



**BEL AIR-BEVERLY CREST NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL  
PLANNING AND LAND USE COMMITTEE  
MINUTES OF VIRTUAL MEETING  
Tuesday, March 10, 2026, 4:30 p.m.  
Conducted via Zoom Webinar**

**CALL TO ORDER, FLAG SALUTE & ROLL CALL**

Co-Chair Jamie Hall called the meeting to order at 4:35 P.M. on Tuesday, March 10, 2026. He noted that the meeting was scheduled to start at the earlier time of 4:30 P.M. due to scheduling issues among committee members. The meeting was conducted virtually via Zoom in conformity with California Senate Bill 707 (Durazo) and LA City Council File 23-1114.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Dr. Travis Longcore, who displayed a flag in the background. Mr. Schlesinger also raised a flag. Ms. Weisberg noted the spirited effort.

Roll call was conducted as follows:

Member	Role	Attendance
Jamie Hall	Co-Chair	Present (chaired first portion; audio-only after Item 9)
Michael Kemp	Co-Chair	Present (chaired Items 5, 6 after Hall's departure)
Leslie Weisberg	Vice-Chair	Present
Robin Greenberg	Member	Present (audio issues at start)
Nickie Miner	Member	Present
Maureen Levinson	Member	Excused Absence
Jason Spradlin	Member	Present
Stephanie Savage	Member	Absent
Robert Schlesinger	Member	Present
Patricia Templeton	Member	Absent

Stella Grey	Member	Absent
Steven Weinberg	Member	Present
Travis Longcore, Ph.D.	Ex Officio	Present (departed after Item 9)

Staff present: Cathy Palmer, Administrative Assistant.

A quorum was established. Note: Co-Chair Hall transferred presiding duties to Co-Chair Kemp following the vote on Item 9, in order to attend a prior commitment. Hall remained connected to the call-in audio only mode to preserve quorum. Dr. Longcore also departed after Item 9.

## 1. APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 10, 2026 AGENDA

---

Co-Chair Hall called for a motion to approve the agenda.

**Motion:** Dr. Travis Longcore moved to approve the agenda. Ms. Nickie Miner seconded. No discussion.

**Vote:** The motion carried unanimously, with no objections and no abstentions.

## 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

---

Co-Chair Hall asked Administrative Assistant Cathy Palmer to confirm whether the January 13, 2026 and February 10, 2026 meeting minutes had been prepared for approval.

Ms. Palmer confirmed that neither set of minutes had been prepared.

**Action:** Items 2(i) and 2(ii) were not acted upon. Approval of the January 13, 2026 and February 10, 2026 meeting minutes is deferred to a future meeting.

## 3. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

---

Co-Chair Hall opened the general public comment period for matters within the Committee's jurisdiction but not on the adopted agenda. He reminded attendees that items on the agenda may only be addressed when the respective item is called, and that the Committee may not take action on matters raised during general public comment under the Brown Act.

One speaker addressed the Committee:

**Timi:** Addressed the Committee regarding Van Nuys Airport (VNY). She stated that LAWA (Los Angeles World Airports) has released six Requests for Proposals, two of which she contended violate existing land use zoning (Ordinance 177327), and one that blurs the legal limits of allowable land use. She described LAWA as pursuing a land recategorization — converting airport commercial land to aviation land — which would facilitate expansion of jet operations, without regulatory approval or environmental review. She also referenced an ongoing land swap proposal similarly in potential violation of existing zoning. She stated she had provided a packet to Dr. Longcore and Co-Chair Kemp and requested that the neighborhood council consider sending a letter to the council member encouraging City Council to protect the existing zoning ordinance and defer any rezoning until completion of a new Van Nuys Airport-specific plan.

Co-Chair Hall thanked the speaker and noted that this matter is within the Committee's purview and has previously been raised by constituents. He stated the Committee will consider agendizing it at a future meeting. No action was taken.

No other speakers raised their hands. General public comment was closed.

#### 4. CHAIR REPORTS

---

##### **Jamie Hall, Co-Chair**

Co-Chair Hall had no formal report.

##### **Michael Kemp, Co-Chair**

Co-Chair Kemp had no formal report.

##### **Leslie Weisberg, Vice-Chair**

Vice-Chair Weisberg had no formal report.

