



Minutes

**Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
Planning & Land Use Committee Meeting
Tuesday April 9, 2024 7:00 P.M.**

Name	P	A	Name	P	A
Robert Schlesinger, Chair	X		Stephanie Savage	X	
Robin Greenberg	X		Nickie Miner	X	
Don Loze		X	Jamie Hall	X	
Shawn Bayliss	X		Jason Spradlin	X	
André Stojka		X	Ellen Evans	X	
Steven Weinberg	X		Patricia Templeton	X	
Maureen Levinson	X		Leslie Weisberg	X	
Stella Grey	X		Travis Longcore <i>ex officio</i>	X	

Chair Schlesinger called the meeting to order at 7:03, related procedural information, and called the roll, with quorum met. Members Weinberg and Templeton arrived shortly thereafter, for a total of 14 present and two absent.

1. The April 9, 2024 Agenda was approved as moved by Savage.
2. **Approval of Minutes:**
 The **January 9, 2024 Minutes (Attachment A)** were unanimously **approved** as moved by Longcore.
 The **February 13, 2024 Minutes (Attachment B)** were unanimously **approved** as moved by Longcore.
3. **General Public Comment: Member Miner** announced the May 5th Fire Station #71 community event and pancake breakfast. **Member Savage** related that, from what she could see in a photo from our newsletter that may have been of the site of the failure at a Mulholland closure, the posts that held the guardrail were not embedded in concrete, which is against BOE’s standards, and their own requirements. A post to hold a guardrail has to be to a certain depth, and that it wasn’t done, which may be the explanation for the failure.
4. **Chair Report:** Robert Schlesinger, Chair related that the BABCNC PO Box, which he checks every 7-10 days, has not had packets on projects and we are not getting many projects to present, for reasons he does not know. He thinks we may need to interact with the Planning Liaison to see if there is a snafu worthy of follow up.
5. **Vice-Chair Report:** Jamie Hall, Vice Chair, noted that he recently learned of an intradepartmental bulletin, a form that the CCP has for intake planners, for reviewing SFD projects in the hills, from 2020, which could be a good outline for us to use when reviewing projects that could be modified.

Projects & Items Scheduled for Presentation, Discussion & Possible Action:

6. 8237 W ROXBURY ROAD 90069 ZA-2023-7317-F ENV-2023-7318-CE

Filed 11/01/2023. Assigned/Staff: Valentina Knox-Jones. 03/22/2024: Danalynn Dominguez.

Project Description: A Zoning Administrators Determination to allow construction and maintenance of a 341 sq ft swimming pool, and a 61 sq ft with an 8 foot high encircling fence/wall around the proposed project.

Applicant: Mike Barry. <mhbarry7@gmail.com>

Representative: Bill Robinson <er4913@gmail.com>

Permanent Link: <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/caseid/MjcxNDQ50>

Mr. Bill Robinson, the applicant's representative, was accompanied by Mr. Mike Barry, the owner of the house, and along with Joseph Park, the architect.

Mr. Robinson related that they are here with regard to the project which includes a swimming pool, and a Jacuzzi from the sidewalk; they have a retaining wall, about 8-1/2', a hedge that goes one foot above the retaining wall, at 9'. When they filed the case, B&S said they'll need a fence, and Planning recommended filing a ZAD. He noted that they initially had a certain height, and they recommended they make it a 5' fence to go around the spa and swimming pool. The architect shared the plans on screen.

Chair Schlesinger and Vice-Chair Hall related that DSPNA needs to be consulted but we'd take questions. Questions were asked and answered. There was no public comment on this project.

A **motion** that this project be **tabled** until after it appears before the HOA, as suggested by Evans, was **moved** by Miner, and added to the motion was that before they appear before the association, they should get a proper zoning review and have a clear understanding of what they're asking for, which was **seconded** by Evans. The motion was **approved** by all but Dr. Longcore who abstained.

7. 1391-1403 N TOWER GROVE DR 90291 ZA-2023-5864-ZAD-HCA ENV-2023-5865-EAF

1391 Lot 11,301.4 sf. – 1401 Lot 15,896.2 sf.

(The project returns following the last PLU meeting in February.)

