



Minutes
Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
Virtual Planning & Land Use Committee Meeting
Tuesday October 14, 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 7:03 P.M. The pledge to the flag was recited and roll called with 8 present initially. Member Weinberg arrived at 7:07 P.M., and Spradlin at 7:55 P.M., a total of 10 present and 3 absent.

1. The September 9, 2025 Agenda was approved unanimously, as moved by Member Miner.
2. **Approval of Minutes:**
 - i. The August 12, 2025 Meeting Minutes (**Attachment A**) were approved 7-0-1 with the abstention from Member Miner, as moved by Member Schlesinger.
 - ii. Approval of the September 9, 2025 Meeting Minutes (**Attachment B**) was deferred to the next meeting.

3. General Public Comment:

There was no comment from the public on any topic within the Committee's jurisdiction but not on the adopted agenda.

[Member Weinberg arrived at 7:07 P.M.]

4. Chair Reports:

Jamie Hall, Co-Chair, Michael Kemp, Co-Chair & Leslie Weisberg, Vice-Chair

Co-Chair Hall noted that SB79 was signed by the governor, passed by the legislature, and noted that it will be interesting to see how it plays out. On the fringes of our neighborhood council we may see a project or two.

Co-Chair Michael Kemp had no report.

Vice-Chair Weisberg reported that the LA City Council voted against Zone Zero and it remains to be seen what happens on a state-wide level. Hall noted that now that the city has taken a position and there is a council file, the Neighborhood Council may take a position.

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

5. 138 N MAPLETON DR ZA-2024-7217-ADJ ENV-2024-7218-CE

[This was heard by PLUC 06/10/2025 & 08/12/2025; returning to appeal PLU decision recommending denial.]

Case Filed: 11/06/2024 Staff Assigned: Alexander Truong

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

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

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.

PLU Motion from June 10th meeting was to continue this, for the applicant to come back with a full scope to look at and discuss the variance requested.

PLU Motion from the August 12th meeting was 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

Planning Department Initial Submittal Documents include Project Application, Findings, Project Plans and Vicinity Map:

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

Co-Chair Hall introduced this item, noting that it was heard by the PLU Committee on 06/10/2025 and 08/12/2025 and that the applicant and his representatives are here to provide a case status and updated information. The land use committee voted to recommended denial for six reasons in the agenda, listed here in the agenda, and the applicant is seen here today to see if perhaps our recommendation may change.

The applicant's representative Steven Somers was present, accompanied by Isaac Lemus and Benjamin Eshaghian from Crest Real Estate, as well as the applicant, Mr. Benjamin Nazarian, regarding 138 North Mapleton Drive.

Steven noted that they wanted the opportunity to meet with us once more. They have discussed this internally with Benjamin and the landscape team and members of the community. He noted that ultimately this is a request for the hedges and wall that is consistent with the neighborhood. It is a situation where there is ample support from the community, from neighbors and no opposition from the neighbors and the surrounding area. Since they were here last, when they had three letters of support, the Mr. Nazarian now has 10 letters of support, and no opposition. He showed a list on the shared screen of the neighbors in support, and noted that since they are the voice of the community, and since this is a project that has wide community support, a prime example of what a homeowner should be doing, talking with their neighbors, being transparent, is why they came back tonight, to reopen the discussion. He noted that Benjamin Eshaghian would discuss the outreach done and Isaac would review the requests.

Mr. Nazarian noted that they want to be good neighbors, are looking forward to moving into the neighborhood, and already know some neighbors. They are not asking for any variances, and since they got permits; they were worried about crime in the neighborhood and realized that the permission they got was for a low wall and are asking to have a wall that is higher, in line with their neighbors, for a taller wall without any other changes to the square footage, and looking to start construction in the next few months.

Isaac Lemus noted that, as mentioned before, their requests are in relation to the proposed over-in height structures in the front yard and side yard, requesting a fence hedge, a retaining wall, vehicular and pedestrian gates, being max height of 12' and for the pilasters on either side of the gate, maximum height of 14 feet. He mentioned the construction parking plan. He listed precedent and listed cases with height requests of the same or greater. Lastly, in terms of them outreaching to the community, formally, they have also done direct outreach on a one-to-one basis including letters, ranging from residents across Holmby Hills and also abutting properties, to their north or along Mapleton Drive, more directly tied to their street or project voicing support. There are no statements of opposition from the community for the project. They ask the board to continue the support for the project.

