

SUNLAND-TUJUNGA NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
SPECIAL LAND-USE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
Aug 6, 2018 (7:30 pm)

- I. Meeting was called to order by chairperson Cindy Cleghorn at 7:57pm
- II. Roll Call
 - a. Present
 - i. Cindy Cleghorn
 - ii. Bill Skiles
 - iii. Elektra Kruger
 - iv. Nina Royal
 - v. David Barron
 - vi. Liliana Sanchez
 - vii. Cathi Comras
 - viii. Pati Potter
 - ix. Richard Marshalian
 - b. Absent
 - i. Debby Beck
 - ii. John Laue
 - iii. Vartan Keshish
 - c. Public Representative present
 - i. Seme Parks – DONE
- III. 10140-10150 Hillhaven – Finalize comment letter, see attached draft
 - a. Cindy C.: At our last meeting we voted to support the construction of 35 apts at 10140 Hillhaven including a density bonus. The Project was previously approved by the City and supported by the STNC under a different case filing several years ago
 - b. The STNC is concerned about the current residents who will be displaced – there are currently 8 units on-site. The STNC requests that the City compensate their move and that the required bicycle parking be reduced to accommodate more car parking
 - c. The purpose of this discussion/action is to determine whether the LUC is happy with the comment letter as written and wishes to recommend it to the Board for final approval or should there be any modifications
 - d. Luke Vella: I am shocked that the LUC spent a mere 10 min on this proposal – that is a lot of units
 - e. Lydia Grant: I also have concerns about the Project. We do need low income housing, but the amount of parking spaces per unit is very low and the fact that they swapped out parking spaces for bicycle parking is not ok
 - i. Per the Bicycle Ord, they need to consider a few things. One, we are a hillside area. There are different regulations for hillside areas. Two, they can go up to 35% if we are in a transit area which we are not. The Housing Dept is now telling renters that if they do not have room in their garages to park their cars, they must move stuff out or be evicted. The wording relative to parking has to be stronger
 - f. Richard M.: This Project has areas where we can give our opinion & areas where we cannot b/c they are pre-empted by City Ord and we have no say. In this case the applicant has used affordable housing to exempt himself from certain design requirements. The only discretionary thing before us was the fascade design. He is w/in

his rights. B/c we cannot speak to the issue of parking, I would rather not include this in the letter

- g. Richard M.: The applicant provided 2 cars/unit, the only thing lacking was guest parking
 - i. Pati P.: Application has 59 vehicle spaces for 35 units. 2 cars/unit would be 70 spaces. It is 2 bdrm units that get 2 spaces, 1 bdrm units only get 1. Every unit should have a min of 2. Whether pre-empted by Ordinance or not, at least we are on record bringing up the issue
 - ii. Nina R.: We need to go to our Councilperson for support on this
 - h. David B.: From 2000 to today, more than 21,000 affordable units have been taken off the market by situations like this. Employees in Planning make good decisions, it is our elected officials that override their decisions, that is where our problem is
 - i. Our elected officials make laws, can repeal laws, can amend laws. I oppose the Project as designed
 - i. Cathi C.: Can the community get a Variance?
 - i. David B.: No, it is a by-right Project. Only the applicant can file for a Variance
 - j. Cindy C.: Does the LUC want to draft a more refined letter, not approve the comment letter en total, postpone sending the draft letter to the STNC Board for their support and invite the applicant back to the LUC?
 - i. Luke V.: It is not a fully by-right Project. There are a lot of things that could have been negotiated. You negotiated Samoa. That guy came w/an application for 60 units, you got it down to 40. That is what should have been done here – a negotiation. Builders do negotiate
 - 1. Cindy C.: Luke V. is right – this committee and this community came out very strong against the Samoa Project
 - ii. Cindy C.: What if we pull this back, not forward it to the Board and invite the applicant back and see if we can't get the Project reduced in some way
 - 1. Pati P.: The community needs to get more involved – I tried to get those people to come to the meeting. I talked to the tenants they say “we need more parking, there is no parking now”
 - iii. Lydia G.: I would add to the letter more specific items eg this is located in a steep hillside area, it is not a transit corridor – bikes should be cut 10% on that basis alone. Also this is a sub-standard street. That is something the City does look at when reviewing these Projects
 - k. **MOTION:** by Nina Royal that the STNC-LUC postpone the comment letter, invite the developer back for further discussion, promote more vehicle parking and less bicycle parking, provide guest parking, see if we can reduce the number of units and see if we can invite a City representative to provide insight into the issues 2nd by Pati Potter
 - i. **Discussion** by Bill Skiles to add to the Motion a reconsideration of our support for the Project
 - ii. **Vote:** 8 ayes, 1 opposition
 - iii. **Motion carries**
- IV. Meeting adjourned at 8:57pm