

**Chatsworth Neighborhood Council, Land Use Committee  
Chatsworth Depot  
Minutes June 20, 2013- Draft Minutes**

Linda van der Valk called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Present: Linda van der Valk, Andre van der Valk, Mary Kaufman, Judi Daniels, Jeff Hammond, Jim van Gundy, Teena Takata, Janice Eddy-Languain, Larry Heller, George Nelson, Mark Levinson, Vicki Briskman

Not Here: Diana Dixon-Davis (excused), Jelena Csanyi (excused), Michael Preis (excused)

**Stakeholder and Public Comments:**

None

Minutes – the minutes for our May meeting were approved with minor corrections.

**Presentations and possible motions:**

**20100 Plummer Street, AT&T Cell Tower - Kathy Phelps**

A prior application for a cell tower in the form of a mono palm in the area was approved at 65 feet, but was not installed due to corporate restructuring. This application is for a 69 cell foot tower, which is colocatable (which is part of why this height is requested). How does the alley function with the cell tower there? The cell tower is in part of the storage space being used by the building occupant. Significant concerns were expressed regarding the lack of maintenance and branches on existing AT&T fake trees in the community, particularly at 11056 De Soto. Multiple comments were made that the presented tree would not be what we would actually get due to lack of maintenance. A request was made that they “clean up” their existing poorly maintained site at 11056 De Soto as a gesture of good will and an expression of caring for the community. Comment was made that the existing tree on site in the pictures provided seemed to be very tall, say 60 + feet high based on estimating the building height and comparing the tree height, but community members at the meeting felt the tree was perhaps only 30-40 feet. Concern was requested since the streets all along the north side are all residential and there are not other cell towers in the area, this significantly decreases the visual appearance of this area. Discussion about possible alternative locations followed. No vote, no action taken.

**10856 Farralone, Boarding Stable**

Just North of Tulsa and Farralone; 77,972 square feet; it is the property north of the horse ranch on the NE corner of Tulsa and Farralone. Has existing horse barn. They have 12 horses and a mini presently, they want to add six more stalls. Expect, eventually, 23/24 horses on property; they will also purchase another parcel to their land. The back of their property is on the wash. 5450 square feet are to be purchased (from the 20-ish home development just to their east), plus they are at two acres (per presenter; this is a conflict with the square feet noted above which was based on zillo which reportedly was an accurate representation of square feet). They have on site parking, clean stalls twice a day, a higher end barn, and already are using automated fly sprayers in the main barn.

Rosemary is a fly deterrent also; their clientele is hunter/jumper show clientele. They have been there since Nov. 2007; they purchased in Feb of 2011. Ficus trees behind the barn to provide some screening to the new home development. Monthly board is \$450 to \$650, depending on stall arrangement. The new development is near to them is a k overlay, discussion about setbacks and distances occurred. They have one arena, one central light for that arena. Hours with trainer are 8 to 8, extended in summer. Presently all horses turn out in the one arena, they are working on creating some additional turnout pens.

Mark made a motion to approve the concept of an equestrian facility/boarding stable on this site. CUP details, including supporting licensed horses, to be worked out with the Equestrian Committee. Vicki seconded. Unanimous approval, no abstentions by the committee.

### **Second Dwelling Units and Horsekeeping Properties**

Jill Haber, AB 1866, ZA 120, Presenting on second dwellings. Lives in the Melody acres area in Tarzana/Woodland Hills, South of Topham. ZA memo 120 is the City of Los Angeles policy memo for these dwellings. AB 1866 was created in early 2000 for high density housing in lower income urban areas. She thinks it should not trump the community plan. At first, it said to stay out of K districts, the ZA 120 opens it up to all lots. You cannot split the lot while adding the second home, but you can put a home with a second address on the lot, no hearing. In their community, these second dwellings have frequently eliminated the horsekeeping ability on the nearby lots. A recently built home ignores setback requirements. This second home is built, has a Certificate of Occupancy, now perhaps could have a permit revocation. These second homes can be built to 1200 square feet. She is trying to work with Alan Bell in Planning. Equine Committee is trying to correct some codes. Once it starts in a neighborhood, it tends to start a trend and the others in the neighborhood also start doing this. Its by right so it doesn't require any real approvals. If the home is attached, it can only be 30% of the existing house. There is a lot of interpretation and gaps between the two documents cited (AB 1866 and ZA 120). Bob Blumenfield is now Council office for them. Mary – we would want a review standard for all of these.

The committee discussed elimination of horsekeeping lots such as those zoned RA and K overlays from consideration for these second dwellings.

We suggest the Neighborhood Council adopt the following motion and post it as a Community impact statement:

A motion was made with respect to these types of second dwelling units.

A moratorium on Second dwelling units contemplated under ZA Memo 120 and/or AB1866 is critically necessary in RA-1, RE-20, RE-40 and A-zoned parcels, including all K overlay parcels in the Chatsworth community plan. Any second dwelling permits that may be thought appropriate, notwithstanding the moratorium directive of this motion, for these zones must go through approval of the Chatsworth Neighborhood Council as with other discretionary major land use approvals. This process will provide an a opportunity for local residents to investigate the effect of such a land improvement on the neighboring properties and community, and review setback requirements applicable to horsekeeping on adjacent properties that sometimes has not been addressed due to these specialized requirements.

In general, the RA and A zoned lots that are part of this directive are not multi family or low income in our community, which was the target type of property initially considered under AB 1866 for the second dwellings. We are very concerned with the impact of this type of development can have on our historic horsekeeping properties that are treasured cornerstone of Chatswoth history, and still preserved today in the community. This motion is made with the intention that it also be filed as a Community Impact Statement. Teena made the Motion. Mary seconded. Approved unanimously, no abstentions by the committee.

A clarification to last months meeting, relating to the Sierra Canyon development review and motion. The CUP for Sierra Canyon was reviewed by several committee members after our last meeting, and we now formally note that their CUP requires a 12 foot sidewalk.

**Commentary on other issues**

July 10 7pm here, Equestrian is meeting at the Depot; Sierra Canyon is expected at this meeting to discuss various issues.

The meeting adjourned 9:00 pm.