

Attachment "A"**Draft Minutes**

**Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
Planning & Land Use Committee
Virtual Meeting — Tuesday, August 11, 2026, 7:00 PM**

In conformity with the January 1, 2026 enactment of California Senate Bill 707 (Durazo) and Los Angeles City Council File 23-1114, this meeting of the Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council Planning & Land Use Committee was conducted virtually via Zoom, in compliance with the Ralph M. Brown Act (Cal. Gov. Code § 54950 et seq.) and applicable City of Los Angeles Neighborhood Council governance requirements.

Call to Order, Flag Salute & Roll Call

Co-Chair Jamie Hall called the meeting to order and conducted a roll call of committee members.

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
Travis Longcore, Ph.D.	X		Steven Weinberg	X	
Maureen Levinson	X		Stella Grey (Excused)		X
			Ellen Evams <i>ex officio</i> (Excused)		X

Quorum: A quorum was present (10 of 12 voting committee members present). Also in attendance: Board Member Mindy Rothstein Mann and Committee Secretary Cathy Palmer (minutes).

Item 1: Approval of the August 11, 2026 Agenda

Co-Chair Hall asked whether members had reviewed the agenda and called for a motion to approve.

MOTION

Motion to approve the August 11, 2026 agenda as presented.

Moved by: Maureen Levinson **Seconded by:** Michael Kemp

Vote: Ayes 10 – Noes 0 – Abstain 0

Result: Carried (10-0-0)

Item 2: Approval of Minutes — June 9, 2026

The June 9, 2026 Planning & Land Use Committee minutes, previously circulated by Committee Secretary Cathy Palmer, were presented for approval. (No committee meeting was held in July 2026.)

MOTION

Motion to approve the June 9, 2026 Planning & Land Use Committee minutes as circulated.

Moved by: Michael Kemp **Seconded by:** Maureen Levinson

Vote: Ayes 10 – Noes 0 – Abstain 0

Result: Carried (10-0-0)

Item 3: General Public Comment

Co-Chair Hall opened the floor for general public comment on matters within the Committee's jurisdiction but not on the agenda. No members of the public requested to speak, and the item was closed.

Item 4: Chair Reports

Co-Chair Jamie Hall

Co-Chair Hall reported that the City of Los Angeles is required by state law to adopt a Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) Ordinance consolidating state fire-safety regulations, and that the City was statutorily obligated to adopt the ordinance by January 1, 2026 but has not yet done so. A draft has been circulated to the City's Public Safety Committee. Because the ordinance incorporates the state minimum fire safe regulations previously discussed by the Committee and directly affects the BABCNC area — which lies within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone — Co-Chair Hall recommended the item be agendaized for a future Committee meeting so the Committee can weigh in before the City Council acts, noting the timeline may require expedited scheduling.

Co-Chair Michael Kemp

Co-Chair Kemp noted that the Mar Vista Neighborhood Council is hosting a public event on Saturday, August 29, 2026, from 6:00–8:00 p.m., at which City Planning staff will discuss recent land-use ordinances such as SB 9. He suggested the Committee consider posting notice of the event on the BABCNC website, without endorsing its content. Co-Chair Hall noted a related proposed "Missing Middle" ordinance that will also affect the neighborhood council area, and suggested both matters be considered at a future agenda-setting meeting.

Vice-Chair Leslie Weisberg

Vice-Chair Weisberg had nothing further to report.

Item 5: 2980 N. Hutton Drive — VTT-84974 / ENV-2025-6474-MND

Case Filed: 11/20/2025 | Assigned: 08/05/2026 | Staff Assigned: Maren Gamboa

Applicant/Representative: Donald Okada; Regina Minor [ARC Land Use & Entitlements, Inc.]

Requested Entitlement: N/A (Vesting Tentative Tract Map)

Applicant's Representative Present: Donald Okada

Project Description

A six-lot single-family subdivision on an approximately 12-acre parcel, with development concentrated on roughly 7 acres in the center of the site and one lot to be dedicated to the City of Los Angeles as a nature preserve. The application proposes only subdivision infrastructure (a private roadway and grading) at this stage; no residential construction is proposed, with lots to be sold individually following completion of infrastructure.