Steven added that along with the community support for this request, there has been an existing condition, unpermitted over-in-height hedge that has been there for decades with no complaint. They now have a home owner who is going forward with a new project trying to permit the adjustment to that which will result in a lower hedge and wall, asking for the proper approval, coming to the board and reaching out to the neighbors in a thorough manner. They feel this is a project that ought to be supported as something that is reasonable, approached the right way.

The floor was opened to the public before committee deliberation. There was none and the Public Comment period on this item was closed. Floor was opened to the committee.

The questions from the last meeting were discussed. In summary,

- 1) Failure to meet with Holmby Hills Homeowners Association -- Steven noted that they have a community chat, and that's how he has reached out. Mr. Nazarian said that Mr. Spradlin's only concern was using parking on Faring and he made a commitment to not use Faring. At this point, the applicant displayed the parking plan and noted that there is ample room for parking and staging without the need to burden public streets.
- 2) Failure to submit Parking Plan for both phases of construction (wall and house) -- No change. The same as included in their landscaping.
- 3) Failure to provide Planting Plan for Proposed Wall. Failure to Demonstrate Compliance with City of LA Fire Code -- Hall asked if the planting plan complies with the fire code. Steven responded that they are not planning to use significant flammable species and the lawn is far from any structures on the property. He noted that this is well manicured and they have learned since the Palisades Fire that well preserved hedges have often had a dampening effect on the spreading of fire.

Co-Chair Hall asked Dr. Longcore to remind us of the issues. Dr. Longcore clarified that we need to separate out what we believe and the level of risk of what different things present and separate that out from what the code requires. Dr. Longcore noted that he has a structure here as well and presumably a landscape plan to go along with the structure. The issue is that this is in the VHFHSZ, which always has been, and Chapter 49 of the

LA City Fire Code does not allow for contiguous groupings of shrubs or trees within the defensible space zone; that is the first 100 feet and another zone beyond that to 200 feet. The entire property is subject to Zone 1, where you are not allowed to have contiguous groups of plants. The code doesn't distinguish between dangerous and non-dangerous plants. He noted that when planning, he'd want to make sure he has looked at and read that code very carefully and knew how he would comply with it. The existing hedge would not comply with the letter of the code, setting aside personal or scientific opinions of whether it poses a risk. Also trees are supposed to be separated out with 10 feet between canopies. That's Zone 1. He noted that Mr. Nazarian's entire fence is in Zone 1. By the letter of the law, they would have to comply with Chapter 49 in the Fire Code.

Just for his knowledge, Dr. Longcore related that Zone Zero is coming along, which will go 0' to 5' for structures, which will actually allow for no vegetation within that zone. Since he is building fresh, to have that clear vegetation, so he would make sure he has his landscapers to understand and comply from the outset. The code doesn't talk about good or bad plants, but the code doesn't make a distinction about good and bad plants but talks about the configuration, contiguity and need for spacing; you would not be allowed to have a contiguous hedge if the code was enforced. He noted that we think all project proponents, developers and designers need to be aware of and read that code because the likelihood of more strict compliance going forward is far greater than it was a year ago.

Mr. Nazarian stated that he is more concerned about the risks brought up here because he believes in the next few years getting fire insurance will be impossible or prohibitively expensive, so they are looking for taking measures that will mitigate the risk of a fire, assuming they'll have minimal insurance like the California Fair Plan. He explained that part of the reason of needing to have the taller walls is: 1) we cannot have the hedges as tall as currently have as a protection of visibility, security and safety purposes, but as a much more effective solution than plant material or the distance from the house is that they are building... an external fire sprinkler system that uses the pool water and as a backup has a foam spray that will cover every building, even 10 feet out from any structure, that goes out automatically if any fire is within one or five miles of the structure... It will make the house wet and cool and not allow any embers to touch the house and have a fire. It had a lot of success. That will be an additional cost, that they weren't expecting but are integrating that into their plans. 2) As soon as there is heat, the vents close... so, they are addressing it both ways. The wall is an important part of adding security since they are concerned about hedging as well and not having such tall hedges. He noted that alternatively, if they don't get the wall, they'd have to leave the existing hedges for the reasons that Dr. Longcore said. He thinks they have a very good plan. Hall noted we'll come back to this because the landscape plans do not demonstrate compliance with the letter of the law. He referenced a comment from Dr. Longcore that 95% of the properties in Bel Air probably do not comply.