Note on Item Order: At the request of the applicant's representative, the Committee agreed to hear Items 7 and 8 (the Gilcrest Drive projects) before Items 5 and 6 (the Sarbonne Road and Chalon Road fence projects). Co-Chair Hall also moved Item 9 (Draft Open Space Element) before Items 5 and 6 due to a prior commitment requiring him to depart. The Committee voted unanimous consent to proceed out of order. Items are summarized below in the order they appear on the agenda.

#### 5. 778 & 772 N. SARBONNE ROAD — OVER-IN-HEIGHT FENCE (CONTINUED FROM AUGUST 12, 2025)

---

Presided over by Co-Chair Kemp.

##### **Project Information**

<b>Case Numbers</b>	ZA-2025-1668-F / ENV-2025-1669-CE
<b>Address</b>	778 & 772 N. Sarbonne Road, Bel Air
<b>Case Filed / Assigned</b>	Filed: March 20, 2025   Assigned: March 25, 2025
<b>City Planner</b>	Esteban Martorell
<b>Applicant</b>	David Dollinger [778 Sarbonne LLC]
<b>Representative</b>	Benjamin Eshaghian [Crest Real Estate]; Tony Russo [Crest Real Estate]
<b>Project Description</b>	Two adjacent single-family residential lots. Action requested: Construction, use, and maintenance of an 8-foot maximum-height vehicular gate, flanked by 8-foot maximum-height ficus nitida hedges and chain-link fencing (updated from 6-foot original request), with native landscaping, all over-in-height, in the front yard setbacks and public right-of-way of both lots.

**Prior PLUC Action**

August 12, 2025: Continued with applicant directed to: (1) reach out to the Bel Air Association (BAA); (2) obtain neighbor approvals; (3) review plans for LAFD compliance; (4) determine if fence can be set further back from public right-of-way (PROW); (5) provide parking plan details; (6) show dimensions of fence from curb.

**Applicant Presentation**

Benjamin Eshaghian (Crest Real Estate) presented updates directly responsive to the six items from the August 2025 continuance. Tony Russo (Crest Real Estate) addressed neighborhood outreach. The following responses were given:

- BAA Outreach and Neighbor Approval (Items 1 & 2): Mr. Russo reported that the team met with Jonathan Brand of the Bel Air Association, who reviewed the plans with various neighbors. No formal opposition was expressed. One outstanding item from the BAA concerned lighting — specifically a request that any gate/fence lighting be downward-facing, low-intensity, and not include bright floodlights. The applicant agreed to condition lighting accordingly and will provide lighting plans consistent with BAA requirements. Mr. Russo noted adequate queuing space is provided at both sites so that vehicles waiting for the gate do not back into the public street.
- Fire Code Compliance (Item 3): Planting plans for both sites were submitted to the LAFD Brush Fire Clearance Unit and approved. The underlying single-family developments at both sites had previously undergone fire and access review by LAFD.
- Setback from PROW (Item 4): A section drawing was presented showing a steep hillside slope immediately behind the proposed fence locations, making a further setback from the PROW physically infeasible.
- Parking Plan (Item 5): 772 Sarbonne has 2 covered and 3 uncovered spaces (5 total); 778 Sarbonne has 5 covered and 2 uncovered spaces (7 total); combined total of 12 parking spaces.
- Fence Dimensions from Curb (Item 6): Site plans show the ficus plantings located 3 feet from the curb. The chain-link fence is 6 feet in height; the vehicular gates are 8 feet in height; ficus hedges (8 feet) screen the chain-link.

Mr. Eshaghian noted that a question remains pending with City Planning regarding whether hedges within 30 feet of a structure are subject to the 6-foot maximum height limitation for shrubs. The applicant has sought clarification from City Planning and stated it will reduce hedge height if required by City Planning's determination.

**Committee Questions and Discussion**

Co-Chair Kemp confirmed the projects involve two separate lots with two houses. He asked about the fence height change from 6 to 8 feet and the hedge issue. Mr. Eshaghian clarified that the chain-link fence remains at 6 feet, while the vehicular gates are 8 feet; the ficus hedges at 8 feet will screen the chain-link from view. Vice-Chair Weisberg asked about BAA involvement, confirmed the BAA had weighed in, and read a text message from Jonathan Brand expressing the BAA's concerns about lighting, setback, and whether the fence encroaches into the PROW — noting that the fence was "about permission, not forgiveness" since it had not yet been built at this location. The committee reviewed the updated plans and was satisfied with the responses to the August conditions, subject to adherence to the BAA's stipulations including the lighting requirement.