Applicant Presentation

- Mr. Okada described the project as centralized within the parcel to preserve setbacks from neighboring properties, with the open-space lot located in the parcel's southeast corner and additional open space along the perimeter.
- Access is via a new private roadway off Hutton Drive, approximately 24–25 feet wide, with grades ranging from roughly 7% to a maximum of 20%; two fire truck turnarounds are proposed (near Lots 1 and 5).
- Grading quantities were identified as approximately 78,843 cubic yards of cut, 65,263 cubic yards of fill, and 11,826 cubic yards of compaction; Mr. Okada stated no soil would be exported from the site.
- Slope stabilization is required to bring the site's slope stability factor from 1.0 up to the current state-mandated 1.5, necessitating significant grading and the removal of approximately 90 trees, which the applicant stated would be replanted after road construction and prior to sale of the lots.
- Maximum home sizes (floor area) by lot were represented to range from approximately 8,000 to 13,000 square feet, per the project's lot matrix.
- On-site water tanks connected to the municipal water supply were proposed for irrigation and fire-suppression purposes.
- Mr. Okada confirmed the roadway design has been reviewed by LAFD, including fire truck turnarounds, and stated the applicant has worked with neighboring property owners, including Kevin Tana, regarding drainage and slope-stability concerns.

Committee Discussion

- Co-Chair Hall and Co-Chair Kemp questioned the applicant regarding retaining wall heights shown on the plans (ranging up to approximately 16 feet), noting the City's 12-foot maximum retaining wall height and asking whether any exception (e.g., for walls attached to a structure or stabilizing a hillside) applied; the applicant could not confirm.
- Co-Chair Hall and Committee Member Stephanie Savage advised that a roadway grade exceeding 20% may trigger the requirement for a zone variance, and separately that the State Minimum Fire Safe Regulations (effective July 1, 2021) impose independent, superseding roadway standards within Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones that may require CAL FIRE approval and supplemental design measures if exceeded; the applicant stated the project's expediter had advised a variance was not required but could not explain why.
- Co-Chair Hall noted that the project's Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) does not yet appear on the City's website and asked the applicant to clarify the status of the CEQA environmental clearance document.
- Committee Member Travis Longcore, Ph.D. — noting his role as the Committee's liaison to the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy — stated that as a Vesting Tentative Tract Map governed by the Subdivision Map Act (Gov. Code § 66474), the advisory agency must deny approval if the project would cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife habitat. Using the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy's Eastern Santa Monica Mountains Habitat Linkage Planning Map, Dr. Longcore identified the parcel as falling within mapped Habitat Block 75 and identified a mapped California Walnut Woodland Alliance (*Juglans californica*), a state-recognized sensitive natural community, on the property in addition to oak woodland. He stated that impacts to a sensitive natural community are presumptively significant under CEQA, that tree replanting does not mitigate this type of impact, and that appropriate mitigation would require either avoidance or a 4:1 restoration/protection ratio. He further stated that, in his capacity as liaison, the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy's position is that it would not support subdivision of the property unless at least 80% of the site is protected, and recommended the Committee not act until it has reviewed the applicant's environmental documentation and the applicant has consulted with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Conservancy.
- Mr. Okada responded that the applicant's biologist found no endangered species residing on the site and that impacts would be minimized through replanting; he stated recently established vegetation in the area post-dated a multi-year drought.

- Committee Member Michael Kemp requested corrections to the application (which listed seven lots in one section, though findings describe six) and requested that retaining wall heights be clearly labeled on the cross-section plans.
- Committee Member Stephanie Savage stated she found no B-permit application associated with the property on Navigate LA, and requested the B-permit number, information on required fire hydrants along the roadway, the proposed haul route and construction management plan, the names of City Planning, Grading, and LAFD staff the applicant has coordinated with, and clarification of how the applicant intends to comply with LAMC provisions governing grading and hauling for commonly-owned sites, given the scale of cut and fill proposed on 2:1 slopes.
- Committee Member Nickie Miner raised concerns regarding the necessity and community impact of the new roadway and its proximity to the adjacent Safady property and requested that potential community impacts of the roadway be further scrutinized.
- Vice-Chair Weisberg confirmed with the applicant that he does not personally reside on, or plan to build a residence on, the property.

Public Comment

Board Member Mindy Rothstein Mann, a nearby resident, spoke in opposition. She stated the lower portion of the property was denuded several years ago when a temporary access road was cut into the hillside and expressed concern regarding the proposed removal of native oak and walnut trees, the loss of one of the few remaining large undeveloped open-space tracts in Benedict Canyon, and the presence of regularly observed wildlife including deer, mountain lions, hawks, and owls. She also noted active springs in the area and expressed concern about the volume of grading and potential need for off-site hauling. Mr. Okada responded that no protected trees had been removed to date, that any prior clearing was for brush/fire-abatement purposes performed with City allowance and arborist oversight, that no soil would be hauled off-site, and that the project is designed to reduce (not create) mudslide and erosion hazard by reducing slope grades below the property, a characterization Dr. Longcore disputed as removing a natural drainage feature.

