



Draft Minutes
Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
Virtual Planning & Land Use Committee Meeting
Tuesday August 12, 2025 7:00 P.M.

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

Co-Chair Hall called the meeting to order at 7:04 PM. Following the flag salute, the roll was called with quorum met. There were 11 present and 2 absent.

1. The August 12, 2025 Agenda was **approved** with 2 abstentions from Weinberg and Savage.
2. **Motion**: The **July 8, 2025** and **July 21, 2025** Meeting Minutes (**Attachments A & B**) were **approved** with 4 abstentions from Members Levinson, Weinberg, Savage and Templeton, as moved by Greenberg and Templeton.
3. **General Public Comment**: There was no public comment on topics within the Committee's jurisdiction but not on the adopted agenda.
4. **Chair Reports**:
Jamie Hall, PLU Committee Co-Chair, reported on the productive newly formed Ad Hoc Committee on the Sepulveda Transit Corridor (STC) DEIR in preparation of a letter at the next full board meeting.
Michael Kemp, PLU Committee Co-Chair, noted that we've been having lots of meetings and thanked those on both the Ad-Hoc STC Committee and this PLU committee for our time.
Leslie Weisberg, PLU Committee Vice-Chair, commended the members of this committee who are also on the Ad Hoc Committee on the Charter Reform Commission, which committee is coming forward with recommendations, and she is proud of the work we are doing. Co-Chair Hall noted, speaking as a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on Charter Reform, that we will all be seeing in the work that the committee has put together, building on our experience in this PLU committee, and are trying to inform the Charter Commission about the usefulness of it and how our work could be enhanced. He noted that we had a really robust discussion at our last ad hoc committee meeting, and thanked Vice-Chair Weisberg for reminding everyone about that.

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

5. 138 N MAPLETON DR ZA-2024-7217-ADJ ENV-2024-7218-CE (Returning from June 10)

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

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

Staff Assigned: Alexander Truong

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 front yard.

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

Isaac Lemus returned following the June PLU meeting and Co-Chair Hall welcomed him back. Isaac provided a refresher and further information. He mentioned the two requests for the same scope along with the CEQA exemption that goes with this. He showed a Power Point Presentation to include a list of precedence in the area as to the 12 foot fences, hedges and a little greater height for the pilasters. He showed comparables including but not limited to 133 Mapleton Dr., 137 Delfern, and 100 Mapleton, he reported community support, having done thorough community outreach to the surrounding area in Holmby Hills and reported on additional addresses for continued support from the neighborhood as well as overall outreach conducted for the proposed project. He pointed out an existing fence that they won't be able to keep, a little adjustment to allow for the space and to carry out a contemporary design, and that currently height is taller than what is proposed.

Isaac noted that the only scope for City Planning is in regards to the over-in-height features in the setback area. He provided a review of the scope of what is being requested and what Planning is reviewing. He noted that there is a home currently under construction on the property that has already been permitted. He and the planner reviewed both the project scope and the letter issued for any project, questions and corrections to be addressed in order to move the project forward and have the case deemed complete, and as a result, the only scope that City Planning is reviewing for entitlement consideration are over-in-height features or structures in the setback area as the scope under the review and triggering their entitlement request for an over-in-height fence or structure, whether hedges, gates, fences, retaining wall. He showed an elevation perspective, with hedging requested in green, retaining wall and fences in orange, and a darker orange or red, as well as the vehicular and pedestrian gates in cyan. He noted that this is the scope of what is being requested, and what City Planning is reviewing.

The floor was opened to the committee, with Member Savage noting that of the samples he gave of similar requests, four were close to that height, one was two feet under than that height and that it is a bigger ask than 11 projects had asked in the history for that area. Isaac noted that he has some support from neighbors, disparate and not abutting. She noted that they should consider planting vines on the center along the wall, at whatever height is to be determined, and planting respectfully in the PROW to screen the wall. She noted that it is not a friendly place and it seems insensitive to the neighbors. Isaac assured her that no part of the wall is going to be exposed and they share the concern for beautifying and adding green space... Savage noted that he said they were removing all the existing hedges and did not see the planting plan. He pointed out the green block on either side, sandwiched in between hedging on either side, stating that there will be a fence proposed and pilasters are only 14' in height. There are other legal approvals that are non-permitted conditions.