**Public Comment**

No members of the public raised their hands to speak. Public comment was closed without any testimony.

### Committee Deliberation and Vote

Mr. Schlesinger moved to recommend the project to the full board. Vice-Chair Weisberg amended the motion to include a condition that the project be approved subject to all stipulations of the Bel Air Association (specifically including lighting conditions). Mr. Weinberg seconded.

**Motion (as adopted):** To recommend support for (approval of) the over-in-height fence at 778 and 772 N. Sarbonne Road (ZA-2025-1668-F), subject to compliance with all stipulations and conditions set forth by the Bel Air Association, including downward-facing, low-intensity lighting consistent with BAA requirements.

**Moved by:** Robert Schlesinger (as amended by Leslie Weisberg).

**Seconded by:** Steven Weinberg.

**Vote (Roll Call):** Ms. Miner — Yes; Mr. Schlesinger — Yes; Mr. Weinberg — Yes; Ms. Weisberg — Yes; Mr. Kemp — Yes; Mr. Hall — Yes.

**Result:** Motion carried unanimously (6-0-0).

## 6. 10770 W. CHALON ROAD — OVER-IN-HEIGHT FENCE (CONTINUED FROM AUGUST 12, 2025)

---

Presided over by Co-Chair Kemp.

### Project Information

<b>Case Numbers</b>	ZA-2025-810-F / ENV-2025-811-CE
<b>Address</b>	10770 W. Chalon Road, Bel Air
<b>Case Filed / Assigned</b>	Filed: February 7, 2025   Assigned: February 27, 2025
<b>City Planner</b>	Esteban Martorell
<b>Applicant</b>	Craig Tessler
<b>Representative</b>	Benjamin Eshaghian [Crest Real Estate]; Tony Russo [Crest Real Estate]
<b>Project Description</b>	Legalization, use, and maintenance of an already-constructed (built without permits) over-in-height fence: 6-foot maximum-height smooth plaster wall with pilasters, 6-foot pedestrian gate, and 6-foot vehicular sliding gate, all flanked by native landscaping, in the front yard setback of the lot. Survey confirmed the wall is fully within the public right-of-way.
<b>Prior PLUC Action</b>	August 12, 2025: Continued with applicant directed to: (1) provide a survey clearly showing whether the wall is in the PROW; (2) provide photos of the wall as constructed; (3) address the need for convex mirrors; (4) obtain support from neighbors; (5) update on whether wall is in PROW.

## Applicant Presentation

Benjamin Eshaghian (Crest Real Estate) presented updates. Tony Russo (Crest Real Estate) addressed the committee's concerns. The following responses were provided:

- Survey (Item 1 & 5): Updated survey was submitted. The survey confirms that the wall is fully within the public right-of-way. The applicant noted that the existing driveway itself is also within the PROW. Photos of the property line, driveway apron locations, and wall extent were shown.
- Photos of Constructed Wall (Item 2): Photos were presented showing the wall and gates as built. The photos showed the wall running essentially at the curb, with the plaster wall flanking two driveway apron locations.
- Convex Mirrors (Item 3): Two convex mirrors have been installed — one at each driveway entrance — to address sightline concerns. Installation was confirmed by both the applicant and Vice-Chair Weisberg.
- Neighbor and BAA (Item 4): Vice-Chair Weisberg relayed a text from BAA representative Jonathan Brand: the fence was built without a permit and received an order to comply. The BAA's stated concern was whether the committee should treat this as a matter of 'forgiveness' rather than 'permission,' and raised questions about the setback from the curb, encroachment into the PROW, and the adequacy of vehicle queuing space.
- Tree Preservation: The wall was built around an existing sycamore tree. An arborist confirmed the tree remains in good health; this was independently verified by the Bureau of Street Services Urban Forestry Division.

Mr. Eshaghian acknowledged the wall was constructed without permits, stating the client was unaware of the regulations. He stated the physical constraints of the driveway — which is itself in the PROW — make it technically difficult to move the wall further back without reducing the driveway width from its current approximately 10–11 feet. He offered to discuss with the client whether any setback improvement might be feasible.

