BEL AIR-BEVERLY CREST NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
PLANNING AND LAND USE COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES OF VIRTUAL MEETING

Tuesday, April 14, 2026, 7:00 p.m.

Conducted via Zoom Webinar

CALL TO ORDER, FLAG SALUTE AND ROLL CALL

Co-Chair Michael Kemp called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. on Tuesday, April 14, 2026. He noted that Co-Chair Jamie Hall was delayed due to another hearing in progress and would join later. The meeting was conducted virtually in conformity with California Senate Bill 707 (Durazo) and LA City Council File 23-1114.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by a combination of Dr. Longcore, Co-Chair Kemp, and other members. Mr. Schlesinger displayed the flag for the salute.

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

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

A quorum was present. Co-Chair Hall did not participate in the meeting. Mr. Weinberg arrived late, after the meeting commenced. Note: Throughout the meeting, Vice-Chair Weisberg declared herself ineligible to vote on most items.

1. APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 14, 2026 AGENDA

Co-Chair Kemp presented the agenda for approval. There was no discussion.

Motion: Mr. Schlesinger moved to approve the April 14, 2026 agenda.

Second: Ms. Miner

Vote: Motion approved by unanimous consent (no opposition or abstentions noted).

---

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Co-Chair Kemp noted that three sets of meeting minutes had been prepared: the January 13, 2026 meeting minutes (Attachment A), the February 10, 2026 meeting minutes (Attachment B), and the March 10, 2026 meeting minutes (Attachment C). He thanked staff (Cathy Palmer) and Dr. Longcore for their work in preparing all three sets.

Co-Chair Kemp asked for any corrections or comments on each set of minutes. None were offered. He proceeded with a combined motion for all three, allowing individual members to vote differently on each. Ms. Templeton indicated she would approve January but abstain from February and March, as she had not been present at those meetings. Ms. Grey also indicated she would approve January and February but abstain from March.

Motion: Mr. Schlesinger moved to approve the January 13, February 10, and March 10, 2026 meeting minutes.

Second: Dr. Longcore

Roll Call Vote (all three sets unless otherwise noted):

Ms. Greenberg – Yes (all three)
Mr. Kemp – Yes (all three)
Ms. Miner – Yes (all three)
Mr. Schlesinger – Yes (all three)
Ms. Grey – Yes – January and February; Abstain – March
Ms. Levinson – Yes (all three)
Ms. Savage – Yes (all three)
Ms. Weisberg – Ineligible
Ms. Templeton – Yes – January; Abstain – February and March
Dr. Longcore (ex officio) – Yes (all three)

Result: Minutes approved. The January 13 minutes were approved by all eligible voters present. The February 10 minutes were approved by a majority of eligible voters, with one abstention, and the March 10 minutes were approved by a majority of eligible voters, with two abstentions.

---

3. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Co-Chair Kemp opened the General Public Comment period, reminding attendees that this period was reserved for matters within the committee's jurisdiction not on the adopted agenda. Public comment is limited to one minute per speaker.

Two members of the public addressed the committee:

Teresa Aldave (1467 Roscomare Road) raised concerns about development at 1400 Linda Flora Drive. She described the following issues: (1) retaining walls constructed under a 2013 permit with corrections issued in 2018 that were never finalized or approved; (2) the associated permits expired in 2023; (3) illegal grading and an estimated 25,000 cubic yards of illegally stockpiled material; (4) an attempted movement of stockpiled material without a required haul route; and (5) uncertainty about a conservation easement that she believed had been recorded by City Council, which the MRCA stated it had no record of. Ms. Aldave reported that approximately 11 slope failure events have occurred along Roscomare since construction began at the site, with five affecting her own property. A severe rain event in 2024 caused damage that forced her family out of their home for approximately one year. She stated that a new owner at 1400 Linda Flora appears to be continuing similar practices rather than remedying the drainage issues. Co-Chair Kemp indicated he would bring the matter to the PLU executive committee to explore agendizing it, and that he has Ms. Aldave's contact information.

Mindy Rothstein Mann (attending as a member of the public) raised a suggestion that the committee consider posting video recordings of its meetings on the BABCNC website after each meeting, to improve public access for people unable to attend in real time. Co-Chair Kemp acknowledged the suggestion.

No other members of the public addressed the committee during the General Public Comment period.

