

SUNLAND-TUJUNGA NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
LAND-USE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
December, 17, 2018

- I. Meeting was called to order at 7:09pm by Chairperson Cindy Cleghorn
- II. Roll Call
 - a. Present
 - i. Cindy Cleghorn
 - ii. Bill Skiles
 - iii. Debby Beck
 - iv. Elektra Kruger
 - v. Nina Royal
 - vi. Vartan Keshish
 - vii. Pati Potter
 - viii. Richard Marshalian
 - b. Absent
 - i. David Barron
 - ii. John Laue
 - iii. Liliana Sanchez
 - iv. Cathi Comras
 - c. No public representatives present
- III. Self-Introduction of Committee Members
- IV. Committee Member declaration of any conflicts of interest or ex-parte communications relating to items on this evening's agenda
 - a. None noted
- V. Approval of Minutes
 - a. No Minutes available. On continuance.
- VI. Status of LUC Minutes on the STNC Website
 - a. LUC Minutes have not been posted to the STNC Website
 - b. Pati P.: Who is sending those Minutes?
 - i. Elektra K.: Since Sept, I have been sending the approved Minutes. On my "to-do list" once I get caught up with backlogged Minutes I will send copies of all Minutes I have taken since serving as Recording Secretary for the LUC
 - c. Bill S.: The Minutes that have been posted are not posted on their correct dates – not only for the LUC, but for other committees as well
 - d. Cindy C.: What action do we need to recommend to the STNC Board?
 - i. Bill S.: The Board needs to establish a standard format for posting of agendas/Minutes/supporting documents on the Website
 - 1. Cindy C.: In the past they have been labelled STNC-LUC-year_month_date of meeting. That way when looking for them, they are sorted
 - 2. **MOTION:** by Bill Skiles that the STNC-LUC request the STNC Board have a consistent naming format for posting LUC Meeting Agendas/Minutes/Supporting Documents 2nd by Nina Royal Vote: 7 Ayes 1 Abstention Motion carries
- VII. Status of LUC Projects on the STNC Website

- a. Cindy C.: With the new website, the STNC has lost the ability to see many land-use Projects that have been reviewed. We need to get that back
 - i. There is no resource e.g. re the presentations scheduled for this evening – normally the application package would be on the website available for anyone to review along w/the outcome of our meetings, letters that go to the City, etc.
 - ii. **MOTION:** by Elektra Kruger that documents that the LUC needs to review prior to a meeting be available e.g. application packet information be on the website prior to the LUC meeting 2nd by Pati Potter Discussion:
 - 1. Cindy Cleghorn: The City is looking into digitizing all applications which will make it easier to review in the future. Currently package information can be scanned and posted on the website
 - 2. Vote: Unanimous approval
- VIII. Status of LUC recommendations forwarded to the STNC Board – Pati Potter
- a. Re Remnant University – the LUC submitted a comment letter which the Board approved. It will be sent to Planning. Has not yet been sent because it does not yet have needed PDF attachments
 - b. Re 6363 Foothill – the proposed recycling center. The LUC submitted a comment letter which the Board approved. Was forwarded to the Planning person in charge this morning
 - c. Re the car wash on Foothill/Apperson, the Board did not approve our comment letter so nothing happened with that at all
- IX. 10220 Fernglen – proposal to demolish a SFR to be replaced with a 10 unit density bonus apartment building with height increase incentive from 33 to 40 ft (See attached plans) – Armin Gharai, engineer
- a. Zoning = RD 1.5 multifamily though the site is currently occupied by a SFR. Of the 10 proposed units, 7 are by-right. 3 units will be added as density bonus as required by State Law 65198 which the City has adopted as part of the Municipal Code
 - i. Of the 3, 1 will be set aside for very low income tenants a two-bedroom apt for \$750-\$800/month
 - ii. The City was requested to approve a density bonus height increase to 40 ft – higher than the 33 ft allowable per the SP to allow for 3 additional units on the top floor
 - b. The building is a modern design
 - c. There will be 9 2-bedroom apts, 1 3-bedroom apartment with two parking spaces for each unit for a total of 19 parking spaces. (*10 units x 2 parking spaces = 20 parking spaces??*) Per Code could have reduced the number of parking spaces available to 14
 - d. Would like community support. Is open to questions, comments, concerns
 - e. Q&A. Q=Question, C=Comment
 - i. Q: You are increasing the height to 40 ft, 7 ft above the permitted 33 ft. Are you adding another floor?
 - 1. Armin G.: Yes
 - ii. C: A 7 ft increase would only give you +/- 6 ft clearance on that additional floor.
 - 1. Armin G.: The SP permits a maximum 33' building. If the building were to be reduced by 1 story it would only be +/- 30'
 - iii. Q: There are 19 parking spaces?
 - 1. Armin G.: 19 spaces all-together for 9 2- and 3- bedroom apartments plus 1 guest space (*The proposed building is for 10 units. 2 spaces/unit + 1 guest space = 21 spaces??*)

