



Minutes  
**Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council**  
**Planning & Land Use Committee *Virtual Meeting***  
**Tuesday October 8, 2024 7:00 P.M.**

Name	P	A	Name	P	A
Robert Schlesinger, Chair	X		Jamie Hall, Vice Chair		X
Don Loze		X	Stephanie Savage	X	
Leslie Weisberg		X	Ellen Evans	X	
Maureen Levinson	X		Stella Grey		X
Patricia Templeton	X		Travis Longcore <i>ex officio</i>		X

Chair Schlesinger called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm and led the flag salute. The roll was called by the minutes-taker, with quorum met. Dr. Longcore handed hosting of the Zoom call over to Member Evans and left for a prior commitment.

1. The October 8, 2024 Agenda was **approved**, as moved by Member Evans.
2. The July 9, 2024 Minutes (Attachment A) were **approved** with one abstention from Member Templeton, as moved by Evans. (*There were no August or September meetings.*)
3. **General Public Comment:** There was no public comment on agenda items not on the adopted agenda.
4. **Chair Reports:** Robert Schlesinger, Chair related that we have four projects coming up. Jamie Hall, Vice Chair, was not present this evening.

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

5. **1701 N Coldwater Canyon Drive ZA-2023-202-F-CU1-HCA**  
 Filed 01/11/2023; accepted for review 06/24/2024, assigned 09/05/2024; Staff Assigned Jaime Espinoza  
Hearing Date: 10/31/2024 09:00 AM  
Applicant: Fernando & Nadina Szew Family Trust Representative: John Parker [Pacific Crest Consultants]  
Project Description: Demo of existing SFD and construction of new SFD with basement, attached garage, ADU, pool, spa, retaining walls, over-in-height perimeter fence, ~~with haul route.~~  
Permanent Link with Initial Submittal Documents: (Applications, Findings, Plans & Vicinity Map)  
<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenummer/ZA-2023-202-F-CU1-HCA>

Applicant’s Representative, Chris Parker, introduced the project, pointing out another address on Monte Cielo Drive. He noted that, while there is mention of a haul route in the project description, in the time they’ve been waiting for a hearing, the project has been redesigned and there is no longer a haul route.

Some comments include reference to the over-height perimeter fence of 6-8 feet in height, with 15” to 30” brick wall with a maximum height and plumb height at any one point of 8 feet.

He noted that the second request is to grant relief for requirements of extra parking spaces once past 2400 square feet. They have parking for the ADU and the rest, but are asking for relief from the two additional parking spaces because of the square footage.

He showed the site plan, as to the gate, pointing out Monte Cielo on the bottom, and Coldwater Canyon on the right of the page. He noted that a third street on the left side is part of the problem, making this a complicated project site. To the left of the project site, they've created a space for the parking for the ADU. They have a driveway to hold additional cars... but it crosses the plane. If there are guests they will have onsite parking. He discussed complications, noting that in addition to having a complicated triple lot, which requires front yard setbacks for both of the sides, which would push the parking deep into the properties, they are also trying to create a lot of open space and have plans for gardens, etc. Other than one location, to create parking space, getting parking at street frontages on either side would require significant grading. He pointed out elevations for the gate, brick, wrought iron above. La Fontaine Court is the other street on the left. Some more elevations show some gates.

He shared some relevant cases within the 500 foot radius, and others that were approved. They listed three at neighboring or nearby properties. They also have photographs of other over-height elements adjacent or very close to the subject property. He noted that it is a hillside area, where residents have erected over-height elements, legally or not, and they are asking for the same rights which they'll do legally.

Questions were asked and answered, including as to the need for the 8' fence, to which Chris noted that even with a six-foot fence in an area there are parts that are easier to jump over a little downhill. If 8' it's harder to jump over. He noted that the other two streets are considered substandard but he doesn't think they are less than 20' wide. The house is 7500 with a basement. Chris noted that the fence will be a more subtle one, not a statement fence; wrought iron at the top to prevent people from scaling it and spikes on the top. Asked about the entertaining kitchen, Chris noted that they are not asking for a second kitchen; the plans that are online are the first... He thinks they were overenthusiastic plans sent 10 months ago. The lattice roof is over patio.

Also discussed were lot coverage, paving and landscaping as well as parking. He was asked to provide the requirement. He noted that they are doing one more curb cut, a discretionary request; a new curb off of La Fontaine Court. There is an existing curb cut on Monte Cielo, which is where they'll be taking driveway access for the new house as well. To create parking coming off front streets (that are going up) would require significantly more grading, for which they'd need a haul route. He hopes that the landscaping outweighs the negative of them requesting less parking.