- 4) Failure to Denote Exact Setback of Wall to Property Line and/or PROW - Isaac noted that it does vary depending on section; at its most conservative, it would be a 5' setback from the property line, along Mapleton Dr. ... not an immediate transition to the street. He spoke to there being enough space to allow for a nice flow and continuation of the overall building pattern of the area.
- 5) Inadequate Revised Findings as to Necessity of Wall Height - Asked if the findings been revised in any way, Isaac noted as to the proposed findings, he doesn't recall. Steven

spoke to the issues of 1) what is impractical and infeasible to which he thinks it is impractical to require a property owner to have walls and hedge that are not consistent with the character of the neighborhood in which the property is located, particularly this property so close to Sunset Boulevard, and with regard to concerns about crime... These are generally wider streets, with greenery in front of where the wall and hedge are located as to the intent of the findings. Two other things the city requires: that the features are compatible or will not adversely degrade adjacent properties which doesn't tie to the necessity of the request, but they've shown neighborhood support, precedent, existing conditions, and, lastly explain why the project is in conformance with the General Plan, Community Plan and Specific Plan.

- 6) Concerns about piecemealing -- Hall noted that generally there has been angst from this committee when we see a project and the city processes one piece as ministerial and the other part as discretionary... Hall is not sure it would have changed much of our position on this and asked if we are just at odds, that you say the city says you can do it. Steven noted on this specific case, as Ben was speaking, they went through the whole permitting process and at the conclusion they didn't realize that what was actually shown as part of the plan didn't provide the security that he and his family was comfortable with, then they decided to include this over-height entitlement; there was no intent of piecemealing. The original project fully by right within the bounds of the regulations' design but this is something that organically came up after.

Member Savage asked if the council office expressed any interest in this project. Steven noted that they rarely get involved when it comes to an over-in-height fence or hedge. Asked, Jennifer Torrance is the field rep at Councilmember Yaroslavsky's office. Asked about his communications with Jason Spradlin, Ben explained he was introduced to him after the last hearing, shared concerns, it was just about parking plan. They didn't expect that question and he suggested to join this call again, share the information and if they have a commitment to not park on Faring, Jason would have their support. Savage noted that it looked like 34 regular-sized vehicles, the scope of the project would factor that size... looking at 34 regular-sized vehicles. Steven noted that contractors are confident they would be able to park workers and construction trucks, at times they might have to have fewer workers parking on site when larger trucks come. He noted that there is ample space for the trucks and workers to park onsite; however, they've identified an alternative parking spot offsite.

Co-Chair Kemp is concerned about the entry to the property and asked if they have enough area for a car to pull off of Mapleton, and what is the distance from the gate to the property line at the entryway? Isaac noted there is queuing available off the property when opening and closing. This was discussed in detail. Steven noted the portion of the driveway between the street and the actual property line is 12' and the wall another 5' from that, roughly 17 feet between the curb and the location of the gate. Kemp expressed concern about the height - 12 feet up to 14 feet; there are hedges that are much taller, this is 3 times that which the code allows normally and he doesn't expect 42 inches; six feet used to be the norm; we've seen 8 feet and now we are at 12 feet which is incredibly tall. Kemp noted that he had asked before if they would consider 10 feet; concerned that they will get higher and precedent set. Steven responded that the height is neighborhood specific... Ben explained that Mapleton is not flat as it goes down to Sunset. The part sloping down to Sunset is taller so the wall looks even. Part of it is 12 feet and part 10 feet; it ranges to match the topography of the street. Mr. Nazarian said they were not planning to make this request. He noted that his wife was concerned about crime in the

neighborhood, citing various anecdotes of crime around them. They are taking measures to create greater security. He is trying to protect his wife and family.

Hall noted that he doesn't have a problem with the wall based on the neighborhood. He will take the applicant at his word that this was not something known at the outset. The findings are mush but they probably can meet the findings. As to the parking plans, he is glad they can resolved that with Mr. Spradlin of the Holmby Hills Association, and that they came back in good faith, to resolve most of these issues. He thinks the LA Fire Code issue is something we should care about and that our letter to the city must include a robust paragraph that the city must condition the project such that the landscaping complies with code. Member Miner acknowledged security issues but noted that the difference between a 10- and 14-foot wall as for people climbing walls. She asked what will be on the top of the wall to deter. Ben doesn't know. They are hiring a security consultant as to this.

