

SUNLAND-TUJUNGA NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

LAND-USE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

APRIL 7, 2014

---

- I. Meeting was called to order at 7:10pm by Committee Chair Dean Sherer
- II. Introduction of Land-Use Committee Members
- III. Roll Call
  - a. Present
    - i. Dean Sherer
    - ii. Bill Skiles
    - iii. Cindy Cleghorn
    - iv. Debby Beck
    - v. Nina Royal
    - vi. David Barron
    - vii. Elektra Kruger
    - viii. Arsen Karamians
    - ix. Lloyd Hitt
    - x. Karen Zimmerman
  - b. Absent
    - i. Chaz VanAalst
    - ii. John Laue
  - c. Public Representative present
    - i. Wesly Hernandez – Field Director CD7 ☺
- IV. Approval of STNC-LUC Meeting Minutes of 3-3-14
  - a. **MOTION:** by Bill Skiles to approve the STNC-LUC Meeting Minutes as written 2<sup>nd</sup> by Karen Zimmerman Vote: Unanimously approved
- V. STNC Board Election results
  - a. There was a great voter turn-out – 671. STNC had the highest voter turn-out in our region. Installation will be Wed night. Although Councilmember Fuentes had planned to install the new Board, he will not be able to make it due to another commitment.
  - b. Election voter turn-out overall for all NCs is up considerably – close to 50% higher than 2 yrs ago citywide. This speaks to the overall improved outreach that NCs are doing. Many new people ran for Board positions which will bring new input to the Boards.
  - c. The Candidate Mixer prior to the elections was well attended. A lot of credit for the success of this event goes to Cindy Cleghorn and Mark Seigel.
- VI. Recommendations to the STNC Board regarding LUC Member appointments
  - a. Roberta Konrad expressed interest in the one vacant position on the LUC
    - i. She lives in Alpine Village, owns her own house. She ran for a position on the General Board and although she did not win she did grow to appreciate what the Council is doing and would like to volunteer for the LUC.

- b. At our next meeting we should re-affirm everyone's interest in remaining on the LUC Committee, let the newly seated Gen. Bd know who is on the Committee, what the LUC is about, etc. so they will have a stronger sense of the value & importance of the LUC.
- c. There is an application procedure for LUC appointments and Cindy will send to anyone interested.
- d. The LUC is the busiest Committee because it meets twice a mo. It is a significant commitment of time and energy and some of the Projects being reviewed here are very important to the community – we get into a lot of substantive land-use issues.

VII. Committee Member Up-Dates

- a. Lot-Line Adjustments at 12232 Big Tujunga Canyon – filed Sept. 2013
  - i. One of the applications has been withdrawn – we don't know which one & don't know why. In this general area there was once a proposal to construct 1,000 homes before Councilmember Greuel had the area down-zoned.
  - ii. This has been on the agenda for 3 months now and remains somewhat of a mystery because we have not been able to get answers to our questions relative to the applicant's long-term intentions for this land.
- b. Report on the March 15 Community Planning Forum in Granada Hills
  - i. Dean S. attended the Forum and had occasion to speak with City Planners that were involved with the Mobility Plan up-dates, the new Health Element for the City of LA and the ReCodeLA – the new zoning code for Los Angeles
  - ii. The Forum was well organized in that attendees did not just walk into an auditorium and listen to Planners speak on what they are doing with their particular Project but there were individual stations with easels explaining goals
    - 1. One could approach people/planners manning each station and interface with them one-on-one – could get into interesting discussions – were offered the opportunity to provide comments either on cards or by video-tape
    - 2. There were boards where one could attach post-it notes with comments/concerns.
    - 3. Comments can also be put on-line plus one can network with members of other communities. We are not alone - many concerns are shared by residents citywide.
    - 4. The Forum set-up avoided a situation in which a single person upset about something in their neighborhood monopolizes a meeting
    - 5. There was a ZIMAS map on a white board in which comments could be captured into a computer. There was a section of S-T on which community members wrote comments about things concerning them
  - iii. ReCodeLA has a "Map-It" program in which one can take a picture of something one likes or dislikes on a smart-phone and can submit it as a comment.
  - iv. Re the Mobility Element Cindy C. spoke to someone from the Mayor's Office who is very interested in helping the community in bettering our streets. STNC has submitted a letter relative to the "great streets" program