---

4. CHAIR REPORTS

Co-Chair Hall was absent. Co-Chair Kemp thanked all participants for attending.

Vice-Chair Weisberg reported that plans are underway for a town hall with candidates for the California Insurance Commissioner, to be moderated by Alex Cohen of Spectrum News (pending Spectrum's approval, with confirmation expected the following day). She noted that nearly all candidates had agreed to participate, with one exception, and credited Ms. Miner for suggesting Ms. Cohen as moderator. She asked Ms. Greenberg to assist with distributing the flyer to homeowners' associations.

Ms. Grey noted that a new "Home Sharing" tab has been added to the ZIMAS permitting and zoning compliance interface, allowing users to check whether a specific property has a home-sharing permit. She shared this as useful information for committee members.

---

5. 1450 N SEABRIGHT PLACE [RETURNING FROM JULY 2025 PLU MEETING]

Case No.: ZA-2024-7305-ADJ-CU1-HCA

Case Filed: November 12, 2024 | Assigned: November 15, 2024 | Staff Assigned: Esther Serrato (ADJ) and Katie Knudson (DPS/COC)

Applicant: Monica Bousa | Representative: Benjamin Eshaghian [Crest Real Estate]; Tony Russo [Crest Real Estate]

Background and Prior Continuance

This item was first presented at the July 8, 2025 PLU Committee meeting and continued. The project has been revised since the original filing. It was continued to allow clarity on whether the SB9 unit would qualify for a waiver of the roadway width requirement. The applicant confirmed that no such waiver has been granted, and the full entitlement process is now being pursued.

Project Description

The project is located in the RE20-1-H-HCR zone, accessible via Tower Grove Drive and Beverly Grove Drive, leading to Seabright Place. The property is 12,434 square feet (below the zone's 20,000 sq. ft. minimum), and the existing home is approximately 1,800–2,000 square feet.

The revised project consists of: (1) a 317 sq. ft. addition to the existing single-family dwelling, primarily converting the existing attached garage to a guest bedroom with a 25 sq. ft. bathroom addition; (2) a new 436 sq. ft. two-unit development (SB9 unit) above a new 489 sq. ft. attached garage; a new pergola and wood deck. The total resulting residential floor area (RFA) would be approximately 2,705 sq. ft. (well below the maximum allowable RFA of 3,801 sq. ft. and the maximum lot coverage of approximately 4,973 sq. ft.). The SB9 unit is two stories; the main dwelling is one story. The SB9 structure would comply with 4-foot front, side, and rear setbacks per SB9 state law. The new garage is partially recessed into the hillside.

The applicant uses SB9 rather than ADU because SB9 provides 4-foot side yard setbacks for both the new unit and the main dwelling, enabling the layout, whereas using an ADU would only apply the reduced setback to the ADU and would trigger an encroachment plane issue.

Seabright Place is a private road approximately 16 feet wide at its narrowest points, serving approximately 3 other properties (one of which also has alternative access via Tower Grove Drive). A turnaround area exists adjacent to the project frontage, though not directly on the property frontage itself.

Entitlements Requested

(1) Class 1 Conditional Use Permit: relief from LAMC Section 12.24.X.28, as applied to Seabright Place, for having a continuous paved roadway of less than 20 feet in width and frontage of less than 20 feet in width;

(2) Zoning Administrator's Adjustment: to permit a lot area of 12,434 sq. ft. in lieu of the otherwise required 20,000 sq. ft. in the RE20 zone (resulting from an illegal lot cut, which is being legalized via Certificate of Compliance);

(3) Certificate of Compliance: to legalize one parcel component that was illegally subdivided after July 29, 1962;

(4) Deemed-to-be-Approved Private Street: review of the access driveway within a private road easement per LAMC Section 18.00 C.

Applicant's Presentation

Benjamin Eshaghian presented a PowerPoint with site plans and elevations. Tony Russo provided supplemental context. Key points:

Lot history: The subject property comprises two parcels. One was legally subdivided; the other was cut after the 1962 cutoff date (illegally). A COC is needed to formalize the combined lot, after which a Zoning Administrator's Adjustment is required because the combined lot area of 12,434 sq. ft. does not meet the 20,000 sq. ft. minimum for RE20 zoning.

Project scope: The applicant characterized this as a modest project: a couple expanding their home and adding a guest house. The SB9 unit functions as a guest house. Applicant stated this is not a speculative investment and the lot's geometry does not lend itself to an urban lot split.

