



Draft Minutes
Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
Virtual Planning & Land Use Committee Meeting
Tuesday September 9, 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 <i>Excused</i>		X	Steven Weinberg	X	
			Travis Longcore <i>ex officio</i>	X	

Co-Chair Hall called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM. Following the recitation of the flag salute, the roll was called with 9 present. Member Grey arrived shortly thereafter for a total of 10 present and 3 absent.

1. The September 9, 2025 Agenda was approved as moved by Kemp. It was noted that the project on Hillside Avenue will not be presenting tonight. They will be presenting to the Neighborhood Association first and will return to the full PLU Committee thereafter.
2. Approval of August 12, 2025 Meeting Minutes (Attachment A) was deferred to the next meeting.

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:

Co-Chair Hall reported that the co-chairs, Vice Chair and Ms. Palmer met in advance of this meeting, as a pre-PLU organizing committee, with an advanced PLU agenda list. Sometimes we have to finagle things because items are continued. We will add a report on the mail that we receive that are not new projects, and want to make sure that everyone is aware of it, to the extent that it affects their neighborhood. Hall also noted that we are planning a couple of educational sessions on topics we think committee members need to know about, e.g., SB9, as we had one SB9 application; and it became apparent that we need to understand the rules for SB9. We will have a separate agendized meeting for that, as well as for the new CEQA rules.

Co-Chair Kemp expressed thanks to Robert Schlesinger and Stephanie Savage, and commended them for all their tireless energy for all those years in their roles as Chair and Vice Chair of this committee when they took over for him in 2016. **Vice-Chair Weisberg** was absent.

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

5. **315 N BEVERLY GLEN BLVD ZA-2025-3016-ADJ ENV-2025-3017-EAF (Returning)**
Permanent Link includes Project Application, Findings, Plans, and Vicinity Map:
<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumbr/ZA-2025-3016-ADJ>
Additional Attachment provided at the 08-27-2025 Board Meeting:
<https://www.babenc.org/assets/documents/16/meeting68bbb760e9d33.pdf>
Case Filed: 05/28/2025 **Assigned:** 06/13/2025 **Staff Assigned:** Esteban Martorell
Owner: Sam Keywanfar Trustee Of the Griffin Terrier Trust
Representatives: Sandra Santoyo sandra@vkengse.com & Jonathan Sagherian jonathan@vkengse.com [VK Engineers, Inc.]
Project Description: Request for a 10 ft Property Fence
Action Requested: Build a 10' property fence
07-08-2025 PLU Committee Meeting Motion: To recommend approving the request for an over in height fence of 10 feet, but only if it stays in its current location.
08-27-2025 Board Meeting Motion: To bring this back to the PLU Committee.

Mr. Daniel Moizel discussed what has transpired since they were last seen. They created a rendering to show the wall, entrance way, and hedging; they want it to be a green wall with multiple layers, hedging, and another layer in front of it. He spoke to the concern to limit the amount of space there because of the loitering and transients camping out, to not find bottles and needles that are currently in that area. They took pictures. One of the important things to the owner, who is on this call, was to save and keep the beauty of the very large sycamore trees and some of the large significant palms in front. He mentioned concerns as to the proximity of the trunk of the tree to the existing wall, and the size of the footing and extensive root system that these large specimen trees have.

Mr. Moizel noted that they have an arborist report, shared with us yesterday. The arborist was 1000% in agreement that 1) the wall should definitely not be put in place because of the proximity to the root system and the challenges the roots would have in proximity to existing sycamore; and 2) the height of the wall in comparison to one of the existing main trunk lines that runs over - he thinks the bottom of that trunk line is sitting on 102 or 104 inches - and a 10-foot wall is 120. They spent time, energy and work and the arborist was adamant that the size of the footing needed for a wall of that size in that location and existing root system would put the existing tree into more distress than it is in today and the severe potential tree of losing the tree in time. In the report it states that it is his recommendation to put the location of the wall at the property line is 5 feet away from the curb, in addition to other reasons why the owner wants a 10-foot wall previously granted in an existing location for the security, sound and safety, and importantly for the safety of those trees that he knows we appreciate and want them to keep.