1. He needs to know that everyone in the community wants to come on board with it because there are numerous opportunities to partake of grant processes.
- v. This Forum was not the only opportunity for the community to provide input in the zoning up-date, the mobility element up-date and the health element. These will also go through normal public hearing cycles.
- vi. There is a report out on the ReCodeLA. It can be accessed on-line.
- vii. The Mobility Element is already in its hearing process – it is time to comment on that.
- viii. The City has never had a Health and Welfare Element before.
- ix. A good place to go for information = the City Planning Web-Site
- c. Master Planned Development Zone (MPD) – Citywide proposed zoning code amendment
  - i. Notice of Public Hearing released for May 7, 2014 room 1070 City Hall. A proposal initiated by City Planning to add the “Master Planned Development Zone” to the Municipal Code to “enable innovative, master-planned developments” (see attached)
  - ii. Per Dean S. the LUC will take this under submission since it is new & we need to review the info. A question might be why are they forging ahead with this Master Plan Zone concept when we are in the middle of the ReCodeLA process
    1. There may be some underlying development/political pressure being brought to bear to cause this to be brought forward now
    2. Peter Moen: This may be an attempt on the part of developers to accumulate areas of land to deal with them in “innovative new ways” – with less constraints, less restrictions, less existing code regulations
    3. Cindy C. requested that Peter M. prepare a list of his concerns, come to the next LUC meeting and share them with us so we can create a comment letter
    4. Peter M.: The number one concern would be “What does this really say”
    5. Dean S. will take it upon himself to call the staff planner who he met at the Forum, let him know that there was a fairly negative reaction to the new MPD zoning designation being proposed and ask what is behind it.
    6. The item will be on the next LUC agenda – we will get some comments together and create a formal communication to send to City Planning. The document is available on-line on the City Planning Web-Site
- d. General Plan Amendment Initiation Memo from the Department of City Planning
  - i. Memo addressed to all concerned “consultants, developers, engineers, surveyors and applicants” describing procedures for filing for/being considered for GPA. (See attached)
    1. General Plan Amendments are only done a couple of times a year – all this memo is saying is what an applicant needs to provide – it is for our information only, not something we need to weigh in on.

2. In the City of LA, General Plan Amendments can only be initiated by the City Council or the City Planning Commission. LA is a charter city and it is so directed in the charter
  3. Dean S.: We need to be sure that this does not speak to changes in how GPAs are to be handled – that filings will not be done on behalf of developers. It sounds as if they are opening the door to allow private property owners to initiate GPAs.
- e. City Planning Memorandum Initiative
- i. Deals with the definition of “short-term rentals”. Cindy C. will post a copy of this on the STNC Web-Site.
- f. Condition Compliance Unit Up-Date
- i. There are two Motions out there now to keep this going (see attached). They should be reviewed. This is a City initiated effort for Code Compliance to move forward. The STNC was in support of it when we first heard about it.
    1. Several months ago our Board submitted a request for a Council File to have all Code Enforcement put under one bureau – that would include code enforcement for Planning, for Building and Safety, etc.
    2. Right now Code Enforcement is a fractured situation – 1 group enforcing building codes, another group enforcing housing issues, another group zoning code issues – actually need a Motion to unify all Code Enforcement with specialties answering to one General Manager like San Francisco
  - ii. Rocky Wiles is a one-woman department following up on code compliance issues – mostly ABC license issues. There is not enough staff to do an effective job overall and these Motions are trying to get more staff for the department.
    1. Every City has it’s own approach to Code Enforcement. When Dean S. first started in Glendale, they had one or two Code Enforcement Officers – now they have 4. Some Cities have upwards of 25.
    2. In other Cities, Code Enforcement Officers enforce zoning code regulations, abandoned vehicles, dilapidated properties – not just Planning and Zoning. LA has never grasped what Code Enforcement entails
    3. John Blue: If they are so short-staffed why don’t they take on knowledgeable volunteers from the NCs just as they did with DWP and the Budget Committee.
    4. Lloyd H.: We as the NC are the code enforcers – we call City Hall. We have to nag them. Lloyd H. worked to shut down a business on a residential street that often had 21 cars and trucks parked in front of it
    5. Building and Safety is getting a little more staff – some retired people are coming back. There are 34 people coming in so there is hope that inspectors will be out enforcing the code.
- g. Above Ground Facilities Ordinance Up-Date

- i. This is for cell towers that go in the public right-of-way. Currently we have no input . We only get a letter from the DWP saying “you are going to get a little box in your parkway.”
      - 1. At Las Lunitas/Summitrose there is a big cell tower that has a blower underneath that makes a lot of noise
      - 2. There is a Citywide working group for the AGF Ordinance that has been trying to get the City to up-date it’s existing Ordinance so there would be notification to surrounding property owners and the NCs.
      - 3. An up-dated Ordinance will allow us to take location and aesthetics into account – not potential health effects.
  - h. Community Care Facilities Ordinance Up-Date
    - i. These are group homes in residential neighborhoods.
    - ii. A new ordinance is still pending.
  - i. Community concerns over Solar Farms
    - i. We have not seen an application at the STNC-LUC meeting & we never may since they are currently permitted by-right – that is what has gotten people so upset – that a large ground level facility could be installed in a residential area
    - ii. The NE region is the most vulnerable to these as we have large land parcels at relatively cheap prices.
    - iii. Energy generated by these commercial facilities is sold to the DWP, something residential rooftop owners do not have the option of doing. Private residential excess energy generated goes to the DWP grid for free.
    - iv. The only aspect of the SP that can be called into play is that relating to landscaping & fencing. The LAMC has nothing relating to Solar Farms. The SP has nothing relating to Solar Farms because the concept did not exist at the time the Plan was being drafted.