Road constraints: Widening Seabright Place to 20 feet would require large retaining walls and would also require widening portions of Beverly Grove Drive and Tower Grove Drive, all of which have multiple pinch points. The applicant presented analysis showing why full widening is impracticable.

Fire access: A turnaround area exists just adjacent to the property frontage. Fire department review occurred at the plan check stage for the original single-family development.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Committee members asked the following:

Ms. Miner: Asked for a summary of what exists and what will be built, and the total additional square footage (approximately 851 sq. ft. additional). She raised a concern about the precedent of approving an SB9 unit in the hillside, noting that SB9 (along with SB10) was among the early bills from state Senator Wiener, and that approving such a unit could set a precedent for larger SB9 units elsewhere in the hillside.

Ms. Grey: Asked about the basis for the lot area adjustment and whether all other development standards (lot coverage) are met. Confirmed that the project is well below the maximum lot coverage of approximately 4,973 sq. ft. (project uses approximately 2,705 sq. ft. RFA) and complies with all setbacks per SB9.

Ms. Templeton: Asked whether the road width relief is triggered specifically by the SB9 unit (confirmed by applicant: without the SB9, the addition alone is under 500 sq. ft. and exempt from BHO). She also raised fire safety questions about the 4-foot passage on the side for firefighter access. Applicant noted that the private street and the large site provide ample fire access, and that the 4-foot setbacks are primarily relevant to one corner of the addition, not the full perimeter.

Ms. Savage: Asked about lot coverage definition and whether hardscape counts (confirmed: only structures over 6 feet above natural grade count, per LAMC §12.21C10). She also asked about the average slope. Applicant noted the site is mostly flat due to prior construction.

Mindy Rothstein Mann (public attendee): Asked about SB9 applicability in fire hazard severity zones, specifically whether SB9 had been precluded post-Palisades fires. Applicant clarified: SB9 was precluded from the Palisades fire rebuild zone by executive order, and SB9 and SB79 are different statutes (SB79 is broader and more aggressive). The 4-foot setback for SB9 is the minimum required per fire code (minimum 3 feet) and is the same as an ADU would receive.

Ms. Templeton: Raised the question of whether the SB9 unit could be split off and sold separately. Applicant noted that while SB9 permits an urban lot split, the 60/40 split requirement would not apply practically to this size lot, and the client's intention is simply to expand their home and add a guest house.

Co-Chair Kemp: Confirmed the SB9 unit is about 436 sq. ft. (similar in size to a small studio apartment, under one bedroom). Asked whether Seabright Drive lower is also under 20 feet (confirmed: it also has pinch points). Asked about the fire turnaround and the relationship of the SB9 structure to the hillside (partially recessed; one-story from above grade on the Seabright side).

Ms. Weisberg: Confirmed with the applicant that there is no intention to further split or convert any unit into a duplex.

Public Comment

No members of the public raised their hand to speak on this item.

Board Discussion and Motion

Ms. Greenberg moved to take no exception to the project. Mr. Schlesinger seconded.

In deliberation, Ms. Templeton expressed concern about adding a second residence on a 16-foot-wide street and the precedent being set under SB9. Ms. Miner echoed concerns about precedent, noting that once an SB9 is approved in the hillside, future owners or neighbors may pursue larger SB9 units. The applicant's representative responded that in his experience, SB9 in hillside settings is almost universally used as a guest house, and that this project is modest and merits being treated differently than speculative development. Co-Chair Kemp noted that the SB9 unit is 436 sq. ft., smaller than most studio apartments, and offered that observation to the committee.

Motion: Ms. Greenberg moved to recommend that the full Board TAKE NO EXCEPTION to Case No. ZA-2024-7305-ADJ-CU1-HCA as presented.

Second: Mr. Schlesinger

Roll Call Vote:

Ms. Weisberg – Ineligible
Ms. Greenberg – Yes
Ms. Miner – Yes
Ms. Levinson – Yes
Ms. Savage – No
Mr. Schlesinger – Yes
Ms. Templeton – No
Ms. Grey – Yes
Mr. Weinberg – Yes
Mr. Kemp – Yes
Dr. Longcore (ex officio) – Abstain

Result: Motion carried, 7-2-1 (7 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstention, 1 ineligible).

