



Minutes
Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
Planning & Land Use Committee Meeting
Tuesday June 11, 2024 7:00 P.M.
TreePeople Conference Room in Coldwater Canyon Park
12601 Mulholland Drive Los Angeles, CA 90210

Name	P	A	Name	P	A
Robert Schlesinger, Chair	X		Stephanie Savage	X	
Robin Greenberg	X		Nickie Miner <i>(virtually)</i>	X	
Don Loze	X		Jamie Hall		X
Shawn Bayliss		X	Jason Spradlin		X
André Stojka <i>(virtually)</i>	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 7:02pm, and provided information from the agenda with regard to holding this meeting which was hybrid: in-person & virtual, and providing public comment. Roll was called with 12 present initially; Member Templeton arrived shortly thereafter for a total of **13 present & 3 absent**. The flag salute was recited.

1. The Agenda was **approved** by unanimous consent as moved by Dr. Longcore.
2. Approval of Minutes:
 - The April 9, 2024 Minutes (**Attachment A**) were **approved** as moved by Evans.
 - Approval of May 14, 2024 Minutes (**Attachment B**) was **postponed** to the next meeting, as moved by Dr. Longcore.
3. **General Public Comment:** There was no comment from the public on any topic within the Committee’s jurisdiction but not on the adopted agenda.
4. **Chair Report:** Robert Schlesinger, Chair: None
5. **Vice-Chair Report:** Jamie Hall, Vice Chair was absent.

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

6. **662 N SEPULVEDA BLVD** ZA-2010-2200-CUB-CLQ-PA2 ENV-2023-3871-CE
 640 N ACANTO St
 Case Filed 06/07/2023 / Assigned Date: 06/09/2023 Staff Assigned: Esther Serrato
Project Description: Restaurant & Full Line of Alcohol beverages sold.
Applicant: ~~Susan D. Lord~~ **David and Jessica Amron (new owners) 662 Bel Air LLC**
Representative: Chloe Parker [Company: Pacific Crest Consultants] (818) 591-9309
Permanent Link: <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/caseid/MjY3ODY10>
 Chris Parker, Entitlement Consultant from Pacific Crest Consultants, introduced the case, and provided a Power Point Presentation as well as hard copies of the application to the committee.

Chris noted that the request is a Plan Approval 2 (PA2) for Conditional Use that has been approved for the last 10-15 years for 662 Sepulveda Boulevard, formerly known as Bel Air Bar & Grill, then as Bel Air Grill or Restaurant, and now is “Umberto’s Trattoria.” He noted that his clients for this project are David and Jessica Amron, 662 Bel Air, LLC, who owns the building. Since filing the case when Susan Lord was the owner of the building, Ms. Lord sold the property to the Amrons last fall. They purchased the restaurant and he showed the grant deed dated October 2023 and Susan Lord no longer owns the property.

The request is for continued sale and dispensing of a full-line of alcoholic beverages for sale onsite and continue to allow for the sale of beer and wine offsite at the Shack in conjunction with restaurant usage.

Chris noted that the last time they were presenting PA1, there was also a second floor space for events; there was an outdoor patio that was also permitted for sale of alcoholic beverages. That space has now been reconverted back into office space. In this request, they’re asking for the continued sales and dispensing at a smaller amount of floor area than what was previously approved. They are also asking for deletion of Condition #8 to remove the need to return routinely for periodic review of approvals for alcoholic beverages.

He provided a detailed history of cases for this project, noting that since 2010 and now, the Planning Department has stopped requiring the re-approvals, and, he is back as required at this time. He reviewed the justification for the request noting that the previous and current owners have demonstrated that they have been good neighbors, doing everything since the CUP in 2011 to make sure there was no immediate impact on the neighborhood from the restaurant operations, the beer and wine sales inside the restaurant and from the Shack outside. They are asking for support to continue sales at the restaurant and the Shack.

Questions were asked and answered, some in regards to previous safety concerns with the sale of alcohol offsite, to which Chris responded. Also noted were previous arguments against the request for the sale of offsite alcohol at the Shack, which included proximity to school buses and late night bus, as well as transients, who would put the neighborhood at risk. Chris noted that he has asked the LAPD, who responded that there have been no complaints that have required LAPD.

Chris noted that the previous and current owner done a good job of making sure not to sell alcohol to people who were clearly inebriated, and who have reported that they haven’t received any calls on a special line for complaints. He noted that there will be a public hearing where someone can relate otherwise. Other concern from that time pertained to people going to the Chevron station that would be purchasing the alcohol.

