



Draft Minutes
Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
Planning & Land Use Committee “Virtual” Meeting
Tuesday July 8, 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	

Co-Chair Hall called the meeting to order at 7:02 P.M. Following the flag salute, the roll was called with quorum met. There were 8 present initially and 10 present by 7:06 P.M.

1. The July 8, 2025 Agenda was approved as moved by Miner.
2. The June 10, 2025 Meeting Minutes (Attachment A) were approved 7-0-1 with Templeton abstaining, as moved by Greenberg.
3. **General Public Comment:** There were no comments from the public on items not on the agenda.

[Michael Kemp arrived at 7:06 P.M.]

BABCNC Board President Dr. Longcore reported that the Draft EIR for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor is out, and that it would be nice to put together a committee made of up members of the PLU and Traffic committees to prepare for comments on this.

4. Chair Reports:

Chair Robert Schlesinger had no report.

Vice-Chair Jamie Hall reported that on July 1st significant amendments to the California Environmental Quality Act were made with significant change which will have profound consequences on projects. He noted that California exempts infill housing from environmental

review in the state's "most consequential" housing reform. He recommended that we all read AB 131, as we will all have to learn about them. This will change the standard of review for when projects are subject to CEQA, which is a huge significant change adopted by the legislature. We'll have to see how that plays out. Member Weisberg asked which project falls under AB 131. Hall offered to put it on the agenda at the next meeting, "Understanding AB 131, the Exceptions and How They Apply to Our Neighborhood."

Chair Schlesinger noted that he'll give Traffic Committee Chairwoman Irene Sandler a call and report back to the board if anyone else wants to join us at those meetings.

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

5. **315 N BEVERLY GLEN BLVD ZA-2025-3016-ADJ ENV-2025-3017-EAF**
Case Filed On: 05/28/2025 **Staff Assigned:** Esteban Martorell
Owner: Sam Keywanfar Trustee Of The Griffin Terrier Trust
Applicant/Representative: Sandra Santoyo [VK Engineers, Inc]
Project Description: Request for a 10 ft Property Fence.
Action Requested: Build a 10' property fence
Permanent Link: <https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenummer/ZA-2025-3016-ADJ>
[This link includes Project Application, Findings, Plans, and Vicinity Map.]

Johnathan Sagherian introduced the project, which he described as mostly a remodel of a SFD built in 1924, noting they are getting more and more permits so they can provide a home for the current owner. He noted that one of the items that came up was Beverly Glen's traffic, volume, noise, and other considerations including safety along the frontage, quite long, almost a couple of hundred feet, as well as the current entrance to the property, which doesn't have enough of a reservoir to protect cars trying to enter and exit the property while people are speeding up and down Beverly Glen.

He noted that although they have some trees along the property line, they don't offer safety and security that the current owner would like and so they looked at the property and as a 3'-1/2" fence offers no protection; so after conversations with the Planning Department to see how they could attempt to provide that, they had no other option but to apply for a varying height, although still 10 feet because there is about a 4' drop from north to south before Beverly Glen on the frontage; so they provided a stair-stepped fence wall that they could make from any material, proposing split-face block, that is decorative as well, to provide security as well as building gates about 20 plus feet, has documentation in our packet to show how they propose a two-way driveway into the property to allow deliveries or anybody coming in, to buzz in or be buzzed into the property without running the risk of being fish-bowled by a car driving down Beverly Glen. He noted that there are properties there with 6', 7' and 8' walls already, and doesn't know how and with what they were built, but feels with these estates, it is critical to be able to have at least some measure of protection for a family.

Vice-Chair Hall explained the format which will now follow with committee questions, his responses, and then opening this up for public comment and committee deliberation. Vice-Chair Hall screen-shared the image of the property.

Questions were asked with comments including but not limited to that they are going to increase the reservoir; the property line is 5' back, and the wall will come all the way up to the end of the property (almost 200 feet; pointing to the neighbor's property.) That is the scope of the project. They're taking out some of the landscaping and replacing, salvaging and/or maintaining trees; protected trees, with hopes it will be a combination of an ivy-grown green wall that will look like a green wall rather than a wall. Asked, Jonathan noted that the entire house is otherwise by right. They have done a protected tree report and are preserving one protected oak tree that won't be affected by the work.