---

6. 3132 N DEEP CANYON DRIVE

Case No.: DIR-2025-4352-SPPC-DRB-MSP / ENV-2025-4353-CE

Case Filed: August 8, 2025 | Assigned: March 4, 2026 | Staff Assigned: Jude Hernandez

Applicant: Arsen Tekeian | Representative: George Avetisyan [Avetect LLC]

Project Description

The project is located at 3132 N. Deep Canyon Drive, just below Mulholland Drive, in the Deep Canyon area. The property is part of a community with deep CC&Rs and a homeowners association. A rear portion of the property was purchased from the adjacent estate property at 13850 Mulholland Drive at a later date and is included in the subject parcel.

The proposed project includes: (1) a 499 sq. ft. interior addition to the existing two-story single-family dwelling with an attached three-car basement garage (the addition is below the 500 sq. ft. BHO threshold); (2) a 434 sq. ft. open balcony extension on the second floor; (3) removal of the existing in-ground pool and replacement with a new pool and spa in the rear of the property, along with pool equipment; (4) a 296 sq. ft. gazebo in the rear; (5) an attached 550 sq. ft. trellis (where the old pool was); and (6) extension of existing retaining walls by approximately 273 linear feet at the

front and rear of the property (not exceeding 10 feet in height), to create a usable flat pad in the rear and to allow for a vehicle pull-up and turnaround area in front. No trees protected under the LAMC are proposed for removal. A 28-inch tree in the front and a few smaller trees will be removed, but none are classified as protected. The applicant confirmed existing trees on the frontage are not protected.

Entitlement Requested

The sole discretionary entitlement requested is Mulholland Design Review (SPPC/DRB/MSP). The applicant is not requesting any other variance or discretionary approval. The applicant mentioned the possibility of considering an SB9 unit in the future after seeing the prior presentation, but this was not part of the current application.

Applicant's Presentation

George Avetisyan presented a PowerPoint with site plans, elevations, 3D renderings (shared with some technical difficulty), and landscape plans. Key points:

Additions: The 499 sq. ft. addition encloses an area already supported by three walls, adding a new fourth wall to create a den. A balcony is added on the second floor above.

Pool relocation: The existing pool is being removed and filled in; a trellis is being placed over the former pool area. The new pool will be placed further back on the property, in a newly created flat pad.

Retaining walls: The front retaining wall extension is intended to create a turnaround/pull-forward area near the kitchen entrance, addressing safety concerns related to backing out onto the steep and fast-moving Deep Canyon Drive. The rear extension creates a usable outdoor area. Neither wall exceeds 10 feet.

HOA status: The applicant confirmed that conversations with the HOA are ongoing and that the HOA has been generally supportive so far. The most-impacted neighbor to the east has also been supportive.

Landscape: The landscape plan incorporates deer grass and other plants as required for the Mulholland Corridor wall coverage requirements.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Ms. Miner: Noted that Deep Canyon has multiple HOAs with strict CC&Rs and asked whether the HOA had formally reviewed the project. The applicant confirmed discussions are ongoing. Ms. Miner stated she would want to know the HOA's position before voting.

Ms. Levinson: Asked about a structure visible in the aerial plans that appeared to be a drainage basin; the applicant identified it as a concrete swale.

Ms. Templeton: Asked about the trellis materials (confirmed: 4x members to comply with fire code). She also raised a concern that deer grass in the landscape plan may be highly flammable and noted that under Los Angeles Fire Code, all new plantings should be less flammable than the average native plant in the area. The applicant agreed to review and, if needed, substitute more fire-resistant plants, noting that Mulholland Design Review would catch the issue if it does not comply. The relevant fire code section was later identified as LAFC §4906.4 (and subsections thereof).

Ms. Greenberg: Asked whether the property owners at 13850 Mulholland and the 3132 Deep Canyon property are related; confirmed they are not.

Ms. Grey: Agreed with Ms. Miner that the HOA's formal position should be known before a vote.

Public Comment

No members of the public raised their hand to speak on this item.

Board Discussion and Procedural Motions

Co-Chair Kemp noted that the outstanding issue identified by most committee members was the HOA's formal position and suggested a motion to continue pending that information. Ms. Greenberg moved to continue the item pending HOA feedback. Ms. Miner seconded.

