



Catherine Palmer <council@babcnc.org>

Re: OPPOSITION TO BEL AIR GLEN PROPOSED GATING (Project: VAC-E1401394)

Travis Longcore <tlongcore@babcnc.org>

Thu, Dec 9, 2021 at 11:42 AM

To: Gabrielle Tsabag <gtsabag@gmail.com>

Cc: Robert Schlesinger <rschlesinger@babcnc.org>, paul.koretz@lacity.org, Jarrett Thompson <jarrett.thompson@lacity.org>, joan.pelico@lacity.org, Moshe Tsabag <moshe@velvetheart.com>, Joan Herman <JHERMAN20@roadrunner.com>, BABCNC Board <board@babcnc.org>, plu@babcnc.org

Dear Gabrielle and Moshe Tsabag,

We have received your comment and it will be considered by BABCNC as it advises the City on this issue.

Sincerely,
Travis Longcore



Travis Longcore, Ph.D. | President

Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council

📞 (310) 247-9719 🌐 babcnc.org ✉️ tlongcore@babcnc.org

[Agendas and Minutes](#)

On Dec 8, 2021, at 2:19 PM, Gabrielle Tsabag <gtsabag@gmail.com> wrote:

December 8, 2021

RE: OPPOSITION TO BEL AIR GLEN PROPOSED GATING
(Project: VAC-E1401394)

Dear Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
President Longcore:

We, the undersigned residents of the BAR HOA, understand that the Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council will be considering Bel Air Glen's proposed vacation and gating project. We are strongly opposed to the proposal, which will negatively affect virtually all residents on and north of Briarwood Drive and west and east of Beverly Glen in Los Angeles 90077, as well as all residents of Beverly Glen and those who use it as a thoroughfare.

We have lived in Bel Air Ridge (BAR - 377 homes) on the west side of Beverly Glen since 2010, a stakeholder group that Bel Air Glen (BAG - 220 homes) does not seem to recognize. BAG's plan will adversely affect us on the west side for a number of reasons:

- As members of the BAR HOA, along with the other homeowners, we have an ownership interest in BAR *common areas east of Beverly Glen*. The proposed gates will impede our access to these properties. Moreover, the gating will limit our access to the BAR facilities located on the *east side of Beverly Glen, including our fitness center, **which we use daily**, pool and tennis courts*, and also will influence our access to our friends who live on the east side of Beverly Glen. Currently we have multiple access points to these

areas, but under the current plan we would be limited to access through Briarwood. This will mean a longer route (in time and distance) for us to reach the BAR facilities and will add a *potentially dangerous left turn* crossing Beverly Glen on-coming traffic to turn on to Briarwood to our travels to the facilities.

And even if we on the west side were given electronic access to BAG's gates, we would have to pass through multiple of them to get our facilities and the rest of our community. This would not only cause inconvenience but disrupt BAR as a community.

- The BAG's plan will negatively impact traffic both on Beverly Glen and on the west side of BAR. Despite BAG's claims, it seems inconceivable that cars having to pass through a gate at the corner of Beverly Glen and Angelo Drive would not cause additional back up on Beverly Glen, particularly during rush hour, *which already presents a very serious and aggravating commute problem for us.*

Cars trying to enter who do not have passes (tradespeople, Amazon and delivery drivers, workers, friends and relatives) will cause even more backup, both at the main gate proposed at Nicada and Woodwardia as well as at Angelo, as the backup is likely to even be worse if gates are not staffed, which we understand is the plan. And what happens when inevitable equipment malfunctions occur at unmanned stations? Inevitable additional back up on Beverly Glen, ***one***

of the most trafficked routes between the Valley and the City.

These back-ups on Beverly Glen, of course, affect not only BAR and BAG but all Beverly Glen residents, as well as those in other parts of the city who travel via Beverly Glen. Drivers seeking to avoid backups on Beverly Glen are likely to try our neighboring canyons, causing additional traffic and inconvenience to neighbors in Bel Air Hills and Benedict Canyons.

- In addition to negatively impacting and causing additional back up on Beverly Glen, it should be obvious that BAG's plan will push more rush hour traffic onto the Nicada to Mulholland (and often Nicada through Bottlebrush to Nicada) thru-way. This too is already a traffic **nightmare** in afternoon-evening rush hour. I appreciate BAG's concern for traffic and safety, but their solution will come at the expense of additional traffic and safety concerns for BAR's and other families on the west side of Beverly Glen.

We are also concerned that BAG's proposal has proceeded this far because of ***inaccuracies and omissions*** in its application that otherwise would have raised red flags. Section II of BAG's Environmental Assessment Form contains a number of incorrect answers:

- Question #3: "Could the project result in annoyance to community residents." BAG responded "no," **but the answer is clearly, "yes."**

Not only BAR residents have expressed their concerns, but some in BAG as well.

- Question #6: "Could the project cause increased traffic congestion through a residential neighborhood, or cause increased street parking or loading? Could the project cause increased congestion in the use of other facilities ...?" **The answer given was "no," but should be "yes."** Please refer to the traffic congestion problem in part above. It is also the case that BAG's plan will cause excess traffic for BAR's Angelo and Briarwood properties. This will occur because under BAG's plan, non-East BAR residents and service providers will only be able to enter BAR through Briarwood. Moreover, when drivers looking for a throughway are stopped at the south Angelo gate, they would be forced to make a U turn on a narrow residential street and return to Beverly Glen, effectively doubling the amount of excess traffic on the south portion of Angelo and Briarwood through BAR.
- Question #8: "Could existing ambient noise levels be increased by the project." Again, the answer given was "no," **but should be "yes."** Conceding that BAG residents will quickly pass through the gates with electronic access, those without such access will need to queue at the gate, waiting for it to be opened. This would include traditionally noisy delivery vehicles (Amazon, UPS, FedEx, USPS, etc.), household employees, construction

vehicles, etc., all of which make significant noise and have tailpipe emissions.

- Question #11: "Could the project change or affect the continued use or enjoyment of a natural, ecological, recreational or scenic area or resource?" BAG responded "no," but the answer should really be "yes." The northernmost two proposed gates are in the outer corridor of the "Mulholland Scenic Parkway." **Prohibiting public access to existing city sidewalks in the Mulholland Scenic Parkway should not be allowed.**
- Question #26: "**Could the project generate a controversy or result in public objections?**" As with Question #3 above, the answer given was "no," but certainly you've heard outcry and objections from many of us. **The answer is clearly "yes."**

We sympathize with BAG's efforts to decrease traffic through its neighborhood, but object to the plan because it will increase traffic and congestion for BAR and negatively impact our 377-home community. Other adjacent neighbors also will be affected. We are all stakeholders in the decision on this matter.

We urge the Bel Air Beverly CREST Neighborhood Council to consider the impact on stakeholders and to oppose the proposed vacation.

Sincerely,

Gabrielle & Moshe Tsabag

2808 Bottlebrush Drive

Los Angeles, CA 90077

Cc: BABCNC Planning and Land Use Chair Robert
Schlesinger

Council Member Paul Koretz

Field Representative Jarrett Thompson

Chief of Staff Joan Pelico