Member Weinberg noted that he is not having a problem with the size of the fence given the care of the neighborhood and outreach. He has a problem with the parking... He noted that with regard to the landscaping plan, we heard some evidence about some mitigation measures, which he would be interested in as a homeowner. The alternative is that leaving the hedges there would probably be worse.

Member Spradlin arrived at 7:55 pm, and said that Mr. Nazarian has worked hard to reach out to the community members on those things that matter to them. The parking plan is super helpful. He noted that his community supports the project.

Dr. Longcore: 1) Since the committee already made a recommendation on this, it would probably be good to have a 2/3rds vote that this should change to take it back up and take a different position. 2) The Fire Code is all over the place, it will be adopted by the end of this year. Zone Zero makes no accommodation as to what species will be adopted; Chapter 49 talks about some species.

The letter should include what people are supposed to be doing within 100 feet of the structure. He read the restrictions aloud:

- Shrubs shall not exceed 6 feet in height.
- Groupings of shrubs are limited to a maximum aggregate diameter of 10 feet.
- Shrub groupings shall be separated from other groupings by 15 feet.
- Shrub grouping should be separated from structures by 30 feet.
- Where shrubs are located below or within a tree's drip line, the lowest branch of the tree has to be 3 times the height of the understory shrubs, or 10 feet, which is greater
- On trees, let new trees be planted and maintained so that the drip line at maturity is 10 feet from any combustible structure and that the horizontal distance between the crowns of new trees shall not be less than 10 feet and existing trees shall be trimmed to provide a minimum separation of 10 feet.

Dr. Longcore explained the Roberts Rule issue - if you are within the same meeting, you can have a motion to reconsider, and this is a different meeting. It is to change a position. He explained that it is a 2/3rds vote to undo in favor of reconsidering our previous recommendation: Discussion was held on this process.

A **motion to reconsider passed**, with none opposed, 1 abstention from Dr. Longcore and 1 recusal from Weisberg, as moved by Hall and seconded by Schlesinger

Co-Chair Hall related the positions that the committee can take, but wanted the motion to include that the committee has concerns about the project's landscape for the project being compliant with the fire code, and would like the Zoning Administrator to carefully review these sections of Chapter 49. Member Spradlin would move to support the project.

Motion: That we support the project, based on the, additional community outreach and additional information provided by the applicant, with the caveat that our letter to the city includes a concern that the landscaping for the project is non-compliant with the fire code, and to specifically reference the sections of Chapter 49, previously read into the record by Dr. Longcore. Hall moved and Weinberg seconded. No deliberation was held and the motion **passed** with 7 yeases, 2 abstentions from Longcore and Schlesinger, and 1 recusal from Weisberg.

6. **14410 W MULHOLLAND DR AA-2024-7366-DPS**

Case Filed: 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 signed 06/29/2022: 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

Planning Department Initial Submittal Documents include Project Application, Private Street Map, and Vicinity Map.

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

Co-Chair Hall introduced this item, noting that the committee should be cognizant that having a private street that has been approved could open the door to further development, which can open a Pandora's Box, which is one reason we like to look at these projects.

Andrew Odum from Crest Real Estate introduced himself, noting that on the agenda it is for the deemed to be approved private street case, but it was approved in September. He offered to explain the history and the discretionary project.

Andrew noted that they have a DIR case associated with this project, which was originally submitted in 2021, the owner opted to return for a modification to the DIR, to go back for that. Within that process the homeowner has lived at the site since 1992, he believes; not in a rush to build but once he started having kids, started thinking about expanding this house and building something almost new. Since the modification was submitted, they started the process in 2023 with the Mulholland office, then got it submitted officially in 2024. They had a Mulholland hearing on this last month, with public notifications and received recommendation for approval from the board of that hearing, and while all that was going on, they submitted for the deemed to

be approved private street, because the DPS request is for he thinks the AA case, they are on a very long easement, along Mulholland there are these very long driveways with homes that use Mulholland addresses that predate the state code for private streets; they are just easements based by lots of people and that is why they went through the DPS process to legalize private street access that they have along their easement. He is here to answer questions on that, and go through what the project is proposing.

