



PLANNING & LAND USE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, January 9, 2018 6:30 pm to 9:00 pm

Location: American Jewish University

15600 Mulholland Drive, 2nd Floor, Room 223 Bel Air, CA 90077

1. Call to Order – Committee Member Roll Call Meeting was called to order at 6:32 pm.

Name	P	A	Name	P	A
Robert Schlesinger Chair	X		Stephanie Savage Vice Chair	X	
Robin Greenberg	X		Nickie Miner	X	
Michael Kemp	X		Jamie Hall		X
Don Loze	X		Jason Spradlin	X	
Maureen Levinson	X		Leslie Weisberg	X	
Stephen Twining	X		Yves Mieszala	X	

2. Approval of January 9, 2018 Agenda Moved by Nickie; Seconded by Robin; 8 yes; 0 no; 0 abstentions; passed.

3. Approval of November 14, 2017 Minutes (circulated with agenda) Moved by Stephanie; Seconded by Robin; 8 yes; 0 no; 0 abstentions; passed.

[Leslie arrived at 6:33, for a total of 9 present.]

4. Public Comments:

Stephen Twining notified the committee and asked that the neighborhood council address WRAC’s motion to oppose the State Bill 827 (Weiner) that would allow unrestricted building near public transit, transit-rich housing projects, with State rather than local/city approval. Laurel Canyon & Sepulveda could be subject to this. Nickie noted that this could extend to side streets along the main boulevards.

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB827

Stephen Twining also presented handouts from the LADWP entitled, “Single Family Dwelling Use Annual Trends by Temperature Zone and Lot Size.”

5. Chair Report: Robert Schlesinger noted that we have too many problems bringing some people in, who wait for their hearings and bypass us.

Motion: Bob will prepare an automatic letter written to any board that the presenter goes before, (e.g., the ZA or the MDRB), which will be held as long as they come back to us; if they don’t the letter will go. **Moved by** Jason; **seconded by** Nickie; **9 yes; 0 no; 0 abstentions; passed.**

Bob clarified that when the presenter comes in, if there are a number of issues, he’ll write a letter pointing out the number of issues to send to the Zoning Administrator; he will hold the letter until the day before the ZA hears it, and, if it they don’t come back, will send the letter.

6. Vice-Chair Report: Stephanie Savage – No report

7. Projects & Items Scheduled for Presentation, Discussion & Possible Action

a) 8500 W Franklin Ave. ZA-2016-3023-ZAD ENV-2016-3024-CE

Lot: 8,692.3 sf R1, SFR, 2nd & 3rd stry add and remodel. Allow 0 frt yd setback in lieu of 5', proposed add to exc 81sf, max allowed 4,258, add 20% increase fr req 24' to a max of 33' (Using 3 Slope Bands)
Owner-App: Randal Haworth 818.262.6593 Agent/Rep: Amilcar Hosterail:
amilcar@briannoteware.com 310.452.5444, Brian Noteware A.I.A. brian@briannoteware.com
310.452.6500 Filed: 8/16/16 Assign: 10/03/16 Azeen Khanmalek azeen.khanmalek@lacity.org
213.978.1336 Richard Reaser richard.reaser@lacity.org 213.978.1240

Mr. Hosterail and Mr. Noteware returned. Mr. Hosterail related that they have a single family residence, two stories, and they are doing an addition and remodel. As to their requests, he noted that they have an existing garage with a nonconforming condition where the footprint actually hits the property line. Their design is to build over the existing footprint.

- 1) First request was to allow 0 front-yard setback in lieu of 5' setback, Mr. Hosterail related that they have this was very common in the area and he didn't hear concerns from us previously.
- 2) When seen previously, they were asking for 81 square feet of increase to allowable FAR. He noted that we had a problem with that and their present solution was to get rid of that; they are no longer asking for excess in square feet.
- 3) They initially were going above height by 20% from allowable 24' they've brought it down to 10% to an overall height of 26.5.' Mr. Hosterail noted that there is a level that pushes the roof up; and that they spoke with the owner, Dr. Haworth ("a painter") who told him that he needed the space to both store his work and go up there to do his painting. Mr. Hosterail related that they brought the roof down. He discussed the attic area. The space leads eventually into the deck. That is the 81 square feet that they were asking for before.

