



Building A Better Community



Minutes

Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council “Virtual” Regular Monthly Board Meeting Wednesday May 28, 2025, 7:00 P.M.

NAME	BOARD SEAT	Present	Absent
Barcohana, Elizabeth	Private Schools Grades K-6 <i>(Selected 09/27/2023)</i>		X
Bayliss, Shawn	At-Large Traditional Stakeholder (2025)		X
Brand, Jonathan	Bel-Air Association <i>(Appointed 04/26/2024 / Seated 05/22/2024)</i>	X	
Evans, Ellen	Community Interest At-Large (2025) / VP – Legislative Affairs	X	
Goodman, Mark MD	Bel-Air Association	X	
Greenberg, Robin	Faith-Based Institutions / VP – Operations <i>(Re-selected 07/2023)</i>	X	
Gros, Mirco	Doheny-Sunset Plaza Neighborhood Association	X	
Hall, Jamie	Laurel Canyon Association	X	
Holmes, Kristie Ph.D.	Public Educational Institutions (2025)		X
Kadin, David Scott	Benedict Canyon Association	X	
Kamin, Aaron	North of Sunset District (2025)	X	
Kwan, Robert (Bobby)	Laurel Canyon Association		X
Levotman, Vadim	North of Sunset District (2025)	X	
Longcore, Travis Ph.D.	Custodians of Open Space / President <i>(Re-selected 07/2023)</i>	X	
Mann, Mindy Rothstein	At-Large Traditional Stakeholder (2025)	X	
Marble, Stacy	Private Schools Grades 7-12 <i>(Selected 06/26/2024)</i>	X	
Marburg, Tad	North of Sunset District (2025) <i>(Elected 06/26/2024)</i>	X	
Miner, Nickie	Benedict Canyon Association	X	
Kemp, Michael	Bel Air Hills Association <i>(Appointed 01/19/2025)</i>	X	
Palmer, Dan	Residents of Beverly Glen		X
Ringler, Robert	Residents of Beverly Glen		X
Ryan, Sandy	Casiano Estates Association <i>(Appointed 01/24/2024)</i>		X
Sandler, Irene	Bel Air Crest Master Association		X
Savage, Stephanie	Laurel Canyon Association	X	
Schlesinger, Robert	Benedict Canyon Association	X	
Silver, Jonathan	Bel-Air Association <i>(Appointed 04/26/2024 / Seated 06/26/2024)</i>		X
Smith, Maureen	Commercial or Office Enterprise Districts (2025)	X	
Spradlin, Jason	Holmby Hills HOA	X	
Steele, Timothy Ph.D.	Bel Air Glen District (2025) / Secretary	X	
Stojka, André	Bel Air Ridge HOA		X
Templeton, Patricia	Bel Air Hills Association	X	
Weinberg, Steven	Franklin-Coldwater District (2025)	X	
Levinson, M. for Weisberg, L.	Bel-Air Association	X	
Wickers, Alonzo	At-Large Youth Rep (2025)		X
Vacant Seat	Benedict Canyon Association		0
Vacant Seat	Laurel Canyon Association		0
Total:		23	11

Dr. Longcore called the meeting to order at 7:11 P.M., noting that the meeting was being held completely online, having provided procedures on Zoom and public comment. He mentioned that the city has a motion for an extension of the authorization for NCs to use teleconferencing for remote meetings (*from January 2026 until January 2031, based on Assembly Bill 467 (Fong). Council file #25-0002-S13.*) Following recital of the pledge of allegiance to the flag, the roll was called by Dr. Steele and quorum (21) was met with 22 present initially.

