

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

---

- I. Meeting was called to order at 7:12pm by Chairperson Cindy Cleghorn
- II. Roll Call
  - a. Present
    - i. Cindy Cleghorn
    - ii. Bill Skiles
    - iii. Elektra Kruger
    - iv. Nina Royal
    - v. David Barron
    - vi. John Laue
    - vii. Liliana Sanchez
    - viii. Karen Zimmerman
    - ix. Pati Potter
    - x. Richard Marshalian
  - b. Absent
    - i. Debby Beck
    - ii. Cathi Comras
  - c. No Public representatives present
- III. Approval of Minutes
  - a. **MOTION:** by Karen Zimmerman to approve the January 22, 2018 STNC-LUC Meeting Minutes as amended 2<sup>nd</sup> by Bill Skiles Vote: Unanimously approved
- IV. 8200 W. Verdugo Crestline Dr., Sunland – proposed installation of an Above Ground Facility with hardship waiver and variance requests located in a public right-of-way
  - a. Notification goes to effected NC – Pati P. is attempting to get them to present. Located on a ridgeline Cindy C.: The presentation needs to be ASAP because AGFs do not require Public Hearings and, more-than-likely, will go through the City process quickly
  - b. Pati P.: In 2014 the STNC wrote a letter for that same address opposing a proposed T-Mobile Cell Tower
    - i. Elektra K.: The T-Mobile was a proposed co-location on a SCE Transmission Tower
- V. 10324 Mt. Gleason, Tujunga – Application for a subdivision
  - a. Richard M. to take on researching/presenting proposal/issues. Located on the south side of Foothill between Apperson and Foothill
- VI. 9917 Commerce Ave. – New signs application
  - a. Karen Z. to research/present proposal/issues (if any)
- VII. 10065 Commerce Ave., Tujunga (x Valmont) – Application for remodel
  - a. Pati P. has spoken to the rep. He is trying to determine when he would like to present & if the Pullmans need to be present again. Nothing new has happened since Mrs. Pullman addressed the LUC except that an official application has now been filed with the City
  - b. Pati P. to take on moving this Project through the LUC
- VIII. 10638 Oro Vista Sunland – proposed CUP for a 30 ft Verizon Cell Tower on the Sunland Neighborhood Church property (See attached pages from application)
  - a. Pati P.: They are coming to present Feb 26.

- b. CUPs are required for Cell Towers on private property which requires a Public Hearing in front of a ZA. The CUP, if granted, will run with the land.
  - c. Cindy C.: Because the City encourages co-location, a tower that is now 30' may be 20% taller/co-located facility
    - i. As part of the Project, 2 existing pine trees will be removed
  - d. Cindy C.: In the past, the NC asked the applicant to raise a balloon 30' so neighbors can visualize the potential impact of a 30' cell tower. LUC to outreach to neighbors to explain the purpose of the balloon & the existence of the proposed application
- IX. 10140-50 Hillhaven – Application for 35 apartments with density bonus for height, front and rear yard, parking reduction & application for Project Permit Compliance for FBCSP
- a. Richard M. to research/present proposal/issues
    - i. Cindy C. to provide application hard copies if needed
- X. Comment letter requesting withdrawal of Senate Bill 827 (See attached copy of proposed Bill)
- a. If approved, it would remove local control of land-use planning
  - b. Cindy C.: Proposes that the STNC write a comment letter asking that the Bill be withdrawn as proposed mirroring arguments presented by Del Rey Resident's Association (see attached)
  - c. LUC: It is not that higher density housing should not be encouraged in transit rich corridors, but that these land-use elements should remain under local control and not be State mandated with regulations that may not fit all local jurisdictions
    - i. Bill S.: Referenced issue with Samoa in which they referred to the bus stop on Foothill as a major transit corridor. SB 827 is essentially going to give them Carte Blanche
    - ii. Cindy C.: The up-coming proposed 35 unit Project on Hillhaven may allow similar give-a-ways
    - iii. Bill S.: Once the Bill is in place, they can waive the ¼ mi/1/2 mi distance anytime they want
  - d. **MOTION:** by Karen Zimmerman for the STNC to prepare and submit a comment letter in opposition to SB 287 2<sup>nd</sup> by Liliana Sanchez
    - i. **Discussion:** There is no disagreement that there should be increased housing density along eg light train lines, but that this should remain under local control and not by State mandated regulations.
    - ii. **Discussion:** Without adding rent-control to the equation, rents in transit rich corridors will be \$2,000 like everywhere else
    - iii. **Vote:** Unanimously approved
  - e. Cindy C. to draft a letter for LUC review
- XI. Comment letter or CIS up-date re Above Ground Facilities (AGF) Ordinance revisions for cell towers in public right-of-ways
- a. STNC submitted a comment letter re FGFs in 2009
  - b. There has been a proposal on the radar to up-date the AGF Ordinance giving greater local control/input, but the City has been dragging its feet to review the existing Ordinance. STNC would like to get the proposed up-date back on track
    - i. **MOTION:** by Pati Potter to resubmit the 2009 CIS urging the City to review and up-date its current AGF Ordinance 2<sup>nd</sup> by John Laue Vote: 9 Ayes, 1 Abstention Motion passes
- XII. Draft approval for CIS re proposed in-lieu fee Draft Ordinance for tree removal (CF 16-0461)
- a. See attached Report from City Attorney's office, Draft Ordinance and sample comment