Co-Chair Kemp asked about the original plans, the wall had steps, with a change in elevation from the north to south side of property line. He noted that on the plans that he brought last time, the further renderings show that the top of the wall continues. Kemp asked if he was planning to slope the wall in line with the topography, with the point being that the wall will never be more than 10 feet. Danny confirmed it will never be more than 10 feet and that you'll never see it from the outside because the hedge will grow to the height of the wall, and you'll never notice the sloping. In the original drawing it was stepped because you had a grade differentiation in the 200 feet from north to south side of the property. The grade differentiation from the north to the south side of the property would be 3-1/2'.

Dr. Longcore asked if in consultation with the arborist he identified places where the structure of the wall would be put over a large root. He completely endorses the idea to protect the sycamores on the property and asked if there would be any stands to keep the wall off the root zone area. Danny responded that when in the process of removing the existing wall and doing the excavation which they'll probably do in the area closer to the tree by hand so they won't bring heavy equipment, they don't want to damage root structure. The arborist recommends a system of smaller roots that are 1" in diameter and how to cut them, 2-inch root sizes or larger, he wants to be onsite. They consulted with that also with the Canary Date Palms, they'll do bridge footing in those areas, if necessary as when they excavate, to cup over the roots to not put additional stress on them. It would be in Jonathan's design for an option for a bridge footing in addition to the conventional footing; and when we hit a root will do the alternate bridge footing.

Kemp asked if parking is allowed in front of this property, to which Danny replied, not that he is aware of. Kemp noted that if there is only 5 foot, for people to step out, Danny noted that from the first plan to the second plan, they created the entrance or throat to the property, opened it up a little bit, and one of that is that as anyone knows who lives on Beverly Glen, it is dangerous, and they wanted to make sure the entrance had enough visibility coming in and out of the gate. Kemp noted that he appreciates the changes they did to the curved area, as to sight or visibility.

Motion: Dr. Longcore moved that the committee recognize the effort and commitment of this owner to protect the sycamores and the large specimen trees there, and that there variance for the over in height fence be granted as the best possible outcome to achieve a fence that is similar to others in the neighborhood. They didn't talk about that, but he goes by every day and it would be similar in stature as those ... in recognition of those things and the resource the significant legacy tree in that the location be allowed to be 5' and over in height. Motion was seconded by Weinberg and passed 10-0-0.

Hall thanked them and welcomed them to attend our full board meeting on 09/24/2025. The property owner thanked us and said he was grateful for the opportunity to bring in the arborist.

6. 3150 N BENEDICT CANYON DR DIR-2025-2287-SPPC-DRB-MSP-HCA ENV-2025-2288-CE Permanent Link with 9 Initial Submittal Documents:
<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumbr/DIR-2025-2287-SPPC-DRB-MSP-HCA>

Case Filed On: 04/17/2025; **Assigned Date:** 07/22/2025 **Staff Assigned:** Tiffany Corrales

Applicant: Peter Georges; **Rep:** Ms. Daphne Abergel [D Design, Inc.] (818) 344-4449

Project Description: New 2-story SFD with basement and 3-car garage. New pool. New detached 2story ALQ (Guest House), new 10ft high retaining wall.

Requests: Specific Plan Compliance; Mulholland Design Review Board

Jamie invited Ms. Daphne Abergel to speak for the first time on the existing environment and what the project entails, the entitlements sought and how they can make the findings.

Ms. Abergel noted that the project is a sfd, approximately 6,500 square foot and ALQ or guest house of another 2,500 square foot; the property is accessed through a private street. She noted that they have already prepared a full package for the MDRB since it is on the outer corridor.

Ms. Abergel provided a Power Point Presentation, of the project. Mr. Peter Georges, the owner of the project, noted that the neighbors are all in support. The current house that will be demolished is currently an eyesore. He noted that they belong to the Benedict Canyon

Association (BCA) as well. Member Levinson asked if the private drive is part of an easement, and who maintains the road, to which he noted that it is a PROW, and he is not sure about the maintenance for the road.

