

Attachment "B"



**BEL AIR-BEVERLY CREST NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
PLANNING AND LAND USE COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES OF VIRTUAL MEETING
Tuesday, February 10, 2026, 7:00 p.m.
*Conducted via Zoom Webinar***

CALL TO ORDER, FLAG SALUTE AND ROLL CALL

Co-Chair Jamie Hall called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 10, 2026. The meeting was conducted virtually in conformity with California Senate Bill 707 (Durazo) and LA City Council File 23-1114.

Co-Chair Hall led the Pledge of Allegiance with the assistance of member Robin Greenberg.

Roll call was conducted by Co-Chair Hall. The following members were in attendance:

Committee Member	Status	Committee Member	Status
Jamie Hall, Co-Chair	Present	Michael Kemp, Co-Chair	Present
Leslie Weisberg, Vice-Chair	Absent	Stephanie Savage	Present
Robin Greenberg	Present	Robert Schlesinger	Present (7:11 PM)
Nickie Miner	Present	Patricia Templeton	Excused Absence
Maureen Levinson	Present	Stella Grey	Present
Jason Spradlin	Present	Steven Weinberg	Excused Absence
Travis Longcore, Ph.D. (ex officio)	Present		

A quorum was present. Robert Schlesinger arrived at 7:11 PM.

1. APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 10, 2026 AGENDA

Co-Chair Hall presented the agenda for approval. Ms. Savage noted that Item 5 referred to "West Wanda Drive" but that the correct street name is Wanda Park Drive. Co-Chair Hall acknowledged the discrepancy and noted it would be reflected in any recommendation letter but determined that it did not require a formal agenda correction.

Motion: Ms. Miner moved to approve the February 10, 2026 agenda.

Second: Ms. Levinson

Vote: Motion carried unanimously 9-0-0.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2(i). November 11, 2025 Meeting Minutes (Attachment A)

Co-Chair Hall confirmed with staff (Cathy Palmer) that the November and December minutes were available for adoption, but that January 2026 minutes (Attachment C) were not ready and would not be voted upon.

Motion: Mr. Kemp moved to approve the November 11, 2025 meeting minutes.

Second: Ms. Levinson

Vote: Motion carried unanimously 9-0-0.

2(ii). December 2, 2025 Meeting Minutes (Attachment B)

Motion: Mr. Kemp moved to approve the December 2, 2025 meeting minutes.

Second: Ms. Levinson

Vote: Motion carried unanimously 9-0-0.

Note: The January 13, 2026 meeting minutes (Attachment C listed on the agenda) were not available for adoption at this meeting and therefore were not voted upon.

3. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Co-Chair Hall opened the General Public Comment period and clarified that this period was limited to matters within the committee's jurisdiction that were not on the adopted agenda. He reminded attendees that public comment on agenda items would be heard separately during the consideration of each item.

The following members of the public addressed the committee:

Marlene H expressed concern about emergency evacuation and traffic gridlock in the Bel Air Crest community. She described serious traffic congestion extending from Cassiano to Skirball Center Drive on the day following the January 28 General BABCNC meeting. She requested assistance connecting with the LA Fire Department, police, and traffic control to develop a coordinated community evacuation plan, particularly in light of the potential enrollment increase

at Milken Community Schools. Co-Chair Hall directed her to contact staff (Cathy Palmer) for further assistance.

Alina Vartany of Bel Air Park corroborated Ms. H's account, describing the gridlock as an "absolute warning" and a life safety risk for a community in a high fire hazard severity zone. She noted that Milken's West Campus queuing requirements were reportedly being violated and questioned how emergency conditions could be managed if existing requirements are not being enforced.

Adele Abrams indicated she wished to speak about 9830 and 9832 Wanda Park Drive, which is an agenda item. She was informed that public comment on that item would be taken when it was called.

Svetlana (last name not stated) of Bel Air Park noted that at recent neighborhood council meetings, many speakers who voiced support for the Milken CUP expansion did not live in the immediately affected neighborhood, and she wanted this context reflected in the record.

Co-Chair Hall closed the General Public Comment period, noting he could not act on the matters raised but confirmed the committee had heard the community's concerns.

4. CHAIR REPORTS

No formal Chair Reports were presented. Co-Chair Hall proceeded directly to the substantive agenda items, noting there were three items to be heard and emphasizing the need to move efficiently through the agenda.

