

**October 21, 2021 Minutes** of the Joint Meeting of the Land Use/Equestrian Committee and the CNC Board -

(Meeting conducted via Zoom)

1. Meeting called to order at approx. 6:35 p.m. by Linda V.

Committee Members present:

Linda and Andre van der Valk

Dorothy Allison

Judith Daniels

Carey Tri

Frank Geraty

Carol Lucas

Vicki Briskman

Absent:

Mark Levinson - Excused

Dan Huffman (no longer on committee)

Jim Van Gundy - excused?

Jeff Hammond – excused?

Quorum? – Yes

2. Stakeholder/Public Comment –

Jeannie Plumb shared that the equestrian light at Canoga as part of the DeerLake Highlands project has been up for some time & has equestrian buttons but they are not activated. DOT has to do it but they are a year behind. Need Council Office help on this. Frank G. said he noticed power cords have been

ripped out – he will follow up on this in this Public Safety & Transportation Committee.

Per Linda V.- wanted to update us on SB9, she spoke with City Atty about problem with ADU's and horsekeeping- Terri Kaufman from C.A. office called her back SB9 doesn't address horsekeeping - said right now if ADU went in and you have a horse, you would be legal non-conforming but would not be able to add another horse or horse barn. C.A. suggested NC do more research about the 75' and 35' distant requirements- where does it come from city zoning code, public health code, or B&S, etc? C.A. suggested ask CD12 to submit a motion for increased setbacks that are compatible with horsekeeping. M. King offered to help with the motion regarding background research. Linda V. is working on it but can't be a motion tonight because not on agenda.

3. Approval of Minutes – August 2021 minutes just rec'd last minute – will cover for next agenda.
4. Project Presentation – 21111 Plummer. – Presented by Donna Tripp, Josh Kreger, Jason Hines VP & Montana Kanen (Overton Moore Properties, industrial real estate company since 1973), & land use consultants from Craig Lawson & Co. Powerpoint presentation - Project is for a proposed industrial building on a partially vacant lot. Important note - We develop properties for the long term. We developed SE corner Desoto and Nordhoff. Project Site is 11 acres bound by Itasca, Variel, & Plummer & Browns Cyn to the west. Is currently partly developed with an approx. 100,000 sf industrial bldg, Custom Control Sensors, from 1960 – they will be moving- we plan to demo existing building and develop site mid- 2023. Plan a state of the art, 239,000 sf one-story bldg, can be split into two businesses. Front corners will be enhanced with main office entry, tall glass façade, etc. Building will be articulated so won't look like one long bldg. Loading will be from behind, by the wash, screened from street view. Approx. 22 loading docks. Main route anticipated from De Soto to Plummer. Some parking in front but most in the rear. All new street improvements will be made including new sidewalks, parkway and street trees. Contaminated soil is in process of getting be cleaned up. Don't know yet who tenant/s will be. Will have sustainable bldg. features to set example for the community (i.e. EV charging, white roof, solar roof accommodation, roof skylights (approx. 2.5%), LED lighting, concrete yard vs. asphalt, replacing existing trees 2:1 and adding a lot of new trees). Will be designed for top quality user, could provide up to 200 jobs, can be modified with more parking, less docks, etc.

Questions –

Andre V. – Q1 – Have you met with mobile home residents on both sides? A- Per Josh Kreger – we are very early in the process – haven't filed yet with Planning- we definitely plan to do outreach and connect with the mobile home residents as well.

Q2 – Concerned about truck traffic at Canoga and Lassen – it's a very busy intersection and there are weight limits all the way through there (i.e. Variel to Lassen shortcut). A- Main access will be De Soto, we'll make sure as part of our traffic analysis that all of the appropriate intersections are looked at.

Q3 – Supportive of industrial or high tech but any problem putting a No Cannabis production, processing or retail? A – Not sure there is a legal mechanism for that but know it is not federally allowed. We have no interest in a cannabis user, looking for high quality, Class A user.

Marianne K. – Q4 – what kind of contamination on site?

Q5 – Concern with truck activity at rear of site- would want to see a much more robust landscape buffer along Browns Cyn planted with large mature shade trees, to provide natural screening to mobile homes to the west, and help to reduce light, noise, and fumes. Maybe consider car parking on the north side if more room is needed to provide a landscape buffer at the rear. A- Plan to plant trees along the entire west side, think we have a 10 foot wide landscape buffer there. Will look at widening that in certain places. Will have limited hours for truck traffic, think it is 7am to 9 pm, which will help with noise concerns.

Q6- Will you be complying with Q conditions? A – yes. Will comply with Q conditons and entitlement includes site plan review.

Q7 – How much solar are you planning for the rooftop?

Q8 – Highly recommend decent shade trees around the site, forget Crape Myrtles, we need something better, we are dying of heat out here.

Judi D – Q9 – how tall will the building be? A – we are still looking at that – restricted to 45 feet. Q10 – will you be able to abide by that? A far as right now, yes.

Q11 – Wanted to point out here is a residential boys town (high school) across from the site, entrance is on Plummer just west of De Soto. A – yes, we are aware of that- will reach out to them as well.

Cari T- Q12 – Will entire site be used for the project? A- yes

Q13 – will entrance be off of Itasca? – yes, the truck entrance will be off of Itasca, vehicle traffic will be more off of Variel. Q14 – So trucks will come in from De Soto to Plummer to Variel to Itasca? A- No, Most will be coming from the north, from De Soto to Itasca.

Q14- I love all the native landscaping, native trees and plants, that will be used.