1. Motion to approve the agenda **passed** by unanimous consent, as moved by Greenberg.
2. Motion to approve the April 23, 2025 Board Meeting Minutes (**Attachment A**) **passed** by unanimous consent, as moved by Schlesinger.
3. **General Public Comment** - There was no comment from the public on topics within the Board's jurisdiction but not on the adopted agenda.
4. **Updates from Elected Officials and Agencies**

Sidney Liss, CD4 Councilmember Raman's Hillside Deputy

- Sidney covers BABCNC's hillside communities of Laurel Canyon and Doheny-Sunset Plaza Neighborhood Association. Sidney.Liss@lacity.org
- Contact their office for any services or issues on the street.
- Saturday 10-2 at Van Nuys/Sherman Oaks Park event with storytelling and community service. [Shine LA | AAPI Day of Service | Saturday, May 31, 2025 | 9:00 AM - 12:00 PM](#)
- The AAPI Oral History Project will be housed in perpetuity at the Library of Congress.
- A Youth Expo Fair with resources will be held at LA Trade Tech College Saturday.

Octaviano Rios, Neighborhood Empowerment Advocate (NEA) from the Dept. of Neighborhood Empowerment octaviano.rios@lacity.org provided updates:

- Congress of Neighborhoods takes place on Saturday September 27th
- Budget Hearings: He encouraged us to check out the recordings and thanked us for our leadership and advocacy. They encourage all 99 NCs to weigh in on the budget.
- The Department of Rec & Parks would still like to receive NC input before the June 2nd deadline. He'll resubmit the link for our surveys.
- NC Funding dates that will be resent include June 1st the final date to submit a check payment and June 20th to make purchases with the NC bank card. Asked for the amount NCs may receive for next fiscal year, Octaviano noted that two numbers were being floated; it was referred back to the B&F committee so it seems the NC budget proposal is back to \$32,000 from \$25,000 but has not been voted on yet. The rollover is more complicated with up to \$10,000 likely still allowed. When finalized, they'll share that.

Shin Black, Chief from LAFD Battalion 9 lafdbattalion9@lacity.org

- Chief Black thanked members of Fire Station #37, who had their first annual pancake breakfast on May 10th; they met people from Bel Air, Westwood and Sawtelle. It was a great event especially for the many children. FS #71 had its annual Pancake Breakfast for its 17th year, another successful event with great interaction with the community. Both stations wanted to extend their gratitude for the support from the neighborhood council and the surrounding community.
- Reminder: Brush clearance begins May 1st. For updates on parcels go to <https://vms3.lafd.org/> where you can get updates on your property.

- Member Kadin asked on behalf of some of his community's residents whether LAFD will use drones proactively for canyons to access areas in the canyons that may not be accessible from the street to see if brush needs to be cleared and if hasn't to notify the homeowners. He also thanked the Chief and the fire fighters who protect us. The Chief said he'd have to reach out to their Brush Unit to see if they're using drones in surveying and prevention. Dr.
- Member Brand asked about the 200 square foot distance in Zone 2 and for the neighboring structures, e.g., DWP, whose parcel would also need to be in compliance.
- Member Hall asked for practical advice to address a neighbor's brush, who doesn't do brush clearance but he gets hassled for it. Chief Black noted that whatever you need to do to bring your property to compliance, in the 200 feet within your parcel, do it, and if the means are there, clear it. Hall noted that the 200 feet extends onto their land and he has been fined with a notice of noncompliance when a neighbor didn't do their brush clearance. Chief noted that he shouldn't be getting a violation as it is not his parcel; it's the neighbors, and that clarity needs to be brought to the inspector.
- Member Miner noted that Fire Station # 99 also had a very successful Fire Service Day for the kids on May 10th as was #71. She asked if the Franklin Canyon Reservoir has water in it, to which the Chief noted that they cannot give answers as to waterways and hydrants. He noted that he refers those questions to DWP has that info.
- Vice President Greenberg named the folks who tabled at the fire station open houses 27, 37, 71, and 99, and named the folks who helped schlep the tent.

5. Presentation on After-Action Review from January Fires (Attachment B) - Jonathan Brand (Bel-Air Association)

Jonathan Brand reported on BAA's After-Action Review of the January Fires. See Attachment B <https://www.babcnc.org/assets/documents/16/meeting6837552c93ced.pdf> . He discussed what BAA does on Red Flag Day and what emergency protocol they follow, including but not limited to checking red flag streets and parking enforcement and communicating with their local police regarding enforcement.