5. 9830 & 9832 WEST WANDA PARK DRIVE

Case No.: ZA-2023-4255-ZAD-HCA / ENV-2023-4256-CE

Case Filed: June 22, 2023 | Hearing Date: January 6, 2026 | Staff Assigned: Alexander Truong

Applicant: Dennis Banks, Banks Consulting

Project Description

The project involves the demolition of an existing single-family residence that spans across two separate parcels (9830 and 9832 Wanda Park Drive) and the construction of a new single-family residence with an attached accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and a three-car garage on each of the two separate parcels. The proposed home at 9830 Wanda Park Drive would be approximately 2,500 square feet (under the 2,800 sq. ft. maximum), and the home at 9832 Wanda Park Drive would be approximately 2,700 square feet (also under the 2,800 sq. ft. maximum). Both structures would be built within the existing building pad, avoiding further grading into the hillside.

The sole discretionary entitlement being sought is a Zone Administrator Determination (ZAD) to reduce the required side yard setback from 6 feet to 4 feet on both the eastern and western sides of each property. The applicant confirmed that an earlier request for a waiver of the front yard dedication requirement has been withdrawn, and the applicant is complying with the required 4-foot front yard right-of-way dedication. A deviation from the 20-foot Continuous Paved Roadway (CPR) requirement under the Hillside Ordinance was also identified in the Notice of Public Hearing as an entitlement being sought.

Applicant's Presentation

Dennis Banks of Banks Consulting presented on behalf of the applicant, with support from project architect Shahram Shokoufandeh (appearing as "Sharam") and assistant Sonia Rivas. Mr. Banks presented aerial and site photographs and made the following points:

Both new single-family homes would be single-use residential, consistent with the zone and area development, conforming with the Bel Air-Beverly Crest Community Plan.

The 2-foot side yard reduction (from 6 to 4 feet) is requested primarily to allow for more usable interior room widths. The new setbacks would actually represent greater separation from the neighboring property at 9828 Wanda Park Drive than the current structure, which sits approximately 1 to 2 feet from the property line.

No trees are proposed to be removed. Both structures will be built within the existing building pad; no additional hillside grading is planned.

The street was measured by the city at 20 feet wide. The applicant is providing a 4-foot front yard dedication, and the project complies with the minimum 5-foot front setback, yielding approximately 9 feet of combined dedication and setback at the street.

All relevant city departments (Department of Transportation, Bureau of Engineering, and Fire Department) reviewed the project during plan check and did not identify adverse impacts on street access or circulation.

There will be no subterranean excavation below 5 feet. All construction will be at grade or higher. A soils report and tree report were completed and approved by city departments, including Urban Forestry.

The buildings will comply with 1-hour fire-rated wall assembly requirements on the side yards facing neighboring properties, and sprinklers will be installed.

Committee Questions

Co-Chair Hall reviewed the Notice of Public Hearing and asked Mr. Banks to clarify which entitlements were being sought. This revealed that the application as filed includes both a ZAD for the side yard setback reduction and a ZAD to deviate from the 20-foot CPR requirement under the Hillside Ordinance. Mr. Banks initially indicated uncertainty about the CPR item but ultimately confirmed the city had advised them to address it. Co-Chair Hall also confirmed the applicant had withdrawn the original request for a front yard dedication waiver.

Dr. Longcore (ex officio) raised questions about the actual width of Wanda Park Drive based on aerial measurements, expressed uncertainty about whether the turnaround requirement at the end of the road was met, and asked about fire safety compliance. The architect confirmed 1-hour rated assemblies and the presence of a turnaround, but the committee noted that these issues were among the items needing further clarification.

Public Comment

Approximately 8-10 members of the public addressed the committee in opposition to the project, with one neighbor from the street speaking in favor. Key themes included:

Street width and safety: Multiple neighbors, including resident Shahram Shokoufandeh, disputed the applicant's claim that Wanda Park Drive is 20 feet wide along its full length, citing specific properties on the street with encroachments that bring the effective width below 20 feet in certain sections. A long-time resident, Kelly Rubin (resident since 1965), stated that "no good will come from major construction on this street."

Fire safety: Neighbors raised concerns about fire access given the narrowness of the road and proximity of new construction to property lines. One speaker, Shahed Toossi, noted that the

reduced setback brings structures closer to property lines and questioned whether new development should be held to higher fire safety standards.

Application inconsistencies: Adele Abrams of 9824 Wanda Park Drive, who stated she had reviewed the permit file, described what she characterized as internal inconsistencies in the application documents, including conflicting setback measurements (4 ft 7 in., 6 ft, and 7 ft listed in different documents), conflicting construction hours (Mon-Fri vs. Mon-Sat), and a request for a haulage plan waiver that she alleged was structured to stay below tonnage thresholds. She also raised concerns about groundwater references in the geological report versus the application form, potential asbestos from demolition, and the adequacy of proposed tree replacements.