Dr. Longcore noted that he sees some sycamores, protected species, to which he noted that the homeowner asked to maintain as much of the vegetation as possible, as it is lush. Longcore asked about the location of the fence. It moves a couple of feet forward to BG. He will remove some of the invasive types that are not necessarily nice, but assumes at the end of the day, if the project is approved, there will be a necessity to provide landscaping drawing and irrigation plans.

Dr. Longcore expressed concern about trimming. He noted with a 10-foot wall, there would be some non-substantial trimming there (to an oak) and asked for a commitment on what is going to happen to the trees. Jonathan noted that some of the palms are overgrown, are a nuisance, the fronds are not friendly; they'd like to adjust the wall line to try to maintain as many of the trees as possible. He is thinking it is not necessarily a really straight line; it can meander a bit, and they could step it slightly, as need be to avoid, as long as they can achieve that goal and salvage any mature trees.

Dr. Longcore mentioned the property next door, where everything got removed. Jonathan discussed major problems with that neighbor, noting that one of the requests he got, they had not anticipated that an 8' high rock fence that ran the south property line -- the wall fell there; he knows he is allowed 8' fence wall outside the front set back but, assuming he gets the 10' he'd like to continue it to just provide some privacy from him. They don't mind building a wall on their side of the property line, they'll be building a by right wall right after the front set back but he'd like to amend their request to allow to do that first 20 feet with an 8 or 10' wall so they can wrap it around to get their southern property line also protected; now it is open, someone can walk through. That's not currently before us. He would like to do it as part of this application, or if it requires that he comes back next month, to do it; they didn't want to come back with a new application but they didn't think that wall would fall down but it did because the gentleman didn't protect the wall and now they don't have a wall.

Member Evans asked if the by right work is for walls or fences, to which Jonathan responded that there is work on the house, they are remodeling the house and keeping the character of the home to its built style, painstakingly maintaining tile, porches, all that is on the eastern façade; addition to the back, a master bedroom, the garage is being converted to a family room; they have permits for one. Evans expressed concern about piece meal. He noted that they didn't request any variances or discretionary approvals.

Member Evans explained that we don't like "piece-mealing," and if this is different, we need a principal for why it is different. Jonathan discussed having three sets of permits: some for interior remodel in 2024, in May a permit for part of the work, and he can provide the board with

permit numbers, will be happy to email that to us. He is obtaining a supplemental now. There is a sewer and drainage easement running westerly of the property line, 7-1/2 feet on their side and 7-1/2 on the property to the west, and there were some issues on existing retaining walls built by Public Works. Because of the way the garage was built, they were delayed...

The floor was opened to committee discussion: Co-Chair Kemp noted that he wasn't able to see plans, is looking for a site plan from curb to proposed wall, and to see the elevation. He asked is it a solid wall or combination of solid and possibly wrought iron? Kemp is concerned about the 10-foot height, asking is there a 4-foot drop within 20 feet of the frontage. Jonathan replied, no, they provided site plan, floor plans and elevations of the walls. At this time, they are proposing a solid wall so when they grow vines they have place to adhere and grow on - which he notes works nicely to turn it into a green wall regardless of what material was used. He noted that the four-foot drop is across the frontage of the property, from the north end, and you go 200 feet south, the grade drops 4' so if you are at 100 at north, you are at 96 at south. So they stepped the wall. It comes through the driveway where it opens up.

Kemp stated that his concern is that 10' is quite high, and can understand security at 6 or 7' and worries that they create a canyon effect along the street. Jonathan noted that he read the minutes from the previous meeting, where the project was asking for 12-14 feet high walls. He noted in his case, the property is so wide, if you look at the scale of the wall face, you have to be right next to the wall, and if you are able to, that's where you will see it. There is no sidewalk there. Nobody technically would be walking down Beverly Glen. If you are across from the park, the height of that wall will look in proportion to the size of the parcel. The property is 200 feet wide. The walls will be no taller than the palm trees that they currently have. As you are driving down, you'll barely see the top of the wall, whether 8, 10 or 6 it won't make a difference.

Member Templeton asked: 1) why are you moving it closer to the street, to which he responded, to better landscape their front yard... which is now growth over the last hundred years, unkempt, unorganized, and to replace the sprinkler system. He wants to salvage the trees but also have landscaping on the street side as well as his side. He discussed the little rubble wall being in a bad place, and that doesn't serve security. He cannot raise it up because the foundations are unclear, and doesn't know when it was built; they still have to tear it down. He noted that once removed, it allows for better maintenance of the mature trees and the ability to plant more trees. 2) Asked why 10 feet - is because it will look better? Jonathan replied that it will be in scale. The property is so wide, a 6' wall would seem miniscule.