Member Evans provided a brief after-action report regarding the North of Sunset area, and Chief Shin Black provided some clarity on red flag day, which, by definition, is when winds are over 25 mph and relative humidity is under 15% with parking restrictions for any street 20 feet or less, no parking on either side; 20-28 feet only one-sided parking and anything over 28 will have two-sided parking. Chief Shin Black stated, in general, any time there is any type of incident that is brewing as far as a wildfire, it is important to make sure you are monitoring your social media, e.g., LAFD Alert, Twitter, the new Genesis evacuation app for the most updated info on evacuation warnings versus evacuation orders versus sheltering in place, to keep involved in what's going on in the fire. There should be strong consideration when there is an evacuation warning to consider it personally as an evacuation order.

[7:45 P.M.] Member Kamin noted that his community is seeking FireWise certification and asked Jonathan about mitigation, to which Jonathan mentioned that a certain number of folks would have to do the home assessment form and provide information about abatement to meet the threshold. Dr. Longcore concluded this agenda item noting that there is not enough red flag street signage and formal designation of red flag streets in the hillsides generally. He hopes that we can all look at this to figure out how to resolve this, as our most important thing is evacuation and getting apparatus in and people out.

6. Planning and Land Use Committee Membership

Action: Possible election of new member to Planning and Land Use Committee to fill vacancy.

Dr. Longcore noted that with Don Loze's passing, we have a vacancy on the Planning and Land Use Committee. We will do reseating of the full committee in July.

Motion to add Michael Kemp, a former member and former Chairperson of the PLU Committee, and an architect of considerable ability and stature, to the PLU Committee, was moved by Dr. Longcore and seconded by Schlesinger. Michael accepted the position and the motion **passed** unanimously by acclamation (23-0-0).

7. Monthly Expenditure Report

Motion to approve April 2025 Monthly Expenditure Report (**Attachment C**) was moved by Levotman, seconded by Templeton, and passed 21-0-0 with 11 absences and 2 ineligible.

8. Purchase of Additional Rechargeable Lights for In-person Meetings at TreePeople

Motion to approve purchase of five Rechargeable Work Lights with Stand, GoGonova Cordless Work Light with Triple LED Lamps, 8AH Battery, 700/1200/2200 Lumen, 4000/6500K Dimmable Camping Light with Detachable Tripod, cost not to exceed \$475. https://www.amazon.com/gp/product/B09VBT3F6C/ref=sw_img_1?smid=A1M2TI1QB R3V7M&th=1

Treasurer Levotman noted that initially we purchased three of these outdoor work lamps in August to test them out and now see that we can use more, specifically 2 for the back bathrooms, 2 for the front bathrooms, and 3 for the path to the parking lot. He noted that the prices of these on Amazon range from \$80-\$100 *or more* on a given date.

Amended motion to approve of up to \$1,000 to buy 7 additional Rechargeable Work Lights with Stand, GoGonova Cordless Work Light lights, for our in-person meetings. It may be much less than that; we want to have a cushion with 7 lights and a \$1,000 cap, for the two sets of restrooms, and the pathway to the parking lot.

Moved by Levotman and seconded by Kamin.

- This order is for the same work lights approved in August 2024 with 1200/2500/5000 lumen (*not* 700/1200/2200). **Updated link:**

https://www.amazon.com/GoGonova-Rechargeable-Cordless-Dimmable-Detachable-dp-B0C2YCFJ9N/dp/B0C2YCFJ9N/ref=dp_ob_title_hi?th=1

Motion **passed** 21-0-0 with 11 absences and 2 ineligible (*Identical to previous vote.*)

9. 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 Sean Nguyen

Planning Dept. Permanent Link - Click on "Initial Submittal Documents" upper right

<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumber/ZA-2024-6267-ZV-HCA>

Additional Attachment from the Applicant:

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1OE_UMtjkLkzLPTff1XbBH7AoOJYdB6Kz?usp=gmail

PLU Committee Motion: To recommend that the project be denied based upon the development of land zoned as agricultural that was intended to serve as a buffer between the residential development and Stone Canyon Reservoir.

