



DRAFT MINUTES

Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council Planning & Land Use Committee “Virtual” Meeting Tuesday June 10, 2025 7:00 P.M.

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

Vice Chair Jamie Hall called the meeting to order at 7:02 P.M. Following the flag salute, Hall called the roll. Quorum was met, with 11 present. Member Kemp arrived at 7:05 for a total of 12 present and one absent.

1. The June 10, 2025 Agenda was **approved** as moved by Schlesinger.
2. The May 13, 2025 Meeting Minutes (Attachment A) were **approved** as moved by Schlesinger.
3. **General Public Comment:** There was no public comment on items not on the adopted agenda.
4. **Chair Reports:** Robert Schlesinger, Chair had no report.

Jamie Hall, Vice Chair reported having attended a Zoom conference yesterday hosted by Nurit Katz with Dr. Longcore on Zone Zero Regulations proposed by the Board of Forestry. There will be additional meetings and an alliance is forming to oppose the regulations, composed of residents, HOAs, academics, experts, and people in the forestry industry. He encouraged everyone participating in this to be speaking up if you want the draft regulations to be modified. He noted that Dr. Longcore gave a great presentation.

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

5. **1000 N CHANTILLY ROAD** **ZA-2025-1311-F ENV-2025-1312-CE**

Project Description:

Request to allow wall/fence with a maximum height of 8’ within the front yard setback

Applicant: Frederick Li frederickli@gmail.com

Representative: Victoria Pakshong victoria@plac-e.com Cathryn Widmann, Place Design

Case Worker: Esteban Martorell

<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumber/ZA-2025-1311-F>

Cathryn Widmann from Place Design gave a presentation on the project which included but was not limited to mention of the letter of support from a neighbor and letter of support from the Bel Air Association (BAA); an

arborist report, showing 2 protected trees, and that this is an existing house built in the 1960s. Member Savage thanked her for reaching out to the neighbors and asked, with the 17+ projects in the area with over-height walls or fences, did they have entitlements for those, to which Ms. Widmann responded that they didn't find any but that information was hard to find out. Discussion was held on the picket fencing to which Dr. Longcore noted that there is a small space between the pickets, and it would be good if they are flat on top and not spiked, to which Mr. Fred Li, the home owner, noted that though there is no crossbar at the top, there will be; it will be fully with a top across every picket. Dr. Longcore and Levinson thanked them for the BAA letter.

The **motion** to recommend approval of this project **passed** **11-0-1** with the abstention from Dr. Longcore, as **moved** by Savage. Vice-Chair Hall explained to the applicants that we recommend that the full Board accept our recommendation. After the Board meeting we'll draft a letter and submit it to the city and the ZA will take it into consideration. He welcomed them to attend our meeting but noted that it was likely not necessary.

6. **15545 W AQUA VERDE DR** **DIR-2025-1520-SPPC-MSP-DRB** **ENV-2025-1521-CE**

Project Description:

Addition of 1,134 sf. (approx. 48' x 25.5') to the existing SFD and living room remodeling.

Action Requested:

Specific Plan Project Compliance. Addition 1,134 sq. ft. at (E) SFD.

Applicant: Nativ Samimi [Narah June Trust] nativsamimi@gmail.com

Rep: Dana Kwon [Design Studio Meta, Inc.] dana@dsmeta.com **Staff Assigned:** Claudia Rodriguez
<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumber/DIR-2025-1520-SPPC-MSP-DRB>

Dana Kwon, the Applicant's representative, provided a brief Power Point Presentation of the project located in the Casiano area. Mr. and Mrs. Samimi were available to answer questions. Showing the site plan, he pointed to the area for the addition and the garage on the south side and noted that the request is for a one-story addition with height under 16' from elevation. The current home is 3,400 square feet. This addition adds 1,134 approximately with a bedroom, a bathroom and an office being added to the front of the house. This is for Mulholland Design Review Board and Specific Plan Project Compliance. The floor was opened to questions. Mrs. Samimi noted that not much of the setback will be changed; they are adding an additional bedroom for their daughter in the front, an office for her, not much else, and no addition to side setbacks. Member Levinson mentioned their two mature trees, which they unfortunately have to remove. They have an arborist report. The applicant noted that the trees are not protected and they'll plant other trees. Dr. Longcore noted that these look like California Redwoods. No other discretionary approval is being sought. They are staying within the prevailing front yard setback and side yard.

