

SUNLAND-TUJUNGA NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL  
Special LAND-USE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
Held at the Apperson Elementary School of Auditorium  
March 3, 2020 -

1. **Call to Order** and Introductions: Meeting was called to order at 7:06pm. Present were Bill Skiles; Pati Potter; Liliana Sanchez; Vartan Keshish; Betty Markowitz, Berj Zadoian. Arsen Karamians. Cindy Cleghorn arrived at 7:15pm and Nina Royal arrived at 7:15pm as an alternate.
2. **COMMITTEE ANNOUNCEMENTS:**
  - a. LUC has an Alternate position open. Send applications to stncsecretary@gmail.com
  - b. Sunhill Marketplace signage hearing 3/6/2020 2pm, STNC is in support of this project regarding changing signage and adding new signage.
  - c. Workshops on Housing elements - Various workshops going in the city for the next 4 to 6 weeks, re: how much housing, If you have an interest please get involved in the workshops.
  - d. Workshop put on by CD7 Visioning Workshop 3/26 at Sunland Sr. Center. The Planning Dept. will be doing their own later in the year.
3. **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**
  - a. Next STNC Board meeting will be 3/11 at Sunland Park rec center.
  - b. 5 people spoke on the ill-effects/health danger of 5G cell.
4. **DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION:** Approval of February 3, 2020 LUC Minutes:
  - a. Betty moved to approve. Vartan 2<sup>nd</sup>
    - All approved motion passed.
5. **DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION:** Project Presenters:
  - a. **6920 Parson Trail–DIR-2019-7629 / ENV-2019-7730-CE**
    - i. Owner, Vartan Issaiyan, gave a full explanation of the 1-acre area where he wants to build the 1,800 barn/structure for his horses.
    - ii. The homes/neighbors are spaced far away from each other.
    - iii. A neighbor attended the meeting giving his support.
    - iv. Hearing all and seeing picture of the proposed structure and the area the project is in compliance with the Scenic Corridor Specific plan
    - v. Pati P. moved to support the project, Vartan K. 2<sup>nd</sup>.
    - vi. All approved, motion passed.
  - b. **10400 Sunland Blvd.** - Removal and replacement of an unmanned 64ft stealth monopine wireless facility. Currently is 45ft. Requesting relief allowing to exceed the height limit of 33ft. Currently it is approx. 45ft.
    - i. The Applicant did not show, unknown reason.
    - ii. A group of Stakeholder and other City residents were at the meeting to speak on this agenda item. It was questioned whether or not that would be proper without have both sides of the issue speak at the meeting.
    - iii. Remind everyone else that the discussion should be on the subject as noted in the agenda which is allowing a 64ft tower, not a discussion of the hazards of various communications technologies.

- iv. Pati recused herself from this discussion and left the room.
- v. Discussion continued with LUC and stockholders bringing up the following points:
  1. Because this is on private property, they need a Conditional Use (CU) Permit to allow the height, which is a significant height.
  2. It is thought that in the area we have 56ft but no 64ft.
  3. When these increases are allowed, it paves the way for other locations with a height increase.
  4. When applications are allowed they are allowed to have another carrier on top to extend even higher.
  5. How can this be stopped from going even higher?
  6. Why is a 64ft tower needed for this project.
  7. What will it do to the aesthetics of our town, of people coming into our area looking at the mountains, ridgeline, what will this do to that?
  8. This is a point the Zoning Administration (ZA) will look at.
  9. Health issues can be noted but in this case that is something the ZA is not suppose to look at those issues.
  10. Mentioned that cell service around La Tuna and down Sunland Blvd is very poor.
  11. More discussion went on cell towers that had nothing to do with the height of this project and info on how to fight.
  12. Yes this is a 4g but massive 4g are needed to put in 5g.
  13. The public has no say on where ones can be place when put onto a power pole.
  14. Allowing this or any tower to increase is a health hazard to our children and pets and wildlife.
  15. Much more discussion along the same line of the danger of cell phones.
- 6. **DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION:** LADOT Information request
  - a. The City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation is asking for information from stakeholders with web sites as noted on the agenda.
  - b. Deadline to submit comment is March 6.
- 7. **DISCUSSION: Review Foothill Blvd. Corridor Specific Plan (FBCSP) and Design Guidelines.**
  - a. Have received calls on such things they are only to use river rock on their business outside. That is not correct please refer to the FBCSP.
  - b. Short explanation of the Specific Plan area maps, there are also Target area and Major Activity areas, which are area the “founding” fathers help with the plans.
  - c. When a building permit is required with the City, the FBCSP comes into effect.
  - d. There is also a Design Guideline.
  - e. Please be aware of these because in the opinion of many the FBCSP and Design Guidelines are not being adhered to.
  - f. Permit is not always property pulled with the City Planning Dept. as required.
  - g. The community needs to be aware in order to help the looks of our community.

- h. <https://planning.lacity.org/plans-policies/community-plan-area/sunland-tujunga-lakeview-terrace-shadow-hills-la-tuna-canyon>
- 8. **DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION:** LUC Procedures – put off until future meeting.
- 9. **EARLY NOTIFICATION /DISCUSSION /POSSIBLE ACTION:**
  - a. 7208 Estela Tujunga –will present at next meeting
  - b. 10240 Commerce – will present at next meeting,
  - c. 10708-10710 Samoa – Discussion and info from residence:
    - i. LUC was not advised of this project by the Planning Dept. but brought to the LUC by the residence of Samoa.
    - ii. By Right project. R1-1
    - iii. Residents are very concerned - this property (corner of Samoa and Hillrose), 5 separate single-family 3 story homes. Each lot is approx.15,000sqft. Frontage 20ft.
    - iv. One neighbor has talked to the City Planners and has open up a case.
    - v. This narrow streets is one of the three exits for the “Seven Hills Estates” homes which is in a Red Flag Zone.
    - vi. The residence have reached out to the Developer with no progress or callbacks.
    - vii. This is not a place to put in 5 homes, power lines, on a hillside in a Red Flag Zone and they intend to fight.
    - viii. How can the city allow 5 homes to be built on property that was already sub-divided back in the 1930. Common R1 lot is 5,000SF.
    - ix. Tree has started to cut, once those are cut the hillside will come down.
    - x. Questions need to be asked by the Planning Dept.
    - xi. As of this meeting have only seen Grading Permits.
    - xii. Suggested the residents’ attend a Board or Safety Commission on Hauling routes so you can talk.
    - xiii. Residence have contacted CD7 Planner (no response was given when asked if that department was of any help)
    - xiv. Residence asked if they can count on the LUC support. Reply was we (LUC) can not speck at this time but please return to meeting with additional information to confirm they are building too big for the area/lot.

**10. Adjourn 9:00pm**