

SUNLAND-TUJUNGA NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL  
LAND-USE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
April 2, 2018

---

- I. Meeting was called to order at 7:16pm by Chairperson Cindy Cleghorn
- II. Self-Introductions of Committee Members
- III. Roll Call
  - a. Present
    - i. Cindy Cleghorn
    - ii. Bill Skiles
    - iii. Elektra Kruger
    - iv. Nina Royal
    - v. David Barron
    - vi. Liliana Sanchez
    - vii. Pati Potter
    - viii. Vartan Keshish
    - ix. Richard Marshalian
  - b. Absent
    - i. Debby Beck
    - ii. John Laue
    - iii. Cathi Comras
  - c. No Public Representatives Present
- IV. Description of NC Land-Use Committee process of review – Cindy Cleghorn
  - a. Described the purpose, function and challenges of the NC system. Invited audience members to consider joining the NC Board/Committees. Described the NC land-use process and City land-use decision making process
  - b. Q: When the NC LUC gets an application packet from the City, is someone from the Committee assigned to outreach to the community?
    - i. The LUC attempts to outreach to the surrounding neighbors through the STNC board region reps and also neighbors.
    - ii. The LUC does not have a budget for mailings.
- V. Approval of Minutes
  - a. **MOTION:** by Pati Potter to approve the March 19, 2018 STNC-LUC Meeting Minutes as amended 2<sup>nd</sup> by Vartan Keshish Vote: Unanimously approved

**Pati Potter recused herself from the committee for the next item.**

Questions & Comments: Q = question from the audience C= Comment from the audience

Video of this part of the LUC meeting is also available on the stnc.org website

<https://vimeo.com/263363354>

- VI. 10638 Oro Vista – CUP for wireless unmanned 33 ft Verizon Cell Tower and associated equipment on Church property
  - a. Verizon representative was unable to attend tonight because her daughter was in a car accident
  - b. C: Verizon is a big company, they should have been able to send someone else out to make the presentation. This is the third LUC meeting in which this item has been on the agenda. Fear they are trying to wear us down and will get approval w/out our input. We

will not let that happen. As they wait, our coalition will get bigger and stronger. We will not permit Verizon to put a Cell Tower in our neighborhood by our children immediately adjacent to people's homes

- c. C: Research + consultation with realtors indicates that 94% of people surveyed will not live next to/near a cell tower. Erecting a Cell Tower will devalue real estate properties by +/- 20%
  - i. C: The proposed Cell Tower, if approved, will be erected immediately adjacent to a private residence and a condominium complex. A condominium currently valued at +/- \$500,000 will drop in value to +/- \$400,000 – a 20% devaluation
  - ii. C: No one is going to want to buy a condominium located immediately adjacent to a Cell Tower. The project needs to be considered from a financial prospective, from an aesthetic prospective and a safety prospective
    - 1. C: We get really high winds at the mouth of the canyon. Gusts could topple the tower onto people's homes
    - 2. C: There is a day-care facility one house away, a school 278' away. Cell Towers should not be constructed in residential areas. That is new legislation – Cell Towers used to be allowed in commercial areas only
- d. C: Verizon is preying on churches. Churches need the money.
  - i. C: Pres of Sunland Elementary PTA – in researching potential effects of Cell Tower radiation, could find no evidence of long-term harm that could come to children bec there has been no experimentation on impacts Cell Towers may have
    - 1. C: As a parent I am concerned that Verizon would even considering erecting a Cell Tower right next to our school. I want to know that there will be no long-term effects to the health and welfare of my children
    - 2. C: My husband works for AT&T – he is shocked that Verizon wireless would put a Cell Tower right next to a condominium complex as well as a school
- e. C: Per the school report, it calls for a 1,500' set-back for any antenna fr a school = +/- ¼ mi - +/- 5 City blocks. Also less than 6 antennas within 0.6 mi. The distance from the proposed location of the Cell Tower to the furthest point of Sunland Elementary = 800'.
  - i. C: The playground begins at 250'. Kids are going to be exposed. There has been no study of biological effects. It doesn't feel safe. Unless someone can hand me a doc proving that these waves are safe, this Cell Tower should not be allowed
- f. C: I work at an airport – anyone going near the tower will see signs saying “working in or around this facility will – *not “may”* – **WILL** cause you cancer”. All because of the microwave
  - i. Cindy C.: Requested a picture of the sign
- g. C: Parent of a Sunland Elementary School student reading from a document – “the human body is made up of billions of cells. The WHO has said that cell phone radiation is classified as a Class B carcinogen. The radiation is destructive of brain function
  - i. C: 5G signals fr Cell Towers penetrate structures & all living things. Microwave radiation, RF exposure, are known health risks. Cell Towers should have set-back guidelines not to be installed at children's playgrounds or in populated areas
  - ii. C: What comes out of Towers is millions of times more powerful than what is coming out of a cell phone. People get tumors behind/in the ear and throat from cell phones

