



Minutes
Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
Virtual Planning & Land Use Committee Meeting
Tuesday December 2, 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 welcomed all in attendance and called the meeting to order at 7:05 P.M. Following the flag salute, Co-Chair Hall called the roll with 9 members present initially. Member Schlesinger joined shortly thereafter for a total of 10 members present.

1. The December 2, 2025 Agenda was **approved** as moved by Dr. Longcore.
2. **Approval of Minutes:**
 - i. The October 14, 2025 Meeting Minutes (Attachment A) were **approved** 9-0-0, as moved by Greenberg.
 - ii. Approval of the November 11, 2025 Meeting Minutes (Attachment B) was **deferred** as they were not available.
3. **General Public Comment:** BABCNC welcomes comments from the public on any topic within the Committee’s jurisdiction but not on the adopted agenda. There was none.
4. **Chair Reports:**
 - Jamie Hall, Co-Chair – None.
 - Michael Kemp, Co-Chair related that he hoped everyone had a lovely Thanksgiving holiday and wished us the best for the coming holidays.
 - Leslie Weisberg, Vice-Chair, wished Robin a happy birthday.
5. **14410 W MULHOLLAND DR AA-2024-7366-DPS (Returned from 10/14/2025 PLU)**
Initial Submittal Documents: Project Application, Private Street Map, and Vicinity Map:
<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumbr/AA-2024-7366-DPS>
Case Filed: 11/13/2024; Staff Assigned: Katie Knudson

Applicant: Haig Bagerdjian Rep: Jimmy Toetz [Crest Real Estate]

Project Description: Deemed to Be Approved Private Street

Present Use: SFD / Proposed Use: SFD+ADU

Action Requested: 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.

10/14/2025 PLU Committee Motion to continue this project, based on concern related to compliance with the state minimum fire safety regulations, specifically whether or not alternative measures that have the same practical effect have been provided and note that the co-chairs and vice-chair of the committee would like to conduct a site walk prior to the next meeting.

Co-Chair Hall introduced this item that has returned, restating the actions requested. He noted that this was continued so members of the committee could go to the site, which he and Vice-Chair Weisberg did separately, and so we could talk about alternative measures to provide fire safety mitigation. He noted that we had discussed compliance with the State Minimum Fire Safe Regulations. Tony Russo was present and introduced Andrew Odum, who provided a brief refresher. Andrew noted that the project proposes that a large part of the flat pad is being dedicated to a new fire truck turnaround, and they are working with Hydrants & Access, to create a hammerhead turnaround on the site.

Co-Chair Hall asked about the hammerhead turnaround at the intervening gate, which will be behind that, with a Knox box and how that works. Tony answered this and other questions as to the way the box works, noting it is a box with a key that only the Fire Department and Emergency services have that allows them to open any gate that has this Knox box, so they have access to use the gate, to physically turn around on the private property. He noted that the site is unique to the end of the road, the perfect location for the turnaround and that there is no other feasible location for a fully compliant hammerhead turnaround on the street.

Tony noted that we had talked about providing a practical effect and noted that there is a benefit for fire safety in the area. Leslie explained the way these boxes work in Bel Air. She has personal experience with that because last January at the time of the fires, the key in the box was obsolete. There must be some plan because the Fire Department won't come back to make sure that the key or remote or combination stays up to date. She was up there and asked if we knew how narrow the street is. Tony noted that there are ways to improve the safety of that Knox box that can be discussed with Building & Safety as well as Hydrants & Access to make sure it will be hooked up to power and will last and if there is a simple solution to make sure it will last for decades to come...

Co-Chair Hall wanted to make sure we were not giving a free pass. He discussed what he observed: He did not see a lot of historical encroachments to the street and there is a curb on one side going up; he didn't see mailboxes or telephone poles. It might be 20 feet or a little less than 20 feet. Jamie pointed out the part of the street where there may be some improvements, that could be widened and improved. Further up he sees a curb on the left, he saw no-parking signs and fire signs, which would be a practical effect as to signage. He pointed out another spot that could have some widening. He did not see a lot of encroachments onto the street. He noted that you would want to find a mechanism to prevent people parking illegally. He showed where it stopped at a fence. Member Weisberg noted that there is no fire hydrant along that road. The project is on the other

side of the gate. Hall opined that in a perfect world, there wouldn't be a private gate along this private street. He thought it would be a bad idea... but it is already there. He wanted to have a conversation to make sure that we were vetting this appropriately and thinking about if this project doesn't comply with the regulations, what measures could be implemented to enhance ingress and egress. He noted the signs that said "Fire Lane Only" and asked if there could be other signs to put up; he didn't see a lot of opportunities for road widening except at the base.