As there was no representative of the applicant present, Dr. Longcore introduced this item, and explained that this is above Stradella, involves both a typical residential parcel and an attached parcel that is zoned “agricultural” that extends behind the two adjacent residential parcels, and the square footage and the footprint involve going down onto the agricultural parcel, over behind the adjacent development. This all is above and looking down on the Stone Canyon Reservoir. Dr. Longcore related his impression, having being at the PLU meeting, that the agricultural parcel was probably accessed at some point and is zoned that way as a buffer between the Stone Canyon Reservoir and the residential parcel because it kind of encompasses the fuel modification zone of those parcels. The committee looked at it and asked that the board recommend that the project be denied based on the development of that land zoned as agricultural which was really intended to serve as a buffer between residential development and the Stone Canyon Reservoir. He doesn’t think that the committee took a position on whether that was specifically legal or illegal; it was just that the entitlements weren’t warranted given that particular site layout.

Motion that we accept and adopt the recommendation of the PLU committee to not support the requested zone variance was moved by Member Hall and seconded by Member Miner.

Discussion was held beginning with Member Templeton who would very strongly state that we are vehemently opposed to using building on agricultural land. She noted that it wasn’t clear if they are requesting using RFA of the agricultural land in order to increase the house size on the residential part, and then there were primarily accessory structures like a pool house, pool, etc., on the agricultural part.

[8:01 P.M.] Templeton noted that it is not only this particular parcel but it runs all along Stradella; on parts of Roscomare, there are agricultural parcels that run behind the regular street parcels. She doesn’t think anyone anticipated that someone else could build behind their house and it would seem that this is the first person trying to do this and we want to make sure this gets stopped in its tracks for a variety of reasons. She believes the homeowners have an expectation that no one would be able to build behind there, and it will increase the area for brush clearance into Stone Canyon, which is a very large area that wildlife uses.

Member Brand asked what variance they are asking for, to which Land Use Vice-Chair Hall explained that apparently how you calculate the RAF maximums is different in

agricultural parcels than in residentially-zoned parcels. It is a request to vary from the standards in the Baseline Hillside Ordinance (BHO). Someone got away with this in 2017 and that was their Exhibit A to why we should be able to do this, another reason we need to think very thoughtfully about when people seek to vary from the ordinance, which, when approved by the city, someone else will ask to use it again and point to the project to say that is why they are allowed. Kemp added, as to the variance that they're asking for, they're saying that normally you have to do a slope band analysis for an RE15 lot; they're saying that the agricultural lot doesn't have to do that but they want to take the area from the agricultural to combine it with their RE 15 to increase square footage.

For a bit of context, Member Kemp added that the BABCNC had similar project in 2017 on Stradella, and there was concern from this board about setting precedent. In the findings on the 2017 project, there was a condition - Condition #8 - that is also in the findings of this applicant that no residential use will be done on that agricultural land. So the project that was approved in 2017 was *not* allowed to have any residential use on there. This project has an ADU on the agricultural land. He noted that on agricultural land, you're supposed to have a minimum of 2-1/2 acres for any dwelling unit, and you are only allowed one. The applicant claimed to the PLU Committee that they could build a house on the agricultural land anyways, and noted that there could be a question there. Member Savage added that there is also a lot of lot coverage, though it is not habitable space, with spas and pools, etc. on that agricultural land. She remembers the project from 2017, that they weren't allowed to build on that Agricultural space but they were benefitting somewhat slightly from the RE area.

Dr. Longcore asked if it is the will of the board that we mention that there shouldn't be any development on the Agricultural land and is there also objection to using the square footage from the agricultural land to increase the square footage on the main parcel?

