

SUNLAND-TUJUNGA NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
JOINT GENERAL/LUC MEETING MINUTES
August 17, 2015

- I. Meeting was called to order by LUC Co-Chair Cindy Cleghorn at 7:13pm
- II. Members present
 - a. Mark Seigel
 - b. Charlie Bradley
 - c. Krysti Clark
 - d. Marlene Hitt
 - e. John VanGuten
 - f. Cindy Cleghorn
 - g. Bill Skiles
 - h. Debby Beck
 - i. Nina Royal
 - j. Elektra Kruger
 - k. David Barron
 - l. John Laue
 - m. Arsen Karamians
 - n. Karen Zimmerman
 - o. Cathi Comras
 - p. Henry Hubert
 - q. Liliana Sanchez
- III. No public representative was present
- IV. Self-Introductions of Board Members
- V. Public Comment
 - a. Wanda _____? _____
 - i. Has been trying for +/- 3 years to find out who and how to get the clock on Commerce running again. Keeps "hitting walls" Has made numerous phone calls, sent numerous E-Mails to Councilmember Felipe Fuentes with no response
 - b. Mark Seigel
 - i. The BBQ this last weekend at Rancho Tujunga was great – they did car crushing, had a mechanical bull, etc
 - c. Cindy Cleghorn
 - i. There will be a community outreach meeting on Sept 24 in this room regarding the proposed DWP water rate increases
 - d. Nina Royal
 - i. Lock it-Hide it-Keep it. Yesterday someone broke into the owner of Caruso's car and stole all of his electronics – his laptop, his iPhone. Do not leave any valuables uncovered.
- VI. Proposed duplex at 10135 Mountair – Art Barsegian
 - a. See attached Plot Plan
 - b. Proposal is for a new 2,550 sq ft 2-story bldg. with 5 parking spaces (no garage – the existing garage is to be demolished) + 342 sq ft storage + 72 sq ft laundry room with 4 bedrooms and 4 baths.
 - i. The 2-story SFD will be above the parking area/carport so the proposed building is actually a three-story building.

- c. There is an existing 1,029 sq ft SFD which is to remain in essence creating a detached duplex on a single 5,503 sq ft lot.
- d. There is no request for a zone change, the owner is going through the permitting process and plan approvals. Claims everything to be within building parameters. The total height of the building is 32'1".
 - i. Q: What is the slope of the lot away from the street? A: The back of the lot is 8' lower Q: So the proposed back house would tower over the existing front house. A: No it would not greatly exceed the visible height of the front house
 - ii. Q: Are you in the SP area? A: Yes Q: What is the height limit in the SP area? A: 30' Q: So what is your Variance? A: We are not asking for a Variance
 - 1. Q: But you have a Case number A: Because it is a SP area – that is why we have to go through a Planning approval C: With a Case number you have to be asking for some kind of Variance A: No just City approval
 - 2. Cindy C.: He has a Case number because he is located in a SP area and must undergo a Project Plan Compliance Review
 - iii. C: The zoning per the Plot Plan is confusing. The "Occupancy Group" is listed as R3/U yet the Legal Description of the lot is listed as RD1.5-1 A: R3 means it is a duplex, U means garage. The RD1.5-1 is information the tax assessor gives us
 - iv. C: Zoning is RD1.5 with a lot area of 5,503 sq ft. Divide the lot area by 1,500 – you would be eligible for 3 units. A: That is correct, but the Project is only for 2
- e. The property is located on Mountair between Valmont and Apperson
- f. C: It looks like a box – it is not attractive – it has no aesthetics. I thought there were Ordinances in place to avoid this. Can you get away with this because it is not visible from the street?
 - i. A: You cannot see it. We will go to Planning and see what they say.
 - ii. C: Neighbors to the side and rear will see this structure even if it cannot be seen from the front. It would be nice to have some aesthetic attributes added.
 - 1. C: It looks so incredibly plain & boxy as if the whole intent of the design was to max the sq ft of the allowable buildable area of the lot. I can appreciate that you want more space, but it could be made more attractive
 - iii. C: I am not going to hold any punches – the building looks like barracks on top of a shoebox. What architectural style is it?
 - 1. A: It is no architectural "style". We were just trying to get the max possible for the family and have room for 5 cars underneath for the people who live/will be living there and reduce off-street parking
 - iv. C: To build something that ugly is not fair to this community – I appreciate you wanting to get the biggest bang for the buck, but please don't do it on the backs of the people of this community.
 - v. C: I don't like the structure, it has no articulation and despite the fact that you say it doesn't matter because no one will see it – that is immaterial because the SP states that articulation is required in everything that is built
- g. Q: All access is off Mountair? A: Yes
- h. Q: Do you have an expeditor assigned to this case? A: No
- i. Q: Will you have to bring in fill to avoid drainage problems? A: Drainage problems will be handled by installation of a new sump pump. In LA there is a Dept of Sanitation Code where they want you to drain all your impervious areas to plant boxes etc – all on-site