Motion & Vote

MOTION TO CONTINUE

Motion to continue Case VTT-84974 / ENV-2025-6474-MND (2980 N. Hutton Drive) to a future PLU Committee meeting, pending receipt by the Committee of: (1) the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and all supporting environmental documentation; (2) an explanation of compliance with the State Minimum Fire Safe Regulations; (3) evidence of consultation with the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy (Paul Edelman) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife regarding habitat and sensitive natural community impacts; (4) an explanation of why a zone variance is not required for the roadway grade; (5) an explanation of why the site's retaining walls are not subject to the Hillside Retaining Wall Ordinance; (6) an explanation of how all excavated soil will be retained on-site, including B-permit status/number, required fire hydrant information, and the proposed haul route or construction management plan; (7) the names of City Planning, Grading/BOE, and LAFD staff assigned to or consulted on the project; (8) a copy of the Tree Report identifying protected status and size of trees proposed for removal; and (9) attendance of the applicant's technical consultants at the continued hearing.

Moved by: Travis Longcore, Ph.D. **Seconded by:** Stephanie Savage

Vote: Ayes 10 – Noes 0 – Abstain 0

Result: Carried (10-0-0) — Item CONTINUED to a future PLU Committee meeting

Item 6: 9988 W. Reevesbury Drive — ZA-2025-3828-CU1 / ENV-2025-3829-EAF

Continued from the June 9, 2026 PLU Committee meeting

Case Filed: 07/09/2025 | Assigned: 07/11/2025 | Staff Assigned: Esther Serrato

Applicants: Ulara and Andrew Rogers | Representative: Itzhel Iannantuono [Itzhel Designs]

Requested Entitlement: Class 1 Conditional Use Permit
Applicant's Representative Present: Iztchel Iannantuono

Project Description

Remodel of an existing home to legalize a previously unpermitted basement level, add an adjacent staircase connecting the two levels, and convert an enclosed garage to an open carport. A Class 1 Conditional Use Permit is required because the abutting street (Reevesbury Drive) is substandard (18 feet, rather than the required 20 feet); as of January 2024, this type of entitlement is processed as a CUP rather than the previously used Zoning Administrator's Determination (ZAD), though Committee Member Travis Longcore, Ph.D. confirmed with Co-Chair Hall that the underlying findings and standard of review are unchanged by the naming convention.

Applicant Update on Prior Committee Conditions

At the June 9, 2026 meeting, the Committee continued this item pending five items. Ms. Iannantuono reported as follows:

- Homeowners Association (Benedict Canyon Association) feedback: Obtained; the applicant's team met with Association representatives Garrett and Mindy.
- Proof of waiver of dedication: Not yet issued; City Planning staff (Esther Serrato) advised this will not be issued until after the entitlement hearing.
- Clarification regarding use of a CUP rather than a ZAD, and whether a hearing is required: Confirmed a hearing will be required; the change from ZAD to CUP reflects a 2024 citywide processes-and-procedures ordinance and does not change the applicable findings.
- Planning Department sign-off: Clarified that final Planning clearance is not issued until after the entitlement hearing process is complete.
- Applicant's agreement to a worker carpool requirement: Confirmed; incorporated into the project's LADOT-approved traffic report.

Committee Discussion

- Co-Chair Hall confirmed the scope of work is limited to interior remodeling and the new staircase, with the existing foundation, retaining wall, and pylons already inspected and approved by both a structural engineer and LADBS Code Enforcement (Ruben Perez).
- Co-Chair Hall noted the applicant's plans include a 5-foot front setback and voluntary conversion of the garage to an open carport to accommodate additional space given the substandard street.
- Members discussed the property's history of unpermitted work by a prior owner, a halted 2019 permit process, and outstanding City code-compliance history; Ms. Iannantuono stated Planning staff confirmed most complaints are resolved, with one 2015 case that staff indicated should already be closed and would be reviewed.

Public Comment

Board Member Mindy Rothstein Mann spoke on behalf of the Benedict Canyon Association, which discussed the project the evening before the meeting. She stated the Association has not formally approved or disapproved the project but does not object provided all outstanding City compliance issues — including orders to comply referenced by Council District 5 field deputy Kenneth Miller — are resolved through the entitlement hearing process. She offered to connect the applicant with Mr. Miller's office for assistance.