Member Savage noted that the permits that are outstanding that were issued seem significant and wonders if those had any impacts on any discretionary entitlements in addition to the request for the front yard over in height wall. He replied no, they are by right on square footage, addition, area, lot coverage, height, and setbacks. The building is and will remain one story. Savage pointed out the existing building takes up a lot of the property and wonders if he is adding to illegal nonconforming side yards. He said those parts will not be added to. Member Miner would vote to support it. Dr. Longcore asked that the lights on either side of the entrance be shielded so the bulbs do not cause glare for oncoming traffic to which Jonathan noted that they are lighting up the driveway, and can use LED and down lights to only illuminate the pathway.

Public Comment:

Danny Moizel the owner's rep and contractor on the project added that it is very important to keep the architectural integrity of the 1920s Spanish style house; important to not add a second story. They are still significantly under the FAR requirements. He noted the big issue of the wall, BG is a freeway and the noise is exuberant, so the idea of the 10-foot wall is to shield from that so the family can take advantage of the front yards, for a park-like environment for a sense of serenity, and security. 2) With crime increasing, everyone is concerned about feeling safe in their own home. As there is a public park across, he notices transients, and wants a sense of safety and security for the family and children. The intent is to landscape the front with the wall, shrubbery and landscape, and to make it *not* feel like a wall. He assured that there are no protected trees to be removed; sycamores are being kept and enhanced with additional landscaping, inside the property.

Jonathan Chodos noted that he is here for another project but wanted to give public comment about the house next door and another across the street, that there is at least another 8-10 foot wall. He noted as a resident, he has no objection to it.

[Public Comment was closed.]

Templeton asked Danny Moizel noting that the new wall will be 5' from the curb while the old wall is -- as he stated, approximately about 8' off the curb, moving forward about 3 feet... Jonathan added that it varies from 8-10 feet.

Motion: To support this project as described moved by Miner, and seconded by Greenberg.

Member Evans believes that if this was a project that had by right work to a house and discretionary permit for just the fence, we would find it bothersome. We need to articulate the reason for why this is different. She thinks that preservation of the original structure, that isn't getting much bigger, is probably a reason because it is not a huge change. Weisberg agreed.

Hall mentioned the suggested condition by Dr. Longcore regarding shielding of the lights. Dr. Longcore noted that he would just consider this a suggestion as the applicant said he was willing to do that. Vice-Chair Hall explained that AB 131 incorporates all the environmental carve outs of SB 35 and SB 9, noting the applicable fire hazard mitigation measures, the Fire Safe Road Regulations. He noted that with the Multiple Projects Ordinance you should apply for all the requested entitlements at the same time... Jonathan noted that they did apply for all at the same time. It took almost six-seven months to get to where they are today; meanwhile the other permits were fast-tracked, reviewed and approved by B&S and Planning.

Ellen wanted to know why we are deviating from our normal policy and thinks it would be helpful to articulate that for our future use. Templeton expressed concerns about moving the wall closer to the street and would like a condition that it be a green wall, landscaped, covered with greenery. Jonathan will comply with the green wall to the letter. The motion **did not carry** with 4 yeses Nickie, Jamie Robin, and Ellen, 4 noes: Patricia, Stephanie, Michael and Leslie, and 2 abstentions Bob and Travis.

New Motion to approve it if the wall stays in its current location was moved by Templeton and seconded by Stephanie. (This motion approves the 10 feet but the wall stays where it is.)

The motion **passed** by 6 yeases: Patricia, Nickie, Jamie, Robin, Bob, and Ellen; 2 noes: Michael and Leslie and 1 abstention: Longcore. Vice-Chair Hall explained that the board will hear this at the next full board meeting and that we are an advisory body.

6. 14410 W MULHOLLAND DR AA-2024-7366-DPS (No-Show)

Case Filed On: 11/13/2024 **Staff Assigned:** KATIE KNUDSON

Applicant: Haig Bagerdjian

Representative: Jimmy Toetz [Crest Real Estate] jimmy@crestrealestate.com

Project Description: Deemed to Be Approved Private Street

Present Use: SFD / **Proposed Use:** SFD+ADU

Action Requested: Applicant is requesting Deemed to be Approved Private Street Status in conjunction with a remodel to an existing SFD which existed prior to September 6, 1961 on a private street.

