



Catherine Palmer <council@babcnc.org>

---

## Re: proposed BelAir Glen gating

---

**Travis Longcore** <tlongcore@babcnc.org>

Mon, Jan 10, 2022 at 7:36 PM

To: Arnold Barron <dadinater@aol.com>

Cc: Paul Koretz <paul.koretz@lacity.org>, Jarrett Thompson

<jarrett.thompson@lacity.org>, Robert Schlesinger <rschlesinger@babcnc.org>

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Barron,

Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council has received your comment on the Bel Air Glen gating proposal and your input will be considered as we advise the City on this proposal.

If you would like to receive BABCNC agendas and community updates, please click through the "Join our mailing list" in my signature block.

Sincerely,

Travis Longcore



**Travis Longcore, Ph.D. | President**

**Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council**

📞 (310) 247-9719    🌐 [babcnc.org](http://babcnc.org)    ✉️ [tlongcore@babcnc.org](mailto:tlongcore@babcnc.org)

[Join our mailing list](#)

On Jan 9, 2022, at 6:57 PM, Arnold Barron <[dadinater@aol.com](mailto:dadinater@aol.com)> wrote:

We are homeowners in the BelAirRidge Association. We strongly oppose the gating of the BelAirGlen Association. We

believe it will be harmful to Beverly Glen traffic and to the homeowners that live in our Association. It will greatly impede the flow of traffic on Beverly Glen and will shunt even more traffic into our area. We are in complete agreement with the letter copied below.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Arnold and Barbara Barron

[2592 Basil Lane](#)

This is the formal response from the Board Members of Bel Air Ridge to the letters that Bel Air Glen distributed to all Bel Air Ridge Association Members and to the Bel Air Ridge Board with regards to the proposed gating and privatization of public roads in and around our neighborhood.

To the Board of Directors of the Bel Air Glen Homeowners Association,

Thank you for your letter of December 15, 2021, regarding your street vacation and gating project. As your long-time neighbors with many common interests, we are committed to working toward amicable resolutions to shared neighborhood issues. However, we have reviewed the seven claims laid out in the letter and find ourselves in disagreement with your reasoning.

We take your claims point by point:

**1. The Bel Air Glen gating will not shift more traffic to the streets of Bel Air Ridge West or Bel Air Ridge East or Beverly Glen.**

Not True: If there is a traffic problem of such significance that BAG is willing to undertake the time and expense of privatizing public streets, then implementing these closures will redirect all that traffic to Beverly Glen, which we all know spills over onto all the surrounding streets. The slightest disruptions to traffic

patterns can have huge impacts to the entire neighborhood. This must be properly studied in depth.

BAG's claim that traffic on northbound Beverly Glen only travels north or east is incorrect. There is a left-hand turn lane dedicated to traffic turning West at the light for Mulholland and Beverly Glen for a reason. The city assumes that a certain amount of traffic will turn left (west) at that light. More cars on the street will have to force traffic to Nicada and Windtree. Beverly Glen will have more cars on it for longer. This is exact case in point as the stop sign introduced at the corner of Valley Vista and Beverly Glen. That caused such a traffic nightmare it was removed shortly afterwards.

## **2. The Bel Air Glen gates will not make it harder for Bel Air Ridge residents to go to work or come home at night or at any other times.**

Not True: What happens when a gate malfunctions and gets stuck in a closed position? Or what happens when someone is at the gate with others behind them who is not entitled to enter? How will that driver get out of line— there is no apparent turnaround option at the gates at either Angelo and Beverly Glen or Nicada and Woodwardia? There is no guard employed anywhere at any time to assist people when there are problems.

More Importantly, Bel Air Ridge residents on the east side of Beverly Glen are concerned about the potential delays the gates could cause in the event of an emergency evacuation or in friends or family getting to them in the event of a medical or other emergency. They don't want the current three, unimpeded means of entering and exiting Bel Air Ridge's east side reduced to one.

Having to enter a passcode or use a fob will take additional time, much less when someone needs to gain access through live voice and/or video access. The three second time claimed by Bel Air Glen is misleading because it does not account for time through the gate at a lower speed caused by the existence of the gate,

closing time for the gate and opening time for another car- not to mention the delay from the potential traffic backups at the gate.

**3. The Bel Air Glen gates will not prevent Bel Air Ridge West from accessing Bel Air Ridge community amenities and friends in Bel Air Ridge East nor will the proposed gates lengthen the time or distance between West and Bel Air Ridge East.**

Not True: It is imperative that BAG understands that all Bel air Ridge members have ownership interests in significant property east of Beverly Glen- specifically three tennis courts, our fitness center, pool and Angelo Park. Excluding BAR members whose units are west of Beverly Glen from your proposed “solution” is beyond egregious insult to our entire association. We are one association, and these gates will forever create two halves.

