

SUNLAND-TUJUNGA NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
LAND-USE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
November 5, 2018

- I. Meeting was called to order at 7:07pm by Chairperson Cindy Cleghorn
- II. Roll Call (no quorum at outset of the meeting)
 - a. Present
 - i. Cindy Cleghorn
 - ii. Elektra Kruger
 - iii. Nina Royal
 - iv. Liliana Sanchez
 - v. Vartan Keshish
 - vi. Pati Potter
 - vii. Richard Marshalian
 - b. Absent
 - i. Bill Skiles
 - ii. Debby Beck
 - iii. David Barron
 - iv. John Laue
 - v. Cathi Comras
 - c. No public representative present
- III. Announcements – Cindy Cleghorn
 - a. Up-Dates on City Planning processes/ordinances
 - i. A 90+ page staff report has passed through the City Planning Commission and will now be forwarded to City Council. Links to the related documents can be accessed on the City Planning Website.
 - 1. This document has to do with how the City processes its application
 - b. Restaurant Beverage Program Ordinance
 - i. There will be a Staff Level Hearing re the proposed Ordinance. The intent of the Ordinance is to cut down the time it takes for restaurants to get alcohol related licenses.
 - 1. If a restaurant can abide by all conditions out-lined in the Ordinance, that application can be approved quicker. Typically applications can take over a year to process. Information link on the agenda.
 - c. City Planning’s new Planning and Land-Use video
 - i. Explains how the City processes applications. Link on the agenda.
 - ii. Project Planning with Jane Choi: <https://youtu.be/fEUGHnumOFQ>
 - d. Community Plan Up-Date
 - i. The S-T et al Community Plan Up-Date is scheduled to begin in 2020. Informational link on the agenda
 - e. City Planning newsletter
 - i. The newsletter comes out quarterly with information on how the Planning Department functions and things going on in the Department
 - f. ReCodeLA Up-Date
 - i. The City is up-dating its entire zoning code. As the Community Plan up-date is being processed, the zoning code will be taken care of during that time. A lot of progress has already been made

1. With the ReCode system, one can add comments directly to the website. Comments can also be sent to the City directly. The City seeks comments on ReCode
- g. General Plan Up-Date
 - i. Link to an on-line survey is on the agenda. First we have a General Plan for the entire City, then the individual Community Plans which in our case is inclusive of S-T-LVT-SH and parts of LTC
 1. A part of that is a Wildlife Pilot Study. There will be an Open House with City Planning Wed Nov 7, 6:30pm-8:30pm (See attached flyer)
- h. General National Elections
 - i. Tomorrow Nov 6
 - i. NC Board Elections 2019
 - i. Scheduled for April 27, 2019. Candidate filing Jan 12-Feb 11, 2019
- IV. Approval of Minutes
 - a. On continuance. Quorum not yet established
- V. Meeting recessed at 7:16pm to call Committee Members to achieve a quorum
- VI. Meeting resumed at 7:24pm, quorum present
- VII. Introduction of Committee Members
- VIII. California High Speed Rail Authority Board meeting scheduled for Nov 15 – see attached CHSRA Board meeting agenda
 - a. Preferred Alternative = SR14 though E1 and E2 remain under consideration
- IX. Foothill Corridor Economic Development – Richard Marshalian
 - a. Working on a proposal for S-T to improve the vitality of the Foothill Corridor and Commercial Areas
- X. Draft CIS for CF 18-1000 – Water and power infrastructure failure in hillside developments
 - a. On continuance
- XI. Cindy C. explained the process of the STNC-LUC in reviewing Land-use applications in S-T
- XII. Finalize comment letter to City Planning re 7740-7770 McGroarty – see attached draft letter
 - a. We will be submitting a comment letter from the STNC as well as copies of comment letters from the neighbors
 - i. One neighbor provided recommended changes to the STNC-LUC Draft Comment Letter
 - ii. Pati P.: The LUC's Draft Comment Letter brings up all the essential points. It is just a Comment Letter w/no commitment to support/oppose. The Planning Depart will be getting copies of all other letters fr the University and neighbors
 - iii. All can attend and testify at the Hearing if one is scheduled.
 - iv. **MOTION:** by Pati Potter that the STNC-LUC Draft Comment Letter be forwarded to the STNC Board for their review and final vote as written 2nd by Nina Royal
Vote: Unanimously approved
- XIII. 6360 Foothill – Recycling Buyback Center
 - a. Presentation scheduled for Nov. 19
- XIV. 6433 La Tuna Cyn Rd – Verdugo Hills Golf Course Project
 - a. FEIR, Project Preferred Alternative 6a – Fred Gaines,, Land-Use Counsel for Snowball West, Inc, current owner of the VHGC
 - i. See attached Notice of Public Hearing, site map of Original Project, site map of post-FEIR Preferred Alternative 6a with Project Description