Member Kemp added that the applicant is saying it is a hardship if he can't use that square footage but during the presentation for the PLU committee, they acknowledged they could build an almost 8,000 square foot house or 7,000+some odd square feet counting the basement if they didn't get the variance. So it seemed to him that a 7,000 square foot house - if you look at the original house that is there - would still seem reasonable and not a hardship. Member Evans recommends having boilerplate language regarding claims of hardship that are baloney to use for these cases as these claims happen so often.

Motion to take the position to oppose the project with the acknowledgement that the board doesn't believe that they should be able to add the agricultural square footage to the overall square footage and that there should not be lot coverage of the agricultural land that was clearly intended as a buffer and to include the word "vehemently."

There was no objection to unanimous consent, minus an abstention from Dr. Longcore and the motion **passed** 22-0-1. He'll draft a letter to reflect the will of the board.

10. 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

Representative: Arvin Shirinyans [ARCHNTECH arvin@archntech.com Scott Moore

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 Dept. Permanent Link - Click on "Initial Submittal Documents" upper right of page <https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumbr/DIR-2024-6335-DRB-SPPC-MSP>

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

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/624zmpvsvpsewrgegrs5g/8414-Edwin-Dr-FULL-SET-2-10-2025.pdf?rlkey=xe9e3cb1zcbh7tpdefq4sbzel&st=afhpsbz9&dl=0>

PLU Committee Motion: 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). (**Attachment D**)

Dr. Longcore noted that this has been heard three times by the PLU Committee and there has been intractable disagreement between neighbors, a settlement on an illegally-built retaining wall and this is a proposal to legalize one of them and landscaping associated with that. The PLUC recommended as noted above.

PLU Committee Vice-Chair Hall added that he wanted the full board to understand that this committee probably spent two and a half hours talking about this over months; tried to see if we could facilitate a conversation between the neighbors so they could resolve this longstanding dispute. During the last meeting it became clear that would not be possible; we simply needed to fulfill our roll to provide advice and recommendation to the decision maker, in this case the Mulholland Design Review Board on how to proceed with the application to legalize the retaining wall. The committee decided to take no opinion on the legalization of the wall but felt that the vegetation proposed should be carefully reviewed to ensure compliance with fire regulation. (See attached draft letter.)

Motion: Hall moved to adopt the committee's recommendation, which was seconded by Templeton.

Mr. Scott Moore representing the applicant spoke as to this applicant's efforts to come up with a design to mitigate any involvement with the neighbor and to finally come into compliance with the code enforcement which runs with the land, specifically in regards to reinforcing the retaining walls, to comply with Section 49, and to get this moving to LADBS to get this permitted and get this moving.

Arvin Shirinyans added that considering the comments regarding the fire resistibility of landscape they're adding, they complied with comments from the PLU committee as to type of trees and distances to plant them from each other. They reduced Toyons in the western rectangular project, close to their neighboring lot, to two instead of 5 or 6 trees;

they reduced the fruitless olive trees in the front to one from three, which provided the opportunity of 10-foot spacing per LA Fire code Chapter 49. He discussed the ground covers by the retaining walls that they have chosen, which he believes address the concerns of the board regarding fire restrictions and recent fires. He noted that the existing hedge in the front yard is already 10 feet away from the other trees that they are proposing and the existing structure. He noted that these addressed the Mulholland Specific Plan guidelines concerns as to landscaping, and plant species. They do not have any prohibited species. They changed vines or coverings or screenings for the walls creeping fig or ficus spaced 6-8 feet, complying with LA Fire Code Chapter 49. Member Miner asked about the ficus trees and about the retaining walls were built.

There was no public comment on this item. Member Savage recused herself because she is a member of the MDRB. Discussion was held.