- h. C: As a high school project, we put flies into a microwave oven for 2 sec two consecutive days. All third generation maggots were deformed – extra legs, no legs, extra wings, no wings – some kind of deformity. And this was just from a household microwave oven
- i. Q: Do you know how many Cell Towers there are in Sunland-Tujunga?
  - i. Cindy C: No, however the STNC has encouraged that Cell Towers be placed in the commercial corridor. We have one at Public Storage, Sunland Bl/Fwy rooftops, office bldg. at Haines Cyn/Foothill, etc
  - ii. Cindy C: There were attempts to put a Cell Tower atop an apartment building across from the Canyon Market – it did not happen. There was an attempt to put one up at Our Lady of Lourdes Church – application denied by the City.
  - iii. Cindy C: Proposed Cell Towers in residential areas have not been approved in Sunland-Tujunga. The STNC has set a precedent – has made it known that it is the wish of this community to limit Cell Towers to commercial areas on private property. This is not the case for cell towers in public rights of way. That is an entirely different process.
  - iv.

**Pati Potter returned to the meeting**

- VII. 9739 Samoa – requesting hardship exemption to reduce a 20’ set-back to 16’ for a new SFR
  - a. See attached application
  - b. Proposal to remove an existing house to be replaced with a new house. Applicants have been in Engineering/PlanCheck for a year already. An internal memo (not code reference) of a PlanCheck Supervisor stated the set-back had to be 26’
    - i. With the assistance of CD7 Planning Deputy Humberto Quintana and a DBS Civil Engineer, the required set-back was determined to be 20’, not 26’ – set-backs being based on averages of existing structures on the block.
      - 1. Average was skewed by an unpermitted garage w/out which the 16’ would be acceptable
      - 2. City is saying owner would have to submit new plans or file for a Variance, both of which would be quite expensive. Proposed new house will not be the largest, tallest, closest to the street, will not interfere w/ utilities
      - 3. **MOTION:** by Elektra Kruger that the STNC support the hardship waiver reducing the set-back from 20’ to 16’ for the proposed project at 9739 Samoa Ave given that the failure to comply with required set-back calculations arises solely from a pre-existing unpermitted garage located on the applicant’s block 2<sup>nd</sup> by David Barron Vote: 7 Ayes 1 Abstention Motion passes
- VIII. Approval of final Draft CIS re In-Lieu Fee Draft Ordinance for Tree Replacement – Richard M.
  - a. See attached Comment Letter
    - i. **MOTION:** by Pati Potter to approve the Draft Comment Letter as written 2<sup>nd</sup> by Vartan Keshish Discussion:
      - 1. Elektra K. referred to an article from the recent NVR (see attached) making reference to an earlier tree-planting program’s monies being repurposed negating the tree-planting program. Insisted the same thing would happen were the proposed In-Lieu Fee Ordinance for Tree Replacement be approved and should not be supported.
      - 2. **AMENDED MOTION:** by Nina Royal that the STNC oppose the proposed In-Lieu Fee for Tree Replacement Ordinance for reasons listed in Richard

M.'s Comment Letter as written 2<sup>nd</sup> by Bill Skiles Vote: 6 Ayes 2  
Abstention Motion passes

- IX. 10140-50 Hillhaven – Application for 35 apts with density bonus, reduced parking, etc
  - a. Thank you to Richard M. for arranging future presentation
- X. 10220-10222 Wilsey – Addition of 2<sup>nd</sup> story to existing SFR + 2 new residences = triplex
  - a. No up-dates
- XI. Public Comments
  - a. No public comments presented
- XII. Committee Up-Dates
  - a. There is a vacancy on the Land-Use Committee. Applications available for interested parties
- XIII. Meeting adjourned at 8:54pm