Member Spradlin asked about the parking plan for construction and staging, noting that he lives eight houses away, represents the neighborhood, and would not be able to vote on this without knowing how it's going to affect the neighborhood, e.g., how parking will look, and opined that Holmby would propose no.

Co-Chair Kemp asked about the fence being a wall with landscaping on both sides; appreciated the slides showing the 6' versus 12' and mentioned previously that 12' is extremely tall for a wall. Kemp asked if he had considered 8 or 10 feet while they have gone to a max. He was told that the 12' was based on communication between the design team and owners, and that they won't go higher than over in height existing precedent for the neighborhood. Asked about the new wall from the curb, Isaac responded 9' from the sidewalk to the property line and an additional 4 or 5 feet to the property line... noting that the street curb to property can go from 15 to 12 feet depending on what part of the property you're looking at.

Dr. Longcore brought up that this is within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) subject to the Fire Code of the City of LA which requires that he submit a landscape plan that demonstrates compliance with the fire code, and doesn't look at a project unless there is a fuel modification plan that the fire department has looked at. He mentioned the need to comply and get a landscape plan to the City for compliance and asked Isaac how he plans to comply with Zone One in this instance of defensible space, in Chapter 49? Isaac noted that it will follow within the fuel modification, and he is focusing on the City's requirements; he brought this up to their Assigned Planner, City Planning and the Office of the Zoning Administrator who confirmed that they are still accepting and approving cases such as theirs requesting hedges.

Dr. Longcore noted that we are dealing with permitting for the home but that they are asking for relief on a project that involves a hedge within Zone 1, not referring to the state requirements but Los Angeles Fire Code that talk about the landscape plans, e.g., shrubs shall not exceed 6 feet in height, groupings limited to a maximum aggregate of 10 feet. He explained what he said last time, and that this does not comply. He doesn't think that we can go forward with a project that doesn't actually address this in one way or another as new construction. He brought up the code that trees have to be managed with 10 feet between the trees and that someone is missing the process to comply; this project over 6' in height and trees are closer than 10 feet apart and noted that Isaac does not show us a plan, so that we are spinning our wheels. Templeton added that new plantings need to be fire resistant, and that he will need to provide support for that. She asked, if you have hedges on both sides 12 feet, why the wall has to be 12 feet. Isaac related that he was not sure why the wall was being sandwiched in between, and that the same criteria apply to both fence and hedges. Templeton was curious why the wall in between needs to be the same height, to which Isaac responded that to have it be consistent in terms of the hedge height makes sense as a design element. There was no public comment on this.

[7:45] Motion: Savage **moved** to continue this project to a later date to address 5 items as follows:

- 1) have a meeting with the Holmby Hills HOA regarding this entitlement request,
 - 2) submittal of parking plan for both the construction of the wall and house,
 - 3) a planting plan for that proposed wall and demonstrate compliance with LA Fire Code,
 - 4) specifically state the exact setback to the wall to the property line and/or PROW so it is not too close; including within item 4 compliance with LA Fire Code Section Chapter 49, because there is some potential hazard by how this is planted,
 - 5) specific findings on why this wall has to be this high. (Other members can add)
- The motion was seconded by Schlesinger.

Member Spradlin asked why not deny it and *not* have him come back as it seems they are piece meal and not bringing all to us. Isaac took note of all the items requested and said he'd be happy to have their determination made today, either way to move the project forward. Hall suggested stating that we recommend denial because the applicant needed to provide information; amend it to include the idea that the project is piecemealing. Stephanie noted you could add concerns about piecemealing a project as number 6.