Ms. Templeton proposed substituting a different motion: to approve the project (take no exception) subject to two conditions: (1) the HOA having no objection to the project as presented; and (2) all new plantings conforming with Los Angeles Fire Code §4906.4 and subsections thereof (fire-resistant planting requirements). She stated this would avoid requiring another full presentation if the HOA approves.

Dr. Longcore clarified the procedural mechanism: Patricia's motion would substitute for Robin's motion, requiring a majority vote first to accept the substitution, and then a separate vote on the substance of the new motion. The committee followed this procedure.

Vote to substitute Patricia's motion for Robin's original motion to continue:

Ms. Weisberg – Ineligible
Ms. Greenberg – Yes
Ms. Miner – No
Ms. Levinson – Abstain
Ms. Savage – Recusal (project reviewed by Mulholland Corridor)
Mr. Schlesinger – Yes
Ms. Templeton – Yes
Ms. Grey – Yes
Mr. Weinberg – Yes
Mr. Kemp – Yes
Dr. Longcore (ex officio) – Abstain

Result: Motion to substitute carried, 6-1-2 (6 yes, 1 no, 2 abstentions, 1 recusal, 1 ineligible). Patricia's substitute motion was placed on the floor.

Vote on substitute motion (approve subject to conditions):

Motion: Ms. Templeton moved to recommend that the full Board APPROVE Case No. DIR-2025-4352-SPPC-DRB-MSP, subject to: (1) the Deep Canyon area HOA having no objection to the project as presented; and (2) all new plantings conforming to Los Angeles Fire Code §4906.4 and its subsections.

Second: On record per the substitution process.

Roll Call Vote:

Ms. Weisberg – Ineligible (recused)
Ms. Greenberg – Yes
Ms. Miner – Abstain
Ms. Levinson – Abstain
Ms. Savage – Recusal
Mr. Schlesinger – Yes
Ms. Templeton – Yes

Ms. Grey – Yes
Mr. Weinberg – Yes
Mr. Kemp – Yes
Dr. Longcore (ex officio) – Abstain

Result: Motion carried, 6-0-3 (6 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstentions, 1 recusal, 1 ineligible).

Dr. Longcore noted that he will agendize this at the full BABCNC Board meeting once the applicant confirms the outcome of HOA engagement.

---

7. 8637 WEST HILLSIDE AVENUE

Case No.: ZA-2025-1640-CU1-HCA / ENV-2025-1641-EAF

Case Filed: March 19, 2025 | Assigned: April 23, 2025 | Staff Assigned: Andres Gutierrez

Applicant: Ka Leung Chan [Veridian Development, LLC] | Representative: Jimmy Toetz [Crest Real Estate]

8. 8643-8645 WEST HILLSIDE AVENUE

Case No.: ZA-2025-1646-CU1-HCA

Case Filed: March 19, 2025 | Assigned: April 23, 2025 | Staff Assigned: Andres Gutierrez

Applicant: Ka Leung Chan [Dudleya Development LLC] | Representative: Jimmy Toetz [Crest Real Estate]

9. 8649 WEST HILLSIDE AVENUE

Case No.: ZA-2025-1653-CU1-HCA

Case Filed: March 12, 2025 | Assigned: April 23, 2025 | Staff Assigned: Andres Gutierrez

Applicant: Ka Leung Chan [Peripheral Properties LLC] | Representative: Jimmy Toetz [Crest Real Estate]

Note: Per the agenda, Items 7, 8, and 9 were reviewed together, as the projects are on three contiguous lots, all owned by the same applicant (through separate LLCs), with the same representative. A ZA hearing has not yet been scheduled for these projects; they are expected to receive a hearing date within a few months.

Project Descriptions

The three projects involve the construction of three new single-family dwellings on three currently vacant, adjacent lots on West Hillside Avenue, a substandard Hillside Limited street in the R1-1HCR zone. Each lot is just over 5,000 square feet and is characterized by very steep slopes (primarily the steeper slope band per hillside ordinance slope band analysis). The proposed designs are substantially similar but not identical:

8637 West Hillside Avenue: New 3-story SFD (1,273 sq. ft., at maximum allowable RFA of 1,274 sq. ft.) over a basement garage, with occupiable rooftop deck, and attached 380 sq. ft.

ADU. Grading: 830 CY; export: 747 CY. 8 on-site trees to be removed (none protected); 2 street trees retained.