Applicant's Response

Mr. Banks was given approximately 5 minutes to respond to community and committee concerns. He stated that the new homes would actually be farther from neighboring property lines than the existing structure. He reiterated that the city had measured the street and found it to be 20 feet, leading to the reduction in the dedication requirement from 8 feet to 4 feet. He confirmed that no subterranean excavation below 5 feet is planned and that the buildings will be built within the existing pad. The project architect confirmed 1-hour fire-rated assemblies and sprinkler systems.

Board Discussion

The committee debated whether to continue the item to a future meeting to obtain updated plans and additional documentation, or to act on the application at this meeting. Ms. Savage initially moved to continue the item and require the applicant to provide complete drawings for both properties and a comprehensive list of questions to be answered. Mr. Kemp supported the motion and added a request for the soils report. Co-Chair Hall requested an updated application with clarity on the specific entitlements being sought.

However, after learning that the ZA hearing was held on January 6, 2026, with the record left open for approximately 60 days (approximately through early March), the committee determined that a continuance to the next regular meeting would not leave adequate time and would likely require a special meeting for the committee and the full board. Co-Chair Hall suggested that the fundamentals of the project were unlikely to change materially and recommended proceeding to a vote on the merits. Ms. Savage withdrew her motion to continue.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Savage moved to recommend denial of the project. The motion incorporated the substance of the committee's concerns, including: (1) the incomplete and inconsistent documentation submitted; (2) concerns about street width and fire access on Wanda Park Drive; (3) unanswered questions regarding the CPR deviation; and (4) general concerns about the impact of major construction on the narrow hillside street.

Motion: Ms. Savage moved to recommend DENIAL of Case No. ZA-2023-4255-ZAD-HCA, based on a list of what was discussed this evening, and the incomplete information provided by the applicant. (She offered to provide that same list discussed above to the applicant.)

Second: Ms. Levinson

Roll Call Vote:

Ms. Savage – Yes

Ms. Miner – Yes

Ms. Greenberg – Yes

Mr. Schlesinger – Yes

Ms. Grey – Yes

Mr. Kemp – Yes
Ms. Levinson – Yes
Mr. Spradlin – Yes
Co-Chair Hall – Yes
Dr. Longcore (ex officio) – Abstain

Result: Motion carried, 9-0-1 (9 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention).

Note: The committee's recommendation will be forwarded to the full BABCNC Board for consideration at its meeting on February 25, 2026. The applicant was invited to attend and present at that meeting.

6. 2555 N. CRESTVIEW DRIVE – MULHOLLAND TENNIS CLUB

Case No.: ZA-2024-1881-ZV / ENV-2024-1882-CE

Case Filed: March 21, 2024 | Hearing Date: February 10, 2026 | Staff Assigned: Andres Gutierrez
Applicant: Mulholland Tennis Club | Representative: Peter Huie (Mulholland Tennis Club); Luis Fernandez

Project Description

The Mulholland Tennis Club (MTC) is a private tennis and recreation club located at 2555 N. Crestview Drive, at the intersection of Crestview Drive and Skyline Drive, established in 1964. The club is capped at 400 household memberships, with approximately 43% of members living within one mile. The club's existing Conditional Use Permit (CUP) permits a private tennis club and customary facilities including a swimming pool, gym, kitchen, dining room, and bar.

The application seeks a Zoning Variance (ZV) to allow the renovation and construction of an outdoor service station bar (approximately 20 feet by 10 feet) under an existing patio cover/breezeway on the tennis deck. The proposed bar would not add any new square footage to the existing building. The proposed location is on the southwest corner of the property, set approximately 50 feet below (in elevation) and approximately 200-250 feet from the nearest residential structure.

The existing structure at that location is a cinder block service counter with no plumbing or electricity. The proposal would upgrade the counter to a proper service bar with plumbing (sink, drain), refrigeration, ice machine, and dishwasher. The club already holds a valid liquor license permitting alcohol service throughout the property, including this area. The proposed bar would seat approximately 6-8 people. Alcohol consumption at the location is therefore not a new use, but the proposed permanent build-out structure requires the variance because A1 zoning generally does not permit such structures.