Asked about the landscape plan, types of trees and how many replacement trees and species, they have already planted two on the side; planted multiple in the back; plan on planting in the front. They need a lot of trees specifically for the office window and daughter's room window. Dr. Longcore mentioned that there is no protection for California Redwoods and noted that the planter boxes will become noncompliant with code probably at the end of this year, as the state is formulating a rule that will ban vegetation as shown, within any structure, where five-feet should not have anything planted in it. The exceptions are existing trees taller than their structure; the planter boxes will become noncompliant according to AB 3784 as of the end of the calendar year. For the plantings, it is advisable to leave 5 feet especially on something new. The Fire Department will come around and tell people to cut out camellias and rose bushes. Vice-Chair Hall commented that notwithstanding that these are *not* locally protected species, they still provide value, and he'd like to see the trees replaced along a 2:1 ratio, and removed outside of nesting season. Greenberg asked if they brought this before their HOA, to which Mrs. Samimi responded that they are aware of it as are all of their neighbors and that everyone is in agreement; they will get an approval from the HOA.

Vice Chair Hall looked at the Specific Plan, under Mulholland Design Guidelines, #54, as to the requirement for replacement, if the loss of any significant native tree is determined unavoidable, the Specific Plan requires

that they be replaced by new trees of the same species at a ratio of 2:1. He noted that existing significant trees should be protected from destruction or damage to the greatest extent feasible. He asked that they try to find a place to plant some replacement trees.

Hall moved that we support the project conditioned on the replacement of the three redwood trees at a 2:1 ratio and that the trees not be removed during bird nesting season; seconded by Miner. They were recommended to do so in late summer/fall rather than spring as owls start in January.

Friendly amendment: to add approval letter from HOA. Nadiv noted that he has never been approached by homes undergoing work asking him for permission. Hall explained that it is part of our job as a Neighborhood Council that neighbors are informed.

Vice Chair Hall acknowledged that this is *not* a variance, but an MDRB. He reiterated that the motion is to approve the project contingent on replacement of the three trees at 2:1 ratio and that they not be removed during bird nesting season, and that the HOA provide evidence of outreach their HOA and nearby residents. Discussion was held on the trees that she has already planted and it was noted to add: **If there is sufficient space.** Mrs. Samimi related that she can see doing at maximum two trees in the front. Dr. Longcore noted that they have space to do something in front and to **maybe change 2:1 to just 1:1.**

Savage recommended that they document the trees / species recently planted to be credited for the replacement trees that they did plant moving forward so they can use those as an allotment for replacement trees. Mrs. Samimi said she asked about the ability to replant the shade tree and was told “no...”

Motion to support the project with the condition that the removed trees be replaced or that appropriate documentation be provided that the applicant has recently planted trees to offset the loss of these trees and that the removal doesn’t occur during nesting season, as well as documentation be provided regarding community outreach.

The motion was moved by Hall, seconded by Miner and **approved** 10-0-1 with the abstention from Dr. Longcore and 1 recusal from Savage.

Savage added a note to the applicant that the MDRB does not approve projects that are white and should be on a gray scale. Vice-Chair Hall invited the applicant to come to the board meeting **with documentation of community outreach** that they can provide in advance of the meeting on June 25th.

7. **138 N MAPLETON DR** **ZA-2024-7217-ADJ** **ENV-2024-7218-CE**

Project Description:

Construction of new fence/wall with varying height from 8 to 12 ft with 14 ft pillars in front and side yard setback area.

Action Requested:

ZA approval for the construction of new property wall, vehicular, max height of 12’ for each element along with gate pillars with a max height of 14’ within the front yard.