Board questions were asked and answered, including but not limited to that of Dr. Longcore who noted that he saw the tree report and that they said they did a bio report. Dr. Longcore wanted to see that, given the walnuts and oaks with the Laurel Sumac, if there is any mapping of the vegetation type on the other side of the street, on the ALQ side, and what they classified that vegetation as being. He asked if a biologist looked at that and thought it was a woodland (as to the walnuts and state law). He would like to see the bio report.

Co-Chair Hall commented that they'll have to take care of the Walnut trees, and that the contractors don't always know or have the respect for trees that they should. Peter Georges noted that the houses that he has built, the most qualified builders are so aware and frightened of touching trees in the city today. For the houses he has built, the trees are under discussion if they are on the property. He'll continue with those teams.

Co-Chair Kemp asked why he would have pools at both locations, to which Mr. Georges noted that he has elderly parents and a son who will be going to college; so if something happens to his parents, it would go to his son. Kemp noted that the caisson that extends from the pool down to the slope will be at least 30 feet exposed. He sees on the arborist report that they have trees down there. He asked if there has been any discussion about shielding 30 caissons and about the visual impact of the caissons. Ms. Abergel noted that there will be dirt and existing slope. It can be planted at the edge, to put vegetation to screen it so that the full 30 feet will *not* be visible. They'd like to plant their lemon and orange trees down the hillside, to have a little farm. They will provide additional shielding than what we have. They want to make sure the folks here are happy. Ms. Abergel noted that on E6, Mulholland will also request the screening.

Discussion was held on the choice to use an ALQ vs an ADU. The ALQ is supposed to be used as a guest house. They are not proposing any other retaining walls on the property; and are trying to keep as much open space and vegetation as possible.

Hall noted that this committee cares a lot about keeping animals free to move. She noted that the house is elevated. Hall pointed out that their proposed landscaping needs to be compliant with fire standards, and that we have seen drawings prepared by landscape architects, and have pointed it out as an issue. (Kemp pointed out that the max size ADU is 1200 square feet.) Hall asked if you can see it from Mulholland, to which she showed only in one spot.

Motion that we take no exception to the project as projected was moved by Kemp and seconded by Weinberg.

Deliberation was held, beginning with Member Savage noting that she won't be able to vote on this project and read from Guidelines 2 and 33 of the Minimum of the Mulholland Specific Plan. Jamie noted that Savage has recused herself from the project and will not be participate.

Miner would like to have them back when plans are more formalized, thinking of the caissons, when the structural is completed, and would like to find out what the MDRB has determined. Peter Georges noted that the caissons are there to support the house so that it doesn't go down the hill and asked how it would affect her view of the project.

Hall noted that we have to make a recommendation to the MDRB and the structural doesn't have to be done until later, that they can present to BCA, and what our role will be. Ms. Abergel noted that any foundation work is not part of the CY calculation.

Miner pointed out that there is the hauling and the visual effect on Benedict Canyon, if 200 or 20 caissons. She'd like to know the number of caissons, the haul route, and staging of construction trucks as well as about the ALQ and how much it space will take up in Benedict Canyon. Hall noted that she raised the number of caissons and the relationship to that, and whether it will trigger a hearing with the BBSC; and also the number of trips. Hall noted that we could ask the applicant the number of trucks and the staging issues. Miner had safety concerns about the area in Benedict Canyon. Hall would ask the applicant to ask Ms. Miner about some of the things she raised, e.g., how much dirt hauling?

Ms. Abergel said they will not be requiring a haul route as they will be below 1000, 900 or 870 CYs. Mr. Georges noted that the civil engineer they have used before; however, he doesn't know how many trucks and noted it isn't done all at one time; the staging is usually on Mulholland Drive. He added that there were two homes built on this block, one is 15,000+ bigger than theirs. He doesn't believe haul trucks can go down Benedict Canyon, and noted there was a lot of hauling done and there were no safety issues. As to construction parking, they're setting up onsite parking area first on the property, and that the neighbors won't have them park on the street. They will have staging on the property. Asked about the number of caissons for the ALQ, Ms. Abergel replied, maybe 15 to 20. For the house, they are using the foundation and the basement as the structure to hold the house, and will try to avoid caissons there. Ms. Abergel concluded that the ALQ will be built on the hillside; there is no other way to build the structure other than with caissons.