## Committee Questions and Discussion

The committee engaged in extensive discussion regarding multiple concerns:

- Construction Without Permits: Members expressed strong concern about the applicant's approach of building first and seeking legalization after the fact. Co-Chair Hall (by phone) advised the committee to evaluate the project as if the wall had not yet been built — asking whether the required findings could be made if this were a brand-new proposal — since granting any advantage for unpermitted construction is inappropriate. Ms. Miner noted the pattern of 'build first, ask forgiveness.'
- Wall at Curb — No Queuing Space: The wall as built is at or within inches of the street curb. Multiple members raised the concern that there is zero queuing space for vehicles waiting for the gate to open, meaning any vehicle waiting for the gate will be stopped in the travel lane of the public street, creating a safety hazard. Mr. Schlesinger noted that with a car parked in the narrow street, a passenger's door could not open. Ms. Weisberg stated the queuing situation is unsafe.
- Public Right-of-Way: The wall is confirmed to be fully within the public right-of-way. Ms. Miner questioned whether any further setback is possible. Mr. Russo acknowledged the PROW encroachment and offered that there may be a discussion about whether some offset from the current position is achievable — though constraints from the driveway width make significant movement difficult.
- Feasibility of Moving the Wall: Co-Chair Kemp noted that if the gate were relocated to the property line, the existing planter between the driveway and the house might need to be removed and the driveway reconfigured — but this could be feasible. Mr. Russo acknowledged this as a conversation to have with the client and team.

- Landscaping Infeasibility: Ms. Miner pointed out that native landscaping cannot realistically be planted in the space between a wall located inches from the curb and the curb itself — a further inconsistency in the application.
- Evaluation Standard: Co-Chair Hall reiterated from prior BABCNC experience that the ZA evaluates after-the-fact requests as if the structure were not there and finds against the applicant if the required findings cannot be made. Hall stated: "If you can make the findings, great. If you can't, then just do the right thing."

### Committee Deliberation and Vote

After discussion, Mr. Russo asked if the committee would allow the item to be continued to allow the applicant team to discuss potential modifications with the client — specifically addressing the wall's distance from the curb and the absence of vehicle queuing space. Co-Chair Kemp indicated support for a continuance.

**Motion (as adopted):** To continue Item 6 (10770 W. Chalon Road, ZA-2025-810-F) to a date uncertain, to allow the applicant and Crest Real Estate team to discuss with the client potential modifications to the wall placement and gate configuration — with particular focus on (a) providing adequate queuing space between the gate and the public street, and (b) reducing the encroachment of the wall into the public right-of-way — and to return to the Committee with a revised proposal.

**Moved by:** Michael Kemp.

**Seconded by:** Jamie Hall.

**Vote (Roll Call):** Ms. Miner — Yes; Mr. Hall — Yes; Mr. Schlesinger — Yes; Mr. Weinberg — Yes; Ms. Weisberg — Yes; Mr. Kemp — Yes.

**Result:** Motion carried unanimously (6-0-0).

### 7. 1665 N. GILCREST DRIVE — MAJOR REMODEL/ADDITION (ZAD) 8. 1660 & 1670 N. GILCREST DRIVE — MAJOR REMODEL/ADDITION (ZAD)

(Heard jointly and out of agenda order, at applicant's request. Presided over by Co-Chair Hall.)

NOTE: The ZA hearing on both projects was scheduled for March 11, 2026 — the following day. CoChair Kemp had previously written to the ZA requesting that the record be kept open for 60–90 days to allow the PLUC process to be completed.

### Project Information

<b>Case Nos. — Item 7</b>	ZA-2023-6125-ZAD / ENV-2023-6127-CE
<b>Address — Item 7</b>	1665 N. Gilcrest Drive
<b>Case Nos. — Item 8</b>	ZA-2023-6126-ZAD / ENV-2023-6127-CE
<b>Address — Item 8</b>	1660 & 1670 N. Gilcrest Drive
<b>Case Filed (both)</b>	September 8, 2023; Accepted for Review: October 3, 2025; Assigned: November 18, 2025
<b>City Planner (both)</b>	Esther Serrato