Building & Safety / City Planning Joint Referral Form: Project is requesting a Deemed to be Approved Private Street for the subject property. Project also includes the addition of ADU that will result in the request of a Haul Route for the export of more than 1,000 CY (*signed 06/29/2022*).

Planning Department Permanent Link:

<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumbr/AA-2024-7366-DPS>

This link includes Project Application, Private Street Map, and Vicinity Map.

[8:00 P.M.] [Attention was turned to #7 as neither Jimmy Toetz nor Andrew Odum were in attendance.]

7. 1450 N SEABRIGHT PL ZA-2024-7305-ADJ-CU1-HCA (Coming back in October)

Applicant: Monica Bousa

Representatives: Benjamin Eshaghian [Company: Crest Real Estate]

Assigned Staff: Esther Serrato (ADI) + Katie Knudson (DPS/COC)

Project Description: This request is part of a proposed project that includes the remodel & addition to existing single-family residence including converting the existing 292 square foot attached garage into guest bedroom and 25 square foot bathroom addition as well as (N) pergola and (N) wood deck. Additionally, Two-Unit Development for (N) 498 square foot Single-Family Dwelling including attached garage and a retaining wall. The proposed project will result in a total of 2,705 square feet of residential floor area (RFA) and continue to receive access via a driveway off of Seabright Pl.

Entitlements Requested:

- Zoning Administrator's Adjustment seeking relief from L.A.M.C Section 12.07.01-C.4: The project is requesting to permit a reduced lot area of 12,434 square feet in lieu of the otherwise required 20,000 square feet in the RE20-1-H-HCR Zone.

Non-Discretionary Planning Cases:

- Certificate of Compliance - California Government Code Section 66499.35 authorizes applications for a Certificate of Compliance to identify whether parcels comply with the Subdivision Map Act.

- Deemed to be Approved Private Street: review for compliance of an access driveway located within a private road easement when the dwelling and access driveway existed and recorded prior to September 6, 1961, pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 18.00 C.

Updated Project Materials: <https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/ozj4ip5h5lz1u3bsgwydg/ACSV-6wqUeoypMSU04SwJvw?rlkey=d9794c2njkaggz028ttowatxk&dl=0>

[Benjamin noted that Andrew Odum should be speaking on #6 if he is in attendance.]

Benjamin Eshaghian from Crest Real Estate presented the adjustment request for a substandard lot, located in the BA-BC region, off of Seabright Place, which receives access through Seabright Place through Seabright Drive, with two entrance points, via Beverly Estate Drive and Tower Grove Drive. He pointed to the vicinity map of the project, two parcels, and pointed to the existing SFD. He reviewed the Zoning Administrator's Adjustment (noted above under Entitlements Requested.)

Ben added that it is in the RE20-1-H-HCR Zone with a lot area of 12,434 square feet. The total proposed residential floor area will be 2,705 square feet. The proposed additions would be a 315 sf addition to the existing SF house consisting of the conversion of the existing garage, as well as a new 25 square foot addition and a 436 sq foot new SB9 unit and 49 square foot new garage. The SFD will remain one story, the new SB 9 a 2nd story, and first floor garage will be 2 stories. There will be 2 parking spots provided in the garage, plus one uncovered and the project will abide by all 4' required setbacks per SB 9, the new SB 9 structure will have a 24'-1-1/4" height. He provided the site plan with the new SB 9 dwelling with the garage underneath, the converted garage is highlighted, and a 25' square foot addition to the existing sfd. There is a proposed wood deck at the top right of the property and a pergola to the south.

He provided some elevations for the proposed SFD, 13'-1" pointing to elevations 10- and 13 on the south. Elevations provided for SB9 and garage on the first floor and steps leading to the second floor where there is a small unit. Asked, there is a Certificate of Compliance (CoC) and the Deemed to be Approved Private Street. He provided an explanation for this, noting that the lot was cut after the date in which the subdivision map act was created, they are moving forward for a CoC to legalize the lot that was cut illegally. The request for ZAA as the lot is 12,434 square feet whereas zoning requires 20,000, which would be impossible to add therequi8red feet to create the required lot. This is a request to build a new sfd pursuant to part of SB 9.