Questions were asked and answered as to why they would make what was existing nonconforming worse by adding height and why they didn't flip the bedroom and bathroom. Questions were answered. He noted the relationship between the latter and the deck, which leads to the pool.

[Don Loze arrived at 6:52 pm for a total of 10 present.]

Stephanie asked that they look at making a way to make it less vertical, to look at the elevations that make the building look extremely tall on the street. He noted that there were other structures in the area with similar conditions of houses over garages. Stephanie asked if they can take another look at the elevations that make the building look extremely tall from the street, where it has a nonconforming front yard. There are no articulations of the surface. Mr. Hosterail noted that this would be improved by improving the fenestration, and that the owner put a little element of Moroccan into the Spanish house.

Motion: That the presenter returns with some options to look at the articulation of the surface to detract from the fact that he has a three-story building and a nonconforming front yard.

Moved by Stephanie; **Seconded** by Jason; **10 yes; 0 no; 0 abstentions; passed.**

b) 8552 W APPIAN WAY ☉ ZA-2017-3198-ZAD ENV-2017-3199-CE

DSP CNC 8/09/17 DRB Total lot 13,128 sf. (was SFD w/access garage/cabana & pool.) Const new SFD w/att 3 car gar, 3,963 total FAR max envelope ht 31'0" const of new pool on hillside and 2 10'0" max ht ret walls. Dedicate 5' along prop line for street purpose & widen exist rdway in frt of prop frontage to meet current Substandard Hillside Limited Street requirements. No veh access from a street to improved to min 20ft CPR to boundary of hillside area.

App: Shane Haffey, Clear Capitol Capital Inv Grp, LLC. 310.398.1500

Arch: John Hamilton JPH@hamiltonarchitects.net Andrew M. Davis AMD@hamiltonarchitects.net

Agent: Curtis Fortier CJF@hamiltonarchitects.net 310.398.1500

Filed & Assign: 8/10/17 ZA: Mindy Nguyen mindy.nguyen@lacity.org 213.978.1241

CE: Blake Lamb blake.lamb@lacity.org 213.978.1167

Richard Reaser richard.reaser@lacity.org 213.978.1240 **Re-scheduled to next month**

c) 8241 W GRAND VIEW DR. ☉ ZA-2017-1398-ZAD ENV-2017-1399-CE

(8246 Mannix Dr) TC 10/05 LM WCB James H

Lots 74 & 75 of Tract No. 798, and Lot L of Tract No. 2042. Total Lot Area 9,244.6

SFR, Const of new 2 story over basement single family residence. Grading No H/Rte or tree remov.

Propty does not have veh access on a cont 20' wide paved route from driveway to boundary of Hillside area. To allow a 33' max building ht with roof slope less than 25% in lieu of 28' in order to eliminate requirement for a roof greater than 25% at house frnt. 2 additional ret walls, total (4). Allow 4 add on-site pkng due to no avail street pkng adj to development, and (b) allow for light well type design on northeasterly side of structure.

Applicant: Scott Spiro saspiro@aol.com 818-903-3371

CEQA - Advanced Engineering & Consulting beth.advengcon@gmail.com 818-222-7982

Agent/Rep: James Heimler Arch jheimier@jhai-architect.com 213.220.0170

Filed: 4/06/17 Assign: 8/17/17 ENV Blake Lamb blake.lamb@lacity.org 213.978.1167

Assign: Jason Hernandez jason.hernandez@lacity.org 213.978.1276

At the November 14, 2017 Planning and Land Use Meeting, the Committee voted 11/0/0 to continue this until LCA hears it and until January PLU meeting. Stephanie gave report that they have looked at this project; it will be sent back to Laurel Canyon; they have requested that we continue this until January

[Bob related that the City has only sent us Grand View and has not sent us Mannix. Stephanie noted that Laurel Canyon does have a list of concerns.]