- iv. C: We are homeowners in Tujunga concerned about how adding these multifamily units will effect the state of the area – traffic, crime, etc. We are just kind of wondering where the end of all this is
- v. Every time one of these things goes up all the neighbors around it that have owned their homes for how many years are effected permanently – once one goes up it opens the door for many others to go up
- vi. At what point do we have enough people living in Tujunga and what are we going to do with all the cars, the traffic, etc.?
 - 1. Armin G.: The area is zoned for multifamily units and there are apartments there next to it, so it is not as if we are trying to do a zone change to get something different
- vii. Chris B. (STNC Region 2 representative): What constitutes “Very Low Income”?
 - 1. Armin G.: The Dept of Housing creates the database every year based on median incomes for the area. 70% of median income constitutes “very low income”
 - 2. It is not a Sec 8 although being a Sec 8 does not mean that any by-right apartment could not be rented under Sec 8. That could be a single mother with a couple of kids, a senior citizen, someone disabled, etc.
- viii. Lydia Grant: Are you being required to put in bicycle spaces?
 - 1. Armin G.: Yes. 1/unit plus 2 short-term spaces = 12 spaces
- ix. Lydia G.: Without the new bike ordinance, how many additional car parking spaces would you have
 - 1. Armin G.: One space
- x. Maryellen Eltgroth: How much does using the density bonus to create the extra 3 units increase your profits?
 - 1. Armin G.: It actually costs a lot of money to build – it is profitable – if it were financially detrimental no one would use it, but it is not as much as you may think
 - 2. The little bit of difference between making a Project viable and not viable – a 7-unit apartment building may not be a very viable Project whereas a 10 unit building might be
- xi. Maryellen E.: What is the percentage for this Project because we see this everywhere – this density bonus and it seems to be something that is overrunning the community – that is partly why we have so much traffic
 - 1. Armin G.: If we were to max the Project we could have designed it w/14 parking spaces & get full ____? _____. It would have been more cost effective, but the owners wanted to provide as much parking as possible because it is easier to rent
 - 2. It is not that I don’t sympathize with you. I go to meetings all over the City, different neighborhoods, they all have the same question. But the truth is it is something we have to do
 - 3. One has to look at the other side the Planners & everyone who comes up w/these codes see. They are looking 10-50-60 yrs in the future when there is going to be a lot less demand for parking b/c ____? ____
- xii. Debby B.: The rendering has white in the design, are those the colors you are planning to us?