Applicant's Presentation

Luis Fernandez presented on behalf of the club, with contributions from Peter Huie (Board Chair) and Troy Pade (General Manager). Key points included:

The project is a minor operational improvement that does not change club operations, membership cap, or noise profile. In 2025, the club hosted only 43 events, the largest being a wedding with 154 attendees. The majority of events involve 20-40 people.

A video was shown demonstrating ambient noise levels from the tennis deck on a Friday evening with 145 people and live music; presenters asserted the sound was not perceptible from the street.

The club has a Mulholland Corridor Overlay approval and a letter of support from the local LAFD station. The club has served as a polling location and hosted public meetings. Over 240 letters of support were submitted.

The practical driver for the variance is that serving staff currently must traverse the full length of the club (approximately 120 feet through a narrow breezeway) to serve the tennis deck, creating a safety risk and service inefficiency. The proposal also improves ADA accessibility to bar service for members with mobility issues.

The applicant stated that the Mulholland Corridor Overlay had already approved the plans, and that the Zoning Variance is required because the service bar use is not ordinarily permitted in the A1 zone.

Committee Questions

Ms. Miner raised concerns about sound transmission in canyon and hillside environments, noting that she had heard from Laurel Canyon residents that noise from the club carries unexpectedly.

The committee discussed the legal basis for the variance. Co-Chair Hall reviewed the required variance findings, including whether strict application of the zoning code would result in practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship, whether there are special circumstances applicable to the property, and whether granting the variance would not be materially detrimental to the public health or adversely affect the general plan. He noted uncertainty about whether the variance requirement is driven by the alcohol service component specifically or by the build-out of the structure in its entirety.

Dr. Longcore raised questions about the history of the site—specifically that a former snack bar at the pool area had been closed—and asked whether the proposed bar was essentially replacing it. The applicant clarified that while both serve food and beverages, the snack bar was in a different location and this project is a new service station on the tennis deck.

Co-Chair Hall stated his inclination to support the motion, noting that the club has been operating since the 1960s, that a bar already exists in another part of the building under the existing CUP, and that the practical necessity of the improvement (safe service to the tennis deck) is well-documented.

Public Comment

Approximately 20 members of the public raised their hands to speak; each was allowed one minute. Public comment was divided, with both supporters and opponents addressing the committee.

Speakers in opposition raised concerns including: increased noise from the outdoor bar; potential for the bar to transform into a public-facing commercial use; fears of traffic increases; concerns about alcohol-related disturbances; the precedent of the bar use being inconsistent with A1 zoning; questions about sound traveling in the canyon and hillside areas; and assertions that a video submitted by opponents of the bar showed trucks associated with club events creating road nuisances.

Speakers in support, including attorney Kathleen Hipps (who stated her home overlooks the tennis deck and she has never experienced noise disruptions), member Dave Geha (who stated his daughter's wedding reception at the club ended at 10:00 p.m. sharp), and general manager Troy Pade, defended the club as a good neighbor. Mr. Pade noted that alcohol sales at the club are down 30% since COVID and disputed that televisions on the tennis deck constitute a "sports bar."

Board Discussion

The committee deliberated on the variance findings. Co-Chair Hall noted that because the club and its existing bar have operated in the A1 zone under a CUP since the 1960s, the applicable baseline when evaluating whether a use is "generally possessed by other properties in the same zone and vicinity" must account for the existing lawful use. A motion to approve the project was already on the floor.

Ms. Savage recused herself from the vote, stating the project had been reviewed by Mulholland (as she is on the Mulholland Design Review Board). With Ms. Savage's recusal, Mr. Spradlin having left the meeting, and Ms. Weisberg absent, the remaining voting members were polled.

Motion and Vote

Motion: A motion to recommend APPROVAL of Case No. ZA-2024-1881-ZV was made (by Kemp) for reasons including that there is no change of use, no increase of members, it's purely a service; there is already there's a service station there.

Second: Levinson

Roll Call Vote:

- Ms. Greenberg – Abstain
- Mr. Kemp – Yes
- Ms. Grey – Abstain
- Mr. Schlesinger – Yes
- Ms. Levinson – Yes
- Ms. Savage – Recused
- Ms. Miner – No
- Co-Chair Hall – Yes
- Dr. Longcore (ex officio) – Abstain

Result: Motion carried, 4-1-3 (4 in favor, 1 opposed, 3 abstentions, 1 recusal).

