



**Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council  
Planning & Land Use Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, May 12, 2026 • Virtual Meeting via Zoom • 7:00 PM**

**MEETING DETAILS**

**Date:** Tuesday, May 12, 2026  
**Time:** Called to order at approximately 7:05 PM; adjourned at approximately 8:25 PM  
**Location:** Virtual Meeting via Zoom  
**Presiding Officer:** Michael Kemp, Co-Chair (in the absence of Jamie Hall, who arrived late)  
**Minutes Recorded By:** Cathy Palmer

**ATTENDANCE**

Member	Role	Attendance
Jamie Hall	Co-Chair	Present (arrived late)
Michael Kemp	Co-Chair	Present
Leslie Weisberg	Vice-Chair	Absent (excused)
Stephanie Savage	Member	Absent
Robin Greenberg	Member	Present
Robert Schlesinger	Member	Present
Nickie Miner	Member	Present
Patricia Templeton	Member	Present
Maureen Levinson	Member	Present
Stella Grey	Member	Present
Jason Spradlin	Member	Present
Steven Weinberg	Member	Absent
Travis Longcore, Ph.D.	Ex Officio	Present

A quorum of 6 members was required. Seven (7) voting committee members were present at the time the meeting was called to order (excluding ex officio member Travis Longcore, Ph.D.).

## **CALL TO ORDER, FLAG SALUTE & ROLL CALL**

---

Co-Chair Michael Kemp called the meeting to order at approximately 7:05 PM. He noted that the meeting is that of the Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council Planning and Land Use Committee and that the public is invited to attend and participate. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by the members present.

Roll call was conducted. Present at the time of call to order: Michael Kemp (Co-Chair), Robin Greenberg, Nickie Miner, Maureen Levinson, Jason Spradlin, Robert Schlesinger, Patricia Templeton, and Stella Grey. Jamie Hall (Co-Chair) arrived later in the meeting. Leslie Weisberg (Vice-Chair), Stephanie Savage, and Steven Weinberg were absent. Travis Longcore, Ph.D. was present as ex officio member.

## **ITEM 1 – APPROVAL OF THE MAY 12, 2026 AGENDA**

---

Co-Chair Kemp called for a motion to approve the May 12, 2026 agenda. Nickie Miner moved to approve; Maureen Levinson seconded. No discussion. Co-Chair Kemp noted that, per Travis Longcore’s advice, roll call votes are required for final actions, but the agenda approval was accepted by consent as presented, with no objections.

**Result: Agenda approved by consent.**

## **ITEM 2 – APPROVAL OF MINUTES: APRIL 14, 2026**

---

Co-Chair Kemp reported that the April 14, 2026 meeting minutes are still being finalized. The committee agreed to continue this item to the June 9, 2026 meeting for review and approval.

**Result: Continued to the June 9, 2026 meeting.**

## **ITEM 3 – GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

---

Co-Chair Kemp opened the floor for general public comment on topics within the committee’s jurisdiction but not on the adopted agenda. Public comment is limited to one (1) minute per speaker.

Anthony Adzhyan, the applicant’s representative for Item 5, was present as an attendee. He indicated he would wait to speak during the project presentation.

Stella Grey commented that she noticed the new format of the meeting minutes looks much cleaner and easier to read and expressed appreciation. Co-Chair Kemp acknowledged that the format was a joint effort between Travis Longcore and Cathy Palmer.

No other public comments were received.

## **ITEM 4 – CHAIR REPORTS**

---

### **Michael Kemp, Co-Chair**

Co-Chair Kemp reported that he attended a meeting that morning with the Chancellor of UCLA alongside other homeowner groups and a representative of the Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council (BABCNC). He expressed being encouraged by the Chancellor’s emphasis on community engagement, noting that the campus Public Safety Department has been renamed to “Campus and Community Safety.”

### **Jamie Hall, Co-Chair**

Co-Chair Hall arrived later in the meeting and provided updates during the Good of the Order section (see below).

### **Leslie Weisberg, Vice-Chair**

Absent.