Hall asked, and Ben noted that Crest has handled more than a handful so far. Jamie noted that this is the first that we have seen. Jamie asked about the roadway, and was told that Seabright Place is substandard, and pursuant to SB 9, they are seeking a waiver, as the addition and SB 9 unit both qualify for ministerial roadway waivers as they are not subject to BHO. He noted that they are in the process of obtaining the waivers now.

Vice-Chair Hall responded that we have to look into that and noted that he mentioned the environmental carve outs in SB 9, one of which is that a project in a VHFHSZ has to adhere to all applicable fire hazard mitigation measures, one of which is the Fire Safe Road Regulations. Ben responded that they are in discussion with Planning to see if those standards would be

applicable or not. Hall noted that one of the standards in the Fire Safe Regulations is that the roadway has to be 20' wide; that this project brings up significant issues and sets precedent going forward. He noted that we need to thoughtfully evaluate this.

They do not have a hearing set yet. Vice-Chair Hall would ask him to come back with more information, e.g., the waivers requested, the planning for the roadways, and why they think State Fire Safe Regulations don't apply, put it as Item #1 on an upcoming agenda.

Ben related to confirm Hall's comment, they have applied for the roadway waiver; it is part of the request; they are seeking to remove it and haven't finalized it yet. Hall noted that there is an interplay between that request and the SB 9 requirements that you have to adhere to all applicable fire hazard mitigation measures. Member Miner agrees to table this.

Dr. Longcore noted that we received updated materials from them which he appreciates and asked why is there a completely different project on the city's website? It used to be a 3,000 sf addition on a substandard street with less than 20' CPR, and now it is two houses, asking if this is a lot split as well. Ben explained that there is just a second dwelling unit proposed, similar to an ADU, an additional unit, and it is going through a different pathway.

Brief discussion was held on two provisions for SB 9. He noted that there is no lot split proposed, only 2nd dwelling unit. Questions were asked as to why they did this, why a separate dwelling unit versus an ADU. Member Savage asked him to provide information accurately delineated on a plan regarding the retaining wall, for when they come back.

He explained that there is one new retaining wall proposed as part of the SB 9 dwelling unit and there is another existing retaining wall currently supporting the pool that is facing on the south side of the property. Savage noted it is a very steep site, and wonders if there are only two RWs; she would like some documentation. Dr. Longcore pointed out what appeared to be several other retaining walls on the screen. Ben will confirm the status of the retaining walls at the next presentation. He believes all the retaining walls, as proposed, would be compliant. Savage noted that anything over 3-1/2 feet will count.

Member Evans noted that she has a little bit of an issue with the idea of trying to get a waiver for Fire Codes and asked what the intended use of the extra dwelling is. Ben couldn't comment on their specific use, noting that the end-user who is currently living in the home and will continue living in the home, will use it, he guesses for guests.

Member Miner mentioned that she heard that SB 9 was described for an urban situation, and that Seabright is not urban, with very substandard streets, in the mountains, and is everything that urban is not. He noted that SB 9 is not precluded from the hillside area; there are additional requirements; they had to obtain an additional bio report that was reviewed by the city.

Miner asked about the additional requirements, to which he noted that they need to verify that it is not included in the PAWS habitat sites.

Vice-Chair Hall noted it is also the same language in AB 131 - provides habitat for sensitive, threatened, endangered species, and that he is not eligible for SB 9. They did a bio report. Hall noted that they have to adhere to all applicable fire hazard mitigation measures including State Fire Safe Road regulations, noting that there are waivers for SB 9 but have to adhere to mitigations measures.

Ben noted that they approved the continuous paved roadway down to the hillside. There is a question as to the adjacent roadway. Vice-Chair Hall asked him to provide the documentation requiring the waiver from the CPR requirement, to which Ben noted that it hasn't been finalized yet, pending deliberations.

Ben shared his screen, pointing out that the roadway is immediately next to a roundabout, and is technically marked as being substandard, less than 20 feet; however, he noted that if you include the paved area of roundabout, it should provide enough but is a technical issue that they are currently reviewing.

Jamie asked, but down Seabright, the rest of the road is not a 20-foot width and asked that when they come back, to show us the actual provision for SB 9 that he believes gives the city the right to waive the CPR requirement.