1. Armin G.: I don't see the Project going to Hearings for a couple of months. We are not married to the design as is. We are open to comments
 2. Changing a color is not a big deal, but I did not create the design so if there is a problem with the white I need to know what it is so I can explain it to the designers
 3. If there is a certain color/pattern I will be glad to take note of it and present it to the designers
 4. Debby B.: In general, when things are painted white there is so much exhaust from the cars that it looks really dingy really fast and does not appear well maintained. There is already so much grey in the street
 5. It would look much more cheerful and aesthetic to have other colors like a nice leafy green or terracotta or a combination of colors
 6. Armin G.: I will take your point, check through some different color patterns with the owners because more than anyone we have to be able to please the owners
 7. Cindy C.: We also have to stay within the guidelines of the SP.
 8. Debby B.: The SP does not want buildings to be painted white or black – they can be used as trim colors
 9. Richard M.: The issue of the white in the SP – white should work well if it is maintained
 10. Cindy C.: We have no loop back to make sure that the white is maintained so if there is a way to get an adjustment to the stark white, that would help
 11. Armin G.: I will go through the SP with the colors and will get back to you. I will bring something next time with different colors on it. Typically if there is something in the design guidelines, the planners will bring it up and there will be changes before final approval
- xiii. Debby B.: Is there a way to give tenants more balconies or overhangs to make the units more livable?
1. Armin G.: On the side of the building there are balconies, but per code they are not allowed to project from the side so they are recessed inside the building
- xiv. Nina R.: Is the extension at the top part of the 40'?
1. Armin G.: No. The extensions are required by the Fire Dept, the 40' goes to the top of the parapet. There is an add'l 10' required to get to the top for the Fire Dept which, per code, is not counted as part of the ht of the bldg
 2. Even at the maximum height per SP of 33', you do still have that additional 10' for stairways to provide roof access
- xv. Bill S.: It is inevitable that apartments are going to come in, but as Debby B. says they need to blend into the surrounding area
1. Armin G.: We go through the neighborhood & take it into account, but in the end the Project will be approved. If there are any comments we look at them seriously to see what we can do to improve the Project
- xvi. Pati P.: That street is not as saturated with apartment buildings as is e.g. Hillhaven. What is the height of the existing apartment buildings?
1. Armin G.: My guess is the existing buildings are to code at +/- 33 ft

- xvii. Pati P.: Many of the current sidewalks are very narrow and the new code calls for wider sidewalks. As you pass through many streets now you see “cut-ins”. Is this Project going to have a “cut-in” from the street?
 - 1. Armin G.: There is a 10’ dedication to widen the street
 - 2. The City does not make the street – they make the developers widen the street. Eventually the entire street will be the same width
 - xviii. Armin G.: The State has changed the laws re density bonus & has asked the cities to adjust their codes accordingly. The City must approve all incentives unless they can find findings showing there is no benefit to the community, etc.
 - 1. The burden of proof has moved from the applicant to the City to say that “this Project is bad”. They have to make the negative findings. From what I hear, 99% of density bonus applications get approved
 - xix. Cindy C.: Is this Project being built with any government funding?
 - 1. Armin G.: No government funding
 - xx. Cindy C.: The landscaping in the renderings, is that the extent of the landscaping you are going to have
 - 1. Armin G.: There will be quite a bit of landscaping
 - xxi. Cindy C.: Left of the parking entrance, there appears to be a walk-in into a unit. Is that into one unit?
 - 1. Armin G.: The walk-in goes into the lobby
- X. 10247 Hillhaven – Demolition of 2 SFR, construction of a 14 unit 3 story density bonus apartment building. Incentive = height increase from 33’ to 44’ – Armin Gharai, engineer (see attached application)
- a. 2 Very Low Income units at +/- 700/mo, 1 manager, 11 market rate
 - b. Zone = R3, GP = Med Residential. Denser than the Fernglen Project which is zoned RD1.5, GP designation of low medium residential
 - c. 13 i-bdrm apts, 1 2 bdrm apt - 1 parking space/1 bdrm unit, 2 parking spaces/2 bdrm unit = total of 16 subterranean parking spaces (?)
 - i. Xc = Change from initial application
 - ii. Lydia Grant: Geographically, we are up in the hills. We are facing Projects with an enormous amount of bicycle parking that people are not going to be using to go to work/school/shopping/etc. Cyclists here are for recreation/exercise
 - 1. To depend on them for general transportation is not realistic – we are not flat, so it would be good if you were to have more parking than the City/State says you don’t have to provide
 - 2. Electing good legislators is something to look at seriously. We have to build more affordable housing to reduce homelessness, but it is a balancing act. We need Projects that will rent – not sit empty
 - 3. This committee should write a letter asking for us as a community and other communities that have similar situations to be able to opt-out of the bicycle plan that shoves e.g. 15 bicycle spaces down our throats that could have been 5-6 vehicle parking spaces
 - d. Density bonus allowance would have allowed us to apply for up to 18 units – we have asked only for 14 units
 - e. Billl S.: The 1-bdrm apts are +/- 700 sq ft. What is the market you are aiming at? Students? Young couples?
 - i. Armin G.: Either single person or couples