VIII. Public Comment

- a. The Crows Nest is open mornings for breakfast
- b. Nina Royal
  - i. Attended the “Save Our Streets” Hearing – a program w/which they want to inc our sales tax by ½% for a total of 9 ½%. They claim the money will go straight to our sts, but there have been too many instances where promises are made & not adhered to.
    - 1. They will not be spending more than they generate – the report related to this proposal lists all streets needing repairs – there is no way this program will generate enough money to fix all those streets.
- c. Mario Sterlings has a new owner. We do not know what the plans are for the property – housing, a restaurant? The owner wants to address the LUC so we will wait until they come and let us know what is happening.
- d. Peter Moen – requested an up-date on the Samoa Property
  - i. We do not know when the Hearing will take place. They are planning on applying for affordable housing funding – whether they have done that yet we do not know. They do not have a haul route permit

- ii. They have been in discussions with the Housing Department about the affordable housing grant. Councilmember Fuentes sent an endorsement of the Project in particular the request for affordable housing funding.
  - iii. Wesley H. stated that the Council Office has been in communication w/the applicant w/regards to improvements in the proposal eg the facade etc but w/ respect to parking on-site if the community has any solutions they will listen
    - 1. His suggestion to consider working out an agreement with the adjacent church for using their lot for overflow parking did not go over very well.
    - 2. The way it is currently designed it is not a good fit for that area and it certainly is lacking in what is needed parking. There is an aggravated parking situation there already – this will only aggravate it further.
    - 3. Peter M.: Speaking to Wesley H – as a representative of the Councilmember he as well as the Councilmember must understand that there are is very passionate resistance to & disappointment w/the Project
  - iv. As it currently stands, what they are proposing is legal including the parking.
    - 1. Nina R.: We are not a transportation corridor – how can that be legal?
    - 2. Debbie B.: They kept saying that because it was affordable housing people are not going to have cars and will be using public transportation. They would not accept that we have no public transportation available here. The UCLA Neighborhood Assessment Report determined that 9 out of 10 S-T residents have cars.
  - e. Cindy C. distributed a flyer (see attached) re the Day St. Project listing requirements for being accepted to move into the Day St. Housing Project.
  - f. Cindy C. distributed a flyer (see attached) announcing the April 24 Big Tujunga Wash Mitigation Area CAC meeting.
  - g. John Blue presented an approach toward dealing with hydraulic fracturing
- IX. Review of Tuna Canyon Detention Station Plans – Lloyd Hitt
  - a. Snowball West will be addressing the LUC re development plans for the VHGC at the next meeting so Lloyd could not speak to it but to the Detention Station only.
    - i. The Detention Station park is increasingly shrinking in size with each new map that comes out. The initial Motion was for “at least one acre”, it was then reduced to ¾ acre and most recently to 6/10 of an acre.
      - 1. Currently the area dedicated to the community is smaller than a dog park. Unfortunate for this Memorial Park.
    - ii. There has to be some kind of agreement w/Snowball West to set aside a portion of land for the memorial whatever it’s size. The coalition would have main control of the park so it could apply for grants. Would be responsible for maintenance.
      - 1. Nothing says that Snowball West must allow access to the memorial park even if it is dedicated historical. Such a dedication merely limits what one can do with the dedicated site, access is not required.
    - iii. Originally 100 oaks and sycamores were going to be removed. With the dedication of the Tuna Canyon Detention Station these will now remain.

- b. Lloyd H. mentioned an event that had taken place in which there were 4 speakers w/ intimate WWII internment histories. 3 Japanese and one German. They spent time in internment camps as children. 5 CSUN students are researching Piper Tech archives.
- X. Item 12 and 13 tabled
- XI. Foothill Town-Center Up-Date
  - a. Since the Town-Center has converted to new ownership, the Council Office has heard nothing but are pursuing that.
  - b. Audience: The site is not being kept up – there is trash everywhere, graffiti. Westly H. will arrange to get Building and Safety to cite them for graffiti removal.
  - c. It was supposed to close escrow in February and they were seeking tenants but Cindy C. has heard nothing. The owner is an out-of-the area Korean gentleman.
- XII. Comment letter re Chamlian School?
  - a. The school is actually located in the City of Glendale, however there are families along the Glendale/LA borderline west of the school that would be affected by a proposed student cap increase from 500 to 700 (see attached flyer)
  - b. The school is located on Lowell so the increased traffic would affect not only the local residents but many both north and south of Foothill as well as traffic conditions on Tujunga Canyon Bl.
  - c. Last year there was a proposal to build a gymnasium which was approved by the City of Glendale – it will be built sometime this year. It is believed that stipulations were placed in the agreement that the student cap was to remain at 500
  - d. The Hearing is scheduled for April 16 at the Glendale Planning Commission – prior to the next LUC meeting. The LUC agreed to let Karen Z. and Nina R. to comment at the Glendale Planning Commission on behalf of the STNC-LUC.
  - e. Dean S. would like to review the MND. Was a traffic study done?
  - f. It was agreed that Karen Z. could submit a letter from the STNC-LUC at the Commission Hearing. She will write a draft and have it reviewed by LUC members via E-Mail.
- XIII. Meeting adjourned at 9:25pm