Templeton raised the question of lot coverage will be, when they add the house, the garage and the separate dwelling unit, he noted that he doesn't know the percentage but that the max allowable is 4,973 sf, and they have 2,705 sf that includes the garages and things. She shares Jamie's concern about fire regulations.

Schlesinger asked him about the garage, to which Ben noted that the garage will remain, single story, it will be converted to living space and a new garage is proposed underneath the SB 9 unit. A new two-story structure proposed with the garage down below.

Hall raised the issue about the provision of SB 9 that says a local agency shall not impose regulations that require dedications of right of way or the construction of off-site improvements... as a condition of issuing a parcel map for an urban lot split. He asked Ben if the construction of offsite improvements would be like widening the road offsite, and noted that this is an urban lot split, which Ben denied. Hall raised further issues on this and asked that the committee note that they are getting away from the CPR language or attempting to, and pointed out the environmental carve out, in the language of the provision, (which he read) that the committee should seek, as to parcels, wetlands, coastal zone, prime farm land, habitat of protected species, subparagraphs B-K, which he noted is the same language in AB 131.

Motion to continue this was moved by Nickie, seconded by Bob. Miner asked and he clarified that the SB9 unit is only two stories, the first floor is the garage, the 2nd floor SB9 unit.

Further deliberation was held, with Member Evans noting that she prefers to see a blanket rejection of all projects now and in the future that don't adhere to the State Fire Safe Roads laws. Hall suggested that we use this as an opportunity to learn what the law is and how the city processes these applications, to learn about SB 9 projects, what the rules are; however, thinks we

should continue this so we can educate ourselves. Templeton agreed with Hall that we need to know what we are talking about so we can articulate it well, as to using SB 9 if it doesn't adhere to Fire Safe Roads, and should get our ducks in a row and be very accurate. Dr. Longcore recommended and Hall agreed to a postponement to the next available slot instead of a continuance as they don't have a hearing as we have a very booked agenda next month. Hall asked Ben to coordinate with Ms. Palmer for next available slot, while the committee looks to be sure what they are asking for complies with the law.)

Motion to postpone this until the next available scheduled time **passed unanimously**.

[8:35 P.M.]

8. 10428 W HEBRON LANE ZA-2024-6828-CU1

Case Filed On: 10/22/2024 Staff Assigned: Esteban Martorell

Applicant: Jonathan P. Chodos [10428 Hebron Lane, LLC] 310-595-4656
Jpchodos@Gmail.Com

Representative: Richard Diaz Primelles [RDP Architecture] info@rdparchitecture.com

Project Description: New 642 Sf 2nd Floor Addition to an Existing 1 Story SFD

Actions Requested

- Relief from requirement that adjacent access to property be improved with a roadway width of 20 feet.

- Relief from requirement of Continuous Paved Roadway of minimum 20 feet to boundary of hillside area.

Planning Department Permanent Link:

<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumbr/ZA-2024-6828-CU1> This link includes Environmental Assessment Form, Findings and Project Plans.

Please See Updated Findings in Attachment "B" and the Dropbox provided by the Applicant:

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/jbobnukey7khyxv9er51u/AP-NSoTzplXQeWqdOixuEXU?rlkey=jktnvo18o0btmepfbx3f3ymyp&dl=0>

The owner, Mr. Jonathan Chodos, presented the case. He noted that he sent us a project summary and wanted to respond to Member Evans' concern about piece-mealing (mentioned above.) He noted that the project was built in two phases, originally built for his 90-y-o mom, a one-bedroom one bath project but when she decided not to live there, they are trying to expand it for a family; trying to add a second story, consisting of a master bedroom, a small bedroom and a bath, to turn the house into a three-bedroom and two-bath house. Since Hebron Lane is 18'-6" wide, they need a variance to add more than 500 square feet at the house. He noted that they didn't know that they had to do it at the outset.

He noted that he sent us a picture of Hebron Lane, how they came to move to 40 years ago, was because they had lived on the Boulevard near Oletha, and moved up to Hebron Lane that is very wide and straight, relative to many of the other streets in the Glen. The pictures show that from BG Boulevard to the house the road is between 18'-6" and 19' wide, and it is actually 20' wide in front of the house, but the down on the Boulevard is the house is next to a big cypress.

He asked Dr. Longcore to bring up the project summary and pointed out the big cypress at the western border of the property, noting from side to side at the property it is 20' wide but there are some choke points where it drops to 18' and the parapet is 18'6". He explained further about the houses on the north and south side of the street, and explained that it is not possible to ask the neighbors to remove walls. He summarized that there is the substandard street by about a foot or a foot and a half in some places... and that they would like to finish it off and have the family move in and enjoy.