Chris shared the site plan, noting that the Shack is attached to the restaurant but is a separate business that shares a couple of walls. There are other prepared foods sold there in addition to beer and wine; sharing the first and second floors. He noted that Susan Lord’s license transferred to the new owner after the State agencies checked the background, and they need the local approval. Chris related that hours are unchanged for both the Shack and the restaurant. Restaurant: Monday through Saturday 11:30am to 9pm and The Shack 7am to 7pm Monday through Saturday. Weisberg would like feedback from the Director of BAA, Jonathan Brand, because of the two accesses into Bel Air there.

Motion to postpone until a time certain and if the applicant isn’t available, postpone until the next time certain; table this until our next meeting, moved by Weisberg, and seconded by Weinberg. Chris has no availability in early July. There was no public comment on this item. Dr. Longcore thinks that the concern is about something that isn’t an issue, a tempest in a teapot, and he wouldn’t postpone. Chair Schlesinger noted that he has never heard of a serious problem serving alcohol there. Levinson agreed that BAA should do some outreach with the neighbors, to let them know it’s up for renewal. Loze agreed with this. The motion to postpone **passed** by all but 2 who opposed.

7. 72 N BEVERLY PARK DIR-2024-3186-DRB-SPPC-MSP-PR-HCA ENV-2024-3187-EAF

Case Filed 5/20/2024 Mathew Quan

Project Description: Single Family Res. Lot 55, Block: None, Tract 38057. APN: 4386-013-021. Lot Area 295-786-.1 SF. Detail: 2-story res to be remodeled, (E) 2 story guest house w/basement to be remodeled. (N) 1-story pool house, (N) Pool '7 Spa. Site has existing buildings (provide copy of permits). Demo of existing buildings; remove of any onsite/tree; grading, haul route.

New Const & addition to existing buildings. Ext renovation or alteration.

One rs unit, adding one = 2. Project requests multi Approval Requests LAMC Sec 13A.2.10? YES

Auth Code Sec 16.50. Ord 167,943 (MSP) required for project within Mulholland Corridor.

Recorded Covenants YES.

Applicant Jean Simonian 8701 Wilshire Blvd. 310.279.3333 mikaelc@ildicoinc.com.

Agent: David Forrest Crest R/E 310.405.5352 david@crestrealestate.com.

Geology & Soils Rept. Geotech Engineering. Tree rept.

Permanent Link: <https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/caseid/Mjc1OTg40>

Isaac Lemus presented the project noting that he was accompanied by David Forrest, from his office, assisting with entitlements for Mulholland process and City Planning, and on the architectural side, on Zoom, were Cerise Carleo & Ilana Spindel, as well as Ryan Leehey, Landscape Architect, all from Harrison Design.

Isaac noted that the project is located right off of Mulholland Drive at the intersection of Beverly Park Lane and Beverly Park Drive, in the North Beverly Park Community. He discussed the project scope, described as a remodel of an existing 20,575 square foot single family dwelling. The remodel will include a 2-story addition to an all already existing 2-story home, basement addition, new pool house, for total all-encompassing RFA of 40,580 square feet. The project also includes a new pool and spa, 2 retaining walls with a max height of 10 feet for each, and then associated landscape and grading. As a result, the entitlements that are associated with this project are threefold: MDRB case, a site plan review, and a haul route for export of 2,310 cy including the bulking factor. Overall lot is 295,786 square feet = 6.8 acres in size.

Isaac noted that they have an existing structure that they are adding onto. As to the building footprint, he noted that they are not expanding, it is all pre-existing as well as the height, existing height is 34' and proposed height is 34'. There is an existing basement that they are looking to add 222 square feet to the basement... There are no protected trees to be impacted or removed or biological resources or sensitive habitats to be impacted or removed as a result of the project.

He noted the haul route conditions entitlement through B&S, after having Mulholland Hearing, and BSC. They expect to go directly onto Mulholland, up the 405 to Sunshine Canyon; no substandard curvy streets.

He discussed compatibility, and reviewed the site plan's general layout; the site plan of basement, to which they are adding a 222 square foot winery. He reviewed the main floor and the rest of the rooms and elevations, noting that they are *not* asking for deviations.

He described the project two-story home, looking to fill the overall envelope, noting architecturally speaking it is postmodern, and overdue for a facelift from the late 1990s/2000. He showed different renderings before and after, including and more natural materials, more in line with Mulholland's Specific Plan. The landscape plan was shown, and various trees that they're proposing, named, to be more harmonious with the surrounding environment and providing privacy.