- b. Elektra K.: Per current LAMC code, a tree-removal applicant is required to replace removed trees. If the applicant claims he/she does not have enough room on-site to plant replacement trees and does not arrange for planting of replacement trees himself/herself, they are required to procure replacement trees and to deliver them to the City nursery at which point they become stock for City planting projects.
  - i. Because the nursery is run by the City the nursery stock is not well cared for and there is an admitted 32% death rate, but at least the other 68% are planted SOMEWHERE.
    - 1. An in-lieu fee is claimed to be an Urban Forestry Fund for the procurement, planting and 3-year watering commitment of planted trees, however there is no guarantee that money will not get pocketed, be diverted or end up as a revenue source for the General Fund and will never be used for the procurement, planting and certainly not for a watering commitment as evidenced by the poor care provided trees in the City nursery. There will be no oversight as to where the money goes or how it will be used.
    - 2. Richard M.: Recommend an amendment to the proposed Ordinance that to implement the intent of the proposed in-lieu fee Ordinance, within one calendar year of collection, the designated replacement trees must be procured, planted and a watering schedule be established and that detailed records be maintained as to when and how much fees were paid and when/where plantings took place
    - 3. John Vasquez: Recommended opposition to the Ordinance so that it does not become policy – such policies are irresponsible in the face of climate change. Data from San Francisco concluded that there were 42,000 potential planting locations. Our City should first follow San Francisco’s lead and conduct an analysis of all viable alternatives that should begin with a Citywide census of potential planting sites.
    - 4. John L. The City, once it plants trees, has no real commitment to watering/caring for said trees. They should work with non-profits such as TreePeople who have a history of caring for trees they have planted
    - 5. Liliana S.: Referenced a Protected Tree Ordinance CF 03-1459-S3 (*this is not an Ordinance, but a Motion for a proposed Protected Tree Ordinance*)
- c. LUC to draft a comment letter to review at the next meeting.
- d. There will be a presentation on this subject next Saturday at PlanCk.
- e. This proposed Ordinance has been distributed for discussion in all NCs Citywide

XIII. Recent Public Hearings

- a. Car Wash at Pinewood/Foothill – under advisement
- b. McDonalds – approved

XIV. 7610 Day St – Under construction. Per Planning, no Project Permit Compliance review required

- a. There is no real opposition to the building being constructed, but there is concern that elements of the SP eg landscaping, sidewalks, etc will have no opportunity for NC input
- b. Building and Safety felt that no SP review was needed because the Project was not in a “target” area.

- i. Same thing happened with “Collision” shop across the street which resulted in unacceptable business aesthetics with objectionable fencing/landscaping and open storage of vehicles, etc
  - ii. The City knows it is all in violation, but has done nothing about it. It is bad planning
  - iii. Elektra K.: Can we submit a general comment letter stating that we do not agree with the City’s policy not to require a Project Permit Compliance review for all applications within Specific Plan areas as a matter of course noting 7610 Day St as an example where this was not required as not to do so negates the whole purpose of having a SP
- XV. NC Budget Advocates Survey
  - a. See link on the agenda
  - b. LUC/audience urged to take the survey and to outreach to the community to do so as well. Asks stakeholders what they believe the City should focus its dollars on
- XVI. ReCodeLA – Zoning Code up-date. Information link = recode.la
  - a. Proposes 16 new residential zone categories
- XVII. 8334 Foothill Bl – reuse of old Security Pacific Bank sign by Alpha Structural
  - a. Supported at last LUC meeting – recommendation for approval to be forwarded to the full Board for final approval
- XVIII. 10326 N. Parr Ave – addition of 440 sq ft to a 1-story SFR
  - a. Letter of support approved at last LUC meeting. Recommendation for approval to be forwarded to the full Board for final approval
- XIX. Public Comments
  - a. Pati Potter
    - i. This coming Saturday from 10am-4pm at the NVCH there will be an Emergency Preparedness Program
  - b. Liliana Sanchez
    - i. Sent a letter to Senator Portantino asking his assistance in finding the budget funds from our former Assemblymember Bocanegra of \$3.5 million to purchase the Canyon Park development property in Big Tujunga Cyn. Waiting for a response
  - c. Elektra Kruger
    - i. A correction to the general understanding of the term “remodel” vs “Project” – it is not retaining one existing wall that constitutes a “remodel”, a “remodel” must retain 50% or more of the existing external walls + 50% of the existing roof or the application must be considered a “Project”
  - d. Nina Royal
    - i. The Mission College Committee had a meeting at which they announced that the S/T Mission College Satellite Campus will have its own full-time Dean which is showing a real commitment.
      - 1. They will be doing an Outreach Program for class registration
      - 2. They will also be looking into providing bus service
      - 3. The campus is expanding to 2 more large spaces on the west side tripling the campus in size. They used to be able to accommodate 40 students, they will now be able to accommodate 120
      - 4. There will be a meeting room that will be available for community gatherings

5. There will be sheriff patrol because the lower level parking area will be in use

e. Cindy Cleghorn

- i. On Feb 22, there will be a “Unity Meeting” at ANC – urged attendance. Its intent is to provide an up-date on the status of the proposed High Speed Train route through our area. It is still proposed to be an above-ground route
- ii. On-Line survey re Open Space vision for General Plan up-date General PlanOurLA2040
  1. See link on the agenda
  2. Urged all to take the survey
- iii. Next LUC meeting will not be until Feb 26 as a Special Meeting because our regular meeting date = President’s Day. There will be a presentation for the Oro Vista cell tower
- iv. Preparations are beginning for the 4<sup>th</sup> of July. Let me know if you want to assist with the preparations

XX. Meeting adjourned at 8:42pm