Applicant: Nadia Adida [138 N Mapleton Investment, LLC] arsine@backenarch.com

Representative: Isaac Lemus [Crest Real Estate] isaac@crestrealestate.com

Staff Assigned: Alexander Truong

<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumbers/ZA-2024-7217-ADJ>

Isaac Lemus from Crest Real Estate introduced himself as the project representative and as a city lobbyist with the city. He noted that they have the requests (noted above) and qualify for CEQA exemption. He described safety and privacy concerns as regards the traffic on Sunset Boulevard.

Following the initial presentation, the floor was opened to questions, some of which included from Member

Kemp who asked about the setback from curb to the proposed wall and noted that he could not understand why 12-14 feet, which is extremely high, and creates a canyon in the street. He asked that Isaac have better plans if he comes back, adding that the wall may have to have some steps in it. Isaac noted that there is a 25-foot side yard setback and a majority of the 90 percent of their proposed fencing and hedging will be side yards; only a small portion at the top of the property will be front yard.

Member Spradlin thanked Isaac for sending the text to the neighborhood. He recommend that Isaac speak with the King Estate, now the Robbie Williams Estate, as they have a massive shared wall. Isaac noted that the owner is in constant communication with the neighbors. Spradlin noted that John at Delfern is fine with the 12 foot wall and if 12 is good enough for John, should be enough for the applicant. Isaac noted that 12 is the height but only 14 feet for the pilasters. Spradlin raised the issue of parking, noting that busses come down, and he has lost rims at the corner there in front of their house; there is a problem when workers at the houses park in the street. He noted that it would help garner support if they had a parking plan during construction for the builders, carpenters, and everyone else, to which Isaac noted that he has a staging and parking plan.

Dr. Longcore followed up with Spradlin's point, on the issue of expected construction project for a house, and asked if they are pursuing permits for the house that should be part of the case, and why the fence is not included in the permits for the house. Dr. Longcore noted that this is not a separate project and that this is "piece-mealing," hiding the entitlement that is part of the project, and now is building a fence, while it is the same project. He noted that it is highly inappropriate to be processing them separately. He noted that we could then talk about what Jason is bringing up: Where is the parking and parking plan? He noted that we should be sending a letter to the city objecting to this kind of a strategy for something that is one project.

Isaac noted that when they submitted the entitlement case to City Planning they did include the overall scope for the home on the property. He provided a detailed explanation on how they removed that scope and it is now strictly the over-height fence. Dr. Longcore noted that this is a city problem; from a CEQA principle, it is one project, it should be considered one project and that he should disclose that it is one project.

Member Grey asked why he refers to this new wall as a retaining wall if it is currently a fence, to which Isaac noted that it will be a fence for a portion, but as it moves southwards on the property due to the slope, it will be retaining in part. Grey noted that will require structural review, which he agreed with. He agreed with Grey that it will be linked to grading permit and asked why we are separating it from the entire project. He agreed that the retaining wall will require separate approvals through Building and Safety, including that the retaining wall will specifically require grading permit and retaining wall permit... Member Grey agrees that it has to be a single project with total grading to be counted, total export, and no piece-mealing should be allowed and noted to Dr. Longcore that if we have to write a separate letter to LADBS and Planning, she thinks we should. Member Evans related that we have to communicate with Planning, whether in letter form or by a call, and is this something we need to move on now in relationship to this project? Dr. Longcore noted that we can include her idea for a letter about piece-mealing on the board agenda for a couple of weeks, and nothing stops anyone from asking about this project.

Member Spradlin gave background on how this came to be a flat lot with some comments including that it is a roughly 2 acre property, formerly owned by Casey Kasem. He died, there was a big trust issue with the estate; they tore it down, it's flat lot, used for parking. He commented that he appreciates the outreach the applicant did for neighborhood but also would like to see plans for everything else. He'd encouraged Isaac to share what he is doing with the neighborhood council and the neighborhood.