- j. Q: The driveway is very narrow as it passes along to the left of the building. How would one get into the parking area? A: They will have to back up into the parking spaces
 - k. Cindy C.: The next step is for the LUC to draft a comment letter. Invited Art Barsegian to return when the letter is being reviewed
- VII. Presentation of the proposal for 221 homes on the VHGC – Janek Dombrowa
- a. Cindy C. clarified that the Project being presented this evening is not the only alternative for the Project on the radar but has been now designated as the “preferred alternative” – the Q&A this evening will focus on the alternative being presented this evening
 - b. This meeting was intended to serve as an effort for Janek D., as the Project’s architect, to reach out to the community about the Project as he envisions it and for the community to reach out to him as to what it would take to get community support
 - c. When the recirculated DEIR comes out, which is anticipated to be soon, there will be a formal presentation by the developer, the traffic engineer, etc.
 - d. There were a few people in the audience who were seeing the proposal for the 1st time, so Janek D. gave a brief history of the Project to date. The original proposal when he first came on board had been for 229 units to be constructed on a terraced topography
 - i. This would have involved a great deal of grading and the loss of many large trees. Janek D. hoped to redesign the Project in such a way as to protect the trees, reduce the grading, improve internal traffic circulation
 - 1. Instead of the terracing of the original proposal, the preferred alternative follows the slope of the mountain
 - 2. The historical oak grove would be preserved and become the centerpiece of the development
 - ii. Janek D. hoped to make the development more internally “walkable”
 - iii. The “base Project” being mitigated in the DEIR is the original proposal. Janek D.’s proposal designated as the “preferred alternative” has been summarily drafted as a proposal in the recirculated DEIR along with an equestrian alternative
 - e. There is a fire control road surrounding the golf course which could be made into a walking trail from 1 end of the Project to the other that could be accessible to the community at large with the endpoints being developed into community amenities
 - i. An education/teaching facility related to local animals/habitat, an amphitheater, a cultural center where kids could gather or adults could hold events, the end facing Tujunga Canyon Bl being turned into a park where kids could play
 - f. There is the potential for construction of a “talking mural” wall along Tujunga Canyon Bl
 - g. Q: In times past there was discussion of attempting to save the golf course. Has this gone by the wayside? A: I have checked with Mike Antonovich’s office to see whether funds he set aside as part of a greater fund collecting effort were still there. They are.
 - i. If the funds cannot be secured to save the golf course, they could possibly still be ear-marked to stay with the community as a whole creating an endowment to be used for public activities eg the amphitheater, animal teaching facility etc
 - h. Q: In working with another Project I have spoken with a group of the Tatavian Mission Indians. They have given me to understand that the oak trees are very sacred to them. Would you be open to speaking with them? A: Yes C: Contact person is Caitlyn Gulley
 - i. Discussed issues with traffic, various options that had been considered by the developer and possible suggestions for mitigations as offered by the Board/audience. The traffic engineer will be part of the post-recirculated DEIR presentation. Pros and cons of suggestions can then be discussed

- j. Q: Does the “preferred alternative” have the same number of units as the original proposal? A: No, it is reduced from 229 units to 221, but the number of bedrooms is greatly reduced by 200 from +/- 900 to +/- 700
 - k. All work whether on a private home or by public works within the area designated as a Los Angeles Historical/Cultural Monument must be reviewed by the Office of Historic Resources.
 - i. The original proposal does have lots in that area and would have to ask for permission to do any work – the “preferred alternative” has no lots within the designated historical monument area
 - l. Whether the development will be gated or not has been bounced back and forth by the developer, but actually the development could be gated to vehicular traffic but still be open to foot traffic.
 - m. Q: I am very sensitive to bad architecture. When may we see renderings of the proposed houses? This intersection is the entrance to our community. If we cannot have the golf course, we should have a development we can be proud of
 - i. A: I would love to have a gathering such as this in which we could all design the houses together.
 - 1. In exchange for community support, I could encourage the developer to design homes acceptable to the community in terms of massing, materials, architecture, consider reduction in the number of units etc
 - n. Q: Will the water system in the area be up-graded? There will be a lot of homes in this development. An acquaintance told me that when new homes were built in her vicinity their water pressure was greatly reduced. A: Yes, the system will be up-graded
 - o. Discussed the lawsuit which went to court Aug 12 including its basis that the developers would drop the lawsuit in exchange for community support of the development, their loss of the lawsuit, the potential of them filing an appeal
 - i. An announcement was released by the City Attorney that the official ruling of the court was to deny the developer’s lawsuit
 - p. Q: What is the least amount of units the developer would accept? A: What needs to be considered is density vs benefits – the greater the density the greater the number of amenities will be made available to the community
- VIII. Approval of the Aug 3, 2015 STNC-LUC Minutes
- a. **MOTION:** by Henry Hubert to accept the STNC-LUC Meeting Minutes as amended 2nd by John Laue Vote: Unanimously approved
- IX. Comment letter regarding 8505 Foothil Bl – Drive-Thru Car Wash
- a. The STNC has already received the approval letter of determination for the Project but there is a hearing scheduled for Aug 31 to determine whether the tunnel needs to be widened (?)
 - i. Noise, traffic, circulation, the recycling center will no longer be at issue. The Project as a whole has already been approved. The only thing at issue is the length (?) of the tunnel.
- X. Comment letter regarding 10551 Pinewood
- a. Hearing notice has been scheduled for 8-28-15 at 10:30am. The STNC has already submitted a letter (see attached)
- XI. Comment letter regarding 10345 Hillhaven
- a. Public Hearing has been scheduled for 8-28-15 at 11:30am ZA adjustment to allow for a 6’ rear yard set-back in lieu of the required 15’ rear yard set-back. They already have their subdivision for three lots.

- b. STNC has not yet submitted a comment letter on this case
- XII. FBCSP/Design Guidelines
 - a. On continuance
- XIII. Council District 7 staff up-dates
 - a. No CD7 representative present
- XIV. Citywide up-dates
 - a. The issue of street vending will be coming up soon in City Council. Right now street vending is illegal. If the committee expresses interest in pursuing this it can be added to a future agenda
 - b. Cindy C. recommended members sign up for the NC Congress to be held Sat Sept 26. There will be 40 workshops offered – there should be something for everyone
- XV. How to get Planning Information – (see attached flyer)
- XVI. Meeting adjourned at 8:59pm