Jim Heimler, Architect, returned and gave a quick overview of the Spiro residence, describing the plans. In addition, he noted that they cut the garage into the hill and pushed the house back. Other notes include but are not limited to: Mr. Heimler mentioned an extra retaining wall, which gives an extra parking spot; if pushed further to the end of the house he could pick up seven cars; it was designed so that they could have seven cars onsite instead of six but he is not presenting that. He changed the plan so that all the cars are on the site. The roof is flat.

Mr. Heimler noted that they're asking to keep the same height; three lots; dirt removal 1,125 cy; he has metal rails on top of retaining walls... there's a power pole. The house has under 2,900 feet; has an elevator for aging members. They're not touching Grand View. "Nobody has extra cars up there." Their rule is to push it back to as many cars onsite as they can. It's a smaller house, no large rooms. Scott and he are both local, from Laurel Canyon.

Questions were asked and answered. Robin asked and he related that this is a new two-story over a basement, which has a 3-car garage and entry, 1st story would be 90 square feet, second story, covered square footage area part of the house; overhangs are very deep.

Five variances requested include height, multiple retaining walls, protected tree removal, substandard access and variance to not improve the street. Stephanie asked about the two trees, to which Mr. Heimler noted that there's a whole grove ... on the hillside; they're clipping that corner, removing and replanting, including two black walnuts. Stephanie noted that the CE, because of the grading, exceeds what's allowed on substandard streets; they're not making improvement, and there are issues on retaining walls. He related that they have been through Plan Check, which has okayed the retaining walls. Stephanie explained that Laurel Canyon is in need of a more thorough CEQA on this. She noted that Mannix is a challenging single-lane street, and that to build there will be a burden to everyone. She asked why the address is still on Grand View while it is not on Grand View. Stephanie noted that on the SMMC Habitat maps, this abuts a mapped habitat zone #55; they're not making any improvement to the

road; the existing road is narrowed. Stephanie noted need for a more thorough review. The applicant stated, as to the retaining walls, that “nothing is over 10 feet.” Stephanie noted that code requires flat space, not sloped or stepped down, and this design does not comply; it must comply per Section 12.22C20 (Stephanie handed a copy of the code section to him). Don asked about other houses near there. Discussed pros and cons of stepping up.

Motion: To deny, pending or subject to any changes he can make and a proper CEQA review. We will provide a list of specifics for him to respond to. **Moved** by Stephanie; **Seconded** by Don; **10 yes; 0 no; 0 abstentions; passed.**

d) 8201 W BELLGAVE PL ☉ ✓ ZA-2017-380-ZAD ENV-2017-381-CE

(Cul-De_Sac, lots 3,4,&5) Lot:23,497, RE9-1 (Laurel Cyn & Hwood Blvd)

New SFD 7,460 sf, does not have a 20' paved roadway, fr drwy apron to hillside area boundary.

Owner: Tyrone Mckillen, Moonraker Cap LLC.

Rep: Crest R/E tony@crestrealestate.com 408.655.0998

Filed: 1/30/17 Accept 6/23/17 Assign: 9/01/17 My La my.la@lacity.org 213.978.1194

ENV Assign: Jason Hernandez jason.hernandez@lacity.org 213-978-1276

Tony Russo returned with plans; he was awaiting the soils report approval, which he has received. He gave a brief review of the new SFD, two stories, with no basement, with grading of only 285 cy. He stated they are compliant with the BHO and LAMC except for the request as to the continuous paved roadway – not in front of their property – but down Crescent Heights, which is less than 20 feet wide, which is why they applied for the ZAD. He reported that their street, Bellgave, is fully compliant; at the end of the cul-de-sac; greater than 20 feet (per Stephanie, substandard CPR).

Tony responded to Stephanie’s questions by email, including but not limited to:

- 1) The grading approval letter, which they now have;
- 2) To confirm grading calculations included the piles and “foundation spoils,” which they do, confirmed with the engineer;
- 3) They confirmed H/3 with their plan checker to make sure piles are in compliance with regulation
- 4) No additional retaining walls would be needed down slope;
- 5) The construction staging and parking plan, they submitted in that email, and provided in package.
- 6) The encroachment plane: They’re RE-9.