Motion & Vote (Initial)

MOTION

Motion to recommend approval of the project (ZA-2025-3828-CU1), on the condition that all work be completed to code.

Moved by: Michael Kemp **Seconded by:** Robert Schlesinger

Vote: Ayes 10 – Noes 0 – Abstain 0

Result: Carried (10-0-0)

Following the vote, Committee Member Stephanie Savage — joined by Committee Member Nickie Miner — asked that the recommendation be formally conditioned on the applicant's obtaining proof of waiver of dedication, rather than relying on a verbal assurance. Co-Chair Hall noted that, as a vote had already been taken, a motion to reconsider was required before the condition could be added.

Motion to Reconsider

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Motion to reconsider the vote on ZA-2025-3828-CU1.

Moved by: Stephanie Savage **Seconded by:** Nickie Miner

Vote: Ayes 10 – Noes 0 – Abstain 0

Result: Carried (10-0-0)

Motion & Vote (As Amended)

MOTION (AS AMENDED)

Motion to recommend approval of the project (ZA-2025-3828-CU1), on the condition that proof of waiver of dedication is obtained.

Moved by: Nickie Miner **Seconded by:** Robert Schlesinger

Vote: Ayes 10 – Noes 0 – Abstain 0

Result: Carried (10-0-0) — **Item APPROVED and recommended to the full Board, conditioned on proof of waiver of dedication being obtained**

Co-Chair Hall advised the applicant's representative that this matter will be forwarded to the full Board for consideration on an upcoming agenda.

Item 7: 10770 W. Chalon Road — ZA-2025-810-F / ENV-2025-811-CE

*Over-in-Height Fence — Continued from the August 12, 2025 and March 10, 2026 PLU Committee meetings
Case Filed: 02/07/2025 | Assigned: 02/27/2025 | Staff Assigned: Esteban Martorell
Applicant: Craig Tessler | Representatives: Benjamin Eshaghian & Tony Russo [Crest Real Estate]
Requested Entitlement: Zoning Administrator approval for a fence/wall up to 8 feet high in the required front setback (LAMC 12.24 X.7)
Applicant's Representative Present: Benjamin Eshaghian*

Project Description

Legalization of an existing 6'8" pedestrian gate and 6'8" vehicular gate flanked by a 6'8" smooth pilaster wall (maximum height, including lamps, of 8 feet), installed by a previous owner without permits; the majority of the wall and gates sit within the public right-of-way. The property has since changed ownership.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Eshaghian presented survey exhibits confirming the location of the existing wall and gates relative to the property line and public right-of-way, and — as a proposed resolution to prior Committee and Bel Air Association concerns regarding lack of vehicle queuing space — offered a "timed gate" concept under which the vehicular gate would remain open during daytime hours to eliminate queuing conflicts with the public right-of-way.

Committee Discussion

- Vice-Chair Weisberg, speaking on behalf of the Bel Air Association, stated the Association had not reviewed the new "timed gate" proposal with its representative, Jonathan Brandt, and reaffirmed the Association's position that while the over-height wall itself is not objectionable, the location of the gates within the public right-of-way remains an unresolved issue.

- Committee Member Maureen Levinson stated the primary concern is the lack of an apron or queuing area allowing a vehicle to safely wait clear of the roadway, noting the location is on a blind curve, and requested the gate be relocated with an apron added so vehicles do not block the public right-of-way. She expressed reluctance to approve a structure built without a permit.
- Co-Chair Kemp stated he would not find the proposed daytime open-gate arrangement acceptable, as it would be unenforceable.
- Committee Member Nickie Miner and Committee Member Travis Longcore, Ph.D. both raised road-safety concerns regarding the gate and fence's location within the public right-of-way on a blind curve.
- Mr. Eshaghian agreed to further discuss configuration alternatives with the Bel Air Association.

Motion & Vote

MOTION TO CONTINUE

Motion to continue Case ZA-2025-810-F (10770 W. Chalon Road) until such time as the applicant has fully discussed the project with, and reached agreement with, the Bel Air Association.