Questions were asked and answered with some comments including the existing is 25,575 and proposed is 40,580 proposed. He discussed the increased RFA, the green plan, trucks coming onto the property, and acknowledged having a grading plan, which he thinks is just general leveling of the existing flat pad.

Member Evans raised questions about how this project meets required findings for Site Plan Review, including #1 that the project is in substantial conformance with the purposes, intent and provisions of the General Plan, applicable Community Plan, and any application Specific Plan, and #3 that any residential project provides recreational and service amenities to improve habitability for its residents and minimize impacts on neighboring properties. Isaac noted that they are not asking for any deviations from any code in the sense that what they are proposing falls in line with what's been outlined by the BHO specifically for the hillside area.

Member Savage asked if she could speak, noting that she would not be voting on this, and was invited to do so. She asked about existing gate in the image, to which Isaac noted that they are *not* asking for an over in height entitlement for the gate because the gate would be behind the property line, behind the HOA setback and behind LADBS setback. He did not know the height specifics, or if existing or not but noted they wouldn't need any entitlements. He noted that the prevailing setback is 40 feet.

In response to question by Savage about the glass bridge that connects to the building, in terms of impacts of the glass on birds, she advised that they consider treated glass or a type of scrim to resist impact. He'll check with the owner about possible mitigation. Mr. Forrest noted there is a wood slat façade as well. He noted that it is an existing bridge structure already there including the roof.

Isaac returned to the former point of the grading plan, noting that they are not looking to extend or going into the existing hillside, noting it might just be for the overall lowering of the site to bring it closer to what is from the street point of view, maybe add a little topography at the existing flat pad.

Mr. Forrest emphasized that this is all within the pre-established building pad, and the intent of the project and the Mulholland Specific Plan is to keep within the natural grade as much as possible. Isaac explained that for Beverly Park, there are a lot of flat pads in the neighborhood but adding grading adds a little more topography which keeps in more conformance with Mulholland. Dr. Longcore offered to send them to someone to answer questions as to the glass, and noted that he could frit the glass railings.

Chair Schlesinger asked about their tree demo plan, how many trees are being removed, to which Mr. Forrest noted that there are no protective trees. Schlesinger asked if they'll be using San Ysidro, to which Isaac noted that they are *not* using San Ysidro for anything and would have that as a condition. Weinberg asked about lighting. All exterior would be low intensity down facing lighting, per the MDRB. Miner would add a condition in writing that San Ysidro shouldn't be used for anything other than passenger traffic.

Asked, Mr. Forrest noted that the typical build of this size should take 30-36 months, up to three years. Member Loze asked them to consider *not* doing the hauling, come back with an idea on how to mitigate 500 trucks, to which Isaac spoke to the designers/architects present on Zoom, as to possibly massaging the earth works. Mr. Forrest spoke on the HCR issues, including construction hours, which he noted will be reduced.

Dr. Longcore related that he heard two substantive questions: 1) Can you use the 6 acres, rework it and not have to take 500 dump trucks of soil out and put it in a landfill? 2) How do you reconcile the additional heating, cooling, and energy consumption of a 40,000 square foot home for one family compared to the 20,000 square foot home for one family under the General Plan that has very specific rules about conserving energy and associated and the greenhouse gas emission? He noted that these are the two questions that deserve real thought, and that there is something such a thing as Net Zero building, designing that does not require additional energy. Dr. Longcore noted that we are an advisory body. He thinks it would be respectful to the process and to have some real language in these plans, if there is any way for the findings to be made, as to these two questions. He suggested they come back, talk with the team, come back, and go forward with strong support from the neighborhood council, to show that they would comply with where we are as a City and the real commitments the City is trying to make in terms of being sensitive to the environment, especially with regards to the 500 dump trucks with lot of carbon emissions and all of the energy consumption.

Motion to postpone until they are ready to come back and discuss whether there is or is not any way to address those two major questions **passed** by all but one abstention from Savage, as moved by Dr. Longcore and Weinberg.

8. [9785 W DRAKE LANE](#) [DIR-2024-2489-DRB-SPPC-MSP-HCA](#) [ENV-2024-2490-EAF](#)

Los Angeles 90210

Lot Area: 51,940 sf.

Project Description: New 2 story Single Family Residence totaling 11,999 sf & basement covering 7,312 sf., w/ 30' hit. Project is in the Outer Corridor downslope not visible from Mulholland Dr., is subject to the requirements of the Baseline Hillside Ord and is not within the Girard Tract. Property is not visible to Mulholland Drive, does not penetrate view shed and does alter access onto the Mulholland right-of way. Greystone Eng. Group, 11022 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 440, Los Angeles, CA 90025. (310) 405-2341.