The **motion** that the BABCNC has no comment on the proposed repairs and retroactive permitting of the retaining wall. BABCNC has concerns that the proposed landscaping may not comply with Chapter 49 of the City of Los Angeles Fire Code (Requirements for Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Areas); specifically, BABCNC recommends review of the definition of fire-resistant vegetation in Section 4902.1 in conjunction with Section 4906 Vegetation Management **passed** 21-0-1 with 1 abstention from Dr. Longcore and but 1 recusal from Savage.

11. **8665-8675 W. Appian Way ZA-2023-7650-ZAD-ZAA-WDI ENV-2023-7651-EAF**
Hearing occurred: 05/20/25 09:30 AM; **PLU Letter sent** to Dylan Lawrence 05/20.

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 Representatives: Larry Mondragon dragon@cfa-la.com [Craig Fry & Associates, LLC]; Daniel Vergara,

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

<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenummer/ZA-2023-7650-ZAD-ZAA-WDI>

"Updated Findings Report" for project details including entitlement requests:

<https://www.babcnc.org/assets/documents/16/meeting681c1004b55d2.pdf>

PLU Committee Motion:

The PLU Committee voted to support the Project (8-0-1) contingent on the following:

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. 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.
5. 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.

It is important to note that the PLU Committee’s support is entirely contingent on these items being provided. (**Attachment E**)

Travis explained that the PLU sent the letter and they kept the record open and continued the item. PLU Committee Vice-Chair Hall introduced this and how the committee voted to support the project contingent on the list above.

Motion that the board adopt the recommendation of the committee passed, seconded by Miner. The motion **passed** 21-0-1, with the abstention from Dr. Longcore.

12. City Budget FY 2025-2026

Motion: Consider attached letter regarding the City’s FY 2025-2026 budget - Kamin (**Attachment F**)

Kamin introduced and moved this item; seconded by Marburg. Discussion was held, with Member Levinson noting that Mayor Bass has been refusing to do the audit on the Inside Safe program. Member Evans thinks a deep level of engagement in the process is productive, to have comments on particular expenditures, and wonders why this is a letter to the Mayor and not a comment to the file on the budget though it could be both. She would propose that it be both. She encourages a level of engagement on the budget that goes beyond budget, which would benefit the process. There is engagement by Members Grey and Weisberg on matters on LADBS. Member Kamin discussed the opportunity for us to reset priorities and say something.

Member Miner mentioned Councilwoman Park’s long and accurate picture of the budget, which nailed what’s wrong to the proposals, e.g., cuts to Fire Department and Police Department, which affect us. She’d like us to consider Parks’ comments in our letter. Member Evans would have had us do this letter two months earlier, and feels we should

support the city moving to a two-year budget process instead of annually, which would be an improvement in the process.

Member Hall thinks we should approve this and thanked the author of the letter for the initiative taken but feels probably because of the lateness, it may not be effective; for doing it but next year, start earlier.

As to suggested revisions to this letter, on the Revenue part, where we talked about Measure ULA, that we should identify areas for improvement, is ambiguous and lacking detail. As to accountability, on the homeless programs, he agrees a lot of money is being wasted, and supports that part of the letter. He wonders if we might say something about the irresponsibility of entering into union contracts with increased wages without the necessary revenue. Templeton felt that this was an excellent letter, between being general enough but specific on important issues, e.g., safety and security, and agrees that we should still get something in though could have done it a few months ago.

Amended Motion: Member Kamin would add Member Levinson's recommendation to add an audit to the Inside Safe program to the Homelessness section and submit this to the appropriate council files, including the budget council file, and add that the city not enter into any further contracts for collective bargaining agreements increasing wages without having assurance that there are the revenues to cover that, to be put that into the Transparency paragraph.

The motion **passed** by 21 yeses, 0 noes, and 1 abstention from Dr. Longcore.

