

**Chatsworth Neighborhood Council, Land Use Committee
Chatsworth Depot
Minutes June 20, 2012 - Draft Minutes**

Jeff Hammond, acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm

Present: Judi Daniels, Jeff Hammond, Mary Kaufman, Teena Takata, Larry Heller, Mark Levinson, Jelena Csyani

Not here: Dan Huffman (excused), Jim Van Gundy (excused), Yvonne Savala, Andre van der Valk (excused), Linda van der Valk (excused), Vicki Briskman (excused), Janice Eddy-Languein, Chuck Knolls (excused)

Jeff & Teena commented that we don't have a quorum, but we suggest that the meeting run in a manner similar to a usual meeting; matters will be presented, motions will be drafted and an informal vote will be taken. No formal actions can be taken due to the lack of a quorum. If time pressures exist due to public meetings, we can make a board member motion at the regular Neighborhood Council meeting, and thereby speed up the approval process.

Stakeholder and Public Comments

Properties coming available for sale; Lima Property for sale; its just on the north side of Canoga, just past the 118 freeway. Could this be acquired, what is cost, check property lines..it would make a nice parking lot for Chatsworth Trails Park. Larry advised he would take a look at it and find out pricing, and he should be able to provide a plot map.

Charles Smith; Browns Creek landowner; stream bed land; what if we could bring that into Parks & Rec control so the future as a trail is more assured? Phyllis Winger could be a contact to reach Smith, or we likely have contact information from when he recently visited our committee.

Comer property (development Property W of Topanga near Tulsa); new partners are in the deal it may move forward.

Baden Avenue – grading notice received, expect that residential project will move forward soon based on the notice.

Open house for Metro link coming June 30

Minutes from May - approval deferred until next meeting.

Presentations and Motions

Egremont School; 19850 Devonshire – CUP for continuation; Jon Perica representative for the school. The school operates as an Elementary School, has been recognized as best elementary school in Southern California. Since 1958, educational operation grants have been in place for this site. A 1994 approval (based on special earthquake rules) allowed the school to rebuild structures severely damaged by the Northridge earthquake; with understanding that in five years a new review of that

building and property would occur. The current director noted that the 1999-required approval had not been made as required. They are requesting an administrative action; nothing is changing, they are completing the 1999 requirement. The case is with the Planning Department, likely initial hearing in late summer/September; then the matter will go to Planning Commission, date estimate is in late October. They request a letter approving the project to be presented to Planning Department. Tina Struve (sp); Executive Director.

The school operates a preschool through 5th grade. Neighbors will be notified before the future hearing, as per usual notice rules. At one time, schools and churches were granted operating permits on a permanent basis, not a term of years. Now there is a tendency to grant CUPs for term of years. They are requesting an indefinite term on the current CUP application. As a backup time request, they would like a 30 year grant. What changes have happened between 1999 and today? There was the required review in 1999; when the earthquake struck in 1994, temporary buildings were dropped onto the site, and a main administration building (which includes some classrooms) was built. Other buildings on the site have not changed, and principally are two classroom buildings. What was 1994 student population? About 230 students. What is it today? 120 students. The 1994 CUP was issued for 240 students. The CUP was granted 8/23/1994....and required a five year review. So the current CUP application effectively is matching the new structure, as built, back to the original grant to confirm it is consistent with that application, and will re-establish the CUP on the site.

Draft Motion – Larry moved to support approval of the CUP as presented; there is no change from any prior CUP. We recommend that the school ensure there is notification to neighbors and address any concerns that arise. Mary seconded. The committee took a straw vote which unanimously was in favor of the motion. However, due to lack of quorum, no formal vote was taken. A discussion about the timing of the hearing and the next Neighborhood Council meeting followed. The school offered that perhaps they could offer a meeting place (and a tour), if a meeting were to occur. Judi worked out some scheduling issues; we may set up a Board meeting (if a quorum can be made in summer) and ask the school for a meeting place, but it depends exactly on when their public hearing will be held. We may issue a committee letter if a formal board position cannot be taken; we will work with them to provide the best outcome for the circumstances of hearing date and if a Board meeting with a quorum can be achieved.

Ride On; 10869 Topanga Canyon Blvd. Brian McQueeny

Ride on was founded in 1994; in 2008 they purchased the Topanga Canyon Blvd. location. They have set as a priority, acquiring and building a permanent site, which is this location. This may be the only nonprofit public facility like this in the City of Los Angeles. They were issued a CUP in 2009. That CUP required a three year plan review. They have to file a letter describing operations, notify neighbors, check back in the CNC. They have done all this. They run Tuesday through Saturday, year round. The plan review is a \$6700 fee, 3 years after the \$10,000 fee to have the CUP processed initially, it's a huge expense. They have ongoing education for youth and horses, and for disabled. They welcome being a part of the community. How long was the CUP for? It appears that this is a new plan approval (that the initial grant was 3 years?). Will they ask for an extended CUP period to stretch out the operational period? Their intention is to obtain a longer period. Brian did mail to mail list. Jelena raised a question about the arena lights. Building and Safety in 2010 suggested the lights were not permitted. Brian believes all are permitted and signed off on. The lights should not spill over under the CUP, but the operational view that Jelena sees suggests otherwise. Brian and Jelena will review this late at night to see the effects and see if additional screening will help resolve the view. In the alternative, trees along the fence line on the west side may assist the screening. Lights – there will be a

photometric layout if the lights were done through the City. Brian advised he has lots of City stamps on light layouts, etc. It was noted that north of Chatsworth street is a dark sky area to reduce wildlife impacts. Other than the issue with the lights, the property seems well run and taken care of.