In addition, Bel Air Glen’s estimates of the negative impact of their gates on travel time from the west side of our community to the east do not consider the frequency with which residents may be coming to our east side property from work or other activities at the Glen Center, off Mulholland or the Valley, not from home, or going to those locations.

The greatest significance is the fact that the blind, unsignalized intersection of Beverly Glen and Briarwood is wholly unsuited to absorb the volume and nature of traffic that would be redirected toward it. This must be studied in detail and a solution must be required before any gating can be considered.

**4. The proposed entry gate at Angelo and Beverly Glen will not congest Beverly Glen.**

Not True: Where are the environmental impact report and independent audited traffic report to back this claim? More cars will cause more congestion. This fact stands until it is refuted with an unbiased independent report.

We’ve responded in more detail to this claim by Bel Air Glen in response to #1 and #3 above.

**5. The proposed gates will not increase noise and tailpipe emissions from visitor, workers, and delivery services to Bel Air Glen.**

Not True: Waiting cars and trucks increase noise and tailpipe emissions by definition. Again, does Bel Air Glen have an environmental impact report and independent audited traffic studies that support this claim?

**6. The proposed gates will not change the continued use and enjoyment of natural, ecological, recreational, or scenic areas or resources.**

We are glad to hear that the Bel Air Glen gating plan will not impede walkers' or bikers' access to these natural, ecological, recreational, or scenic areas or resources. We all live in a very special place. But some who want to enjoy these wonderful areas and resources may not have the capability to walk or bike them. They may want to drive through or drive to a scenic spot. Bel Air Ridge is one community, and our sense of community is one of the unique benefits of living in Bel Air Ridge. By creating physical barriers between us, the gates will detract from the quality of Bel Air Ridge's neighborhood environment and violate our essential character as a unified community.

**7. Tim Steele does not represent Bel Air Glen HOA on the Neighborhood Council.**

We never claimed that Mr. Steele represents the HOA. We merely shared with our residents the full listing of the Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council (BABCNC) and its Planning and Land Use Committee, copied from the BABCNC website. That listing shows that Mr. Steele represents Bel Air Glen district on BABCNC and is a member of the PLU, as recently confirmed by the BABCNC President. However, we did not single out Mr. Steele in any way, so we wonder why this issue was raised to us. It appears irrelevant.

## **Other Concerns:**

### **Disaster response:**

We wonder what happens in the case of a disaster or other events that destroys one of Bel Air Glen's privatized streets and Bel Air Glen does not have the resources to fix it? How will the access of Bel Air Ridge's east side residents be assured?

Where is the study that shows how much in reserve BAG must have to guarantee continued access to the roads incase of an earthquake or fire? (Please see 1994 Northridge Quake damage to Angelo Drive for further details)

### **Services:**

What of deliveries, landscapers, construction workers and home assistants who work on Bel Air Ridge's east side- Simple tasks such as food delivery and Amazon delivery? Will these service providers get passwords or other means to get through the Bel Air Glen gates, or will they need to go through Briarwood? If the latter, this will add tremendously to Briarwood traffic. This additional mileage may well put the entire east portion of BAR outside of the 5 miles delivery radius of many delivery services.

Moreover, many of these workers and providers are coming from Mulholland or the Valley. As pointed out above, being restricted to Briarwood and not having access to Angelo will unfairly add travel time and 1.2 miles of distance (.6 miles each way) for these individuals.

### **Communications:**

Finally, we'd like to respond to the misleading comments about the Bel Air Ridge Board's lack of responsiveness. Our Board President speaks for the full Board. We remind you that our recently retired Board President, Mr. Rosario Vizzie, met with your President on at least three occasions to share perspectives and to voice our opposition to the Bel Air Glen gating plan and the reasons for it. In addition, Bel Air Ridge Board Members attended the Town Hall meeting that Bel Air Glen hosted and were not allowed to speak.

In all these communications, Bel Air Glen has dismissed our legitimate concerns, as your letter repeats, and has been unwilling to pull back on any of its plans. Bel Air Glen has not attempted any kind of meaningful dialogue with Bel Air Ridge.

***Bel Air Glen shouldn't be permitted to privatize its currently public roads at the expense of Bel Air Ridge, our other Beverly Glen neighbors, the general public.***

**Better Path Forward:**

We think a better solution is for Bel Air Glen and Bel Air Ridge to join as neighbors to pursue additional traffic management at Beverly Glen and Mulholland to facilitate the flow of traffic on Beverly Glen for the benefit of both our communities and for everyone who uses Beverly Glen. In a city and neighborhood where traffic congestion is universal, the gating project leapfrogs over the cautious and incremental measures (no right turn signs, speed bumps, etc.) that should be attempted first in a situation like this, so that the effects of the measures--including the effects on traffic in the surrounding community--can be weighed.

Your respectfully,

Amir Navab  
President of the Board of Directors  
Bel Air Ridge Homeowners Association