Motion: Co-Chair Hall **moved** to recommend **denying** the project on the basis that the applicant did *not* provide sufficient information in these areas:

- 1) Failure to meet with Holmby Hills Homeowners Association
- 2) Failure to submit Parking Plan for both phases of construction (wall and house)
- 3) Failure to provide Planting Plan for Proposed Wall. Failure to Demonstrate Compliance with City of LA Fire Code
- 4) Failure to Denote Exact Setback of Wall to Property Line and/or PROW.
- 5) Inadequate Revised Findings as to Necessity of Wall Height
- 6) Concerns about piecemealing

The motion was **seconded** by Weisberg. Member Templeton noted that this is just for the fence; however, Member Spradlin noted that we have no idea of the scope of the project unless they share that and it is on record. Greenberg called the question. The motion **passed** with **two abstentions** from Dr. Longcore and Member Templeton. Hall encouraged Isaac to speak to their client and resolve these issues and come back to the full board.

6. 778 & 772 N SARBONNE ROAD ZA-2025-1668-F ENV-2025-1669-CE

Applicant: David Dollinger [778 Sarbonne LLC]

Representative: Benjamin Eshaghian [Crest Real Estate]

Case Filed 03/20/2025 & Assigned 03/25/2025 Staff Assigned: ESTEBAN MARTORELL

Project Description: SFD

Action Requested: New 6' max high over-in-height fence and 6' max hedge in the front yard setback of the lots and public ROW.

See Permanent Link on the Planning Website for five (5) Initial Submittal Documents

<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumber/ZA-2025-1668-F>

Ben Eshaghian provided a presentation. Dr. Longcore noted that we have the same issue with the Fire Safe Elements and asked if he has created a landscape plan which demonstrates how this is pursuant to the Chapter 49 of the Fire Code.

[For reference on Fire Code, Chapter 49 Requirements for Wildland-Urban Interface:

https://codes.iccsafe.org/content/CACLAFC2023P1/chapter-49-requirements-for-wildland-urban-interface-fire-areas#CACLAFC2023P1_Pt04_Ch49_Sec4906]

Ben responded that he has planting plans for each project pursuant to LAMC. Hall asked if they've been reviewed for compliance with the City of LA Fire Code. Isaac responded, not yet but generally following LA City Planning approval as part of the conditions, they are expected to have the planting plans before the LAFD to be sure that the species are not incongruous. Hall expressed having little faith that the City is enforcing the code noting that we feel we have an ethical and moral obligation to review these projects.

Templeton raised the safety issue of hedges from the road as seen on Google Maps, to which Levinson agreed that the fence was so close to the curb, which she sees when she walks on that every day. Levinson noted that if they didn't reach out to the Bel Air Association, she'd like to

see sign offs from the neighbors and wants to know if the lots are tied or not. She noted that there are no sidewalks and people walk that road and she'd like to see the setback further from the PROW as cars come around which means the hedges would be further back as well. Member Weisberg asked about the parking plan, to which Ben noted that he'd confer with the team about that but believes they have some onsite parking available, and since none is available on Sarbonne, additional workers would have to be shuttled. Ben noted that they have a planted continuous 3' wide clear escape path.

Motion was moved by Levinson **to continue** the hearing on this project and see what answers Isaac comes back with as to outreaching to the BAA, and getting signoff letters from neighbors, as to the pathway Ben mentioned, she'd like to see more space; have proof that there'll be space even with a hedge growing in front; and to see more pictures of what this is going to look like as well as issues regarding fire code and vegetation.

[As Ben reported that the lots were not tied, the two addresses with two houses to be built have the same owner, this was taken off a list of concerns.]

Co-Chair Kemp asked for a clarification as to what appears to be a chain link fence between the curb and the property line, asking if the new chain-link fence is on the property line. Ben responded that it is right on the property line. Kemp asked him to please show the dimension of the fence from curb line. Templeton noted that if the chain-link fence is on the property line, he mentioned that it is on the PROW; Ben acknowledged that they need have an open revocable permit for the fence that would be permitted for 42 inches.

Hall reiterated need to review plans to determine compliance with fire code and asked if it was possible to set fence further back from the right-of-way and provide details regarding parking plans. The motion to continue was seconded by Schlesinger.