<b>Applicant (both)</b>	GT Dave [Gilcrest LLC]
<b>Representative (both)</b>	Abhi Kalra & Tony Russo [Crest Real Estate]
<b>Project — Item 7 (1665)</b>	Major remodel/addition of existing single-family dwelling to a new three-story, 7,729 sq. ft. SFD (max height 28'6"), with pool, spa, hardscape, decks, sports court, and two retaining walls (max 10 ft.). Grading: 2,246 CY; haul export: 3,433 CY.
<b>Project — Item 8 (1660/1670)</b>	Demolition of existing SFD at 1670 and major remodel/addition of existing SFD at 1660, resulting in a two-story 13,230 sq. ft. SFD (max height 32'8"), plus basement, indoor/outdoor pool/spa, decks, attached ADU (replacing demolished unit at 1670), attached garage with 6 spaces, and two retaining walls (max 10 ft.). Lot line adjustment between 1660 and 1670. Total including
	basement: approximately 15,000 sq. ft. Grading: 5,974 CY; haul export: 6,951 CY.
<b>Combined Totals</b>	Three existing homes (combined ~10,000 sq. ft.) replaced by two new homes (~20,000 sq. ft. above grade; ~15,000 sq. ft. at 1660/70 alone). Total grading export: ~10,384 CY (approximately 1,000+ haul truck loads).
<b>Entitlements Requested</b>	For both: (1) ZAD relief from LAMC 12.21-C-10.3 for continuous paved roadway (CPR) less than 20 feet wide; (2) ZAD relief from adjacent roadway width requirement less than 20 feet wide; (3) Haul route approval. Projects are located at the terminus of Gilcrest Drive, a narrow hillside cul-de-sac street.
<b>Hearing Date (ZA)</b>	March 11, 2026 (next day). ZA virtual hearing at 9:30 AM (Item 7) and 10:00 AM (Item 8).

### Applicant Presentation

Abhi Kalra (Crest Real Estate) presented using shared-screen slides. Tony Russo (Crest Real Estate) addressed questions and supplemented the presentation regarding neighborhood outreach and proposed construction conditions.

Mr. Kalra described the two related projects as being on adjacent properties at the terminus (dead end) of Gilcrest Drive. Three existing homes are currently on the three lots. Under the combined projects, 1670 will be demolished and its lot combined (via lot line adjustment) with 1660 to create one larger parcel for a single large home with an ADU; 1665 will be separately remodeled into a new home. This results in a net reduction of one dwelling unit, replaced by an ADU.

The properties are located at the dead end of a hillside street (Gilcrest Drive) that is approximately 18 feet wide with parking allowed on one side, creating effectively a one-lane street. The paved road ends near the project frontage. A private driveway provides access from the Gilcrest terminus up to the lots. The proposed project includes widening this private driveway to 26 feet and constructing a hammerhead turnaround at the end to improve emergency vehicle access. A deemed-to-be-approved private street easement for 26-foot ingress/egress already exists for this portion.

Mr. Kalra presented the findings that will be submitted to the ZA, including that the project improves access (widening the driveway to 26 feet and adding a hammerhead turnaround), provides adequate on-site parking, and is compatible in scale with other large hillside homes on Gilcrest. He cited several precedent cases for similar ZAD relief on Gilcrest and Linda Crest Drive. Ms. Weisberg noted that the

two Linda Crest precedents cited were approximately 20 years old; Mr. Cotsen later noted they predate the 2021 rule changes.

Mr. Russo announced additional voluntary construction conditions the applicant is prepared to condition into any ZA approval, developed in consultation with neighbors on Lloydcrest:

- No staging of construction or concrete trucks on public streets (all must stage on site);
- Only one haul truck at a time allowed in hillside streets (Linda Crest, Lloyd Crest, Gilcrest, Schulyer, Beverly Crest);
- No hauling on trash days;
- Flagmen at locations to be requested by neighboring residents, with radio communication between flagmen;
- Daily street cleaning following dirt hauling or concrete operations;
- No construction vehicle parking on hillside streets; workers to be shuttled from off-site parking (Bel Air Association lot and a secondary Doheny location);
- Construction managed by Freeman Group (owner's rep) and contractor Dow Build, both described as reputable hillside construction firms;
- All conditions to be formally incorporated into ZA approval, not merely verbal assurances.

In response to Co-Chair Hall's question, Mr. Russo stated the applicant is not willing to reduce the size of the homes and does not anticipate changes to home square footage, though engineers may be consulted on whether grading volume could be reduced through construction methods.