Tony responded that he understands that there could be opportunities for widening in the future, they do front other peoples' property; it is still a private road, there is a public portion, at the beginning, Mulholland... What they are proposing is the turnaround on the site and a hydrant. When it comes to improving the ingress and egress, that's a substantial improvement to having no turnaround. Tony noted that there is a little bit of a bump out, but it is not compliant for a fire truck which this would be. To clarify, asked if he is putting in a hydrant, Tony noted that yes, there is a hydrant placed on the property; no others on the street; two on Mulholland Drive.

Member Weisberg asked if he thought if the Fire Department comes up there and sees that narrow road completely ablaze, would they try to get to that gate and tie in to that, and doesn't he think it prudent to add another fire hydrant outside that gate to protect those properties? The applicant's representatives provided responses to this.

Co-Chair Hall suggested additional signage that there should be no parking on either side of the private street to facilitate ingress and egress. Tony imagines the neighbors would appreciate that. He doesn't think they'd be opposed to the signage. Andrew noted that the portion where the car is on the other side of the street is public property. Andrew pointed out a portion that is paved where a neighbor parks. He believes the area that Jamie is pointing out is paved. Hall acknowledged that we can't ignore the fact that this private street approval has a fire truck turnaround and a fire hydrant that's being added.

Hall recommended that we suggest to the decision maker, in our letter, say we believe this project is subject to the regulations and we believe that in order to provide for concurrent ingress and egress that additional signage should be installed to denote that there is no parking on either side of the street allowed. Tony noted that they could also see where to put more signage and the applicant representatives could coordinate with LAFD to be sure there are reasonable measures to ensure the longevity of the Knox box. He doesn't think it is an unreasonable condition and thinks it can be added. Andrew will ask the homeowner if he knows about the house Robin asked about.

Motion: Co-Chair Hall moved that we recommend approval of this private street application on the condition that additional signage be installed on the roadway to denote that no parking is allowed on either side of the street, and that appropriate conditions to ensure longevity and contents of the Knox boxes, to the satisfaction of LAFD. Also, in our transmittal to the decision maker, we explicitly state that we reviewed this project with an eye for compliance with the State Minimum Fire Safe Regulations. The motion was seconded by Co-Chair Kemp. None opposed and the motion **passed 10-0-0.**

6. **11300 W CHALON ROAD DIR-2025-1457-ADJ-HCA ENV-2025-1458-CE ZA-2025-1457 (Revision of Approved Plans for ZA-2016-4114-ZAA)**
Initial Submittal Documents: Application, Findings, Notice of Exemption, Plans and Vicinity Map: <https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenummer/ZA-2025-1457>
Case Filed 03/11/2025, Assigned 03/19/2025, and Staff Assigned: Esteban Martorell
App: Matthew Tambor [Better Space Inc.] Rep: John Parker [Pacific Crest Consultants]
Project Description: Present Use: SFD; **Proposed Use:** SFD +ADU **Action Requested:**
ZAA for a front yard setback of 3’9” in lieu of 5’ for a second-floor addition above an existing garage with the identical front yard setback and an ADU conversion.

Christopher John Parker introduced the project. He noted that they are requesting to enclose that which was permitted as a patio and asking for it to remain 3’9” the same distance from the front property line from the garage below. Also, the conversion of the ADU is by right but they are talking about it. The project was reviewed and approved by Bel Air Association (BAA) six weeks ago. They will still provide four parking spaces, use closed parentheses, 4 in the attached garage and 2 in the driveway. Still provide 4 parking spaces. No change to the existing footprint or height of the SFD with this request; it is just to enclose an open patio. The patio height and location have already been approved; it goes back to 2017 approval when they asked for extra floor area. He is finishing the project and realizes that he’ll never use an open patio above his garage and wants to convert it into a den with a closet.