- f. Q: Why are you requesting the increase in height? Is there a limit to how many people can live in these units?
- i. Armin G.: We are getting 2 incentives – one for overall height, one for one story higher than code generally allows. 44' to the parapet + 10' for the staircase = 54' total height
 - ii. Pati P.: Generally a story = +/- 10ft. You have a 3-story building. What is the height of every story of your bldg. – just the 3 stories – not the roof, not the projections? Why do you need more than 30'?
 1. Armin G.: The parapet has a +/- 3 ft wall surrounding the roof. The lot is downsloped from the street. The height is measured from the lowest point of the building which in this case is at the back of the building
 2. Cindy C.: So the 44' will be at the backside of the building and appear less from the street?
 3. Armin G.: Yes
 4. Cindy C.: What will the elevation be at the front?
 5. Armin G.: +/- 35'-36' - iii. Richard M.: This is greater than a 20% increase.
 1. Armin G.: A 20% increase would be a discretionary allowance by a ZA – density bonus is a 35% allowance per Ordinance
- g. Debby B.: I am really worried about this neighborhood not having enough parking. Hillhaven in general is a disaster with how narrow it is – I don't know where people are going to park knowing what the rest of Hillhaven looks like
- i. It is unrealistic to believe that only one person will live in each apt so that is going to make a big parking problem, but we are not the City so we do not get to dictate how many parking spaces are theoretically needed
- h. I have the same general comment about the architecture as that for the proposed Fernglan Project – it is not very inviting
- i. Re the 1260 sq ft “roof deck”. Is that usable space for residents to share as it is listed under “Open Space” calculation of the required 1400 sq ft Open Space (100 sq ft/unit x 14 units = 1400 sq ft). 1260 sq ft roof deck + 140 sq ft of 630ft x 630ft rec rm = 1400 sq ft
- i. Is that usable sturdy decking material?
 1. Armin G.: It is going to be built so it could be used like a space for “common area” where they can go and sit – have seats, etc. Only 10% of the total rec rm area is allowed in the Open Space calculation
 2. The owners wanted to provide a gym as part of the rec rm – something they were not required to do so while the total space is 540 sq ft, only 10% is credited to Open Space
 3. Debby B.: What floor is the rec rm on?
 4. Armin G.: It should be on the first floor
 - ii. Debby B.: I like the idea of the roof deck because it does give a big expanse of O.S. Is it all one big common area?
 1. Armin G.: There is some landscaping, but there will be some furnishings so it will appear carpentalized in a couple spaces there
 - iii. Bill S.: Re the roof deck floor plan, it looks like there are 2 large 640 sq ft rooms on the roof with doors on them. Are these enclosed?
 1. Armin G.: They are enclosed per code as required by the Fire Department to provide staircase access to the roof
 2. Bill S.: Do these have roofs on them?