The motion is to continue this so the applicant can address these issues:

- 1) Reach to out BAA
- 2) Obtain approvals from neighbors
- 3) Review plans to determine compliance with LA Fire Code.
- 4) Question: Is it possible to set fence further back from PROW?
- 5) Provide details regarding parking plan.
- 6) Show dimension of fence from curb line

The motion **carried** unanimously.

7. 10770 W CHALON ROAD ZA-2025-810-F ENV-2025-811-CE

Applicant: Craig Tessler

Representative: Benjamin Eshaghian [Crest Real Estate]

Case Filed 02/07/2025 & Assigned 02/27/2025

Staff Assigned: ESTEBAN MARTORELL

Project Description: SFD

Action Requested: An 8' max high over-in-height fence/pilasters and 8' max vehicular entry sliding and pedestrian gates in the front yard setback of the lot.

Permanent Link without Initial Submittal Documents:

<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenummer/ZA-2025-810-F>

Co-Chair Hall welcomed Benjamin back, and read the action requested as described above, as a request for an 8' max high over-in-height fence/pilasters and 8' max vehicular entry sliding and pedestrian gates in the front yard setback of the lot.

Benjamin presented this project on 10770 W. Chalon Road, in the same vicinity as the previous project, off of Bellagio Road coming up Sarbonne Road and taking a little dip into Chalon Road. He noted that the request has been updated to grant relief for legalization, use, and maintenance of a 6-foot-high max pedestrian gate and 6-foot-high max vehicular gate, flanked by a 6-foot-high max smooth plaster wall with pilasters along with native landscaping, all of which are over in height. The project previously had over-in-height hedges and a fence, and the clients unaware of the regulations, smoothed it out and built a plaster wall, and added a vehicular gate and a pedestrian gate without knowledge. They received an order to comply in 10/2024 and came to Crest and made the request to legalize the over-in-height fence previously constructed.

He showed the images, and pointed to the fence, rolling gates, and the property line located right where the gate is. He showed older - and did *not* have current - photos of the constructed fence, and noted that they don't have better drawings. The original submission was from the fabricator for the rolling fence and they've hired a landscape architect for a submission to the City.

Co-Chair Kemp asked for the site plan, noting that he sees the rolling gate and fence they're asking for but that it looks like the property line is further back, and the property line coordinate on the map is of great concern. Ben noted that they didn't mark it well. Kemp explained he has to clearly show where the property line is, as it would be a great concern if it is in the PROW.

Member Weinberg noted that he stated that they are asking for 6' max over in height but the drawing on his slide asked for 6'8" over in height. Ben noted that he believes the ask is 6' 8".

Member Levinson noted that it is very close to the curb. She appreciates that they made a little divot for a Sycamore tree. It is against the curb and a little space to accommodate the tree. She thinks that since the wall has been built, there is a danger. There's a curve where the property is. It calls for a convex traffic mirrors and a sign off for the neighbors.

Dr. Longcore showed ZIMAS' property boundaries noting it is pretty clear that the property line is on the other side of (pointing) here. Co-Chair Hall noted that these are not always exact. Dr. Longcore noted that if you look at the zoning, you can see how close the house is to the property line and he has no trouble concluding that it extends to the PROW.

Motion to continue this and have the applicant come back with a survey that clearly shows whether or not the wall is in the PROW and a photo of the property and a couple of other concerns was moved by Templeton and seconded by Levinson.

Co-Chair Hall noted that Ms. Palmer will send the notes over to Ben to include concerns:

1. Need for convex mirrors
2. Support from neighbors
3. Concern about wall being in PROW. Update
4. Photos of wall as constructed

Hall asked, and Ben responded that there is no hearing coming up; they just hired a new landscape architect and they're still in the process. The motion **passed** by unanimous consent.

**8. 2166 N STANLEY HILLS DR (Parcel 2) ZA 2025-1386-CUI-HCA ENV-2024-6712-EAF
2172 N STANLEY HILLS DR (Parcel 1) ZA-2024-6711-CU1-HCA ENV-2024-6712-EAF**
Applicant: Rouzbeh Zarrinbakhsh [Stanley Family Residence LLC]

Representative: Sami Kohanim [Entitle and Permits]

Case Filed 03/07/2025 & Assigned 03/26/2025 Staff Assigned: ALEXANDER TRUONG

Project Description:

Construction of a new SFD with a two-car garage.