### **Committee Questions and Discussion**

The Committee asked the applicant numerous questions:

- **Scale and Size:** Co-Chair Kemp asked whether the proposed homes are built to maximum allowable FAR. Mr. Kalra confirmed the projects are below the FAR maximum (1665: 7,729 sq. ft. proposed vs. 11,719 sq. ft. maximum; 1660/1670: 13,230 sq. ft. proposed vs. 14,500 sq. ft. maximum). The combined homes represent a near-doubling of the combined square footage of the three existing homes (~10,000 sq. ft. vs. ~20,000 sq. ft. above grade).
- **Haul Truck Volume:** Vice-Chair Weisberg noted that 10,384 cubic yards of export grading, at approximately 10 cubic yards per truck, equals roughly 1,000 haul loads — not including demolition debris or concrete trucks. She pressed on the logistics of routing this volume through the narrow hillside streets. Mr. Russo confirmed the standard hillside rule of one haul truck at a time in the area and noted that due to the site being at a dead end, all trucks must drive onto the site rather than staging on the street.
- **Construction Timeline:** Mr. Russo estimated heavy construction at several months to a year; the full project could take "a few years."
- **Hearing Continuance Request:** Co-Chair Hall asked whether the applicant would request a continuance of the next day's ZA hearing to allow more community engagement. Mr. Russo stated the applicant was willing to keep the ZA record open but was uncertain whether the client would consent to a formal continuance of the hearing itself.
- **Home Size Reduction:** Co-Chair Hall asked whether the client would consider reducing home size to reduce hauling impacts. Mr. Russo stated he did not expect the client to change home size.

### **Public Comment**

A large number of neighbors from the Gilcrest, Lloydcrest, and Linda Crest neighborhoods provided public comment, virtually all in strong opposition. Co-Chair Hall extended comment time to 3 minutes per speaker and asked each speaker to address: (a) whether they had been contacted by the applicant's team, and (b) their views on the proposed voluntary conditions.

**Derek Mason:** Stated he was never contacted despite the applicant's claims of outreach. He lives on the corner of Gilcrest and Lloydcrest. He described six years of ongoing construction nightmare at 1500 and 1510 Gilcrest, including workers parking in front of his home despite assurances to the contrary, his housekeeper unable to park near his home, and fire trucks blocked from passing. He filed complaints with CD5 in September 2025 that have not been investigated. He stated assurances from developers are meaningless in practice and asked what recourse residents have when conditions are violated. Hall clarified that the neighborhood council is advisory only and cannot enforce conditions.

**Lisa B:** Stated she was never contacted. She documented fire trucks unable to get through on Lloydcrest due to construction at 1520 Gilcrest, requiring helicopters to respond to an incident. She said assurances of off-site staging mean nothing based on experience with 1520 Gilcrest, where construction vehicles regularly park in front of fire hydrants.

**Jay Marciano:** Stated combining the approximately 1,000 dirt haul loads with concrete truck loads creates approximately 4,000 total round trips. With only one truck permitted at a time, the logistics are mathematically impractical within any reasonable timeframe.

**Charlotte Wayne Bamford:** Stated she received notice only for the 1660 project and only learned of the 1665 project through this neighborhood council meeting — despite being listed in the applicant's outreach materials. She questioned whether the letter of support from 1646 Gilcrest was submitted by the same owner as the applicant (since 1646 is a vacant lot). She echoed street safety concerns for elderly neighbors and reiterated that the scale of construction is the core problem regardless of management quality.

**Tobey Cotsen:** Stated that in canvassing the neighborhood, only Charlotte received notice from the applicant. He noted the ZA hearing is tomorrow, creating the impression that the applicant is rushing the project through with minimal notice. He stated the cited precedent cases predate the 2021 rule changes and therefore have no bearing. He raised concerns about the fire hazard severity zone designation, questioned how fire trucks would access through the proposed gate, stated the projects do not comply with state fire-safe regulations (CPR less than 20 feet, cul-de-sac location), raised environmental concerns about runoff, slope stability, wildlife habitat, and native vegetation impacts under accelerated grading, and requested that the committee continue the item to allow fuller community participation.

**Blair Berk:** Stated she received no notice and only learned of the project the previous Friday. She expanded on storm runoff issues — rain from the steep Gilcrest site already floods the street and carries debris, even without construction. She also raised tree damage concerns, noting that a prior large construction project on Gilcrest caused the irreparable loss of two old eucalyptus trees on her property because trucks on the narrow street struck the trees instead of parked cars. She noted a near-90-degree turn at the Lloydcrest corner that large hauling trucks cannot navigate without hitting obstructions. She stated the demolition debris from two homes has not been addressed in the haul estimate.

**Christina Noonan:** Stated trucks en route to the site must pass her home. She described ongoing problems with a smaller-scale construction project on Lloydcrest — driveway blocked by trucks, having to personally find drivers to move vehicles, 10 flat tires from construction nails, and general construction traffic gridlock. She asked that worker busing be confirmed.