Member Levinson noted that she has read about the junior ADU.

Peter Georges noted that they all have to put up a bond for construction; the only disruption is one house at the bottom of the hill. Member Savage offered general information as to her having been required to count her grading from her foundations in the total grading. Mr. Georges stated that he leans more towards every piece of dirt having to be calculated in the assessment of the civil engineer.

Miner stated that she is thinking about staging on Mulholland. Mr. Georges noted that the staging is on the other side, and that the problem is the food trucks. He has never heard of one problem on the staging; the only problem is the food trucks when people park on the middle of the street on the north side and middle of Mulholland. The haul trucks park on the other side and there is no problem. Ms. Abergel noted that there is no way to avoid construction and not feel it; you can observe all the rules and regulations as to the amount of trucks but the house still needs to be built. Member Grey asked about the entertainment area, the roof. They won't have anything on the roof, as required by Mulholland; no access or entertainment on the top.

We had a motion and a second; a proposed amendment by Miner. Questions were answered. Miner would like to conduct a site walk before voting on this matter and would recommend continuance and not an amendment.

Co-Chair Kemp would leave his motion to "take no exception" to this project, and that if there is any change in the project scope, asked that we be notified. The motion **passed** by 6 yeses, 2 noes from Schlesinger and Miner, 1 abstention from Longcore and 1 recusal from Savage. Miner

can reach out to Peter Georges.

Mr. Georges noted that Ms. Miner can feel free to reach out to him. Co-Chair Hall asked Mr. Georges to send his contact number to Ms. Palmer, and that we will make sure that we get it over to Ms. Miner, and she and Mr. Schlesinger can have a conversation and get some of their questions answered.

7. **8637 W HILLSIDE AVE** **ZA-2025-1640-CU1-HCA**
<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumbr/ZA-2025-1640-CU1-HCA>
8643-8645 W HILLSIDE AVE **ZA-2025-1646-CU1-HCA**
<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumbr/ZA-2025-1646-CU1-HCA>
Project Description:

Construction, use, and maintenance of a (n) SFD and ADU on a lot that does not have a continuous paved roadway greater than 20' in the R1 hillside zone.

- 8649 W HILLSIDE AVE** **ZA-2025-1653-CU1-HCA**
<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumbr/ZA-2025-1653-CU1-HCA>
Project Description:

New SFD w/ attached ADU on a substandard hillside street:

Assigned Date: 04/23/2025; **Staff Assigned:** Andres Gutierrez

Applicant: Ka Leung Chan [Peripheral Properties LLC]

Representative: Jimmy Toetz [Crest Real Estate]

Deferred after the agenda went out until being heard by the neighborhood association.

8. **10327 Tupelo Lane Case #: ZA-2023-1289-ZAA-ZAD-HCA** (*Returning from 05/13 PLUC mtg.*)
<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumbr/ZA-2023-1289-ZAA-ZAD-HCA>
Plan Set provided at the 05-13-2025 PLU Meeting:
<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/vcb09jahgyh2idnkzeuqq/241010-TUPELO-DELTA-4-Planning-Resubmission-Set.pdf?rlkey=f7a5y329oj3ylevuq7cb59wsf&dl=0>

Updated Project Description

Project Scope:

Project proposes the construction use and maintenance of a new, 1,997 sq. ft. (per RFA), two story, single-family dwelling with an occupy-able rooftop deck with pool and spa, all over a basement garage, **and 3 new retaining walls** on a Substandard Hillside Limited Street. Project also includes an approximately 56' extension of the paved roadway of Tupelo Lane to the west edge of the lot with a new 14' driveway with 2' gutter in public right of way.

