

SUNLAND-TUJUNGA NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
LAND-USE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
June 1, 2015

- I. Meeting was called to order by Interim Co-Chair Bill Skiles at 7:09pm
- II. Roll Call
 - a. Present
 - i. Cindy Cleghorn
 - ii. Bill Skiles
 - iii. Debby Beck
 - iv. Nina Royal
 - v. Elektra Kruger
 - vi. Roberta Konrad
 - vii. John Laue
 - viii. Arsen Karamians
 - ix. Cathi Comras
 - x. Karen Zimmerman
 - b. Absent
 - i. Chaz Van Aalst
 - ii. David Barron
 - c. No Public representative present
- III. Approval of STNC-LUC Meeting Minutes of 5-11-15
 - a. **MOTION:** by John Laue to approve the STNC-LUC Meeting Minutes of 5-11-15 as written 2nd by Karen Zimmerman Vote: Unanimously approved
- IV. Public Comments
 - a. Simon Hicks
 - i. Proposes a “Station” at the old K-Mart property which has been vacant since 2004. Would like the STNC-LUC to consider some potential options for site development eg creation of a complex to function as a focal point for the community
 - 1. The complex might include a library/community center/post office/etc and ultimately could be used strategically to pull the HSR East Corridors off the table
 - 2. The complex would be based on the award-winning library complex in CalTexas. Requested that the subject be agendized to a future STNC-LUC meeting
 - b. Dr. Tom Williams
 - i. People are confused as to use of CEQA at this point as it relates to HSR. Thus far, the community meetings held have been purely public relations meetings – they have no standing in the CEQA process – They have not been public “Hearings”
 - 1. They have accepted written comment cards, however this is something that is standard from the beginning of the Scoping process through the EIR process. Next week will be a CaHSR Authority Board Meeting – that is a “Hearing”
 - 2. The Board meeting must comply with the Brown Act. Any written item submitted must become part of the administrative record. The

confusion for most people is realizing that they have currently merely been in an extended Scoping process which has no recognition in CEQA.

3. Dr. Williams recommended that the STNC sponsor a workshop on CEQA in the next month or so on how to use it and how it is abused.

- c. Lilianna Sanchez
 - i. Re 12400 Big Tujunga Cyn Rd, representing the SaveBigTujungaCanyon Group which submitted three copies of letters for the STNC-LUC record that have been received from elected representatives opposing the proposed up-zoning (See attached)
 - ii. The District Representative for US Senator Diane Feinstein came to see the property and have offered to help with any possible federal issues eg the endangered species impacted, 9 of which have been called out so far
 - iii. The Group has submitted a Public Records Act request from the Planning Department and from Councilmember Fuentes' Office – they should be responding within 10 days on anything related to the Canyon Park Development
 1. Any memos, any E-Mails, any visits from January 1st to the present
 - d. Bill Eick
 - i. Regarding HSR: There is a meeting scheduled for June 9, 10am, downtown at the Ronald Reagan State Bldg. It is important to get as many people as possible to attend – recommended that STNC outreaches this via its web-site
 1. Arrive early because there will be security screening
 2. Each person will only get 90 sec to speak, it is admittedly a long way to go to speak for 90 sec, but those 90 sec are critical
 3. With respect to CEQA, the position of CaHSR is that they do not have to comply with CEQA claiming it to be a federal project and a federal court decision stated they do not have to. Claim only to be subject to NEPA, a federal environmental policy act
 4. The federal court decision stating that the CAHSR is not subject to CEQA because it is a federal project is being appealed
 - e. Sheri Smith
 - i. The last presentation at Bolton Hall prior to the 2-month summer recess is on June 13 and will be on the story of Wildlife Waystation (see attached flyer). Martine Collette will speak about the history of the Waystation and where they are at now.
 - ii. On June 27th, the Randy Van Horne Singers will perform at Bolton Hall at 2:30pm (see attached flyer) Tickets are for sale on the web-site or at Bolton Hall
- V. 9162 Foothill Bl, TTM for a 6 home subdivision – Charles Begin, subdivider, in escrow to purchase property pending entitlement approvals
- a. Proposed to subdivide into 6, 20,000 sq ft lots. Claims to be in compliance with the San Gabriel Verdugo Mountains Specific Preservation Specific Plan.
 - b. There is an access from Plateau via an easement, but has decided not to disturb the neighbors there and intend to access the property from Foothill
 - i. Rosa Figueroa claims the property in question has no access from Plateau and that there is no easement over her land as is being claimed and she intends to fence off her land – the only persons permitted access is CalTrans so they can do brush clearance/weed abatement for fire protection. Other than that it is private property and no one can rightfully cross it.