**Juliana Maio:** Learned of the project two days prior. Noted no permits have been issued yet and expressed confidence that the community has legal tools to contest detrimental projects. Explained she had previously halted a large home construction for three years through legal challenge.

**Cheryl Karton:** Acknowledged the applicant's assurances but noted a current project on Lloydcrest regularly runs multiple hauling trucks simultaneously in violation of the one-truck rule, with no enforcement. Characterized the logistics of this project as "impractical and impossible" if rules are actually followed.

**Ian:** Stated his family has been associated with the street since the 1950s. Raised the cumulative impact of multiple ongoing construction projects across the neighborhood. Calculated that at 4 trucks per day — a realistic maximum given street constraints and turnaround times — the project would take many more years than estimated. Received notice only for 1665, not for 1660/1670. Requested full city planning files be shared with neighbors.

## Applicant Response

Mr. Russo responded to public comments. He apologized to Charlotte and Ian for any gaps in outreach, confirmed they should have received letters. He provided his contact information to the full meeting (tony@crestrealestate.com; 408-655-0998) and asked all affected residents to reach out. He offered to add "no hauling on trash days" to the voluntary conditions based on a suggestion raised during public comment. He reaffirmed the applicant's willingness to condition all stated construction obligations into the ZA approval rather than leaving them as mere verbal assurances. He reiterated that the site being at the dead end means trucks must drive onto the site, which is a logistical advantage over street-side projects. He stated construction management by Freeman Group and contractor Dow Build should be relied upon for good-faith implementation.

Mr. Kalra added that during pre-construction excavation, the existing flat pad between the three homes provides ample staging for haul trucks before the driveway improvements are complete, so the public street would not be used for turnaround.

## Committee Deliberation and Vote

Co-Chair Hall noted that the Committee is in a difficult position because the ZA hearing is scheduled for the following morning. He recommended the Committee offer its advisory opinion that evening, noting the ZA record had been asked to remain open for 60–90 days. Ms. Miner expressed strong opposition to any exemptions from the hillside ordinance and the cumulative environmental and neighborhood character impacts. No committee member expressed support for the project as presented.

Co-Chair Kemp moved to recommend that the full Neighborhood Council not support the projects as presented, citing the projects' failure to satisfy the required finding that the project's location, size, height, and operations will be compatible with and will not adversely affect or further degrade adjacent properties.

**Motion (as adopted):** To recommend to the full Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council that it NOT support approval of the projects at 1665 N. Gilcrest Drive (ZA-2023-6125-ZAD) and 1660/1670 N. Gilcrest Drive (ZA-2023-6126-ZAD), as presented, based on the finding that the projects fail to satisfy the required ZAD compatibility finding — specifically that the projects' location, size, height, and operations will not be compatible with and will adversely affect or further degrade adjacent properties and the neighborhood.

**Moved by:** Michael Kemp.

**Seconded by:** Nickie Miner.

**Vote (Roll Call):** Ms. Miner — Yes; Mr. Kemp — Yes; Ms. Weisberg — Abstain; Mr. Schlesinger — Yes; Mr. Weinberg — Yes; Mr. Hall — Yes; Dr. Longcore — Abstain.

**Result:** Motion carried (5 Yes, 0 No, 2 Abstain).

Co-Chair Hall informed the public that this recommendation will be forwarded to the full BABCNC Board at its next regular meeting on March 25, 2026 at 7:00 P.M. The public will have an additional opportunity to speak. The applicant's team is also welcome to present at the board meeting. The formal letter to the ZA will be written and submitted after the board acts. Co-Chair Hall noted that if circumstances change and the applicant wishes to return to the PLUC for a further hearing, the Committee would be open to that.

## 9. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE MOTION REGARDING COMMENTS ON DRAFT OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

---

(Heard out of agenda order, before Items 5 and 6, due to Co-Chair Hall's prior commitment. Presided by Co-Chair Hall. Comment deadline: March 31, 2026.)

Co-Chair Hall provided background: the City of Los Angeles is updating its Open Space Element of the General Plan for the first time since the 1970s, as required by California SB 1425. A draft is posted for public comment with a deadline of March 31, 2026. Hall proposed the BABCNC submit a comment letter to the City and presented ideas for the letter. He invited committee members to add their own ideas, asking Ms. Palmer to note them, and proposed that Hall draft the letter, and bring it to the full board at the March 25 meeting for approval, and submit it before the March 31 deadline.