## **ITEM 5 – 1690 SUMMITRIDGE DRIVE – AA-2026-495-PM-HCA / ENV-2026-496-EAF**

---

### **Case Information**

**Address:** 1690 Summitridge Drive

**Case Number:** AA-2026-495-PM-HCA / ENV-2026-496-EAF

**Case Filed:** February 3, 2026

**Assigned:** March 4, 2026

**City Staff Assigned:** Ariel Jones

**Applicant:** Esmaeil Soumeeh

**Representative:** Anthony Adzhyan (civil engineer; first-time attendee at a neighborhood council meeting)

**Project Description:** Parcel map to subdivide an RE40 lot into 2 lots within the Bel-Air Crest Community Plan Area and High Fire Severity Zone. No new construction proposed.

### **Presentation**

Representative Anthony Adzhyan was promoted to panelist status and shared his screen to present the parcel map and vicinity materials.

Mr. Adzhyan described the project as a straightforward lot split of an existing RE40 lot into two parcels (Parcel A and Parcel B), with no construction proposed at this time. He stated that the applicant's previous permit attempts from approximately 2018 to build on the property were canceled, and the owners have since started fresh. The only current objective is the subdivision.

The lot is located on Summitridge Drive, accessed via Floral Way / Greenbridge Drive, with two alternative routes. The site is downsloped, somewhat steep, with no protected trees identified per a tree specialist report. Two dedicated easement areas are present on the right side and bottom of the property.

### **Committee Discussion**

The committee raised the following questions and concerns:

- Robert Schlesinger: Sought clarification on the boundary lines and easements shown on the parcel map. The representative clarified that the double white lines represent easements dedicated to the city, and the lot boundary extends beyond them.
- Nickie Miner: Asked about the location and access to the property via Summit Ridge Drive. The representative confirmed access from Floral Way/Greenbridge Drive and Summit Ridge Drive as two alternatives. Ms. Miner also raised concern about the future haul/construction route, noting the road is steep, narrow, and winding. The representative stated no haul route currently exists as no construction is proposed but noted that pile digging (if any) would generate only 2–3 truckloads of dirt.
- Jamie Hall: Clarified terminology, noting that Ms. Miner's question about a "haul route" was more accurately a question about a future construction vehicle access route. Hall noted this may be a "buy-right" project if it meets all applicable standards, meaning the committee may have no future discretionary review opportunity.
- Patricia Templeton: Asked about the dimensions and slope of the parcels. The representative confirmed each parcel would be approximately half of the total lot. The frontages are approximately 122 feet (Parcel A) and 203 feet (Parcel B). Average slope was stated at approximately 0.8 (steep but walkable on the upper portion). Templeton also noted that some materials referenced future development and questioned the reason for the lot split; the representative could not provide the owners' specific rationale.
- Stella Grey: Identified inconsistencies in the submitted findings (e.g., Finding 7 referenced a "proposed building" despite no construction being proposed). She directed the representative to

revise findings to explain — not merely state — compliance. She also raised a concern about how easement-related findings could be supported without construction plans in hand. The representative acknowledged this and agreed to revise the findings.

- Maureen Levinson: Expressed concern about the density implications of two potential future construction sites on a single former lot.
- Stella Grey and Robert Schlesinger: Raised the question of whether conditions of approval could be attached, such as requiring a single contractor or specifying a construction route. Jamie Hall advised that conditions could be requested but would not be legally binding if the parcel were sold. He further emphasized that once the lot is split, if the future project is fully by-right (e.g., BHO-compliant, no export exceeding 1,000 cubic yards), the neighborhood council may have no further discretionary review opportunity.
- Stella Grey: Referenced an older building permit (closed) for a 5-story single-family residence. Michael Kemp and Jamie Hall noted that 5-story structures cascading down a hillside can comply with height limits if each section stays within the envelope.
- Jamie Hall: Cited the new Process and Procedures Ordinance (Chapter 1A of the Zoning Code), which prohibits piecemealing of projects. If a new construction application were filed shortly after this subdivision, and it became apparent the projects were related, this could constitute a violation of the Municipal Code. Hall noted he was not suggesting any wrongdoing but wanted the representative to be aware.
- Anthony Adzhyan: Confirmed he has been told by the city planner that any future construction would require additional review and would likely come before the neighborhood council again. He stated that he is only tasked with the subdivision, and that the owners stated they have no current plans.