1. Charles B.: There is no intent to cross it – the intent is to access the property from Foothill. But also the Title Company did say the property had an easement to access the property
- c. Homes are proposed to be from 3,000 sq ft to 4,000 sq ft, single story (application lists as 2-story)
- d. Current zoning is RA-1-K, but application refers to an RE-20 zoned project though there is no application for a zone change. Mr. Begini is unaware of this discrepancy.
- e. Owner of property = Ronald Cassini.
- f. Q: What is the size of the property?
 - i. A: 3.45 acres
 - ii. C: On the Master Land Use Permit Application, the project is listed as being for Lot 40 and 41 Tract 9659 for a total lot area of +/- 149,846 sq ft which indeed is +/- 3.45 acres, but on the Subdividers Statement the tract area is listed as 2.704 “net acres” with 117,795 “gross areas”. First, the 117,795 = sq ft, not acreage and second 2.704 does not match the 3.45 acres. This is confusing.
- g. Q: Has a SDO calculation been done – a TTM requires it
 - i. A: Claims that it was done, but does not know if it is available in the application package.
 - ii. C: The application states that there is 0% less than 10% slope, 50% at 10-15% slope and 50% greater than 15% slope.
 1. This is not a Slope Density calculation per the SDO. First the average slope of the entire property must be determined. The Slope Density = 50 minus the average slope divide by 35. That figure = the maximum number of homes permitted on the property.
 2. 6 houses at the proposed RE20 would require 120,000 sq ft. 117,795 sq ft would only allow 5.1 houses and that is not taking into account any possible slope deductions
- h. The proposed E3 route for the HSR goes right under the property
- i. C: There is an earthquake fault right through that area. If you look at the map of the Hansen Dam Master Plan, it shows the location of the fault on the south side of the Wash. Mr. Begini was urged to review the maps to review where his property lies relative too that fault
- j. Q: The property is horse property. With the freeway there, do you have a secret pathway to get horses to the Wash where all the trails are?
 - i. A: We will need to explore that – that is why we are here – we need your help.
- k. Q: Have you committed to the property?
 - i. A: Yes, we are spending money on it
- l. Q: To clarify, any full commitment is pending entitlements
 - i. A: Yes, but we are spending money
- m. C: You may want to take what you are hearing here this evening under advisement and check out if this is truly an investment you want to commit to
 - i. A: That is why we are here
- n. C: The location has been a fire hazard ever since we bought our adjacent property. An earthquake knocked down a house that was on the property in question forcing the family out because they could not rebuild. The current owner never clears the brush. In 1991 when he hadn't cleared it, a fire swept up from Foothill, burned all my trees, all my plants and caught the house on the opposite side of me on fire. I just recently cleared part of your property