7. TREE REMOVAL – 9966 WEST LIEBE DRIVE (Board of Public Works)

Board of Public Works Agenda Item – February 11, 2026 BPW Meeting (Page 5; Attachments from Page 275)

Project Description

This item was presented to the committee by Mindy Rothstein Mann (alternate CFAC representative for CD5), who had brought the project to the committee's attention. The project involves the demolition of an existing single-family residence at 9966 West Liebe Drive and the construction of a replacement single-family home of approximately the same size (approximately 4,200 sq. ft. existing vs. approximately 4,400 sq. ft. proposed), with a new pool relocated from the side to the rear of the property. A new ADU is also proposed.

The Board of Public Works (BPW) was scheduled to hear this item the following morning (February 11, 2026, at 10:00 a.m.). The BPW recommendation includes: (1) a CEQA categorical exemption finding under Section 15303 (Class 3); (2) a finding that no exceptions to the categorical exemption apply; and (3) approval of a fee permit to remove seventeen (17) protected trees and shrubs, with required tree replacements.

The proposed demolition triggers a non-conforming hillside requirement under LADBS Grading Division rules, which require the property's hillside to meet a minimum slope stability safety factor. Because the new pool is proposed near a retaining wall at the rear of the property, the grading requirement is triggered. The applicant's proposed method to achieve the required slope stability factor involves removing 17 protected trees/shrubs from the hillside and replacing them with new plantings, primarily at the top of the slope.

Discussion

Co-Chair Hall explained the LADBS slope stability requirement and noted there are multiple ways to achieve the required safety factor. The cheapest method—scraping the hillside and installing retaining walls—requires removal of existing trees and vegetation. However, alternative methods such as drilling caissons into the earth can stabilize the hillside while preserving trees, although at significantly greater cost (estimated at approximately three times as expensive). He indicated that in another project he had worked on, over 95% of trees were saved using the caisson method.

Dr. Longcore (ex officio) confirmed that the hillside behind the property contains native shrubs and trees and agreed that the 17-tree removal represents a significant ecological loss. He stated the committee's recommendation should be that alternative methods preserving more of the hillside should be explored, even at greater expense.

Mr. Schlesinger noted that tree root systems provide inherent hillside stability, meaning their removal could compromise the hillside they are intended to stabilize.

Ms. Rothstein Mann added that the replacement plan—planting approximately 60 small trees toward the top of the steep slope—was unlikely to succeed ecologically, given the existing native habitat at the hilltop. Co-Chair Hall described the replanting plan as "ecologically unsound," with Dr. Longcore agreeing with that characterization.

The committee noted that there is no public call-in option for BPW committee hearings; however, the BPW full board allows remote participation, and Ms. Rothstein Mann indicated she had submitted written comments and hoped to address the BPW board remotely.

Motion and Vote

Co-Chair Hall moved a motion to oppose the Board of Public Works recommendation to approve removal of the 17 protected trees at 9966 West Liebe Drive.

Motion: Co-Chair Hall moved that the committee OPPOSE the Board of Public Works recommendation to approve the fee permit for removal of seventeen (17) protected trees at 9966 West Liebe Drive, on the grounds that: (1) too many protected trees are being removed; (2) alternative methods should be explored that would achieve the same slope stability safety factor required by the LADBS Grading Division without the mass removal of protected trees; and (3) the replanting plan is ecologically unsound.

Second: Mr. Schlesinger

Roll Call Vote:

- Mr. Schlesinger – Yes
- Ms. Miner – Yes
- Mr. Kemp – Yes
- Ms. Greenberg – Yes
- Ms. Grey – Yes
- Ms. Levinson – Yes
- Ms. Savage – Yes
- Co-Chair Hall – Yes

Dr. Longcore (ex officio) – Yes

Result: Motion carried unanimously, 9-0-0 (all present voting members in favor).

Note: Co-Chair Hall authorized Ms. Rothstein Mann to convey the committee's position of opposition to the Board of Public Works as the committee's official position. The full BABCNC Board will consider this recommendation at its meeting on February 25, 2026.

GOOD OF THE ORDER AND ADJOURNMENT

Several committee members expressed appreciation for Co-Chair Hall's leadership through what was described as an approximately three and a half hour meeting. Ms. Savage noted that it was committee member Don's birthday on Valentine's Day. Cathy Palmer also noted that Mr. Schlesinger's wedding anniversary falls on Valentine's Day.

Co-Chair Hall adjourned the meeting at **10:28 PM**. The next regular meeting of the Planning and Land Use Committee is scheduled for Tuesday, March 10, 2026, at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Palmer, Committee Staff

Jamie Hall, Co-Chair, Planning and Land Use Committee

Michael Kemp, Co-Chair, Planning and Land Use Committee

Minutes approved at the _____ meeting of the BABCNC Planning and Land Use Committee