton disagreed with. Levinson asked how many parking spaces on site, a total of 5 for 14,000; the only other project is at 2226, the other large project in the area, the other homes look like 4,000 square feet on average. He responded 15-16,000 in the area.

**Public comment:** Michael Kemp gave public comment, as a representative of BAHA, noting that this project did come to BAHA Architectural Review Committee on April 10<sup>th</sup>, somewhat limited in scope. The committee looked at setbacks of the house, and took no exception to the project. A little more context: The precedent at 2180 Stradella we reviewed. He was concerned about the possibility of setting precedent and noted that there is a condition of approval for no RFA construction used or maintained in the A1 Zone portion and that their concern was that there is an ADU, as noted on the plans submitted for an ALQ. **Public comment was closed.**

Further discussion was held with Member Templeton providing some background that originally the A1 lot belonged to the city and was sold off as an A1 lot, sometimes running 3 or 4 or more, and a lot of them along Roscomare; 2180 did get the approval and they did not build anything behind their home, and when they requested approvals they stated that they'd remain unimproved. They plan to improve their entire strip behind the neighbor's pools, e.g., cabanas, pools, while people bought those homes with the expectation of peace behind them. She noted that this is an agricultural lot and she would be opposed. She noted that what struck her was the very small amount of grading when the total is over 1500 still allowed in the RE zone but according to the civil drawings, in their package, page C1 and C11, they show the volume of cut for the floors but no foundations, and it seems incomplete in that way. They require another view from what we are reviewing tonight.

**Motion** to deny based upon the applicant's desire to develop the agricultural lands on the property was moved by Templeton, who thinks this may not literally be in violation of the city code but is in violation of the intent of the land. She is surprised that there is no covenant on the lands on these agricultural parcels. The motion was seconded by Spradlin. Following deliberation, the **motion to deny passed 7-0-1** with the abstention from Dr. Longcore.

**9. Council File 25-0173: Residential and Commercial Construction Projects / Building and Safety Permits / Extension / Natural Disasters / Los Angeles Municipal Code / Amendment - (Continued from 03/11/2025)**

**Motion** to support the motion in Council File 25-0173, which establishes extended permit validity following natural disasters, as presented by Councilwoman Traci Park, CD11, and Councilwoman Katy Yaroslavsky, CD5. It has been referred to the LA City PLUM Committee. *(No action; discussion was deferred due to time constraints.)*

**Full Council File** <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=25-0173>

**Full Council File Motion** [https://clkrep.lacity.org/online/docs/2025/25-0173\\_misc\\_2-14-25.pdf](https://clkrep.lacity.org/online/docs/2025/25-0173_misc_2-14-25.pdf)

Vice Chair Hall thanked everybody for staying late and the meeting adjourned at approximately 9:45 PM to meet again on June 10, 2025 at 7:00 P.M.