Moved by: Maureen Levinson **Seconded by:** Steven Weinberg

Vote: Ayes 10 – Noes 0 – Abstain 0

Result: Carried (10-0-0) — Item CONTINUED to a future PLU Committee meeting

Item 8: 2620 N. Benedict Canyon Drive — ZA-2026-1036-ADJ / ENV-2026-1037-EAF

Case Filed: 02/26/2026 | Assigned: 06/16/2026 | Staff Assigned: Monique Acosta

Applicant: 2620 Benedict Canyon LLC | Representative: Benjamin Eshaghian [Crest Real Estate]

Requested Entitlement: Adjustment(s) pursuant to LAMC 12.28 / 13B.5.2 for relief from: (1) 10-ft side yard setback for a detached accessory structure; (2) prohibition on detached accessory structures within 55 ft of the front property line; (3) 8-ft maximum fence/wall height in the front yard setback

Applicant's Representatives Present: Benjamin Eshaghian and Tony Russo [Crest Real Estate]

Project Description

Construction of a new 122-square-foot security guardhouse (including a closet and restroom) near the property's vehicular entrance, together with associated modification of an existing retaining wall and over-height perimeter fencing/pilasters, requiring adjustment relief from front-yard setback, 55-foot accessory-structure setback, and fence-height standards.

Applicant Presentation

- Mr. Eshaghian presented site plans, elevations, and a floor plan of the proposed guardhouse, along with photographs of the site and precedent examples of similar guardhouse approvals in the vicinity.
- Mr. Russo, joining as the applicant's land use consultant, confirmed the existing residence has had only minor alteration/repair permits and an unpulled 2024 ALQ application, and stated the current request is solely for the guardhouse and is not part of a piecemealed larger project.

Committee Discussion

- Co-Chair Hall asked whether any discretionary entitlement had previously been obtained for the main residence, to confirm the request is not an improper piecemealing of a larger project; Mr. Russo confirmed it is not.
- Committee Member Michael Kemp identified multiple discrepancies between the application, findings, and site plan: the findings and application describe encroachment into the 10-foot side yard setback, but the site plan shows no side-yard encroachment; the actual encroachment (into the 12'6" front yard setback) was not disclosed in the application narrative; and the dimension from the front property line to the guardhouse (8'-9½") was not labeled on the site plan. Mr. Kemp requested corrected plans, a revised project narrative, and corrected findings prior to the matter being heard by the full Board. Mr. Russo and Mr. Eshaghian agreed to correct the application, findings, and plans accordingly.

- Committee Member Stephanie Savage asked the applicant to confirm the location of an existing power pole shown on the elevations relative to the property line; Mr. Eshaghian and Mr. Russo confirmed the pole and overhead lines run within the public right-of-way, parallel to the property line along Benedict Canyon Drive, and do not conflict with the proposed guardhouse.
- Mr. Kemp and Mr. Russo discussed at length whether the guardhouse could be relocated approximately 3'9" to avoid the front-yard setback encroachment entirely. Mr. Russo stated several alternative locations (including further up the driveway and converting the structure to an ADU) had been studied and rejected due to grading/slope impacts, loss of sightlines for screening vehicles at the gate, and the client's preference to avoid an ADU designation. Mr. Kemp stated he supports the concept of a guardhouse at this general location, but expressed concern that alternatives to the setback encroachment were not fully explored before the adjustment was requested.
- Committee Member Nickie Miner raised road-safety concerns specific to this stretch of Benedict Canyon Drive, requesting renderings showing sightlines and cautioning that granting an off-code encroachment could set a precedent. In response, the applicant's team presented photo exhibits showing an on-site queuing space (approximately 8' x 18') and an apron of over 10 feet, and stated the guardhouse would sit behind existing mature landscaping and would not obstruct driver sightlines.
- Committee Member Steven Weinberg confirmed with the applicant that vehicles queuing at the guardhouse would remain fully on the property, per the photo exhibits and plans.

Public Comment

No members of the public requested to speak on this item.

Motion & Vote

MOTION

Motion, subject to corrected plans and findings — accurately reflecting the front-yard (not side-yard) setback encroachment and showing the guardhouse dimension from the front property line — being provided to the Committee before the matter is heard by the full Board, that the Committee recommend the Board take no exception to the proposal.

Moved by: Travis Longcore, Ph.D. **Seconded by:** Steven Weinberg

Vote: Ayes 10 – Noes 0 – Abstain 0

Result: Carried (10-0-0) — Item **APPROVED** and recommended to the full Board, subject to submission of corrected plans and findings

Good of the Order & Adjournment

Co-Chair Hall asked whether any member had additional matters for the good of the order. Several members offered closing remarks thanking Co-Chair Hall for leading the meeting. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:20 PM.

Next Regular Meeting: Tuesday, September 8, 2026, 7:00 PM