### **Fire Safety Regulations – Clarification by Jamie Hall**

Prior to the motion, Jamie Hall shared his research on the California State Minimum Fire Safe Regulations. He noted that the regulations specifically carve out lot line adjustments from their scope. However, they do apply to building permits for new construction not relating to an existing structure, and to new parcels created. Hall indicated that if future development occurs, access standards (including the 20-foot continuous paved roadway requirement) would be evaluated at that time.

Travis Longcore, Ph.D. asked whether there are any pinch points on Summitridge less than 20 feet wide. The representative stated there are none.

### **Motion**

Stella Grey moved to recommend approval of the project with the following conditions:

- The applicant’s findings be revised and cleaned up prior to presentation to the full BABCNC Board, to provide substantive explanations rather than mere statements of compliance; and
- The applicant agrees to present to the Neighborhood Council at such time as the property owners decide to develop the parcels.

Jamie Hall offered a friendly amendment incorporating the second condition above, which Stella Grey accepted. Jason Spradlin seconded.

### **Roll Call Vote**

Member	Vote
Michael Kemp	Yes

Jamie Hall	Yes
Robin Greenberg	Yes
Robert Schlesinger	Yes
Patricia Templeton	Yes
Maureen Levinson	Yes
Stella Grey	Yes
Jason Spradlin	Yes
Nickie Miner	Abstain
Travis Longcore, Ph.D.	Abstain (ex officio)

**Result: Motion carries (8 Yes, 1 Abstain, 1 Abstain ex officio). The committee recommends approval of Case AA-2026-495-PM-HCA with the stated conditions. The matter will be forwarded to the full BABCNC Board at its meeting scheduled for the last Wednesday of May 2026.**

## **ITEM 6 – DISCUSSION ON AB130 – EDUCATIONAL PRESENTATION**

---

Co-Chair Hall led an educational presentation on Assembly Bill 130 (AB130), the CEQA streamlining legislation signed by Governor Newsom as part of the 2025 state budget trailer bill process. The presentation covered the background, provisions, and practical implications of the new law for the committee’s work.

### **Background on CEQA**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was adopted in 1970 and requires all state and local public agencies to identify, disclose, and mitigate potentially significant environmental effects of projects. The committee primarily encounters categorical exemptions in its work, particularly Class 3 and Class 32 exemptions. Mitigated Negative Declarations (MNDs) have become exceedingly rare; Hall noted that only 5 MNDs have been issued citywide in the City of Los Angeles in 2026.

### **AB130 Overview**

AB130 became effective June 30, 2025, and represents one of the most significant CEQA reforms in recent history. Key points discussed:

- AB130 creates a new statutory exemption for housing development projects, different from a categorical exemption in that it has no exceptions — if a project is eligible, it is exempt, period.
- The law largely codifies and expands the existing Class 32 categorical exemption.
- AB130 applies exclusively to housing development — not commercial or other uses.
- A companion bill, SB131, also passed but was noted as less directly relevant to BABCNC’s jurisdiction.

### **Key Eligibility Criteria for AB130**

To qualify for the AB130 statutory exemption, a project must meet all of the following:

- Site size: Up to 20 acres (expanded from the Class 32 limit of 5 acres).
- Location in an urban area: Defined broadly to include all incorporated municipalities, including areas within the Santa Monica Mountains, which Hall noted may not reflect common understanding of “urban.”
- Previously developed or substantially surrounded by urban uses: The site must meet at least one of four criteria — prior urban development, 75% perimeter adjacency to urban uses, 75% area within ¼ mile developed with urban uses, or 3 of 4 sides adjoining urban uses.

- Consistency with applicable General Plan and zoning ordinances. Hall cautioned that the City of Los Angeles sometimes interprets this as “consistent if the exception is granted,” a position he finds legally problematic.
- No habitat for sensitive or protected species: A biologist must sign an attestation under penalty of perjury confirming no qualifying habitat exists on the site. Hall expressed concern that the City does not independently verify these attestations.
- Compliance with environmental carve-outs (see below).