- ii. The property is surrounded by SFRs to the north atop a ridge, to the east by single-family multi-housing and Open Space to the west. The VHGC has now been closed for almost 2 years
- iii. The GP for this area has a land-use designation of “low medium density”. A # of possible zoning designations could fall under this GP land-Use designation, however the S-T et al CP states that it may only have an RD5 zoning designation
- iv. Per State regulation, the GP land-use designation & zoning designation must coincide. The current RA-1 & A-1 zones fail to coincide w/the GP land-use designation of “low med density” thus a Vested ZC to RD5 is being requested
- v. There is no request for a Variance. The Project proposes to develop only the acreage that has already been disturbed over the years by the golf course. The Original Project requested 229 units
- vi. Taking comments to the DEIR into consideration a new alternative – 6a – was created for 215 units which would be clustered in the SE corner of the site not touching the Open Space area of the site
- vii. The 6a alternative will have “balanced on-site grading” with no trucks taking fill onto or off the site. There will be a reduced number of tree removals eg 82 oak trees to 29. An acre has been set aside for the Tuna Cyn Detention Station CHM
- viii. A number of traffic mitigations are being required by the City – widening Tujunga Cyn Bl to its full dedication. The intersection of Tujunga Cyn Bl and La Tuna Cyn Rd/Honolulu Ave will have one left turn, one shared and one right turn
- ix. The first Public Hearing will be in front of the Hearing Officer of the Deputy Advisory Agency on Nov 28. The Hearing Officer will make a recommendation
- x. From there the next Hearing will be in front of the City Planning Commission which has the first “yes or no” vote. Tentatively scheduled for Jan 24 to be held in the valley
- xi. The final decision will be made by City Council in mid-2019 being heard first in the Council’s Planning and Land-Use Management (PLUM) Committee
- b. Compromised Alternative – Marc Stirdivant, Chairman of V.O.I.C.E.
 - i. In Feb, representatives of Snowball West reached out to Paul Edelman of the MRCA with an offer to discuss reducing the number of lots in the development creating new parkland on the site
 - ii. These discussions were expanded to include the Trust for Public Land (TPL), VOICE and the Tuna Cyn Detention Station Coalition. After numerous meetings – proposals and counter-proposals – a compromise was reached
 - iii. There is a consensus among the 5 groups that have been working on this together that for the compromised park proposal to go forward, it must have the support of the community
 - iv. Marc S. came before the LUC to present the compromised park proposal to see if the community sees this as a reasonable alternative or not. The community is not bound by the compromise proposal developed.
 - v. The elements of the proposal are a reduction in the number of units from 215 to 169 making 46 lots available for purchase in 3 sections to be appraised at fair market value and sold to the MRCA /Trust for Public Land at a 10% discount
 - vi. The MRCA will become the owner and operator of the park with a permanent maintenance fund based on Homeowner’s Association fees established by the MRCA.