Motion – Teena moved, To support the extension of the CUP time period for Ride On, with the same operating conditions as the current CUP. Review and possible improvement of the arena lights used for night lighting is to be considered. Mark seconded. A straw vote was unanimous with one recusal, but again, no formal position was taken due to lack of a quorum.

Sierra Canyon Athletic Field, (De Soto west side, near Rinaldi) Presenters Lesa Slaughter, Joe Masada (architect). Phase 2 of athletic field is presently being reviewed. They are presenting here as part of a compliance review. How do Phase 2 with no Phase 1 determination? In general, Phase 1 does not need to be settled before Phase 2 moves forward. Their CUP also didn't require a finding on Phase 1 before moving forward. B permit is offsite work. They are beginning Phase 2 construction; to be built over the next 2 years or so. Sierra Canyon has a 5 acre high school site, 14 acre middle school site, and the 11 acre sports field along De Soto. There are two permits related to the sports field – the school has received the permits for the onsite work; notices out about a month ago, to start within a week or so. Offsite permits applied for also, they are B permits – in public way. They will widen De Soto from near the 118 off ramp to 300 feet south of Rinaldi; they will also upgrade lights at De Soto and Rinaldi; and improve the equestrian trail and sidewalk east west from De Soto to Rinaldi Street through the area where the street was vacated. Likely that permit will be issued in three to four months. The parking lot is covered under the already issued permit, as it is onsite.

Improvements to be made on their property are as follows. The baseball field will be graded and planted; 16 parking spaces will be made on the field road, the parking lot includes all the additional spaces. Bleachers are to be installed onsite for 150 seats at baseball, 300 seats at the football field; lights for pedestrians in parking area are 30 feet high; 30 foot high lights for pedestrians are also near football/soccer field. Four 70 foot high lights (measured from the base of the light) are at the football field for field lighting. Construction will start with DWP drain pipe correction. First step of any construction is to lower the DWP drain conduit that runs through the future baseball field, to be lowered 3 to 12 feet; it's about a 5 foot diameter pipe. The DWP pipe drains into the channel on west side. The drain improvement has no impact to De Soto; that is all on their property. The toilet near the football field (east side) connects to the City sewer on De Soto.

The other permit for offsite work includes De Soto improvements for sidewalks. There is a 7 foot additional width, 100 feet long deceleration lane) on southbound De Soto before the Rinaldi driveway. DWP, conduits electrical, paving infield road, parking lot last, then De Soto improvement is happening.

Parking is an in/out at DeSoto. There is a turnaround in the parking lot. The parking lot does not go through to Rinaldi in front of the school. The parking area turnaround could be used as part of the school drop off. Concerns were strong on the people, horses, car issues created by the parking area/Rinaldi. The driveway includes a 30 foot entrance from De Soto. 10 foot wide sidewalk; equestrian trail 12 feet wide, sidewalk connects and equestrian trail turns N and stops on north side of parking lot, with the 12 foot width on the equestrian trail continuing through the turn.

Questions were raised about the handicap accommodations near Rinaldi and Independence. The 25 foot Rinaldi utility easement ROW includes a 10 foot sidewalk and equestrian trail. Trees are to be planted along the north side of the parking lot. The equestrian trail does not meet the traffic light at

De Soto; the equestrians have to cross the driveway into the athletic field parking lot to approach the light. Can there be a brushed surface for the driveway access? It improves the nonslip. This is part of the B permit drawings. 12 foot sidewalk along De Soto is to be built. If the sidewalk is on the Rinaldi street, its in the public right of way. Questions about whose land the equestrian trail needs to be on; and there may be clarifying language through letters between applicant and the City. The pole for requesting the crossing light that will be used by equestrians and pedestrians will be changed; and hopefully the equestrian button may be relocated so it is accessible. DOT will inspect that light eventually including the button; also issues with proximity of the do not walk button, and the equestrian crossing demand button; what is an appropriate amount of space? Mary has some pictures and details on acceptable distance between equestrian and pedestrian light spacing in that area, and will provide that information to Sierra Canyon.

Also concerns with concrete vaults in that immediate area that horses may need to stand on as demand for lights are made. 15% slope along driveway? It is steep....as it turns down into the parking area from De Soto. A request was made that an additional equestrian demand for crossing light be located at the direct easterly side of the equestrian trail. This demand light to be set at equestrian height and as an additional light to the equestrian pushbutton at the signal. Many horses may be very intimidated by standing at the light due to traffic and standing in a less confined, softer surface space while light is not changing at the east edge of the equestrian trail would provide a safer "holding" area and will have some more space for the horses. Along the driveway and at the traffic light area, the horses need effective nonskid surface – the nonskid surface location needs to be called out specifically as to where it is to be located so it's in the right place. The area by the light where equestrians are to begin the street crossing MUST NOT be on the sidewalk, since horses are not legally allowed on the sidewalk, as they must use the street. Consider specifying Cal Trans heavy traffic rated vaults to prevent damage to vaults by horse hooves especially and improve safety. The committee will provide a letter to Sierra Canyon on some areas of concern, specifically on light pole button configuration; non skid surfaces; need for safe crossing not involving a sidewalk for equestrians, add supplemental equestrian demand pole at the east side of the trail at De Soto, etc. Also street vaults that are strong; grit added for surfacing? No vote, or straw vote; we will forward information to SC on certain issues.

No community announcements were made.

Meeting adjourned 9:05pm.