3. Armin G.: No, they just have railings around them as does the roof deck which needs to be 10' away from the edge of the roof so there will not be an area from which one can overlook the neighbors
 - j. Cindy C.: Re landscaping – will it be more than it appears in the renderings?
 - i. Armin G.: There will be some more, but will not have as much as the Fernglen Project. The Fernglen Project has a much deeper front yard providing for more landscaping
 - k. Cindy C.: When you go in the front door, will that be the lobby?
 - i. Armin G.: Yes
 - l. Cindy C.: The biggest challenge that communities have now is the State mandate for Affordable Housing. In fact there is a Bill that one of the State Senators has put forth to make it even worse than what it is now
- XI. Discussion of processes/procedures to create documents for the LUC/History of the LUC – Cindy Cleghorn
- a. The LUC started before the NC was approved. Has been very active in land-use issues over the last 15 years. Before the LUC, there were very active vocal community leaders who helped develop what is now the FBCSP
 - b. There has been a very active community when it comes to trying to preserve our community as best as possible and to go along with development that works in our community
 - i. We have not been “Nimbys” saying “No” to all applications – it is that we want proposed Projects to fit/to work within our community
 1. Bill S.: At the NC Board meeting last Wednesday, they had an in-depth discussion of the LUC pointing out that the By-Laws do not give outreach authority to the LUC, but to the Outreach Committee
 2. If we were to turn that whole business over to the Outreach Committee it won't work because there is no Outreach Committee. They don't function, but they have drawn the line in the sand and I am mad
 3. Lydia G.: By-Laws basically say what the rules are. If there is no reference to an action, does the committee have the right to do it? Only if it outright says they don't, the committee may not engage in an activity
 4. The issue is that we have some people in the community that are trying to control the community and what is going to come in here. They made a big scene at the NC Board meeting demanding to understand why this committee thinks it is necessary to outreach to the community
 5. They are trying to take away this committee's right to outreach to the public, want this action to fall under the Outreach Committee & to shut down the LUC in its entirety removing all current committee members
 6. Cindy C.: We also don't have the tools to get the Projects up on the website – the NC needs to get a functional website so we can put Projects up there for all to see.
 7. Instead I put them into a Google Drive making it look like its all under my control – lacking transparency. I never wanted to do it that way. So now we are getting hit as if it is our fault and that is unfortunate
 8. Mark S.: Something you need to convey to the Board is that you would like them to provide a place on the STNC website where the LUC can deposit files for the public to look at

9. They took that ability away early in the process of website update leaving us unable to provide that function to the community as the LUC normally would leaving us the need to find an alternative place to store stuff e.g. Google Drive. That needs to be brought out
10. The other thing from what I have seen during 17 years of working with this community – with this committee which existed even 2 years before the NC was started – it was the whole process of the group that was to bring forth people from the community so they could see what was coming and allow them to have an input to developers
11. C: It appears to be an administrative issue – who provides the resources to have the technology to use? The Minutes were last posted in 2013. As a former State of California volunteer of the CVA we would have had our hands cut off if Minutes were not posted in a timely manner
12. Cindy C.: The NC has a budget of \$42,000/yr. The Bd approves all expenditures. They have a website by which they are supposed to be outreaching on a regular basis – it is in the By-Laws, it is directed by the City
13. They are not doing it. When the new Board came in in 2016, the newly elected leaders changed passwords, shut down access etc. and it has never been fixed, updated or new processes initiated
14. Pati P.: The 2016 secretary had the responsibility of posting Minutes submitted by each committee – that secretary at some point resigned. The new secretary lasted 2 months transferring to a new position
15. Pati P.: That new secretary never had a chance to correct things. Then we got a new secretary who is in there now. In that time we lost the Treasurer – a position Cindy took over to properly maintain records
16. Then a couple of months ago the STNC decided to update the website. What you see on the website now -- a good portion of the information did not get transferred over
17. You are saying the last posted Minutes are from 2013 – all Minutes were there until 2 months ago when the STNC transferred to the new system. So everything has not been brought up to date
18. Debby B.: My main beef w/Bd Members & their complaints – they don't come to LUC meetings, they don't know what goes on, how transparent we are, how we communicate w/the presenters, how polite we are etc. – they don't see it b/c they are not here
19. How can they understand or comment on all these complaints when they don't even see it for themselves?
20. Cindy C.: We need to think about this and come back with some suggestions to add to our list to submit to the Board. There are other NCs in the City that have Standing Rules – maybe we should look at that
21. A couple of things that came up at the contentious Board Meeting. It related to the car wash project at Apperson/Foothill. The City hearing was on the 27th.
22. The By-Laws of the NC states that a rep of this committee is to attend public hearings and negotiate with developers. I did that and submitted the draft letter that the Bd was going to vote on that evening