Hall asked what the remodel is and how many houses are off of this private street, to which Andrew noted that they are at the very end of this private street. There are approximately 12 or 14 homes off of this private street, maybe more; some have access to the private street on public property within the PROW of Mulholland... At the intersection of Mulholland and Beverly Glen, there is another little driveway... Andrew shared his screen, to show the property and lot lines (pointing). Asked the scope of the remodel, Andrew noted that it is a major remodel and addition, showing the site plan.

He discussed height restrictions, from grade 2 story house, the rest of the house is single story; a basement, an ADU and a pool. They have created a room on the site for a fire truck turnaround, they created a very large concrete pad, and 25% of space for the fire truck turnaround. (Discussed the gate). Below that is a pool. It is a dead end road, at least 500 feet long, the driveway narrows down to 13 feet for large portions. For some portions it gets closer to 18 feet, but varies widely. Two gates along the private street.

Hall noted that private streets don't have to obtain ZADs; they don't have to be 20' wide. He thinks that the loophole should be closed which makes zero sense from a policy perspective. Andrew noted that the loophole exists because they can't widen the road. Hall raised the issue of the State Minimum Fire Safe Regulations for private driveways, for gates. The regulations do require 20' width but driveways can be 14' a minimum of on 10' traffic lane... Andrew noted that the gate they have control over they are proposing 20-foot wide gate and a 20-foot wide minimum driveway for 25' fire truck turnaround. Hall noted that there is an exception for building projects related to an existing structure, for a pure remodel you're exempt from the regulations.

Member Miner asked to see photos of the existing house on that lot and what it will be, and the difference in square footage, and the average square footage of the rest of the homes on that private street. He screen shared the images. Andrew provided some information on the plan within the MDRB requirements. He noted that the surrounding homes range from two 9,000 square foot homes, in their close proximity; most of the others are 3,000, 4,000 square foot range. Satellite view (pointing) shows a collection of two story and single story homes, some much larger, further down, lots that are heavily developed, further down on the private street. He thinks they are one of the last remaining single-story homes along this area.

Member Savage asked if they are filing for Mulholland Specific Plan case, to which he reviewed the history mentioned earlier and noted that they had the Mulholland hearing last month, in September, and received a conditional approval on it. A big part of the reason they went back was to add more floor area in the basement, and in 2023, there was a multi-lot slope failure on their back slope, where a little portion of their neighbor's property and their property had a slope failure that went into the yard of their neighbor. Because of their soils report, they are installing a retaining wall that goes up and down with the site and putting in 2 and 1 grates along the back.

Savage asked if they'll stripe the hammerhead turnaround. He noted that they expect to go back to Hydrants and Access, as mentioned. They have a list of things they need to do. They'll need a private hydrant along with outlining the fire truck turnaround and providing the necessary KnoxBoxes at the gate so the fire department can access the gate and override the code. She read aloud what is needed to obtain an administrative clearance, and was interested to know if the property is located on a prominent ridge to which he noted that it is not. He noted that the board is not weighing in on the ADU on the site but the Mulholland staff will do an administrative clearance. He also noted that it is not a mapped prominent ridge. They are allowed to have an ADU on the site and they are not near a stream or parkland.

Hall clarified something on the State Minimum Fire Safe Regulations, to clear up something he said incorrectly. He referenced a home being built on Runyon Canyon Road off of Mulholland, and that he had to learn the difference between a road and a driveway, and read the rules aloud. He noted that this driveway may be a road that serves more than four residential units. He said something incorrect, that he was exempt from the regulations; that's not true. Looking at the scope. Hall noted that if he was only seeking a building permit this would mean you are not subject to regulations, or "a use permit," to utilize land in a particular way. Hall further discussed a discretionary permit to use.

Hall noted that he wants them to review the project for the State Minimum Fire Safe Regulations, there are provisions for turnarounds, and he knows that they're building a turnaround; look at the standards and confirm that what has been proposed meets the standards, for turnouts and turnarounds. It is 1273.05 and just confirm that what you have proposed meets the standards.

They discussed this further.

Committee discussion was held on whether we need to continue this.

Savage noted that they should have the opportunity to answer unanswered questions. It's not just the fire truck turnaround, and Savage noted that it is not just about the fire truck turnaround, but that she has seen things including that the fire hydrant was applied for but never installed. Tony noted that they are providing the turnaround. He would prefer to save the returning to the committee for projects that are truly complex. Andrew reiterated that this fire truck turnaround, they have been on since 2021... He is fine for us to do the backup research.