Please see attached link provided by the applicant in lieu of documents on the Planning Case

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1AAajYo8RAXOHdym5dR5DOZz4dvBYQSDC&usp=drive_fs

Co-Chair Hall recused himself because he is the president of a nonprofit with a financial interest within 500 feet from the project site. He turned off his video and audio and Co-Chair Kemp took over the chairing of this portion of the meeting.

Mr. Sami Kohanim introduced himself. He noted that they had to file two ZA cases for two single family dwellings in the R1 zone, side by side. Their request is to waive the hillside requirement of continuous paved roadway (CPR) less than 20 feet down hillside and without improving the roadway less than 20 feet. He noted that both projects are pretty much the same. His client is building one house for himself and one for his mother. He lives close by, up the hill, and wants to move here to build these two homes for his mother and himself. Besides the two requests for relief from the requirements for CPR and as to the minimal roadway, they are not requesting other entitlements. He shared the two projects side by side on the screen, provided site plan, floor plans, two car garages per sfd, and roof plans for both projects. He noted that 2172 has a roof deck but because of the height 2166 does not have a roof deck.

He provided elevations, front, rear, side elevations and sections, basic renderings of the projects from the front, side, and from the front as well. They have a grading plan; they are not going over the 1,000 CY, and do not need a haul route. He noted that it is below code and they have landscape plans for both projects. They are *not* removing any protected trees which the landscape architect is well aware of, and built all the landscape in-between to not disturb the protected trees of the project.

Questions were asked and answered, including but not limited to those prepared by Member Savage who had eight questions. She related that she has done three B permit improvements on her property frontage and noted that there have been four projects that have done the road widening on Stanley Hills. She doesn't know who stated that there are accidents because of road widening. She thinks it is the narrow roads that are the problem.

- 1) When he demolished the existing structures, did he have an AQMD permit with the grading permit?
- 2) She looked at his project and because he is asking for a dedication, pushing his property back into the hill... there is a lot of grading. She is happy to calculate it. It is well over the 1,000 cy because when you have two properties of common ownership, they are counted together. So, on roads such Stanley Hills with less than 20 feet width, he is limited on BHO to 750 yards, so he will have to have a haul route.
- 3) Side yard setbacks... based on height, vary, seem to vary, seems would be 6' on either side. Why are they different?
- 4) Retaining walls on the back - it shows no freeboard on drawing A5.01. She is surprised it is that steep in the back yard. She had a property above on Groveland. It is puzzling to her that it is that high but his drawing showed no freeboard that would be a basic requirement with the Grading Department. The retaining wall height is a concern to her.

- 5) The tree removals that he is not doing she guesses because he doesn't want to widen the road. The road widening has historically been a benefit to the neighborhood.
- 6) If he were to improve the road, as the previous owner had been prepared to do, he could get out of that 8 yard dedication and bring his project forward.
- 7) If he could verify the square footage, because the only drawings she could look at were on the planning website, and she came up with one of the houses in the area being 3,025 less the garage of 200-exempt only; that is exceeding his allowable slope analysis of 2104. She needs the square footage to be verified...
- 8) He had some double-height space that she wonders if that is calculated; and that dovetails with parking requirement. If you have two and are exceeding 2400 square feet, he will need a third.

Mr. Kohanim responded that he could send us all the shared folder; the projects are *not* together, the reason they filed two separate entitlements. He reported proposing under 750 CY of soil removal; that one house is 2104 square feet and the other is 2340 square feet, well within the slope band analysis square footages.

Mr. Kohanim noted that LADBS has already approved the plans for zoning, checked everything, stamped their plans as far as zoning and side yards, and they're good on everything except the two requested entitlements. Savage noted that she is happy to provide information for him as she has built frequently in that area. She reiterated that for properties under common ownership, the grading is considered one project. She wanted to inform him of her real concerns.