- vii. There will be a one-time fund for the Tuna Canyon Detention Coalition for creation of the Tuna Canyon Detention park.
- viii. The compromise proposal would result in 6.3 acres of open golf course land plus 28.4 acres of undeveloped hillside O.S. for a total of 34.7 acres of O.S. parkland owned & operated by the MRCA, the operations & maintenance arm of the SMMC
- ix. This is alternative 6a for the 215 units, 46 lots of which are to be purchased by the MRCA thereby reducing the buildable lots to 169. The Project footprint would be reduced from 25.s acres to _____?_____
- x. The MRCA would make improvements to the park including the upper section along Tujunga Cyn Bl where they envisioning putting a small parking lot at a trailhead leading to the undeveloped open space
- xi. Funding for the Project would be raised largely by the TPL as well as other entities, the total cost estimated to be between 6-8 million dollars.
- xii. The organizations are not asking the community to support the housing Project – they are asking the community to think about supporting the compromised parkland proposal which would serve the best interests of the community
- xiii. Q: What was the land originally zoned for? I was under the impression it is zoned A1 for +/- 24 homes. Why are you proposing 215?
 - 1. Fred G.: Repeated the concept of the GP vs Zoning which at RD5 would have allowed for a maximum of 244 homes. The GP supercedes zoning
- xiv. Q: If the MRCA is involved , why did they not just purchase the entire 58 acre site and dedicate it to Open Space?
 - 1. Marc S.: That has always been the goal and remains our goal today, but we are advocating for the compromise because the owners are not willing sellers of the entire property. The TPL reached out to them on several occasions to discuss purchasing the whole site
 - 2. Keep in mind that Snowball is not giving away the lots, they are selling them. It is now the goal of the TPL and MRCA to find the 8 million dollars
 - 3. They can seek funds from Prop 1 passed a few years ago, LA County Measure A, Prop 68 - the parks bond that voters agreed upon last June and perhaps Prop 3 – another ballot measure on the ballot tomorrow
 - 4. While these will provide funds for purchases like this, they would not cover the \$35 million it would take to purchase the whole property so the hope is to find something achievable, like this compromise alternative
- xv. Q: How do we know that you will not just back out of the agreement once the 215 unit alternative is approved?
 - 1. Fred G.: We will sign an agreement to sell certain lots to the MRCA/TPL if the City approves the 215 lot 6a alternative – the agreement will be signed in advance of the City’s Public Hearings
 - 2. Cindy C.: For clarification, you will get approval for the 215 – that would be what the City approves. The City is not involved in any way with the agreement between Snowball and the other organizations?
 - 3. Fred G.: That is correct – the agreement is between us and the MRCA
 - 4. Cindy C.: So it is outside and after the City’s approval of this application?
 - 5. Fred G.: Yes – the agreement is to sell 46 lots to the MRCA

- xvi. Further points and counterpoints were made re traffic issues vs traffic studies and Fire Dept write-offs
- xvii. Q: Why is it that VOICE, which is an org claiming to support us did not have us involved in the negotiations with Snowball – making a compromise we had no part in. We will tell them how we feel about their “negotiations”
 - 1. Marc S.: Nothing has been formalized yet – we are not yet that far ahead. This presentation is our opportunity to even bring this option on board. Nothing has been signed – this is just our chance to tell you what we think is a good plan. You are not bound by it
- xviii. C/Q: This Project, the way it is laid out – what they are trying to do – is convince us that they have zoning clearance for more than 24 houses. But they don’t so why are they “compromising” on 169 homes that they do not have?
- xix. C: They don’t have clearance – we have to stand up and say NO – no zone changes allowed. If we stand up, it will not happen. I expect VOICE and the MRCA to stand up with us, not to be making compromises behind closed doors
- xx. C: We also need to help you understand that Los Angeles has a traffic problem. We should not be building these large developments in areas that have no mass transit – that is absurd
- xxi. Cindy C.: Re the design of the homes – I apologize, but that is just not fitting with the surrounding area. I hope they can be modified significantly
- c. Cindy C.: Everyone, you have an opportunity to direct your questions and concerns directly to the City right now. There will be a Public Hearing on the 28th. I encourage you to do so
 - i. Emphasized to the audience that this is the first time that the NC also has heard of the compromise alternative. It is not in a NCs best interests to ever get together with any presenters on a one-to-one basis
 - ii. Stakeholders however do not have these restrictions and are encouraged to meet with developers to ask questions and share concerns
 - iii. (Asking of the presenters): Have you made this presentation to the Councilwoman Yet?
 - 1. Fred G.: Yes, we made it to her staff presenting the same hand-outs that were shared with the LUC and audience this evening
 - 2. C: That is backwards – you should have come to us before going to the Councilmember
 - 3. Cindy C.: (To the audience): The CM can meet w/anyone & encouraged the audience to set up their own meetings with the Councilmember
 - 4. Pati P.: I did invite the Councilmember’s Planning staff to attend this evening so they could answer questions more from the City’s perspective to help the community understand the reasoning behind the proposals – things not totally clear to us. But they were not able to come this evening for whatever reason.
 - 5. Cindy C.: It is critically important that those representing our Councilwoman are not here tonight to hear you. We need to have that voice – you need to go to the Public Hearing on the 28th
 - 6. C: Our representatives are not here to listen to the people they represent. It really behooves us - every single one of us – to place a phone call and urge every single one of your neighbors to place a phone

call as well because the fact that our representatives are not in this room is horrible

XV. Meeting adjourned at 9:25pm