

**Sunland Tujunga Neighborhood Council**  
**Minutes of Residential Land Use Committee (RLUC)**  
**June 24, 2004**  
held at the Sunland Tujuga Municipal Building

Meeting called to order at 7:05 PM by Mark Seigel. In attendance Mark Seigel, Cindy Cleghorn, Steve Crouch, Debby Beck, Barbara Higgins, Ken Gilliland, Rhonda Herbel-Gilliland, John Buonauro, Ginny Buonauro, Elise Richardson, Dale Thrush, Mark Fogwell, Lorraine Fogwell, Ray Mirzakhanian, Rick Percell, Debra Baumann, Gina Tanner, Lisa Levy Buch, Ed Rock.

Minutes of June 16, 2004 meeting approved with corrections.

General Comments/Questions:

Dale Thrush - Clarification regarding Fire Sprinklers being a requirement of the Building and Safety code so therefore is not considered a mitigation. It is a mitigation whether the Building and Safety Code requires it or not. It mitigates a circumstance.

Rhonda Herbel - Question: Isn't it a requirement to disclose/discuss mitigations proposed as who? (Dale refers question to Barbara) The MMRP (Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program) discusses mitigation; EIRS are not required to identify whether mitigation is proposed by the developer or applicant.

Steve Crouch - Why addressing sprinkler mitigation when the DEIR has nothing to do with houses. DEIR is not about building homes. Does mitigation relate to the project description? Proposed Equestrian Park is to be owned by the Homeowner's Association? Runoff example.

Dale Thrush - Adequacy of the DEIR is a legal issue. Should RLUC be discussing it? RLUC should look at the DEIR as a primary function. CEQA requires feasible mitigation. Should focus on layperson's view or more "political" issues.

Debby Beck - Mr. Percell has said he's not building all the homes but that he will probably build some homes.

Discussion regarding proposed RLUC survey

Chairman, Mark Seigel requested that Rhonda and Julianne bring sample questions for the next survey that RLUC has planned to next week's RLUC meeting. Everyone should look at the community responses to recent budget survey and bring ideas to chairman for survey specific to Canyon Hills.

Developer Comments:

Rick Percell - Responses are in and due next Wednesday to the City who will determine if the responses are sufficient. If not, they will say. Have been responding in batches to the City but are down to the last couple of relatively large letters (CAP, Sierra Club). Still working on the simulated drive through animation and simulated 210 freeway. Should be ready next week. Filing "Major Plan Review" in two weeks. Hearings start from there. Per Lisa, will take months before hearings start. This filing will be before the release of the Final EIR. There is a City backlog. Rick will continue to come to meetings. Discussion re: deadline for commenting on FEIR. 10 days? No, per Barbara. Final EIR comes out and comment period continues to last public hearing on the project before the posting of "Notice of Determination". Regarding the access road connected with the Duke property. Chose to stay with the existing plan as shown and not connect with the Duke property. Developer asked and received no opinions contrary so didn't change it.

Regarding the Duke property. They are engineering their site. They want to sell it. Would sell to SMMC. Council office asked if Whitebird would purchase the Duke property. Not interested at this time as price is at \$3 million for 10 units. Rick doesn't want to do the engineering.

Public Resources section of CEQA is 10-day minimum, not maximum, so can be longer as checked by Barbara Higgins in the CEQA guidelines book.

#### Comments regarding June 23 Canyon Hills Community Meeting

Lisa Levy Buch - Asked how many people did not attend their meeting. Only 4 in the room raised their hands.

Steve Crouch - Meeting was an education meeting but had a sales table. Feels it taints the educational aspect. If trying to sell, questions everything. Also on the table were the support cards available for people to fill out.

Rhonda Herbel also taken aback by seeing this.

Lisa Levy Buch responded that people always ask for this info. People are interested in living there.

Nina Royal - Adamantly concerned why VICA and the L.A. Chamber support Canyon Hills when they have nothing to do with Sunland Tujunga (Foothill communities).

Ken Gilliland - Comments regarding the Traffic table. Person at the table uncomfortable with his questions regarding trip generation, 2,694 vehicle trips a day, 496 during rush hour, leaving 2,200 for the rest of the day. Person did not have an answer. Referring to bottleneck, people will have to know this is when they buy it and live with it.

Dale Thrush responded that the Department of Transportation keeps traffic moving. Has to scope the study. Impact on peak hour traffic at major intersections. Dale says the numbers make sense. Ken's comment is concerned with the fact that this person did not have any information on his concern and that in Site A, one entrance will have to deal with being backed up. Fear of other accesses being opened up such as La Tuna Canyon Road and other side streets.

Barbara Higgins - Thought the meeting was excellent. Exhibits and expert consultants available were well organized. Well done. Good turnout.

Mark Seigel - asked Barbara if she has seen other events like this? Barbara said she was only commenting on this event.

Rhonda - Discussed with Botanist and FORMA conflicting mitigation measures re: erosion control vs. high fire zone and habitat. Expert said he would like to know more and thought it was a good question. Subsequent impact of their mitigation. Rhonda would like them to explore alternative mitigation more suitable to the site conditions and project goals.

Debby Beck - What happens with interested buyers?

Lisa Levy Buch (response) - Uses it to sell. Becomes a legal list.

Mark Fogwell - Is the interested buyer list used to express favor for the project?

Lisa Levy Buch - "No". Support cards are shown to the City. People have to fill out for themselves. They give copies to the City and its public information. Usually the State gives out the info with the confidential data blacked out upon request.

Rhonda Herbel asked who was custodian of the box of comments that go to the City? Lisa Levy Buch answered it is her. Steve Crouch asked if our committee could also then obtain a copy of the public comments? Dale asked if she had a chance to summarize any of the comments yet and she said no. Some comments and discussion ensued as to access to and handling of public comments.

Gina Tanner - Expressed concern with Comment Card personal information being spread. No confidentiality.

At this time the committee discussion moved on to developing a chart of pros and cons about the project (see following).

#### Samples of information suggested for the Chart

This chart will continue to be developed at each meeting. Generally discussed that it is not an analysis of the DEIR per se, but of quality of life concerns and may relate to/or reference some of what's in the DEIR. Dale suggested things like: Economic Impact, Open Space. Are we to be evaluating all the alternatives listed in the EIR? No, generally discussed staying to general topics which may relate to any number of the alternatives. Dale encouraged consideration of issues important to PLUM Chair such as Inclusionary Housing. Regional transportation plans = near transportation.

Other initial thoughts included:

1. Precedent Setting Nature of Altering the Community Plan, General Plan, Specific Plan, Ordinances
2. Traffic
3. Public Services
4. Open Space  
Cluster vs. Ranchette
5. Community Survey input/results
6. Visual appearance of the community
7. Economic impact of 280 new homes  
Business  
Property Values
8. Developer build his buy right
9. Need for more housing in L.A. City - Pressure by State and City

Examples: Inclusionary  
Affordable  
Distribution

10. Risk of further subdivision if develops buy right

## 11. Cultural impacts

Everyone is to send brainstorm list to Mark at w6mes@yahoo.com

Meeting adjourned at 9:05 PM.

Minutes taken by Cindy Cleghorn.

(Approved on June 30, 2004 with corrections by the RLUC committee.)