Stephanie will provide Co-Chair Kemp with her list. Savage noted that a motion can be made to continue this to address other concerns. Mr. Kohanim stated that he thought he answered all his questions. He noted that they are not asking for anything besides this, 20 feet down the hillside and opined that 100% of the time this *type of request* is approved. Savage noted that this has not been approved without a road improvement.

Co-Chair Kemp opened the floor to committee members, whereupon Member Templeton asked how wide the road and was told it is 18' with parking on one side of the street.

Public Comment:

Randy Dodge was born and lives across the street. There is a state law that says there is no building houses on a street that is less than 20 feet. He noted that they are going around the state law that is there for safety. He noted it is a very dense neighborhood. They can't even handle the traffic here now. He noted that the applicant wants to tear down 300-foot trees that have been there since he was a child. He noted that it is unsafe for this neighborhood, and that we don't need the density. He stated that this has been an empty lot since 1970, there were two cottages on it, and he wants to come destroy the whole ambience of this neighborhood, build... there are two pine trees and a redwood tree, 100 feet tall and home to animals and birds. The trees will be cut down. There is no way construction can go on here. He noted that there was a party the other day with many cars, gridlocked for an hour. This is putting our neighborhood at risk. This is not a place that should be built. He implored everyone to come and visit this site. This can't be done on a video. This is dangerous, and all the neighbors are against it. You can't just come in and say, oh, I don't want to make it 20 foot wide. That's not the issue. The City can't ignore the state law. This should not even get off the ground.

Kim Gottlieb-Walker and her husband both live up the block and are absolutely opposed to this project. Their neighborhood is an old overcrowded neighborhood and with the streets are only

18' wide, they live in constant fear of a fire, because no way can a fire engine get in and the people evacuate. She noted that whomever approved this should be ashamed of themselves because they do not understand this neighborhood and the dangers that we face. This literally jeopardizes our lives. To make it denser, to add these two-story bunkers, with no land around them, and no place for parking for staging, puts us all in danger. She noted that their street is totally maxed out. No way for fire engines to get in. They are absolutely opposed to the project. It is not in keeping with the neighborhood and endangers us all. And the old growth trees are homes for hawks, owls and birds that protect our neighborhood from the rodent population, we have a very delicate ecological balance in this neighborhood, and this would cause huge damage to our native population of wildlife.

Kim Gottlieb-Walker's husband, Jeffrey Walker, stated that he cannot understand how this got so far and why people don't understand why the rules exist up here for everybody's safety. No one ever mentions lack of infrastructure, the failing infrastructure up here in sewage, water and gas, and in the last couple of years, they've had leaks in all three. They do not hear anything addressing what needs improvement here. They have regular red flag days and asked what happens during construction with red flag warnings. There are more patches on the streets; they have trouble with trucks, and the regular power outages. In the last year with the fires, and the fact that the rodent population is increasing and the influx of wildlife from both sides, there is no way to widen the streets without taking out those old growth trees that they need. The size of that property is appropriate for maybe one family home at most, with a nice yard and plenty of space for off street parking, and the neighborhood could live with that, with one family, with plenty of room around it, but to put two two-story bunkers is outrageous.

Roy Faerber lives adjacent to the proposed projects 2174 Stanley Hills right next to the northern property that will have the deck on it. He saw it going on, and reached out to the applicant, invited them over to the house, and had a meeting to talk about it. They didn't have the nuances worked out and he asked him to share the plans with him so he could look at it and see if he could help with them with the neighborhood. He is not totally against their requests if they were building a reasonable. The amount of earth and retaining walls they'd have to build... to protect the house behind it... he doesn't see how anyone can approve anything. He wants to see the math. He can't believe that this could go forward without having someone really looking at this, an engineer. He can't have his hillside falling down. They share the same hillside. If they are going to cut it out and put in a house and pool. He needs to hire people to look at this. He'd be happy to meet with the owner again. He doesn't want this to go forward without further analysis and discussion.