Email: info@greystoneeng.com Soheil Moeini info@greystoneeng.com

Applicant: Kevin Tanna Kevin@kacapital.com

Representative: Tara Harrison Permits@taraharrison.LA

Permanent Link: <https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/caseid/Mjc1MjY10>

Kevin Tanna, the owner of 9785 Drake Lane, introduced himself and noted that Tara Harrison would not be here this evening. Mr. Tanna presented the project, noting that Drake Lane is a private road off of Hutton, in a beautiful area, where he and his family have lived for five years and love being there, noting the beauty of the area, the nature and wildlife, including oak trees.

He noted that they are just expanding the footprint a little bit and adding on, adding a second story. He explained that they have to dig down to build back on bedrock. He provided a presentation, pointing out the overall property, larger than the neighbors' lots. The majority of his 54,000 square feet is largely flat. There is an existing tennis court. He pointed out the driveway is a shared street that other neighbors use. That version is 15 feet lower than the pad, and they wanted a basement that would access that part of the road to the property. They are designing around an oak tree (pointing). He showed existing plan and renderings of the new site. They are not removing any trees, they have a lot of oak, black walnuts, sycamores, none of which trees will be impacted.

Questions asked and answered including but not limited to variances requested, which he noted are only the MDRB. There will be a 3000 cy haul route from Hutton to Mulholland to 405. Staging will be done on the property, on the flat area. As to neighbor support, Evans noted that it would be great to take them through it before we weigh in, and Loze encouraged him to find out what the HOAs would like to know from him.

Dr. Longcore asked if he was part of an association, which he related he was not. Dr. Longcore explained the position of the Neighborhood Council, organized under the City of Los Angeles Charter... that our job is advisory to the City, and within our NC territory there are many residents' associations / home owner associations. Mr. Tanna related that he is not part of an HOA but would be willing to seek one out. It was noted that this project is in the BCA area and Schlesinger noted that in that area near Hutton there are three HOAs that are strongly stick to CC&Rs.

Questions were asked and answered, including as to glass, for which Dr. Longcore will send him info. Evans would like to understand the flow of staging and hauling, and Weisberg asked about the turnaround for the trucks, which questions he responded to. Miner asked about how many homes in the area have basements dug into the hills, the square footage of the basement and number of caissons. He believes the basement is about 4,800 square feet basement, including garage-park. He discussed caissons and noted that another approach would be to re-compact the entire site, which would be too disruptive to what is there now. There was discussion about parking, where he noted that there is no street parking. Everything is on the site (on proposed site plan 7).

Motion to postpone any recommendation until meeting that may be online; he'll be meeting with Benedict Canyon Association, and hopefully we meet again before he goes to MDRB **passed** unanimously as **moved** by Weisberg and Evans.

9. Expand Existing Notification Requirements Prior to Issuance of a Demolition or Structure Permit

Discussion and Motion: To support the motion in Council File 18-0406

<https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=18-0406> proposed by Councilwoman Katy Yaroslavsky with the following amendment:

- Add a requirement for the demolition permit applicants to provide LADBS Plan Check with a proof of compliance with Rule 1403 for asbestos clearance <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/reg-xiv/rule-1403.pdf>. LADBS shall consult with AQMD and LAFD regarding implementation of this request.

Background:

- Currently, LADBS and its Plan Check Department rely solely on applicants' integrity to report compliance with Rule 1403 for asbestos clearance <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/reg-xiv/rule-1403.pdf> by simply signing an affidavit.

- Unfortunately, some applicants have signed affidavits without performing necessary tests to prevent neighbors and construction workers from being exposed to debris contaminated with asbestos. After our reports, AQMD intervened, stopping demolitions and enforcing compliance.

- By requesting a proof of compliance from SoCalAQMD or LAFD we will ensure that public health and safety are further protected during demolition from asbestos-contamination.

Member Grey presented this motion, noting that Councilmember Katy Yaroslavsky has a motion to change the notification process for demolitions. Grey would add a clause to the motion with regard to asbestos in existing buildings to "Add a requirement for the demolition permit applicants to provide LADBS Plan Check with a proof of compliance with Rule 1403 for asbestos clearance."

Motion to support the motion in Council File 18-0406 **if amended** to add a requirement for the demolition permit applicants to provide LADBS Plan Check with a proof of compliance with AQMD's Rule 1403 for asbestos clearance, **passed** by unanimous consent as **moved** by Grey and **seconded** by Evans.

The meeting adjourned at 8:55pm, to return (*virtually only*) on July 9, 2024 at 7:00pm.