Motion to continue this with hopes that the applicant will come back with a full scope, so we can look at that, and discuss this variance he is requesting moved by Spradlin, and seconded by Schlesinger. Hall responded to Grey's question about continuing this if the scope will be different, stating they should present the required findings, the necessity and the constructability of the fence, and that everything that will be presented on the

lot be shared with us so we could have that discussion. Levinson would deny it due to piece-mealing, to which Hall would grant the applicant to come back. Isaac noted that they do not have a hearing date yet. He will come back to us, and the sooner the better.

Motion to postpone this to our next regularly-scheduled PLU meeting **passed** by 11-0-1 with the abstention from Levinson.

8. **50 W BEVERLY PARK WAY** **DIR-2024-6995-SPPC-DRB-HCA ENV-2024-6996-EAF**

Project Description:

New SFD & ADU

Action Requested: MDRB

Applicant: Jean Simonian [Beverly BP LLC] john@ildicoinc.com

Representative: David Forrest [Crest Real Estate] david@crestrealestate.com Isaac Lemus

Assigned Staff: Claudia Rodriguez

<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumber/DIR-2024-6995-SPPC-DRB-HCA>

Member Savage recused herself because of her position on the MDRB.

Isaac Lemus provided slides, noting this is in North Beverly Park, for estate-sized homes. It is zoned RE Residential Estate 40, as well as specific CC&Rs for the area, with their home at the center of North Beverly Park, surrounded by other properties of similar size, lot and building. The smaller neighbors are abutting. He noted that the goal is to fit into the context of the neighborhood and claims that they are in compliance with the Specific Plan. It is fully compliant, but due to the overall size and location of the home, they don't qualify for exemption, and have to go through MDRB process. He explained the project; and noted that the property is wrapped around by Beverly Park Way, and in the rear they have Beverly Park. He shared some project history for context, noting the project received approval from Mulholland, submitted in 2014 but received in 2016, with a different owner. He provided details on downsizing of the project resulting in gross area reduced from 62,407 square feet to 45,281 square feet.

He noted that the project went through grading after being approved and because of their downsizing will utilize the overall flat pad and foot print, making the house smaller. They are making the basement smaller so there will be an import rather than export, import of 908 CY. He continued pointing out the interiors, the top floor, private corridors, roof plan, sloped roof, adherent to the Mulholland guidelines, noting that there are no skylights, which they are avoiding for the entirety of the project. He reviewed the accessory structures, ADU, BBQ area, roof plan associated with that; an elevation view, and noted that there are no requests for deviations from code; they are completely adherent to overall height; not going over any of the square footage. He discussed style and landscaping, and showed elevations as well as renderings to make sure of being adherent in overall style...

For the landscape plan, there are proposing upwards of 70 new trees on the property; no protected trees to be removed or impacted. There will be only one tree removal altogether, replaced at 4:1 ratio, included in the overall 70 trees that will be planted. They have a bio report, with no biological resources that will be impacted or removals, and they have a soils report. They will have to go through grading review and LADBS review.

They have HOA approval as well as overall correspondence with the neighborhood. There will be hearing with MDRB when their review is deemed complete for this project. The floor was opened to the committee for questions, beginning with Member Savage who noted that she is a member of the MDRB and would not speak on the design on the house but has concern because the application included two ADUs for the property and on the DRB she noted that they don't chime in for ADUs because they are considered sort of as a by-right thing but not in all cases. She noted that many of you may have received an email from Senator Ben Allen this evening as to updated VHFHSZ mapping, which would include this property in the Santa Monica Mountain

Range that would only allow one ADU. She wanted to confirm that there is only one ADU and not two, which he confirmed. The size of the ADU is 1,063 square feet, which Savage noted could be allowed if it is not within 200 feet of parkland and other criteria, including streams, park land, prominent ridges which would eliminate any administrative clearance for any ADU. Isaac noted that Parkland has to be defined as publicly owned property as opposed to green space, privately. Longcore noted that that is what is across the street.