He noted that they have the HOA approval and have been in conversations with adjacent neighbor, who don’t seem to have an issue with the project. They sent out mailers to the neighbors, and only one responded. Discussed grading report. Stephanie noted that it is very steep. Jason has no issue; Maureen noted issue of neighbor behind; Stephanie asked if they have a contingency plan for overflow for parking, as they are on a cul-de-sac. Tony will confirm this with the team and contact neighbors. Don asked about the rules set forth in the Bel Air Rules. Robert noted that David Ryu of CD4 has his own, or the HCR still pending. Tony would go along with one truck at a time. Leslie would like neighbors contacted again, to be sure there are no problems, and about parking.

Motion: To approve subject to all the neighbors are reached out to, including adjacent down the hill, that parking is established, with a contingency plan, and one truck on site at any given time, (one in and one out), according to the Bel Air Rules. **Moved** by Jason; **Seconded** by Robin; **8 yes; 1 no; 1 abstention:** Nickie; **passed.** Robin asked Tony to knock on doors & contact neighbors; he agreed to do.

e) 8301 W GRAND VIEW DR ☉ ZA-2016-4722-ZV-ZAD-ZAA ✓ (None 60629)

New SFD, a basement, 2 above ground living levels, upper parking/access level with a total floor area of 3,167 sf, height of 45 ft on a 4,439.9 sq ft lot fronting a Substandard Hillside limited st in an R-1 zone. Site is undeveloped/vacant. 45 ft exceeds the max envelope height on a lot that does not have vehicular access route by way of street improved with a min 20 ft wide continuous paved roadway from the driveway apron to the boundary of the hillside area. 3 retaining walls up to 17 ft in ht within required

yard in lieu of the max ht of 3.5 ft. Asking for Zone Variance.

Appl: James Mellinger james@ladrill.com 805.308.5266 Arch: Hunter Leggit Studio,

hunter@hunterleggitt.com 310.780.9708 Denver, CO Agent/Rep: Craig Fry & Assoc.

Larry Mondragon dragon@craigfryandassociates.com 310.621.2309

Filed: 12/09/2016 Assign: 1/06/17 Project Planner: Jason Hernandez jason.hernandez@lacity.org

213.478.1276 **Rescheduled to February**

[Michael Kemp arrived at 7:51 pm, for a total of 11 present; one absent: Jamie.]

f) 1830 Blue Heights Dr. ZA-2017-3054-? 90069 ENV-2016-4327-EAF PS-1437 10/05 TBC

Lot 44,122.7 SFD, new 11,478 sf w/att 9,463 sf basement, 4 car attached gar & pool. Var to permit driveway observing a max ht of 12.16 ft above nat grade w/in frt yd setback & 25.63 ft above grd w/in the Northerly side yrd setback (incl guard rails) in conj w const of a SFD , in lieu of 3.5 ft and 6 feet respectively in a hillside area. ZA Deter to permit 8 ret walls from 0-12 ft and soil nail wall to a max ht of 35ft as well as a front yrd setbk of for a SFD. Req ZA adjmnt to permit const of a retwall w/inside yd setbk to a 10ft max. Grading 10,053 cy incl rough cut, rough fill, backfill and grading for piles and grade beams. Net export of 9,432 cy and two protected oak trees. (Per presenter, these are black walnuts, not oaks) replaced on a 4 to 1 basis and significant trees at a ratio of 1 to 1.

Appl: Avi Lerner & Travor Short, A&T Development, LLC.

Agent: Chris Parker PCC, Chris@PCCLA.com 805.216.7900

Filed: 10/14/16 Assign: 2/09/17 Jason Hernandez jason.hernandez@lacity.org 213.978.1276

Nicole Kuklok-Waldman (rep), “Entitlement and Outreach Consultant,” and Steve Byrne, owner, presented. (Chris Parker was unable to attend.) Nicole Kuklok-Waldman (Nicole) explained that they are asking for primarily adjustments related to access to the site; 75 feet from bottom to top; none for the building; building is within the old Hillside Ordinance (“you’ve got some basement there.”) They’re asking for variances for three setbacks and retaining wall in setback; Variance for over height driveway in front yard setback, variance for multiple and over height retaining walls, variance for a soil nail wall of 35’ high, variance for grading beyond allowable per site and per substandard access, permit to remove and replace protected trees, variance for substandard CPR-per LAMC 12.28.