### **Environmental Carve-Outs (Sites NOT Eligible for AB130)**

The following site types are excluded from AB130 eligibility:

- Coastal zone
- Prime farmland or farmland of statewide importance
- Wetlands
- Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone — however, there is an exception to this exception for sites excluded from the hazard zone by a local agency, or sites with adopted fire hazard mitigation measures. Hall noted this creates complexity.
- Hazardous waste sites
- Earthquake fault zones
- Special flood hazard areas (some exist in Laurel Canyon)
- Regulatory floodways
- Lands identified for conservation in adopted natural community conservation plans, or other adopted natural resource protection plans. Hall noted the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy’s adopted Natural Resource Protection Plan, which the City does not recognize despite being adopted by a state agency.
- Habitat for protected species (candidate, sensitive, or species of special status, as well as fully protected and federally listed species).
- Lands under conservation easement

### **Discussion: Habitat Definition**

Robert Schlesinger raised the question of whether an animal (e.g., a mountain lion) that previously used but has since vacated a property affects the property’s habitat designation. Jamie Hall noted this is a highly contested legal and scientific question, including:

- Whether habitat means the parcel has biological features necessary to support a species, or whether it requires an observation, or regular presence.
- The law provides no definition of “habitat.”

Travis Longcore, Ph.D. noted that from a strict ecological definition, habitat encompasses any area a species needs to survive, including movement corridors. He acknowledged, however, that regulatory implementation tends to apply a more common-sense understanding (e.g., a sidewalk a mountain lion crosses would not typically meet the regulatory definition, even if ecologically it is habitat).

### **Tribal Consultation Requirement**

AB130 uniquely includes a tribal consultation requirement, which was absent from prior categorical exemptions. This is particularly relevant for virgin land in the Santa Monica Mountains. Hall noted this is an improvement over the Class 32 exemption, which had no such requirement.

### **AB130 Checklist in Zimas**

Hall demonstrated that the City of Los Angeles has added an AB130 eligibility checklist to the Zimas system (under Planning and Zoning Information). This checklist allows committee members to review the City’s preliminary eligibility determinations for projects. Hall cautioned that the checklist is for reference purposes only, and additional information may be required. He noted that at least one

checklist on file shows “yes” for “within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone,” which would ordinarily render the project ineligible — illustrating that the checklist may be incomplete or inconsistent.

### **Brief Note**

Patricia Templeton noted she had reviewed AB130 and observed that it contained additional provisions beyond those related to CEQA. For example, it could allow properties previously owned by religious institutions to be automatically rezoned for housing, with possible implications for properties such as the former AJU/Milken property in the area. Hall acknowledged this and noted that the bill included a number of provisions that may not have passed through the normal legislative process.

### **Corrective Legislation**

Hall noted that some corrective legislation is moving through the legislature to address portions of AB130 that received pushback, though he was uncertain whether it would pass.

### **Zimas Mailing Labels Feature**

Hall highlighted a new feature in the Zimas system: a Mailing Labels Report under the Reports section. This tool allows users to generate mailing labels for all properties within a specified radius (e.g., 200 feet) of a project site. Hall suggested this could be used to request that applicants send postcards to neighboring properties notifying them of an upcoming neighborhood council hearing, provided the agenda is set at least two weeks in advance. The committee expressed enthusiasm for this idea.

## **GOOD OF THE ORDER**

---

### **Purple Line Extension / D Line Opening**

Co-Chair Hall announced that the Purple Line Extension (D Line) opened last Friday (May 8, 2026). The La Cienega/Wilshire station is approximately one and a half blocks from his office. Hall took the line to City Hall earlier that day, reporting the trip took approximately 25 minutes door to door. He encouraged committee members to ride the new segment and noted that the stations are currently in excellent condition.

Cathy Palmer added that the four (sic) [three] new stations are hosting community events for the next couple of weeks, including food, meditation, yoga, and music. She encouraged members to check online for details.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

---

Co-Chair Kemp adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:25 PM.

**Next Meeting: Tuesday, June 9, 2026, at 7:00 PM (Virtual)**

[www.babcnc.org](http://www.babcnc.org)

[info@babcnc.org](mailto:info@babcnc.org)