Sandra Carradine related that she had lived in the neighborhood for eight years, not currently but over the eight years has seen so much overdevelopment and lack of following the rules, even the basic Baseline Hillside Ordinance, and the City may not be aware of the BHO. She noted that maybe because a lot of it is done on line now, and no one comes with feet on the ground to see these properties; look at plans and signs off on them. She agrees with every point of the previous speakers but would like to add that she was actively -- becomes suspect that he is going to live in one house and for his mother... Just little family Joes here, when those structures were demolished... they were there possibly for 100 years, and to her shock they demolished those buildings without communicating with the asbestos control agency and they were reported and it was inspected, and she personally saw, with her own eyes, 20-some unknowing unsuspecting workers, with no masks, no protective covering, handling those materials; no licensed removal truck; it was a worker's black-bed parked there on the side, and these 20 unsuspecting workers not to mention the entire neighborhood being exposed to the asbestos. The follow-up

documented that there was asbestos contamination and there were going to be five different contamination removal procedures, and this owner was going to be cited with contamination. It was going to be difficult... The follow-up with the asbestos agency has been slow. They demolished buildings built with asbestos; not only the demolition went forward without the proper sign offs, what about the removal of the asbestos that has to go to a designated not a regular waste site, which she observed with her own eyes. Not only the safety of the road, which is completely dangerous and she believes this is more than an accident waiting to happen; it is a tragedy waiting to happen. Those roads cannot handle any more. She knows that people deserve to own and develop property but they must be forced to develop it in some type of a reasonable and lawful manner and if they can't do that, they shouldn't be able to build at all. She can follow up with the documentation with the supervisor and inspector who went to the property, and provide more because she didn't find out about the meeting. She noted that she has a son who lives in the neighborhood; she had lived in the neighborhood and may want to move back to the neighborhood but it is shocking to her that they went ahead and exposed got-only knows because air blows and that simple fact can tell you that they are full of crap.

[This concluded public comment on this item.]

Dr. Longcore related that he has a concern procedurally about taking any action tonight because the materials were that were posted were not able to be accessed by members of the public as we have just heard from the testimony. We have a requirement that those materials be available before the meeting if they are available to the board. He noted that he was a little concerned... about going forward when there wasn't access to everyone at the same time. He had a concern about that, that it would be more appropriate to maybe get some answers to some of the questions and to have a hearing after the full package has been made available, without restriction, so that the public has a chance to review it on an equal footing and give their comments in that manner. He just wanted to do that.

[9:04 PM]

He also wanted to note, and the reason he asked the question about whether these were two vacant lots is a reminder that the statewide fire safe regulations do apply in instances where there's no current building. So we confirmed with the applicant that there is no current building on either of those lots and therefore, the exception to the requirement that the state law requiring that there be 20-foot continuous paved roadway down to the end of the high fire hazard severity zone does apply here because it's not associated with an existing property. Caveat that he is not a lawyer; he can miss something, but this is his understanding of the situation, so he has pretty grave concerns. He knows other situations like this, where you're starting with a fresh lot and there's just no way to -- except, if you can argue, that you can get an alternative level of safety in some other way than the roadway width. He thinks we've already heard enough testimony from the neighborhood about the level of congestion and ingress and egress that you cannot have evacuation and fire apparatus access at same time here, and that's the whole reason that the state very intentionally, passed this at the state level and made it binding to the very high fire hazard severity zone within the local responsibility areas, which we are. With that, he left it to us to decide how to proceed. He just wanted to raise those issues.

Motion to continue this project to a later date was moved by Member Savage, and she will provide a list of items, had mentioned 8 but will add a 9th item on a parking and staging plan and will listen to the recording to listen to the Laurel Canyon community public comment to add anything there.

Member Savage also wanted to mention that the grading retaining wall shoring plan check correction sheets state that a public hearing is required for onsite import or export of earth materials in excess of 1000 CY in hillside grading area, Code 7006.7, to submit a haul route application to the B&S Commissioner's office, processing time 8 weeks, and telephone number.