Entitlements Requested:

- 1) ZAD Approval for the construction of a SFD on a lot that does not have at least a minimum adjacent roadway width of 20 ft.
- 2) ZAD Approval for construction of a SFD on a lot that does not have a continuous paved roadway width of 20' from the driveway apron to the boundary of the hillside.
- 3) ZAD Approval for the construction of 1 additional, max 10' high retaining wall, for a total of (3) retaining walls, in lieu of the (2) retaining walls otherwise allowed.
- 4) Haul Route for export of 1,551 CY of soil.

Applicant: Katherine Kelly kmkell09@gmail.com **Representatives:** Jimmy Toetz jimmy@crestrealestate.com and Tony Russo [Crest Real Estate] **Assigned Staff:** Ariel Jones
May 13, 2025 PLU Motion BABCNC-PLU Committee requests continuation for more

information including:

Jimmy Toetz reviewed the project and read aloud to include the updated information. He presented a PPP with site map and renderings of what it will look like when complete. He was accompanied by Tony Russo, both of Crest Real Estate.

The following questions following the prior meeting were addressed:

1. **Provide any planned conditions for MRCA / wildlife access for the proposed development on Tupelo.** *Spoke on this 5th*
They are speaking with Garrett; in process. Tony Russo added that they are still mapping where the access easement should go. They are internally reviewing how they want to address the conservation easement.
2. **Provide heights of retaining walls for every floor level of the tall (4) story house including toe of slope wall. Please include roadway elevations, and every floor level elevation.** *Spoke on this first with visuals.*
3. **Provide any planned road improvement and fire truck access and LAFD requirements for access, including required driveway slope less than 20% grade (and show transitions, if possible).** *Spoke on this 6th*
Waiting on direction from Planning; waiting for PlanCheck. Tony noted that they are not moving forward until they see getting approval from the ZA, and that there will be a conditions of approval.
4. **Provide any information on bird safe glazing for the proposed project. They have found bird-safe glazing to be applied.**
Jimmy noted that they are happy to implement that if that makes the difference for us in our review of their project.
5. **Provide protected tree distances (including canopy) verification.** *Spoke on this 2nd.*
6. **Provide Title 24 report that would show the proposed glazing would be allowed under current regulations. If you have not completed any title 24 report; please advise on how this amount of glazing would be allowed.**
They have not completed any Title 24 reports; awaiting planning approval. Will have to comply with Title 24. They have not run those numbers yet.
7. **Provide any planned required B permit information (even preliminary BOE drawings) for the 56' of driveway, including slopes percentages (and show transitions, if possible).**
Tony noted that they will need a B permit; awaiting planning approval before... improving somewhat of the built condition; some widening of the road; it is nuanced. Effectively they need Planning's action. Jimmy noted that currently, the extent of their B permit information is the proposed site improvements with gutter and debris channel. The B permit drawings will be later. They'll have to comply with all regulations put forward.
8. **Provide a construction parking and staging plan for the phases of the project (foundation & framing; and trades for finish work).** *Spoke on this 3rd*
9. **Provide information on the minimums for State of California Fire Safe regulations and include the required discretionary entitlement findings for "impractical or infeasible" for improvement of continuous paved roadway (CPR) on this Street (Tupelo).** *Spoke 4th*
Questions were asked and answered including the offsite trees that will not be impacted as a result of what is constructed. Miner mentioned roof top deck with a pool and a spa at the top. Hall continued to have concern about adherence to Minimum Fire Safe Regulations noting that there is no question that these regulations apply to his project. Hall agrees that it wouldn't be possible or feasible to widen all portions and asked what

portions of the road he'd be willing to do. Tony noted that there are portions where there is a curb, flat portions that could be shifted over, and easy to move. As long as they are not providing a retaining wall... He noted that BOE doesn't want retaining walls in the PROW that are supporting upslope conditions, and noted that they are running this in Sunset Plaza. Jamie noted that the rules exist and the BOE has to make it impractical or infeasible to do so.

