

SUNLAND-TUJUNGA NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL  
LAND-USE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
July 16, 2018

---

- I. Meeting was called to order by Chairperson Cindy Cleghorn at 7:30pm
- II. Roll Call
  - a. Present
    - i. Cindy Cleghorn
    - ii. Bill Skiles
    - iii. Elektra Kruger
    - iv. Nina Royal
    - v. Liliana Sanchez
    - vi. Cathi Comras
    - vii. Richard Marshalian
  - b. Absent
    - i. Debby Beck
    - ii. David Barron
    - iii. John Laue
    - iv. Vartan Keshish
    - v. Pati Potter
- III. Self-Introduction of Committee Members
- IV. Declaration of conflicts of interest or ex-parte communications relating to items on the agenda
  - a. None
- V. Approval of Minutes
  - a. **MOTION:** by Nina Royal to approve the June 11, 2018 and June 25, 2018 STNC-LUC Meeting Minutes as amended 2<sup>nd</sup> by Liliana Sanchez Vote: Unanimously approved
- VI. Announcements
  - a. The new proposed ADU Ordinance was heard at the CPC this last Thursday 7-12-18. It is an Ordinance to amend Sec 12.03 and Sec 12.22 and repeal portions of Sec 12.24 ch 1-3 of the LAMC for the purpose of regulating the ADU
    - i. The Hearing focused a lot on hillside construction
  - b. The Safe Parking Rules have been renewed with a new sunset date of January 1, 2019. LAMC 85.02
  - c. Suggestions for future topics on LUC agendas
    - i. An up-date from the Cannabis Committee. Outreach to Cat Packer requesting her return with an up-date report to the LUC and stakeholders so they can ask questions
      1. Richard M.: Perhaps the LUC could prepare questions to send to her that she could respond to without her needing to come here in person
      2. Cindy C.: We will check into that
- VII. STNC Neighborhood Council Strategic Plan – Cindy Cleghorn
  - a. Has been approved by the STNC Board. Should be posted on the STNC Web-Site
- VIII. Cindy C. described the LUC review process:
  - a. Receipt of information packet
  - b. Information scanned and distributed
  - c. There may be on-site visits

- d. Presentation by applicant/representative
  - e. Q&A with stakeholders present
  - f. Preparation of a draft comment letter indicating support/opposition/neutral position with comments to recommend to the Full STNC Board for final vote
    - i. Items considered in review/comment letter = item 6 a-f of the agenda
  - g. Get timeline to Hearing Date, Letter of Determination, etc
- IX. Review and approve revised comment letter for 6477 Foothill Bl.
- a. The recommended LUC draft letter was not approved by the STNC Board as both stakeholders and the applicant were not happy that certain points had not been addressed.
    - i. The function of this evening's meeting is to review the amended letter, take points related to finalizing a draft recommendation letter to then re-submit to the Full Board for a final review/vote.
  - b. The environmental documents related to this Project have not yet been released, so there is more to come with respect to this proposal. The comment letter now under review are early comments from the community requested by the applicant himself
  - c. Any questions/comments related to this agenda item this evening are to be focused on the letter only – details of the Project itself have already been addressed in multiple prior presentations
    - i. Mr. Azaryan: Referring to Pg 2 of the letter, there is no reference to traffic, no reference to parking issues, no reference to red curbs on Foothill
    - ii. Linda: I am the direct neighbor & there are still things that are unclear to me re my property line. My concern is my home and the building that currently holds up my property – the applicant intends to tear that bldg. down completely
      - 1. He has never specified the height of the wall that he is going to replace it with
    - iii. Linda: My car was totaled at that intersection two weeks ago so there is a definite traffic concern on that corner
  - d. Meeting recessed due to unruly audience at 7:45pm. Called in police presence
  - e. Meeting resumed at 7:55pm
- X. 10140-10150 Hillhaven – Up-dated plans for a 35 unit apt bldg. with density bonus incentives. 8 affordable units
- a. Changes based on comments from last LUC meeting
    - i. Red trim to brown
    - ii. Glass guardrails to metal
    - iii. Off-road gated entry for parking with roll-up/roll-down gate
  - b. 59 vehicle parking spaces/39 bicycle parking spaces. 2 bdr units = 2 vehicle parking spaces, 1 bdr units = 1 parking space, no on-site guest parking. 35 std size spaces, rest compact. Some standard parking, some tandem. 1 bicycle space/unit + 4 guest spaces.
    - i. Q: Could some bicycle parking spaces be exchanged for additional vehicle parking? Topography is not conducive to bicycles in this hilly area
      - 1. A: Bicycle parking is required by City Code = 1 bicycle space/unit
      - 2. Lydia G.: The NC can always submit a comment/recommendation that some of the bicycle parking be exchanged for vehicle parking since this hilly community is not a place where people ride bikes a lot and there is already no available off-site street parking
      - 3. A: Can't really put vehicle parking in the bicycle parking area – there is no room for back-up