13. Charter Reform Commission Membership

Discussion & Possible Motion: It is incumbent on the Charter Reform Commission to examine the structures created to increase community input in the previous charter reform. These include both Neighborhood Councils and Area Planning Commissions. Out of eight nominees, none has experience in either body. Thousands of Angelenos participate in the 99 Neighborhood Councils that now exist. It was incumbent on the nominators to choose somebody with deep knowledge of the neighborhood council system to serve on the commission. We oppose all nominees until this is corrected and will submit CISs to files CF 25-1200-S15, S16, S17, and S18 reflecting this position.

Ellen introduced this item, and the background motion to have a Charter Reform Commission with appointees from the Mayor and President and Pro-tem. In July the appointments were made and they would have something to put on the ballot in 2026. This would also consider NCs and area planning commissions which were invented in the previous charter reform as a way to give community more input. She recommended a book on the LA's previous charter reform process. Evans would reevaluate this to have something on the ballot for NCs to have more power to comment at every hearing for at

least three minutes. After not appointing anyone for eight months, the Mayor decided to have an application process, which she did, and then her appointments came out last week. Not a single person appointed has any experience with NCs or area planning commissions. Evans would encourage the WRAC and LANCC alliances to speak up that at least one or more of the appointees come from NCs.

Motion to comment on the council file, that of the four recent appointees from the Mayor, that these appointments should *not* go through without at least one person from neighborhood councils, moved by Evans, and seconded by Schlesinger.

Dr. Longcore noted that we will make it very clear that we are not commenting on the applicants but on the inability of the city officials to respect the body that the people set up in the last charter reform to have the people be the voice of the neighborhoods.

The motion **passed** by 21 yeses, 0 noes and 1 abstention from Templeton

14. WRAC Motion – Oppose SB 79 / Support CF 25-0002-19:

BABCNC, a member of the Westside Regional Alliance of Councils (WRAC), opposes SB 79 (Wiener), which further erodes local control over land use and zoning decisions, requires streamlined approval of very high multifamily buildings near certain bus stops and rail lines in single-family neighborhoods even when municipalities such as Los Angeles already have a state-approved and compliant Housing Element, and compromises public safety by failing to include an unconditional exemption for the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.

BABCNC further supports the resolution in City Council by Councilmember John S. Lee, second by Councilwoman Traci Park (CF 25-0002-S19), for the City Council to add to its State Legislative Program for 2025-26 opposition to SB 79 unless amended to exempt municipalities with a state-approved and compliant Housing Element.”

See [Background Information](#). See League of California Cities [opposition to SB 79](#). See also [City Watch](#) column re SB 79.

Dr. Longcore introduced this. He noted that the VHFHSZs are larger than they used to be because of the new maps. He noted that this is state politics via the city.

The motion was moved by Miner and seconded by Greenberg. Miner noted that our City Attorney wrote a letter. Dr. Longcore noted that this is a large unfunded local mandate for the infrastructure. Member Evans added so soon after the fires that we have a bill which doesn’t recognize our evacuation challenges, and we should definitely send this letter. Member Kamin is concerned that the burn areas is where they want to put up multi-family buildings, and the whole area will be a land grab for multifamily structures.

The motion **passed** by unanimous consent 21-0-0.

15. Amend LAMC 56.16 – No riding e-bicycles on sidewalks

Motion: BABCNC, a member of the Westside Regional Alliance of Councils (WRAC), supports banning all classes of e-bicycles (e-bikes) from riding on a sidewalk or a boardwalk in the City of Los Angeles, to address serious public safety concerns and reports of rising accidents, injuries and deaths from collisions between e-bikes and pedestrians.

“To accomplish this objective, BABCNC supports the Los Angeles City Council passing, and the Mayor approving, an ordinance updating Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 56.15.

BICYCLE RIDING – SIDEWALKS to read (additions in *italics/underlined*):

“1. No person shall ride, operate or use a bicycle, unicycle, skateboard, cart, wagon, wheelchair, roller skates, or any other device moved exclusively by human power, on a sidewalk, bikeway or boardwalk in a willful or wanton disregard for the safety of persons or property.