Grey noted that he is asking for a third retaining wall, and asked what he can build with two retaining walls on this lot. He answered you have the two retaining walls on the right; the third is more an extension of the house because it is the steps that lead up to the property. Grey would like to see what he could build with two walls. She would ask for additional discretionary permission.

Savage would like the info from MRCA and to see the B permit drawings. She also wondered if he has added the additional entitlement requirement for 20% grading on the driveway. Tony answered that he did that one because it is in the PROW. The B permit drawings are helpful. She noted you would be precluding the building of other properties... She'd like to see the Title 24 report, a basic thing to do when figuring out your windows, and noted that it is a lot of glazing. Tony responded that they haven't done structural.

Nickie would add the topic of roof decks to the deliberation.

Hall does not think this is ready to vote on and stated that we have been told they're willing to do some road improvements; some widening some parts of Tupelo Lane; other requests are related to road standards; whether or not the ZA can conclude it is impractical or infeasible to require the applicant to engage in these road improvements. Hall would think it is probably infeasible to widen all portions of Tupelo from Beverly Glen to the project site but not portions of it, but we don't have that information now. He pointed out that there is a particular section of Tupelo Lane that can be easily widened.

Tony as a final point, and to respond to maybe continuing, noted that there are two things: 1) they would be happy for the NC in a letter, either in support or denial, to include a condition for the applicant to widen wherever feasible.

Hall noted the other issue, that he widening a portion of Tupelo, doing road construction, and pointed out that he is extending Tupelo Lane, he has a road exceeding 20% grade. He noted that we cannot ignore this.

Dr. Longcore notes that this is something we as a NC have a position on, and the position is pretty clear - you have to comply with the state Fire Safe Regulations, because that's the law, and we can't recommend that any of the findings can be made if you don't. He'd suggest the committee give the applicant a choice: Either go forward and formulate a position on this project as presented, which will not provide the 20-foot CPR and cannot make the findings, and therefore will have a recommendation from the committee to the board that we cannot under any circumstance support this project because there is no argument put before us that they are going to achieve the same practical effect. Or if the applicant prefers to come back with a presentation specifically on how the same practical effect of the slope requirements and width requirements of the access road will be offset on this project to the extent that we can make the finding that this doesn't create a risk of harm to the community and the findings cannot for any sort of ZA determination cannot

be made. One option make a recommendation now, because it is clear to him that this can't be made, and we don't have any business, without evidence in our record that you can achieve the same practical effect, even if you widen a little bit. It is about increase and egress all the way with vehicles going in and coming out at the same time, and without that, you are just not supposed to develop. Offer the applicant the choice... or go ahead and recommend that this protect simply can't be built under state law.

Tony responded, noting Jimmy brought up a slide on this; however, noted, nonetheless, there are still other issues that the NC has with regard as same practical effect. He will respond as an alternative the committee can make a recommendation today and if they are able to include some additional information to illuminate discussion on same practical effect, and if can convince the full board on the 24th then great.

Dr. Longcore noted that embedded in his recommendation, we should not be in the business of holding projects month after month after month... on something we cannot make a recommendation if there is no solution to it. It is the committee's decision. Hall noted that we cannot get into full robust discussion at the NC meeting.

With that, Hall moved that we recommend that the city deny the requested entitlements, due to the failure to comply with the State Minimal Fire Safe Regulations as it pertains to roadway width and grade, as well as on the basis that the project cannot satisfy the required findings embedded in the municipal code due to the noncompliance with the state regulations and the feasibility of improving portions of Tupelo Lane. The motion was seconded by Member Savage.

Hall noted that Miner wanted to have a discussion about the appropriateness of rooftop deck in the VHFHSZs.

Amendment to include as an additional justification a concern for rooftop decks in VHFHSZs. Member Savage accepted the friendly amendment.

The motion **passed** by 9 yeases; 0 noes and 1 abstention from Dr. Longcore.

Co-Chair Hall invited Tony to the Board on 09/24.

Good of the Order

None.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:20 P.M. to return on October 14, 2025 at 7:00 P.M.