Dr. Longcore noted that even though he disagrees with it, Zone Zero is coming along with the state of California and is supposed to be in place by the end of the year. He noted that they have plantings mapped that are incompatible with this oncoming rule. He recommends that they go put a 5' buffer around the foot print of the eaves of the entire structure and don't put any plantings there, move it all out five feet; the hedge and the two trees in the front entry have to be planted such that their canopy cannot be within 10 feet of the roofline at maturity and at least five feet from the side of the structure; every single wall put 5' buffer without putting anything flammable there. He noted that this is not an endorsement of the policy but is likely what he will have to comply with. The other thing he'd say is he is glad we have a "castle district" in America. Forty-three of his house would fit into that structure. From an environmental impact in the world, he hates it but you can do. He noted in the piles of dirt which probably came from the seed bank, is growing is a Royal Lupin. So there is nature there and it is resilient and it will likely get covered there, but it's nice to know it is there, and that when of this is all gone it will reclaim it once again. Robin asked where the BBQ area is and was told it is an enclosed BBQ area, going through the permitting process it will have to adhere to fire code; not outdoor and not exposed to elements or vegetation on the outside.

Vice-Chair Hall wishes there was a way to quantify the burden on the environment that a house like this causes, with metric fashion, because all the concrete and what is required to make something like this happen, if we could quantify it, people should have to pay for that, and it should be posted like a scarlet letter. All people see in the end is this beautiful big house, and they don't know what has to happen. This is not a good thing for the environment. He thinks there is no upper limit to that size of a home in LA. It is a byproduct of your lot size and what RFA you can get out of that. At that point it stops being in a home for a single person. There was a massage room... He noted it is not his taste but he doesn't have any substantive project with regard to the project.

Motion to take no position with regard to this project and send it to the MDRB; was moved by Jamie and seconded by Jason. The motion **passed** 10-0-1+1 with the abstention from Dr. Longcore, and the recusal from Savage.

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

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

Member Hall introduced this item, noting it was a motion from Councilmembers Park and Yaroslavsky, referred to PLUM and we are here to consider if this is good or bad, and if there is full NC support.

Member Kemp is not clear on what they are asking for as to time limit. His understanding is that a building permit is good for two years and you can get two more six-month extensions and asked what are they asking for? Hall read the motion and Evans asked Grey to present information on this.

Member Grey noted that she doesn't know either how this functions; it is completely up to LADBS whatever they are pleased to do. There is a code that they don't follow and internal bulletins that they allegedly follow. Grey noted that for her, when the motion suggests that unusual circumstances should trigger the extension, she wants to see material proof of what kind of unusual circumstances a person faces; it sounds like blank cover to unlimited permit longevity, and we know how it affects our neighborhood, that present all kinds of dangers, and lowers property values, the result of this unruly permit control. For her, it has to be somehow documented on why extend this permit, and there should be difference between houses that will be rebuilt and bring new houses and that it needs to be thought through. She isn't prepared to make specific suggestions but there are pitfalls here. It has to be tuned much thoroughly and there has to be some sort of enforcement measures, like what happens when you don't finish, when the permit expires? Take it down? It has to be thought through.

Hall asked and Grey noted that he committee has not taken up this motion, as it is very dormant. He asked if she would be willing to do a deeper dive into this motion and have discussions before her committee. She agreed to do so. Hall noted that this sounds good in the abstract, it could have profound implications, thinking of Blue Heights, when sometimes the little things matter because the person's plan check expired, they were able to get them to adhere to the new HCR overlay zone, which required them to reduce the size of the house. Sometimes it is a good thing for plan checks or permits to expire so projects that are not making progress they become subject to new laws that have passed, so we have fewer of the nonconforming projects in the neighborhood. It could be a recipe to give LADBS even more discretion.

Dr. Longcore noted that Hall is headed to where he is headed, and thinks this is a "WWDD" situation - "What Would Don Do?" and the first thing you'd point to is the Hadid project, where it all turned on the expiration of permits, and not having timely requests for the continuation of permits. He thinks that giving that unrestricted discretion for complex projects to DBS is like the opposite of where we were headed. Don would say we need bonds for completion so that we don't have these eyesores - "constructus interruptus" - in our neighborhoods. This is a pathway to more of that. He has compassion for people needing to rebuild but doesn't think this solution solves this problem in a way that doesn't also introduce significant other ceding of the public's right to have a well-regulated building environment to a department that sees the clients not as the public but as the developers.