- ii. Nina R.: They have Variances for developers, why not for communities? This Project is going to be a community hardship parking-wise. We are not in a public-transit area. It makes no sense.
        - 1. A: We do not really want bicycle parking either because auto-parking is important and the value of vehicular parking availability is higher, but we have no control over it – the City has a Bicycle Ordinance
        - 2. Lydia G.: I know of another Project that put in 100 bicycle spaces because they did not want to put in car parking and not one of those bicycle spaces have ever been used
    - c. Q: What will the cost of the affordable units be?
      - i. A: That will be established by the Housing Department, but probably low income = +/- \$600/month (4 units) and very low = +/- \$400/month (4 units). Both low and very low units will be mixed 1 and 2 bedroom units
    - d. Q: There are currently 8 units on-site under rent control – what happens to those residents?
      - i. A: They have priority to move into the new building in affordable units if they classify as low or very low income
      - ii. Q: Does the City do anything for the tenants that are being displaced?
        - 1. A: There is a fee that needs to be paid – to be determined by the Housing Department, but will probably run from \$17,000 - \$20,000 each
    - e. Richard M.: Basically, this Project is by-right – the only question is one of design
    - f. Applicant is open to other comments/changes if possible, but there are three guidelines that must be followed:
      - i. FBCSP
      - ii. Urban Design Guidelines
      - iii. Community Plan
    - g. **MOTION:** by Richard Marshalian to support the proposed Project at 10140-10150 Hillhaven 2<sup>nd</sup> by Nina Royal Discussion by Cathi Comras: Could the support be qualified that parking issues should be reconsidered to allow increased on-site vehicular parking Vote: Unanimous approval qualified with request for review of possible increased on-site vehicular parking (Liliana S. stepped out of the room – did not vote)
- XI. 6152 Sister Elsie – ZA/Project Permit Compliance for new SFR
  - a. ZA determination needed to approve construction on street not improved to 20 ft width. Applicant seeking relief from code requirement of same.
  - b. 2-story SFR, 2,700 sq ft livable area on a 24,000 sq ft lot. Livable footprint = 8% of the lot, hardscape limited to 10% of the lot w/80% open to landscaping. Designed to minimize grading to 86% less than permitted = 600 cu yds export = only 3 truckloads. Most soil will be used on-site to do compaction for the bldg. foundation
    - i. A drastic reduction from a previous proposal by someone else.
  - c. The house itself is designed to have many sustainable features eg building to face prevailing winds to collect/use thermogenic \_\_\_\_\_? \_\_\_\_\_ = natural air coming into the side, rooftop solar panels, rain-water capture for landscape irrigation, etc
  - d. There is a street issue – as a contractor and a future neighbor, I will be sensitive to that and will use the minimal size machinery possible. Will work during typical business hours to minimize traffic impact on area residents
  - e. There will be improvements in front of the house ie curb, gutters, sidewalks. Have 3 ft dedication.
  - f. Cindy C.: Have you had a chance to meet with the neighbors?