She noted that per LAMC Section 91.70003 the definition of site is as follows: any lot or parcel of land or contiguous combination thereof under the same ownership where grading is performed or permitted constitutes one site; so, grading is a basic correction sheet item, it is one property, under the same ownership and they are restricted because of the width of the street to 750 CY and they are declaring over 2100 CY; so they would require a haul route, which would be added to this entitlement among other things. Savage said she could list these things or provide a list for the applicant, along with any other input from community or community members.

Mr. Kohanim noted that it is not 2100 CY and that he didn't know where she got those figures. He explained that they filed this ZAD case with the lot line adjustment, and the city said, per single family, you must file a separate case and they are treated as separate cases. Member Savage explained that she came up with 2100 cubic yards on the drawings that she could access on the Planning website. It was uploaded in the Planning website. She noted, like others at this meeting this evening, she couldn't access the drive. He noted that he shared the file with the NC.

Dr. Longcore noted that we used his link as a Google drive and didn't mirror it but should have mirrored it. His concern is that it was not available to members of the public but only some people whom he gave access to. Mr. Kohanim has given him access and we can now make sure no one has any question before he comes back, and they can review the information in the drive as a matter for us to comply with the Brown Act. Dr. Longcore apologized for the snafu, noting that it was assumed that his site was available to everyone but it wasn't, and we have to make sure that everyone has access out of fairness.

The motion was seconded by Greenberg.

Travis clarified that the **motion** was to continue in a request to answer questions that will be provided in email to the applicant after the meeting. The motion **passed** by all but one abstention from Dr. Longcore and one recusal by Hall.

[We will make Mr. Kohanim's plans on his drive available to the public prior to the meeting.]

Questions for continued project 2166 & 2172 Stanley Hills Drive-

1. Did you have an AQMD permit associated with the demolition permit?
2. Grading exceeds 1000 CY (or 750 CY for streets less than 20' wide). When properties are under common ownership they are considered (1) site under LAMC Section 91.70003, haul route is required. See attached grading correction sheet, code 70006.7. And if a ZAA or other entitlement (in order to exceed allowed grading) is needed it must be filed with the current ZA case. R-1 allows 750 CY on streets less than 20'. And do you have grading calculations for each project?
3. Side yard setbacks... based on height, vary, seem to vary, seems would be 6' on either side. Please verify building height & each side yard setback. And R-1 encroachment plane applies to side yards as well, verify compliance.

4. Rear yard retaining walls in the backyard show no freeboard on drawing A5.01. Will the (2) walls be taller than 10' including required freeboard. Provide spot elevations.
5. The tree removals at front of property would allow road widening has historically been a benefit to the neighborhood. Will trees be removed and will there be 1:1 replacements?
6. If he were to improve the road, as the previous owner had been prepared to do, you could eliminate 6' of the 8' of dedication and this would help reduce your grading. Note relief from road improvement along property frontage has been required of (4) recent projects on Stanley Hills Drive & (5) on Groveland Drive, as well as other project in the area.
7. For each house (2166 & 2172): Please verify the square footage per floor, note only 200 SF of garage is exempt square footage .Include square footage for ceilings over 14' high.
8. Confirm onsite parking spaces - standard & compact. Square footage relates to parking requirement for each house SF over 2400 requires a third parking spot.
9. Provide a parking and staging plan for the various phases of construction.
10. Include any updated information on the plans for the next hearing.
11. Minimum State Fire Regulations – for new construction on and/or accessed by roads less than 20' wide have minimum requirement of 20' in width (Cal. Code Rags. Title 14, 1273.01)

Comments from (5) neighbors included: narrow street frontage, wildlife concerns & impact, tree removals, failing infrastructure, concerns for abutting properties and mediation of hillside walls due to large backyard cut in hill, project not reasonable size on small lots, house demolished without AQMD permit, among other concerns.

Good of the Order: Co-Chair Hall related, that he, Co-Chair Kemp, and Vice-Chair Weisberg and Ms. Palmer met as to the projects. He also spoke about having educational meetings.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 9:14 PM, to meet on **September 9th 2025 at 7:00 P.M.**