He was asked if vehicle lifts were a possibility. He noted that this is their request, they're hoping that with the buffer of landscaping, unofficial parking spaces will be a solution. Asked, the road width is 24 feet and La Fontaine Court is 30 feet, so there is street parking on both streets. There is street parking. There is a full entertainment kitchen in the ADU and lounge; seems the ADU is 75% for entertaining. He related that the ADU is next to the pool and outdoor area. He wouldn't be surprised if they use the ADU as a cabana.

There will be two curb cuts for both the house and ADU and asked if this is another ask from the City to do that. Asked about the curb cuts, one is along La Fontaine Court to create compact parking space for the ADU. He noted that the client isn't planning on renting out the ADU, but maybe adult children or parents who need board care may live there. To protect the ADU for future owners, the parking space is being created with a curb cut up La Fontaine Court as far north as he could get. Committee members would like to see the actual plans, not preliminary plans, before making any conclusion about this project. He noted that they have a ZA Hearing on 10/31, he'll tell the ZA that they have a request for more information and come back in November.

**Motion** to continue this item to provide additional information on issues including but not limited to parking, curb cuts, and lot coverage. Member Savage will make a list of things that they'd require. Motion was moved

by Member Savage. **Amendment** to include plans for the fence, if they'll have hedges that will hide the fence, and if the fence will have spikes was **moved** by Templeton, and seconded. The motion **passed** by all five members present and voting.

Subsequent to the meeting, the following questions were sent to Mr. Parker re 1701 Coldwater Canyon Drive:

- 1) Please confirm lot coverage for structures over 6' high for the entire project.
- 2) Please confirm ZA case ( ZA-2023-202-F-CU1-HCA)- stating "Demo of existing SFD and construction of new SFD with basement, attached garage, ADU, pool, spa, retaining walls, over-in-height perimeter fence, with haul route" . Note this entitlement description does not include the reduced parking entitlement, per the meeting discussion.
- 3) Please verify the entitlement request for the significant reduction in parking for a large house. Code would require (6) spaces - including ADU, yet the project plans only (3) spaces provided. No findings provided in in the DCP online project plans, if you have information please update. And if the owner has explored vehicle lifts for parking solutions to meet the BHO requirements?
- 4) In the PLU meeting, you mentioned the haul route was not needed? The Civil drawing C2.3 says otherwise. Please verify the haul route is not needed, since the project plans on the DCP case show significant basement cut. Please verify any revisions to grading and CY, exempt & nonexempt.
- 5) Please verify 8' over height fence construction. Drawings show flat top rail and no points on the top rail. Confirm no sharp points/finials on top fence. Will the hedge be removed or cut to an 8' height? Or will they be planting a new hedge or leaving it just an 8' iron fence?
- 6) Please verify total RFA exempt & nonexempt.
- 7) Please verify the ADU will be used for housing not a gym and provide curb cuts dimensions for ADU parking DCP online project plans do not provide curb cut information. Please verify that it will not be used as an entertainment or recreation space (in addition to not being used as a gym)?

6. **Milken Community School 15600 Mulholland ZA-1996-18445 -PAD-PA4  
& Shawn Shirdel 15523 Casiano Court**

*No tentative hearing date yet.*

Representative: John Parker / Pacific Crest Consultants 818-591-9309. [E-mail: Chris@PCCLA.com](mailto:Chris@PCCLA.com)

Project: Lot-Line Adjustment (LLA) between the Milken School and 15523 Casiano (**Attachment B**)

Request: Pursuant to Section 13.B.2.3.H.2 of Chapter 1 of the LAMC, Milken Community School (Milken) is requesting Modification of Entitlement to CUP for reduction of site area of 4,808 sf, being conveyed from the total lot area of 943,027 square feet (21.65 acres) via a LLA in Case No. AA-2021-10362-PMEX to the adjacent property located at 15523 Casiano Court (Project). [Mr. Shirdel proposed to build a pool and deck in rear yard at 15523 Casiano Court; approved by MDRB (ZA-2022-9228-ZAA-DRB-SPP-MSP); needs approval of LLA with neighbor, Milken (formerly American Jewish University) in order to build.]

Chris shared his screen again, noting this is not about Milken; it's about his client who lives on Casiano Court that overlooks the south-end of what is now Milken, and they started the project when it was AJU. His client would like to build a pool with a deck in his rear yard. To do that, he asked AJU if they would allow a lot line adjustment, as AJU had done with several other neighbors on Casiano, so there wouldn't be setback issues. He noted that it started with a parcel map exemption. He put Milken School, because of where they are today. There is not going to be any new RFA on either site. Milken School is being generous to continue the request from previous owner.