Committee noted that review of the drawings provided revealed little information about the project specifics. Drawings included a site plan with no elevations or sections and committee determined that they would have to provide more information.

Owner, Steve, said they will improve the road all the way around to Sunset Plaza from SP to property. They met with MRCA regarding wildlife corridors and have gotten no feedback from them. The house will blend in with the landscape, and won’t be an eyesore. The driveway design is to create privacy. Bob asked about 8 retaining walls; told they’re in a row following the driveway; there are eight because of the topography. Michael asked about the max heights of driveway. Nicole will send full set of plans.

Jason asked what improvements at what parts of the road, Steve noted that the city wants the road improved, and that “the whole road will be like new.” Stephanie asked what level (standards) will the street be improved as it has private access, retaining walls. Nickie asked how many houses are in the neighborhood with the same number of bathrooms. Nicole responded six or seven and that she will send us the findings. Maureen asked about fire roads and alternative evacuation routes, which Nicole said she will provide. Jason noted the pink house and unusual access through that property to another roadway (which is withdrawn). Don asked why two basements exempted from FAR and why 9,400 yards of turf removed: 1,800 trucks. Robert noted, with the addition of 25% for fluff factor. Sewer access was unknown. Because the site hasn’t been developed before, there has been no prior grading.

The project was filed under BHO 2011. As to the two basements: 1,200 square feet basement is a guest quarter, separate from other basement. Maureen and Leslie asked about lighting, about obtrusive lighting, to which Steve noted that there would be none of that and Nicole will follow up with that. Bob asked and Steve said he will “green up” the concrete piles and consult with Urban Forestry. Nicole will check on the staging area. Maureen asked how deep the caissons are, and we were told that shallow bedrock was about 3 ft. Hearing is not scheduled yet. Mike Kemp explained that their plot plan has no grades on it. They have to present one with grades on it if they want us to consider this.

Motion: To continue this project until March if they can provide a full set of plans, staging plan, haul route plan, building cross sections to see the heights. **Moved** by Michael; **Seconded** by Maureen; **11 yes; 0 no; 0 abstentions; passed.**

Follow-up, Discussion & Possible Action on other Projects:

8. **Update on Ridgeline Ordinance** – Don Loze related that he was told today that we’ll probably have some information for a meeting by the end of this week; thinks we’ll get acknowledgement of lack of material in the drafts given to us. Will be given a set of bullet points. Will discuss issues we’d like to see in a draft ordinance.

9. **Update on Proposed Protected Tree Code Amendment (CPC-2016-4520-CA)** Maureen Levinson noted that they are taking public comment. Steve noted that the Hillside Federation heard about this.

10. **Discussion was held on posting site in the DSPNA territory for PLU agenda.** Yves will check.

Current Case Updates by PLUC Members on pending projects: See Project Tracking List

11. New Packages Received: See Project Tracking List
12. Certified Neighborhood Council (CNC) Reporting Review of New Projects Submitted
13. Upcoming Hearings: See Project Tracking List (Subject to discussion & action)
14. Determination Letters Received: See Project Tracking List
15. Pending Haul Routes (Update by any PLU Committee members)
16. Proactive Tracking, Tasks & Projects (Update, Discussion & Possible Action)

Maureen asked about CEQA, noting the hearing in October, where Jamie did a presentation before the BBSC, where the city planners keep bringing up studies, e.g., “national studies” and “local traffic studies” as their basis for determinations. She is concerned that they are rubberstamping everything because of these and would like these studies need to be looked at; suspects they don’t include hillsides and the uniqueness of hillsides, which are without city blocks but have “one way in and one way out.”

Bob noted comment in the CEQA manual, that the ruling organization must consider certain things, and was told that the City Attorney interpreted this differently. Maureen noted that in the recording of that meeting, the City Attorney was advising them how to vote. She would like to see them address cumulative impacts.

17. **Adjournment:** Don moved to adjourn; Leslie seconded; meeting adjourned at 8:37 pm.

Next BABCNC PLUC Meeting: February 13, 2018 7:00 pm @ AJU