8643-8645 West Hillside Avenue: New 3-story SFD (1,148 sq. ft., below maximum allowable 1,219 sq. ft.) over a basement garage, with rooftop deck, and attached 500 sq. ft. ADU. Grading: 870 CY; export: 730 CY. 6 on-site trees to be removed; 3 street trees retained.

8649 West Hillside Avenue: New 3-story SFD (1,146 sq. ft., below maximum allowable 1,365 sq. ft.) over a basement garage, with rooftop deck, and attached 500 sq. ft. ADU. Grading: 995 CY (total grading, not export); export: 747 CY. 1 on-site tree retained; removal of right-of-way trees required at driveway location.

Each dwelling is stacked vertically: basement garage → attached ADU → SFD (floors 2 and 3) → rooftop deck. Access is by elevator and/or stairway. The designs are set as far into the hillside as possible to minimize visual impact and reduce grading. The three projects have a combined export of approximately 2,224 cubic yards.

Each project will widen Hillside Avenue to 20 feet along its own frontage. However, there are at least 5 identified pinch points on the haul route (on Franklin Avenue and Kings Road) caused by existing structures in or adjacent to the right-of-way that cannot be remedied by these applicants.

Entitlements Requested

(1) Class 1 Conditional Use Permit (all three): to deviate from the 20-foot Continuous Paved Roadway requirement;

(2) Haul route permit (all three, combined): combined export exceeds the 1,000 CY threshold for R1 zone; on a Hillside Limited street, the per-site maximum is 75% of 1,000 = 750 CY. Each site is at or under 750 CY for export;

(3) ZAD for third retaining wall (8649 only): due to site geometry and slope stability requirements, 8649 requires a third retaining wall, which exceeds the two-wall allowable per the hillside ordinance.

Applicant's Presentation

Jimmy Toetz (Crest Real Estate) presented a PowerPoint with vicinity maps, slope band analyses, photographs, site plans, cross-sections, elevations, and precedent cases. Tony Russo supplemented with construction and outreach information. Key points:

Design rationale: The steep slope band analysis severely limits buildable area. The designs maximize allowed RFA while minimizing grading and staying within hillside ordinance limits. The garage-basement → ADU → SFD stacking is the only viable configuration given the slope.

Road context: Hillside Avenue is a narrow street. The applicant identified at least 5 pinch points along the haul route that cannot be remediated by these projects. The applicant is widening to 20 feet along its own frontage.

No protected trees: None of the three lots contain protected trees or shrubs per LAMC. Some on-site trees and right-of-way trees at 8649 will be removed; the applicant is retaining all that can be retained.

DSPNA construction monitoring agreement: The applicant is working with the Doheny Sunset Plaza Neighborhood Association (DSPNA) on a construction monitoring agreement. The agreement is in progress; most terms have been agreed to but some client-specific issues remain. The agreement covers construction monitoring, noise mitigation, street cleaning, and similar protections.

Haul route: The haul route is proposed via Kings Road to Hollywood Boulevard, because that intersection is metered, making it the preferred exit from the hillside streets.

Precedents: Several precedent ZAD cases were cited along Franklin Avenue and nearby, including a case at 8441 W. Franklin Avenue that was approved (and later appealed and conditions amended to allow 4 retaining walls, more than the 3 sought here).

Committee Questions and Discussion

Ms. Templeton: Asked whether state law prohibits new construction on substandard hillside streets on previously vacant lots. The applicant's representative stated he is not aware of any recent change in the city's processing of such cases, and that a "taking" argument would arise if projects already-approved under existing law were blocked retroactively. Ms. Templeton also confirmed that because all three lots are under common ownership (through separate LLCs), the cubic yardages should be cumulated, which is why a haul route is required.

Ms. Savage: Raised numerous detailed concerns: (1) the B permit (Bureau of Engineering street widening permit) has not yet been submitted; sections shown did not include right-of-way work; (2) whether shoring is included in the cubic yardage calculations (the applicant clarified total grading vs. export figures); (3) the apparent height of the structures as measured from lowest grade to highest parapet, which she estimated at approximately 73 feet based on visual review—this is a concern under certain LADBS inspection interpretations; (4) confirmation of retaining wall counts for each project; (5) construction staging and parking for simultaneous construction on all three sites plus an additional project on Franklin Avenue; (6) status of DSPNA agreement; (7) parking for ADU occupants.