### Key Concepts Proposed by Co-Chair Hall

- **Rezoning of Acquired Open Space:** Require the City to rezone all land acquired for open space by MRCA (Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority), SMMC (Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy), and other land trusts. Currently such lands remain residentially zoned even after acquisition, making accurate citywide open space mapping and planning impossible.
- **Designation of Priority Private Open Space:** Like some community plans already do, identify privately-owned lands with the highest open space value as targets for future acquisition or conservation, so decision-makers and developers know these areas carry elevated environmental significance.
- **Right of First Refusal for MRCA on City-Owned Hillside Lands:** The existing Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy Act grants MRCA a right of first refusal on city-owned lands within the Santa Monica Mountains Zone, but many ecologically equivalent hillside properties elsewhere in the city have no such protection. Hall proposed codifying in the Los Angeles Administrative Code a right of first refusal for MRCA on city-owned hillside lands beyond the current zone, so the City does not sell sensitive property to developers without first offering it for conservation.
- **Open Space Impact Fee:** Establish a development mitigation fee for projects that eliminate environmentally sensitive open space, creating a dedicated funding stream for future open space acquisition. Hall acknowledged this would face opposition from housing advocates but noted that the vast majority of impacted hillside lands are for large luxury homes, not affordable housing.
- **Broaden Quimby Fund Eligibility:** Current City policy restricts Quimby Act funds (paid by developers) to active recreational uses requiring a physical amenity such as playground equipment. Hall proposed broadening the definition to allow Quimby funds to be used for passive open space conservation and land acquisition, opening a significant potential funding source.
- **Salvage Provisions from the Suspended Wildlife Ordinance:** The City's wildlife ordinance is currently in abeyance. Hall suggested reviewing that ordinance to identify specific provisions that could be incorporated into the open space element, preserving elements of that policy effort.
- **Nonprofit Park Management Partnerships:** Encourage partnerships with organizations like TreePeople (which manages a city-owned park under agreement with the City and produces a higher-quality result than typical City management) as a model for future open space stewardship. Dr. Longcore offered a note of caution that not every nonprofit is as capable as TreePeople; Hall acknowledged this.
- **Trail Networks from Paper Streets:** Many undeveloped paper streets in hillside neighborhoods are already used informally as trails. Hall proposed a citywide policy encouraging conversion of

suitable paper streets into formal trail corridors, noting it is already expressed in the Hollywood Community Plan but should be a citywide policy.

### Committee Member Additions

- Ms. Miner: Proposed including a policy against the sale of hillside flag lots to developers; and ensuring that MRCA first-right-of-refusal acquisitions are priced at a significant discount to reflect the conservation purpose, with dedicated maintenance funding included for acquired parcels.
- Dr. Longcore: Added a note of caution on the nonprofit partnership idea (see above). Noted that Hoag Canyon is an example of the type of private land that should be identified under the priority designation concept.

**Motion (as adopted):** To authorize Co-Chair Hall to draft a comment letter on the City's Draft Open Space Element, incorporating the concepts discussed at the meeting, for review and approval by the full BABCNC Board at the March 25, 2026 meeting, and for submission to the City before the March 31, 2026 comment deadline. The letter to be limited to concepts discussed at this public meeting; any additional ideas to be raised at the March 25 board meeting or through subsequent authorized process.

**Moved by:** Michael Kemp.

**Seconded by:** Nickie Miner.

**Vote (Roll Call):** Ms. Miner — Yes; Ms. Weisberg — Yes; Mr. Kemp — Yes; Mr. Weinberg — Yes; Mr. Schlesinger — Yes; Mr. Hall — Yes; Dr. Longcore — Abstain (noting his role with an open space body).

**Result:** Motion carried (6 Yes, 0 No, 1 Abstain).

Following the vote, Co-Chair Hall transferred presiding duties to Co-Chair Kemp. Hall remained on the call-in audio-only mode to preserve quorum. Dr. Longcore also left the call at this time.

### GOOD OF THE ORDER & ADJOURNMENT

---

Co-Chair Kemp asked whether any committee member had anything to raise under Good of the Order. No items were raised.

Co-Chair Kemp adjourned the meeting at 7:12 PM. He noted the meeting ran approximately three hours and thanked all participants for their time.

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the full Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council Board is March 25, 2026 at 7:00 P.M. The next regular Planning & Land Use Committee meeting is scheduled for April 14, 2026 at 7:00 P.M.