23. That got back to the Bd & they screamed b/c it was as if I gave their letter in advance of the Bd approving it. But at the same time their agenda was not properly worded so they couldn't take any action
24. They had to hold the STNC Bd action over to Dec 12. I immediately contacted the City, picked up the letter & brought it back. The City has nothing from STNC except the verbal comments made at the Hearing
25. I heard very strongly about doing outreach. I really don't understand what the purpose of the NC system is if it minimizes outreach. This needs to be incorporated into our processes
26. Lydia G.: A big issue that the Board had was whether the Board approved the training LUC provided new committee members. Board members know little about land-use – Cindy C. trains City agencies on land-use issues. Who better to train LUC members?
27. My fear was the Bd wanted to make the decision then & there to have Cindy C. removed & the LUC dissolved. I said you better go to the City Atty because that would have been a huge violation of By-Laws
28. Bill S.: What offended me was they never gave us so much as the opportunity to answer anything – they just came out with all this stuff – they didn't know what they were doing.
29. Cindy C.: We do want succession – I don't expect to be here forever – I have other things to do
30. Lydia G.: But not all at once. Members on the LUC has to be people with experience as well as new
31. Richard M.: Volunteered to write a draft LUC processes including suggestions for ways to improve transparency including resources to be more effective so everyone has access to information
32. Lacking information access, lacks transparency. Will add any other suggestions.
33. Debby B.: We on this committee and they on the Board are supposed to be representing the people in the community, not voicing our own personal opinions
34. While we all do occasionally, enforcing the SP is what this committee was originally for. W/in the guidelines of the SP we may make suggestions to help make Projects/bldgs more compatible
35. It sounds like the Board is trying to impose their personal opinion – that is not their job
36. Lydia G.: All people should understand what a CUP is – what a CUP process is – how that effects a Project proposal. All people should understand CEQA – how that effects a Project proposal

XII. 6433 La Tuna Canyon Golf Course Project

- a. They are scheduled for a Public Hearing on January 24. STNC does not yet have confirmation, but is trying to get Snowball and V.O.I.C.E. to come to the next NC meeting on Jan 9

XIII. Committee Updates

- a. A number of LUC members have not been attending or have not been able to attend LUC meetings. We would like to look at opening these positions to Board Members or anyone interested in serving. Suggested removals:
 - i. John Laue – long term non-attendance

- ii. William Malouf – long term non-attendance though serving only as an alternate
 - iii. David Barron – Has moved out of the area
 - iv. Cathi Comras – Can't come on Mondays due to her work schedule, but does work with letters etc. in the background
 - b. Bill S.: I have said to the Board that I want to see one of each regional reps at every LUC meeting in which there is an item on the LUC agenda within their region. If that takes filling LUC seats with Board Members, so be it
- XIV. STNC CISs – Cindy Cleghorn
 - a. If anyone has a proposed CIS, send them to me – I have a list of what came out of the VANC meeting so the LUC can review whether there are any it would like to consider for a CIS
- XV. Public Comments
 - a. None noted
- XVI. Announcements
 - a. Open House and Public Hearings on CEQA Transportation Update to comply with State Legislation SB 743, Link on the agenda
 - b. Hearing for Restaurant Beverage Program Ordinance = January 31, 2019, 6:30pm at Marvin Braude bldg. 6262 Van Nuys Bl. Van Nuys. Links to Draft Ordinance, FAQs and Hearing Notice on the agenda
- XVII. Meeting adjourned at 9:26pm