Filed: 08/25/23. Assign/Staff: 9/05/23. Esteban Martorell

Project Description: New 11,505 square foot single family residence with basement.

Applicant: [ST SKY LLC]

Representative: Isaac Lemus (CREST REAL ESTATE) 310.994.6657

Permanent Link: <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/caseid/MjY5OTI10>

Isaac Lemus returned following the February PLU Committee meeting, providing an overview of the project. Some comments included that the project consists of a new 11,505 sfd with basement, on a lot 46,168 square feet; a haul route 1,942 CY of earth is required. He re-presented the information provided at the February meeting and discussed their request in detail, noting that they are requesting two alleviations from the 20-foot width roadway requirement along their property frontage (part 1) and the continuous paved roadway (CPR) (part 2). Pointing to areas B and A, he noted that in terms of meeting the intent, the roads are quite close to meeting the threshold for CPR; not tight winding streets, which is one of the reasons they are requesting relief from the requirement.

He noted that at the previous presentation, their goal was to improve the frontage with the one area of concern the power pole (pointing), without having to relocate it and what the options looked like. They explored the B permit process and will be executing a B permit, to be conducted within the public right of way (PROW) outside of their property lines. They are able to improve their frontage except the power pole; the most they can increase the size is to 19.6 feet. He discussed how they lowered the area in question or area of concern from the 17 feet up to 20 feet, and areas that don't meet the 20' requirement but are much closer.

He recapped previously discussed points, including but not limited to the cumulative impacts and conditions of the site, noting that some of the largest concerns of Planning are ingress and egress and overall circulation issues to improve overall access... and going over the CPR, clarified that the majority meets the 20' width requirement; only small areas 19.6, 19.4 or 19.3 besides those pinch points, meet requirements. There are multiple streets that provide access to their property, e.g., Beverly Estate Drive to Benedict Canyon, and the other way, continuation of Tower Grove Drive which connects to Beverly Drive and loops around. There are multiple points of access. He discussed areas to turn around, which he described as being a lot larger than 20' access, and down Tower Grove Drive where there are a couple of cut outs or shoulder areas. He noted that the increased points of access removes the need to remove the power poles. He pointed out their fire hydrant access, and sprinkler across the entire home to help stop the spread of wildfires. He reiterated that the only request is for frontage and CPR at those specific points of concern.

As to the project, he noted that they are only proposing a sfd, made of three separate lots, and related that that three separate sfds can be built on those lots, but by having one larger, there is limited impact from a biological standpoint and no protected trees. His haul route will have a separate hearing, with specific conditions. He added some current information.

Questions were asked and answered, following which the need for further clarification including issues of feasibility and infeasibility based on the worth of the project was noted.

Motion to **continue** this item and we will provide them a list of issues to address was moved by Savage and seconded by Miner. Questions would include 1) How can we guarantee that the B-Permit work will be performed? 2) How does project meet same practical effect requirements set forth in the Fire Safe Road Regulations to provide for safe ingress and egress for evacuation and fire vehicles? What additional things are they doing to provide the same practical effect as that 20-foot road requirement; additional things further providing safe ingress and egress? He gets to demonstrate why that meets the standard. The committee noted that if we do determine that it is the same practical effect, there is still a question of feasibility, and we would still want to know more about feasibility. 3) In summary, is it truly infeasibility to widen the portion of the road to 20'? 4) See tree report created. 5) Revocable permits for the driveway bridge, the driveway slope and the entry stairs and structures to access the house. 6) Confirmation of overall height of the house. 7) Staging details. 9) Weight of trucks. 10) Details regarding active sites in close proximity. (Impact of ambitious projects in this area; have a count of what impactful construction sites drilling caissons over 200 cement mixer visits that clog up the roads; how many new homes and renovations.) The motion **passed** by 11 yeses, 1 abstention from Longcore.

The meeting adjourned at 9:12 to return on May 14, 20024 at 7:00 PM.