He noted that in 1996, AJU got a Conditional Use that created the campus as we know it; defined the campus; it said this is the legal description and size of the campus. In the infinite wisdom of Planning, any change to that original grant needs a plan approval. Even if not asking for a new floor area or new use, they are changing the legal description asking for a few hundred square feet. There is this case, the PA4, the 4<sup>th</sup> Plan Approval that this site has had to go through since 1996. For his client, they had to file a DRB case with Mulholland, because there is more than 250 yards of grading, and a deck over 50 CY of grading. MDRB was scheduled three times before Stephanie was on the DRB, they were lost and cancelled all the meetings. The

part of the property that his client will get is officially zoned RU40 but is only a few hundred feet; not 40,000 square feet. The two closest neighbors did this. He is here to ask for the NC to support the Plan Approval that has been requested that allows the definition of Milken School to change slightly, and since we're here that we have a Plan Approval and ZA case.

Questions were asked and answered. He noted that the CD office supports it and the Milken School and neighbors support it. There have been no letters or objections or known opposition. **Motion** to approve both the Plan Approval and the ZA Adjustment was **approved** as **moved** by Templeton and Savage.

7. **8520 Allenwood Road DIR-2024-4933-DRB-SPPC-MSP. ENV-2024-4933-DRB-SPPC-NS**

Project Permit Compliance/Design Review Filed 8/01/24; Assigned 08/22/2024; Staff Assigned Jude Hernandez Legal Description: Lot 22 TR 23186; Lot 21 TR 23186; Total Lot Area. 10,574.4 sq ft.

Applicant, Owner of Record & Agent: Amelia Stephenson [Kingsley Stephenson Architecture] (310) 748-9551 [amelia@kingsley-stephenson.com](mailto:amelia@kingsley-stephenson.com)

Project Description: Interior remodel/addition to (E) 3,257 sf SFD Project includes additions of 368.1 sf and 58.1 sf on 1st floor and 122.4 sf and 103 sf on 2nd floor, resulting in a total proposed RFA of 3,908.6 sf.

**Permanent Link with Initial Submittal Documents**: (Application, Findings, Plans & Vicinity Map)

<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumbr/DIR-2024-4933-DRB-SPPC-MSP>

**Additional documentation can be found in Ms. Stephenson's Dropbox:**

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/wh94ydtcwok8mkbj9t8l/ABP9LaIrcOHVzvbLcRBonmE?rlkey=bd2uf3kfpjoicmqbswbdoue5&dl=0>

Amelia shared her screen starting with her site plan and described each of the additions and the decks. She was able to reuse doors and windows and would only add four or five new window or door units for the whole project. She wouldn't have to destroy any that they have. **Motion** to **support** this project passed by all five members present and voting, as **moved** by Evans/Templeton.

8. **3191 N TOPPINGTON DR LA 90210 DIR-2024-4993-MSP-DRB-SPPC ENV-2024-4994-CE.**

Project Permit Compliance/Design Review Filed 08/23/2024 Staff Assigned Claudia Rodriguez Lot 20, Block None, TR 24946. APN-4385005043. Lot Area 73,454 sq. ft.

Appl., Owner of Record Michelle Farhadi [michellefarhadi@yahoo.com](mailto:michellefarhadi@yahoo.com) 310.508.5300 Farhadi Family Trust Rep: Susana Juarez / Nathan Mendelsohn [NS Designs] 323-384-6316 [nathan@nsdesignsonline.com](mailto:nathan@nsdesignsonline.com)

Project Description: Construction of a new 439 sq. ft. Recreation Room with top deck in conjunction with an existing 7,784 sq. ft. with a new residential floor area of 8, 223 sq. ft.

**Permanent Link with Initial Submittal Documents**: (Application, Environmental Determination, Findings and Plans) <https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumbr/DIR-2024-4993-MSP-DRB-SPPC>

Nathan noted that typically this project would be exempt from MDRB; however, they just did a major addition and renovation approved in 2019, so any floor area that they add will require another review. This is for construction of a one-story rec room with outdoor seating area, fire pit and barbeque, in the back of the house, and there is a huge 12- feet high retaining wall that they got approved. The rec room will be in front of that wall and in front of that is a tennis court that was already permitted. This is strictly about the rec room 450 square feet, RFA, not visible from Mulholland, an uphill property; no chance someone could see inside. It will be 14' high at the base of the building. The area that is being proposed on is flat, so no grading is proposed; just regular footings. The building design will match the house as it is. They are proposing a roof deck on top of this, for the owners. Member Savage related that typically we get to review plans in this process, which he did not have. **Motion** to table this to a time certain with plans **passed** as **moved** by Evans and Levinson.

The meeting adjourned at 8:28 PM to November 12, 2024 at 7:00 PM.