Member Miner doesn't trust this. She thinks despite the good intentions that may be, she doesn't think they are qualified to make this kind of a decision, and she is against it. Member Kemp agrees with everybody here; he thinks three years for a residential project is reasonable these days; most projects that he sees take two years; four years for commercial; however, he would not leave discretion with LADBS, like a plan checker to make the decision to let the projects through. He thinks that the motion needs a lot of work.

Hall noted that this is in the Council File Management System, the motion was made on February 14th and there has been one CIS from Westside NC which is to oppose the amendment unless amended to apply solely to the Palisades Fire Disaster Zone... This has been referred to the PLUM committee but there is no update in the council file. He thinks the committee should think about what we should do. Should we refer this our LADBS Subcommittee and ask Stella to do some more research with more meetings and coming back with a recommendation or oppose it now? He was open to suggestions.

Dr. Longcore noted that a letter that mentions some specific comments and concerns that elaborates a little would be appropriate. This committee could recommend and appoint someone to draft that to then bring to the board. Hall asked who would draft a letter that could be turned into a CIS and sent to the council file. Member Grey volunteered with participation of the subcommittee or anyone, and would draft something and send it around. Chair Schlesinger agrees with passing the letter around.

Motion that our committee's recommendation could be to oppose the motion for reasons stated herein, and he believes that Stella's committee should also consider this and we could vote on it and bring it to the Board was moved by Hall. Chair Schlesinger agreed that Stella draft the basic letter and pass it around.

Vice-Chair Hall reiterated that the motion is to oppose the motions for the reasons stated herein and accept Stella's generous offer to draft the letter, and that she can work with Cathy, himself and Dr. Longcore on the language and consider that at the next NC meeting. Member Miner would limit this position to the Palisades and not make it citywide.

The motion was seconded by Schlesinger, and **passed 11-0-1** with the abstention from Dr. Longcore. Need to circulate it by the 23rd.

Good of the Order

Dr. Longcore related that there is a question of who will chair this committee, and noted that Bob has served valiantly and has asked that his position be replaced. He noted that Hall is doing a great job, and that there is probably space for more than one person to work with Travis and Cathy, and that we have former chair Kemp and other people qualified to do so. He will be able to nominate someone in July. He opened it up to the committee on what we think; who is interested; how do you want to do it?

Hall volunteered to chair the meetings if this is something that we want. There is more work that happens behind the scenes. He noted that Cathy has been helping there. He can write the letters, chair meetings. Longcore noted that we may be more limited in terms of Cathy's time, and we need a leadership team. Who wants to help organize and make sure we have the agenda together. Leslie would be happy to know more about that. Michael noted that has just come back, and recalled that he used to do everything. He could easily spend 10 hours a week on that. He is glad to help and is still getting up to speed on how things are organized. Travis noted that he has been promoted at work and his time will be scarcer, and would like us to have a team of people to support Cathy and make sure we contact all the applicants. He agrees that Jamie is an absolutely excellent chair.

Savage noted that "What Would Don Do?" that Travis mentioned is a great thing and we should all think every time "WWDO?" as the gold standard.

Schlesinger mentioned that Don had issues that were dropped since he passed. Evans recalled one of those issues which was in regards to haul routes, which is why we wanted to talk have a talk with Yaroslavsky's office. Travis will get back in touch with Kenneth Miller with CD5, for reintroduction to the Planning staff, the issues of what's going on with the Wildlife Ordinance and the Ridgeline Ordinance, things we've brought up to them time and again but haven't seen action on. Dr. Longcore noted that everyone gets a half-ear pass because of the fires.

Schlesinger asked about the availability of Yaroslavsky to which Member Weisberg expressed great confidence in the Councilwoman, noting that the issues of planning and land use is where she comes from but that she is currently preoccupied with the budget and the city. She is a PLU attorney and these are core issues that she cares about, but she is taking a big leadership role and is focused on the budget.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:30 P.M.

Next meeting: July 8, 2025 at 7:00 P.M.