Hall asked if they could do a by right project; however, they added about 200 sf previously. The original owner had bootlegged in a bunch of stuff at the lower level, made that all legitimate. Now they are over the 500 foot. Hall noted that he seen additions under 500 so as to not trigger the Hillside Ordinance.

Hall asked if he has spoken to the neighbors, to which he noted he noted that the people across the street has no objection and the people to the east have no objection to the project at all; there hasn't been any objection to the project. Asked about construction worker parking and staging happen, to which he noted that the workers park on the Boulevard, walk up, there is a two-car car port and driveway... it hasn't been an issue.

Greenberg noted that he had mentioned the Italian cypresses x 2, to which he noted that they are both staying and that all of the foundation was already in and this is only on top of that existing footprint. Jamie asked further about the adjacent roadway width, to which he noted there is no problem in front of his project... the problem is down towards the boulevard.

Hall asked him on the two requests:

- Relief from requirement that adjacent access to property be improved with a roadway width of 20 feet.
- Relief from requirement of Continuous Paved Roadway of minimum 20 feet to boundary of hillside area.

As to the adjacent access, Mr. Chodos was asked if he was willing to widen the road, and stated that the roadway is dedicated to 20' and he is willing to pull the road back 2' so it is 20' wide. He thinks he does *not* need an entitlement to deviate from the adjacent roadway requirement. He pointed to a rubble wall that will be coming out and will be replaced with a new wall, back to 20 feet. Asked if he will need B permit, Mr. Chodos replied no problem BOE asked for 3 feet that. He pointed out that on the right, the south side, most of the driveways go up steeply, and pointing out a neighbor's wall at 18 feet, telephone poles.

Member Savage thinks people should get B permits, as it makes it safer for everyone, she thinks people who are encroaching should have all their debris removed from the PROW to make it safer for others. She discussed you do a B-permit, sometimes they have to move the telephone poles. Templeton asked, if in front of his property, if he is willing to get the B permit, which he confirmed. He is able to withdraw the entitlement request.

Member Evans asked for a reminder of the Fire Safe Road requirement would be in respect to the front of this property, to which Hall noted that there is an exception for a project where there

was a previous or existing structure, they get a free pass from the 20-foot road requirement. Evans asked for clarification that the footprint isn't changing, there is already a building, so they get a free pass. Dr. Longcore noted that the point is that this an existing structure.

Dr. Longcore noted that he is sitting close to the site, not close enough to recuse himself but would not be voting. He wanted to say this is typical for those who don't know The Glen, all these streets are short and narrow; if this were a new project on a new parcel, he would say we should not be building new houses without appropriate access on these kind of streets. This is exactly the kind of project, if there should be exemptions for this kind of thing, this is the project. It is not an over the top upgrade; it is minimal; they did the right thing by legalizing previous square footage that triggered this. It is pretty close to The Glen, not that far up. There are two fire hydrants on Hebron; an additional piece of fire equipment that they do have. He is not going to vote on this but this is the kind of thing you'd want your neighbors to do in this situation.

Hall read the Code Section for the statement on Fire Safe Regulations as to building permits for new construction not related to an existing structure, In this case, there is an existing structure, so that the 20 foot roadway requirement doesn't apply. There was no public comment.

Motion to approve this project moved by Evans and seconded by Greenberg.

Friendly amendment that this also includes that the request to deviate from the adjacent roadway requirement be withdrawn and the roadway in front of the property be improved to 20 feet was moved by Hall and agreed to by Evans and Greenberg.

Passed 9-0-1 with the abstention from Dr. Longcore.

Good of the Order

Member Greenberg related that when she was serving as National Director of Realtors, they had to beg the senators and congress people to add flood insurance and what she saw on TV about those people going through the floods was heartbreaking. Hall shared that he has a picture from his parent's home in Texas, where a block and a half down from them water was up to the roof. He agreed that we all should give thought to the people who died in Texas. He recalls a flash flood while on a canoe trip down river, and a rescue party saved them. He noted that what happened was not a new thing but was an extraordinary event.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 9:00 P.M.

Next Meeting: August 12, 2025 at 7:00 P.M.

www.babcnc.org

info@babcnc.org