He pointed out the site plan, pointing out the area to be enclosed on the second floor and the area of the attached ADU on the first floor. He noted it is an official by right ADU, part of the overall final phase of his client’s renovations and additions to the house. It is existing space being converted into an ADU. He discussed the hashed-out areas on the screen. He noted that the ADU is its own dwelling unit with an extra door, the walkway, gate and onto the street. They will get one of the four parking spaces.

Co-Chair Kemp noted that he serves on the Bel Air Association (BAA) Architectural Review and was part of the review of this project and shared his observations which were discussed. Co-Chair Hall noted that he already got 10% more than allowed in the Hillside Ordinance and that a skeptical person would say this is all part of a plan you are already getting more. Chris responded that the original approval in 2017 occurred before the ADU rules. They have candidates for residing in the ADU. The BAA approval letter was shown. After discussion, Chris showed the deck, noting that what we were seeing was permitted, and although it doesn't look much like a deck, that was officially the deck that they were allowed to build. Now he just wants to put a roof on it.

Weisberg noted that the BAA indicated that they want to see proof that the neighbors have been contacted and agreed. Chris would be happy to have this as a condition of approval. Hall noted that it seemed like gamesmanship, but the person is taking advantage of the ADU laws now, being subtracted from the total square footage; only talking about 13” now. He’d support it but does not want it. Member Grey questioned if the structure was illegally built according to the permit in 2017. Asked, there will be nothing above the garage. She hasn’t seen anything that proves that enclosure was permitted. Chris noted that they allowed the ugliest deck and that BAA looked at it. **Motion** to support **passed 8-0-2**, as **moved** by Miner, **seconded** by Schlesinger, with the abstentions from Dr. Longcore and Member Savage.

7. **1709 N FERRARI DRIVE ZA-2025-4707-ADJ**

Initial Submittal Documents: Application, Findings, Parcel & Vicinity Maps:

<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumbr/ZA-2025-4707-ADJ>

Case Filed 08/20/2025; Assigned 08/27/2025; Staff Assigned: Esther Serrato

Applicant: Annette Kleinbard [Annette Kleinbard Revocable Living Trust]

Representative: John Parker [Pacific Crest Consultants]

Project Description: **Present Use:** SFD; **Proposed Use:** SFD (no change)

Action Requested: Adjustment to permit reduction in lot area for the subject property requirement to 14,000 sf in lieu of 20,000 sf in the RE20 Zone in conjunction with a LLA with 1642 San Ysidro Drive

Chris Parker introduced the project, noting it is for a lot line adjustment, that gets approved administratively, and they have an additional adjustment request. They are not proposing any construction in conjunction with the adjustment and the lot lines that currently criss-cross all over the place. This is a way that the two property owners can have lot lines that match on the ground. He showed the site plan, San Ysidro at the lower left of lot line map, and Ferrari (*green*) with the existing lot lines done a long time ago. They want to remove the green and put the red lines (*pointing*). They listed two properties; the third is passive in the hillside area.

He pointed out where their clients are, at Ferrari, and at San Ysidro, noting that it makes more sense for the clients at San Ysidro for their backyard for their backyard to extend to the top of the hillside, unlike, just randomly in the middle (*pointing*). He noted that it makes sense for the San Ysidro property owners to have their whole driveway instead of having a driveway controlled in park by a neighbor on the other side of a mountain. He explained that this will just clean up all the dumb mapmaking done decades ago. The hedge is where the current property line is, allowing it to go up. Further details were discussed with questions asked and answered including but not limited questions as regards the other property, and the encroachment, which they are not fixing because when you do a LLA you are only allowed to do three parcels at the same time. His client on San Ysidro has an easement to have those improvements. They need relief for Ferrari to complete the LLA.

Motion to support the project **passed** 9-0-1, as **moved** by Miner, and **seconded** by Savage, with Longcore abstaining.

Good of the Order and Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 P.M. to return on January 13, 2025 at 7:00 P.M.