- i. Charles B.: We will clear it
 - o. C: There are numerous errors on the application form as well as items that just do not make sense:
 - i. Total number of parking spaces = 2 (That is assumed to be 2/house, not 2 total)
 - ii. Total number of sq ft of floor area = 3,500 sq ft (That is assumed to be 3,500 sq ft/house, not total for the development)
 - iii. Number of stories = 2 (You told us these would be single story houses)
 - iv. Circulation identified by name of all major and secondary highways within 1,000 ft of the proposed project (nothing is filled in)
 - v. Base flood is listed as 50' (That is questionable)
 - vi. On the Subdivider's Statement, Item 8&9 should reflect the total number of units per total sq ft floor area eg "6/24,000 sq ft" (improperly filled out)
 - vii. Parking listed as N/A (parking in a single family development is very applicable)
 - viii. Guest parking listed as 2 (guest parking is not applicable to single family developments)
 - ix. Item #22: "If the tract is for condominium or cooperative conversion purposes, list the number of existing parking spaces". Filled in as "4" (This project is not a conversion. To make any entry to this question makes no sense)
 - x. Item #25: Asks for a description of the proposed project which is responded to as "6 lot subdivision at RE20,000 with single family and private road" (Firstly, there is no such zone as RE20,000 – it is assumed that this is intended to read RE20 and secondly this is what causes us to question whether there is any intent to file a zone change because the current zoning is RA-1-K)
 - xi. If this form was filled out by Johnson Karan and he claims to be a consultant, I would be very concerned.
 - xii. Karen Z: It is obvious a lot has been brought to Mr. Begin's attention already that he needs to look into and at this point there really is no action for the LUC to take on this matter at this time. It might be best to ask Mr. Begin to review the application and return to us at a future date to present a corrected application
 - 1. Mr. Begin was welcomed to contact the STNC-LUC at a future date at which time he would gladly be agendized
 - p. STNC-LUC: Upon completion of Minutes of this evening's meeting, notes relative to the proposed development at 9162 Foothill bl. will be sent to City Planning
- VI. Committee Member Up-Dates/Announcements
 - a. The LUC still has a vacancy on the committee if anyone is interested in joining the committee or if any alternate wishes to move into a committee position
 - b. Nina R. presented news referencing the status of the Mission College Satellite Campus on the old K-Mart/Home Depot site. We campaigned for Measure J on the promise that S-T would get a satellite campus. A curriculum had been established and plans for the anchor campus plus associated shops + underground parking were drawn up
 - i. Then President of Mission College is now a trustee of the College Board
 - ii. A month or two ago Assemblywoman Patty Lopez was informed that it was about time the satellite campus was opened for which \$25 million of the \$50 million Measure J monies were still available
 - 1. The other half of the money went to LA City College which resulted in a fiasco in that they built their college, leased it out to a Charter School and was itself going to take over the Southwestern College

- iii. In the interim, the person responsible for the S-T Mission College satellite campus project was forced to retire and the funds were frozen. Because nothing was happening, Nina R. and her group spoke with Mission College President Perez who recommended looking into it because the college also did not know what was happening to the monies + colleges were now looking for income producing properties – a win-win since a college campus would be built with property income generation off-setting college operating expenses
 - 1. Ms. Lopez wrote a letter to the Chancellor copied to all Board Members saying it has been almost ten years since passage of Measure J and S-T deserved its satellite campus. The newly elected Chancellor responded that they were no longer interested in a S-T satellite campus.
 - 2. Nina R. recommended formation of an ad hoc committee to fight for the \$25 million that belongs to us. We passed the bond and LA City College got their college. It is not right for S-T to not get theirs. The money is still there
 - 3. Lilianna Sanchez: The Great Streets Initiative Committee submitted a property across the street from K-Mart behind the new BackDoor Bakery to serve as a temporary school while the college was being constructed.
 - 4. Lilianna S.: President Perez promised us that he would get us some college classes in the area on Foothill, an item on the Great Streets Initiative Committee’s wish-list so that might be something for an ad hoc satellite campus committee to undertake
 - c. On Saturday June 13 at 10am, there will be a Neighborhood Revitalization Institute held here at the S-T branch library (see attached flyer)
 - d. There will be a Hearing tomorrow for the HSR (see attached flyer). One can log into the meeting on a U-Stream at 6pm tomorrow night. For anyone interested in attending, bus transportation is being set-up. Reservations are needed today so appropriate size bus can be reserved. Efforts are afoot to get bus rentals coordinated through the help of some of our elected officials
- VII. Council District Staff up-dates
 - a. No staff members present
- VIII. 8005 Foothill, CUB application
 - a. Application for beer/wine at the site of the current Jimmy Deans. It is proposed to be a different type of restaurant. Application is in the STNC office, there has not yet been a presentation. It is hoped to bring the presentation to the June 15 LUC meeting.
- IX. Meeting adjourned at 8:03pm