Applicant response on height: The applicant's representative stated that height in the hillside ordinance is measured by the envelope height (not from lowest adjacent grade to highest parapet), unless a ZAD is specifically requested for a height deviation. The project complies with the hillside envelope. Ms. Savage disagreed, citing LADBS inspector interpretations she had personally encountered, and asked for documentation.

Ms. Levinson: Raised concerns about construction impacts on neighboring properties opposite the narrow street, including soil and dirt impacts, and asked about contractor liability insurance (confirmed: contractor will carry liability insurance; provisions in the DSPNA agreement include house washing for neighbors).

Ms. Greenberg: Asked whether the applicant (owner) has prior hillside construction experience and requested a copy of the DSPNA construction monitoring agreement, stating she could not approve the project without seeing it.

Ms. Miner: Expressed broad concern about the project's impact on wildlife habitat, the apparent mass of three large structures on a steep hillside, and the practical impossibility of construction logistics on such a narrow street. She stated the neighborhood does not lend itself to this type of development.

Public Comment

One member of the public addressed the committee:

Margaret Black (Kings Road) expressed strong concern about the construction impacts on the Kings Road neighborhood. She noted that an approved project at 8441 W. Franklin Avenue has not yet started construction; if that project and these three projects proceed simultaneously, she described it as creating unmanageable safety concerns. She questioned how the haul route could work on Kings Road given the street's substandard conditions and asked how many parking spaces were provided per unit. The applicant confirmed two covered spaces per SFD and that state law ADU requirements do not mandate additional parking for the ADU. Ms. Black commented that LADBS does not adequately account for cumulative risk management on hillside streets.

Board Discussion and Motion

Following public comment, Ms. Savage moved to continue the items and requested that the applicant provide additional information on eight specific points. Ms. Miner added a request (via Ms. Grey's prompt) that a copy of the DSPNA construction monitoring agreement be provided. The amended motion to continue was as follows:

Motion: Ms. Savage moved to CONTINUE Items 7, 8, and 9 (Case Nos. ZA-2025-1640-CU1-HCA, ZA-2025-1646-CU1-HCA, and ZA-2025-1653-CU1-HCA) and directed the applicant to provide the following information prior to the next presentation:

1. Information on the B permit, including the frontage widening specifics, any vertical cuts, and the full extent of the B permit;
2. Verification of cubic yardage for each property, including shoring, and confirmation of whether additional entitlements are required for any site where grading (including shoring) may exceed the allowable threshold;
3. Verification of the height of all three structures from the lowest point at grade to the top of the roof/parapet structure;
4. Confirmation that there are no protected trees on any of the three properties (including the rear portions), and identification of where any required tree replacements for significant trees will be planted;
5. Confirmation of all retaining walls for all three projects, including any shoring-related walls;
6. Information on construction staging for all three projects if occurring simultaneously, and in consideration of the concurrent project at 8441 W. Franklin Avenue;
7. Confirmation of the status and final terms of the DSPNA construction monitoring agreement, and provision of a copy of that agreement to the committee; and
8. Clarification of parking requirements: confirmation of the number of required covered parking spaces for houses of the proposed square footage, and whether any additional parking is required for the ADU.

Second: Ms. Templeton

Roll Call Vote:

Ms. Weisberg – Ineligible
Ms. Greenberg – Yes
Ms. Miner – Yes
Ms. Levinson – Yes
Ms. Savage – Yes
Mr. Schlesinger – Yes
Ms. Templeton – Yes
Ms. Grey – Yes
Mr. Weinberg – Yes
Mr. Kemp – Yes
Dr. Longcore (ex officio) – Abstain

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

Co-Chair Kemp noted that the committee would provide the applicant with a written list of the conditions. The applicant is expected to return once the requested information is available.

GOOD OF THE ORDER AND ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Grey offered a general observation that assurances from applicants regarding how ADUs will be used (e.g., as a guest house vs. a rental) are practically unenforceable unless the restriction is attached to the property deed by covenant, and that the committee should bear that in mind when evaluating such assurances.

Dr. Longcore noted that the in-person board meeting has been scheduled for July 2026, as that was the earliest available room booking.

Mr. Kemp thanked all committee members for their patience and diligence through a busy agenda. Ms. Miner thanked him for running a well-organized meeting.

Co-Chair Kemp adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:17 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Planning and Land Use Committee is scheduled for Tuesday, May 12, 2026, at 7:00 p.m.