(Amended by Ord. No. 166,189, Eff. 10/7/90.) *No person shall ride, operate or use any class of electric bicycle (e-bike) on a sidewalk or boardwalk in the City of Los Angeles. (Amended by a new Ordinance passed by the LA City Council.)*

“2. No person shall ride, operate or use a bicycle, *electric bicycle (e-bike)* or unicycle on Ocean Front Walk between Marine Street and Via Marina within the City of Los Angeles, except that bicycle, *electric bicycle (e-bike)* or unicycle riding shall be permitted along the bicycle path adjacent to Ocean Front Walk between Marine Street and Washington Boulevard. (Amended by Ord. No. 153,474, Eff. 4/12/80.) *(Amended by a new Ordinance passed by the LA City Council.)*

“3. No person shall operate on a beach bicycle path, or on an area of a beach which is set aside for bicycle, *electric bicycle (e-bike)* or unicycle use, any bicycle, *electric bicycle (e-bike)* or tricycle which provides for side-by-side seating thereon or which has affixed thereto any attachment or appendage which protrudes from the side of the bicycle, *electric bicycle (e-bike)* or tricycle and is used or designed to carry another person or persons thereon. *(Amended by a new Ordinance passed by the LA City Council.)*

“BABCNC further requests that Councilmembers representing WRAC member councils (Park, Yaroslavsky, Hutt and/or Raman) bring a motion in Council requesting amendment of Municipal Code Sec. 56.15 as set forth above.” [Background Information](#)

Miner moved and Schlesinger seconded. Dr. Longcore pointed out that this may be a code cleanup, as it is illegal to ride bicycles on the sidewalk but it doesn't say E-bikes, sometimes you have to tell people stuff even though it should be obvious. Member Gros noted that it is extremely dangerous and life threatening to not ride on the sidewalks and to be on the streets, and the problem is that we need more bike paths or repaint the existing ones we have now. Templeton noted that this is amending Section 56.15, which indicates that you can ride on the sidewalk but not in an unsafe manner, and wondered if there may be another section.

At 9:00 P.M., Levotman called the question and the motion **passed** 19 yeases, 1 no from Gros, and 2 abstentions from Evans and Longcore. Savage did not vote but was present.

16. Postpone Caltrans Repaving Project on the 405

Motion: BABCNC, a member of the Westside Regional Alliance of Councils (WRAC), urgently requests that Caltrans delay the I-405 Pavement Rehabilitation Project (<https://dot.ca.gov/caltrans-near-me/district-7/district-7-news/d7-caltrans-to-host>

[meeting-for-the-interstate-405-sepulveda-pass-pavement-rehabilitation-project](#)) until after:

- 1) All lanes of Pacific Coast Highway are reopened, and
- 2) All Palisades fire debris removal is complete.

BABCNC believes that this delay is reasonable given that the I-405 Pavement Rehabilitation project is scheduled to take four years, and we ask that Caltrans accommodate this important request.

BABCNC further requests that Councilmembers representing WRAC member councils (Park, Yaroslavsky, Hutt and/or Raman) bring a resolution in Council to effectuate this request on behalf of the City." [Background Information](#)

Miner moved, Smith seconded. Brief discussion was held, including question if this is related to possible flooding, to which Dr. Longcore noted that Caltrans is having a webinar in the next day or two. He'll send it out.

The motion **passed** by unanimous consent, 20-0-0.

Good of the Order - Member Evans thanked Mirco for his service on this board, which was seconded by Member Kamin and the Outreach Committee. Dr. Longcore and others on the board expressed their thanks and appreciation to Mirco. Mirco responded that this was a fun journey, and his greatest pleasure has been meeting us in person at TreePeople and virtually as well, and appreciated all that the NC does for the neighborhood.

Adjournment - Dr. Longcore thanked everyone for their contributions and noted that we'll do our follow-ups. The meeting adjourned at 9:09 P.M.

Next meeting is on **June 25th** on Zoom at **7:00 P.M.**