- i. A: Yes, has 7 signatures
- g. C: Re the Hillside Ord, st improvements would require street improvement from Day St. to your property. Sister Elsie is in a terrible state of disrepair. In front of my house there is room for only one car, so how can any kind of heavy-duty equipment go up/down
- h. C: My wall is right against the street and any kind of vibration would be detrimental to my wall. Didn't the prior owner have street issues?
  - i. A: No. The prior owner was approved for a 6,000 sq ft house which would have required major grading
  - ii. A: Applying for a Variance from the Hillside Ordinance requirement. No one person should be responsible for street improvement to Day Street
- i. Q: If something were to happen to my wall, will you be responsible for that?
  - i. A: Will use the smallest possible size equipment +/- the size of a City Trash Truck
- j. Ben: I totally get the structural issues w/the road, etc but he brought up a whole back-up road – something probably nobody has noticed. Repair of Sister Elsie should not be on them alone – the problem effects all of us
  - i. Lydia G.: I am close to people in Public Works. I will see what I can do to push them to get that road fixed on the basis of it being an emergency hazard. None of you should be responsible for the street, it should be a City responsibility
    1. Paolina: Thanked Lydia G. for her offer. The neighbors did get hold of the Dept again & they did say they would be sending out structural engineers to check it out & saw them a few days ago actually checking out the road
    2. Paolina: There was always an excuse for not repairing the road – an upcoming sewer construction, etc. After 20 years of waiting, we wrote “we are done waiting” – that is when the Commissioner apologized
    3. Lydia G.: We have a brand new General Manager which may be why he is so receptive
    4. Paolina: It is a shame that you want to build at the narrowest part of the road. As soon as you pass my house it is actually a 2 lane road, so anytime any traffic gets blocked it is where your house will be
    5. Paolina: So as long as you don't park a truck on the road at that point  
.....
    6. Owner: I will try to be a good neighbor
    7. Paolina: We will be calling you if that issue comes up
    8. Lydia G.: How many other sidewalks are there in that area? The LUC could write a letter recommending that no curb/gutter/sidewalk improvements be required and that the dedication be used for street widening efforts
  - ii. Liliana S.: You and the neighbors might coordinate on this particular concern – it is dangerous
    1. Paolina: We have an E-Mail information trail that goes through all the neighbors. If you give me your E-Mail address, I will add you to that list
- k. Mary Ellen Eltgroth: Re water/sewage – what kind of system & drainage would you have?
  - i. Architect: We are on septic tank. We will be using rainwater for irrigation – from the rooftop the square footage of water will be directed to a storage tank for future use as irrigation water to save City water
- l. Cindy C.: You are within the SPSP. What is the height of the building?

- i. A: The height is 28', but the house itself sits lower than most of the properties around there so as seen from the road, the height will be less than 20'
      - m. Cindy C.: Do you know what your timeline is at this point?
        - i. A: The Planning Dept is preparing their reports. They are waiting for comments from the community. It will probably be a couple of months and hopefully construction can start in a year
  - XII. Return to item 6477 Foothill
    - a. Cindy C.: The agenda item is focusing only on the revised comment letter. The original recommended comment letter went to the Full STNC Bd – the Bd, the Neighbors and the applicant wanted more comments included so the letter was sent back to the LUC
      - i. Basically it is the same letter with additional comments from the applicant and the neighbors addressing the question that came up about exploring the possibility of a traffic signal and the turn-outs
        - 1. Arnie Abramayan: It was my understanding at the STNC General Meeting at which I was present that the Executive Committee and the LUC were to hold a joint committee meeting to discuss this letter
        - 2. Arnie A.: The meeting was not to be yet again solely of the LUC. I am for the Project. I believe the gentleman is bending over backwards to for the community
        - 3. Sonia Tatulian: I am for the Proj at 6477 Foothill Bl. This LUC voted on this Proj on May 27 and a letter was submitted to the STNC on June 13. The STNC was supposed to have a Special Meeting to revise the letter
          - a. The letter has not been revised, it contains none of the positive comments presented by people present in support of the Project. The letter was never revised other than to refer to it as “Revised Comment Letter”
        - 4. Lydia G.: I am neither for or against the Project, but there are some concerns that need to be addressed. The LUC should not be writing any letter until the Environmental Review is done
      - ii. Cindy C.: A reminder – the Environmental Document is not yet done. When it is a lot of the details being talked about get to be weighed into again. This comment letter is just to help the City in their decision – and there will still be a Public Hearing where everyone can participate
- XIII. Meeting adjourned at 9:07pm