Hall noted that we've learned that this is not a driveway, it is a road, because it accesses more than four residential units; therefore it must be 20' wide and it doesn't matter if a private street is exempt from the ZAD requirement from the BHO, and the only way deviate is if they provide alternative mitigations that provide the same practical effect; the question becomes is that turnaround enough at the end of the road? Is it the same practical effect of having a 20-foot wide roadway? Hall noted that we have a duty to look at these projects after the fire, to ensure that they comply with the State Minimum Fire Safe Regulations.

Hall believes this is a project to look at to determine if it complies with the fire safe regulations; the road is not 20' wide, or alternative with the same practical effect of having a 20-foot wide roadway.

Hall asked about the intervening gates? Andrew discussed the one installed previously for a security issue. The gate that they're installing has to be done with the Hydrants and Access. Hall clarified that we need to explore alternative mitigations with the same practical effect in

addition to the turnaround. They haven't even provided assurance that there won't be people parking in the parking lot. Tony noted that Hydrants and Access want them to stripe it.

Savage noted that we can all look at least 20 properties that have the hammerhead requirement that have all cars parked in it at all times.

Hall noted that they could hire fire experts to find out what the same practical effect would be; that the city is going to continue to do business as usual unless we continue to press. Tony said for other projects, he can understand where Hall is coming from; he doesn't think much will change if we come back and rehash the same questions.

Hall read aloud the definition of the same practical effect definition and noted the need to have concurrent ingress and egress, and need to ask how you can provide some alternative measures to allow that to happen.

Levinson had a question about negligence and our responsibility, Crest's responsibility and the city's responsibility if these type of projects get approved without the proper wildfire considerations, who is held accountable? The record will reflect that we brought up this issue and continue to bring up the issue...

Tony noted that there is not an established pathway for homeowners... if the rules change, they inform the clients and the design consultants to make the changes. As of now, they try to be mindful... frustrating. He feels that this project is of a net benefit though in their opinion it may not have the same practical effect.

Hall noted that he would have to walk the road to see what other mitigations could be done. He doesn't have that information.

Weisberg and Hall would volunteer to do a site walk with other members of the committee, less than a quorum, which could be somewhat of a test case, and look at it and brainstorm alternative measures.

Motion: to continue this project, based on concern related to compliance with the State Minimum Fire Safe Regulations specifically whether or not alternative measures that have the same practical effect have been provided and note that the two chairs of the committee and the vice chair would like to conduct a site walk prior to the next meeting.

Moved by Hall, **seconded** by Miner. Tony offered to join us. Miner noted that this particular project should take leadership for doing the right thing in the current and future of these regulations in the hills.

The motion **passed** 9-0-1 with the abstention from Dr. Longcore.

1510 N GILCREST DR **ZA-2025-3652-ADJ** **ENV-2025-3653-EAF**

Case Filed: 06/30/2025 **Staff Assigned:** Monique Acosta

Applicant: Brent Karasiuk [Company: GCP Holdings, LLC]

Representative: Jimmy Toetz [Company: Crest Real Estate]

Project Description: Relief to allow a 0' S.Y. Setback in lieu of the 10' setback to construct (n) stairs (n) pedestrian lift & (n) freestanding screening wall.

Planning Department Initial Submittal Documents include Project Application,

Environmental Assessment Form, Findings, Project Plans & Vicinity Map:
<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumbr/ZA-2025-3652-ADJ>

Jimmy Toetz provided a screen share of a power point presentation, and the floor was opened to committee questions.

Motion to recommend approval of this project, but will note two items of concern in our letter of support. 1) The landscaping proposed does not appear to be compliant with Chapter 49 of City of Los Angeles Fire Code, 2) The project does not comply with Section 1276.01 of the State Minimum Fire Safe Regulations regarding set back from property lines and therefore BABCNC requests that the applicant's architect evaluate and incorporate alternative methods to reduce structure-to-structure ignition, as required by the State code. Moved by Hall, seconded by Miner.

There was no public comment on this item, and the motion **passed** 9-0-1, with the abstention from Dr. Longcore.

Co-Chair Hall asked Mr. Russo if, before our neighborhood council meeting, he could come to our neighborhood council meeting with some ideas from his architect to reduce structure-to-structure ignition, to which Mr. Russo said he would do so.

Good of the Order & Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:34 PM to meet again on **November 11, 2025 at 7:00 P.M.**