Carol L – Q15- Will solar be implemented or room just made for it and how much capacity? A- City doesn't require we actually put in solar with the building but if we have a heavy power user, it is likely a lot of solar will be used. I believe the roof can accommodate 50% of rooftop for solar or might be higher than than.

Q16 – Will there be a rainwater collection system? A – Yes, we will collect rainwater on-site an infiltrate into to the groundwater to use back on to the site for plant/landscape irrigation except in previous contamination areas.

Frank G- Q17 – What kind of contamination is in the soil? A – Mainly VOCs and solvents used for degreasing – its not a huge release on site. Q18 – will that be a barrier situation or removal? A – there will be a barrier under the building and owners have already entered into remediation at the site.

5. Project Presentation - ZA-2021-4695-CUB at 21725 - 21729 Devonshire to Request a permit the sale of beer and wine only in a café and board game retail space. This is at the former Chatsworth Florist site.

Presenter – George Caceres – I'm a small retailer looking to start a café and board game venue, trying to promote community and family atmosphere. Beer and wine will be incidental to any coffee, food, or board games. Got this model from a couple places we visited around the country, philidelphia and seattle. Proposed hours – 6am – 10 pm daily, alcohol sales from 5 pm – 10 pm Monday -Thurs, and 12 noon- 10 pm Friday – Sun.

Linda V- Q1 – Are those the hours you are going to be specifically asking for in your application? A – yes

Marianne K. Q2 – exciting concept, I like the idea of board games – is there a site plan and floor plan, parking etc.? It looks like you are legal non-conforming but I'd want to see that first, also, the floor plan helps to indicate what type of alcohol license (i.e. bar or restaurant). – A- plan shows 3 parking spaces but think we can get 5 – 6 spaces in the back. Will provide site and floor plan. It wont be a bar. It does have a kitchen in it – delayed us about 9 months to update/put in.

Q3 – Looks like exterior work is being done – can you share what is being done and does that fall within the DRB review?

Linda V. Q4 – Are you preparing cooking there or is it a café like starbucks style? A- we are mostly heating up, we'll have crepes, etc, will cook up on a crepe machine, etc.

Cari T – Q5 – What is the square footage and is it replacing florist with a restaurant? A – 3,060 sf - per Linda V – bdlg is from 1950s/60's- has multiple addresses, had 3 different uses at one time.

Linda V – Okay George, if you can provide add'l info and come back next month that will be great – Per George will do and he will have his architect speak to exterior work that has been done.

6. 2021- 2029 Housing Element Update – Marianne gave update. Was approved by CPC on 10/14- going to City Council in Nov. Some features in Housing Element

- Rezoning (upzoning) of approx.. 240,000 parcels in the city to comply with housing capacity required per RHNA – these are to be considered, will have to go through usual hearing process, etc. but will have to be done within 3 years to be in compliance with state RHNA. My concern is I think we should be proactive with this instead of reactive. Having problem with their excel spreadsheet to hone in on chatsworth parcels only (i.e. cant sort, etc) but would want to research each site and address ones that we think are inappropriate for upzoning. Once I can get a workable spreadsheet, if anyone else is interested and working on this research let me know. Should look at equine areas, potential historic, high fire hazard areas, sensitive habitat areas, etc.
- Survey LA- would also want to look at all chatsworth properites on survey LA and see if any should be designated so they can be protected. SB9 & 10 does not apply to properites with designated historic resources. Important Note- “potential historic” is not protected per CEQA, so if it is a by-right project, it can be demolished. Looking for someone who may want to work on that research as well. Concerned about existing properties that may currently have affordable units, not RSO, that could be demolished, like Tiki Apartments on Canoga- that is a potential historic property.
- Marianne shared screened – showed color coded map on the Housing Element website that shows areas considered for upzoning- i.e. some areas of concern would be properties along Chatsworth Street. Not sure of the actual density yet that goes with color coding, have to research that more, but this is just to give you an idea. This is not the same as “Re-

Code” which I believe is first being applied to downtown then will be applied during community plan updates.

7. Tree Protection Policy – Marianne didn’t have time to present this but the idea is to come up with ways to improve tree protection in the city. Right now there are only 5 protected trees under the city policy - large “non-protected” mature trees can be cut down with a 1:1 replacement 24-inch box, which really doesn’t replace what is lost. Looking to protect healthy large trees from being removed in the first place and propose to the city. If anyone interested in doing some research on that – that would be helpful too, like look at other jurisdictions that have lots of trees, what is their policy and compare it to ours. Marianne will put together a summary of existing policy and weaknesses in the process.

Redistricting Update – Marianne gave update – on Map K2.5-4 – very little change to Chatsworth – discussed other map that someone drew up from the Woodland Hills NC that took the Chatsworth Preserve entirely out of CD12- shared concern with Woodland Hills NC as well as the Re-Districting Commission that the Chats. Preserve needs to stay in CD12.

8. 21501, 21405 Chatsworth Street & 10737 Canoga – Former Davis Ranch – all addresses have complaints of code violations –

10737 Canoga- electrical permit needed for the light poles and luminaries, same with 21405 Chatsworth, and a certificate of occupancy is required for the use of land at 21501 Chatsworth. The Council Office has flagged these all together and reported to Building & safety.

Discussion – Jeanne Plumb comments – wanted to share earlier, that the equestrian setbacks came from city zoning in 1984. On the tree policy- ordinance was passed on that back in the 70’s. Regarding Davis Ranch – it is zoned RA for residential, it cannot be used for commercial use such as a soccer field or athletic field- there is nothing in the code that differentiates personal use of athletic fields. I am comfortable now this is on the Councilmans radar. Also, the improvements at Chatsworth & Canoga have to do with the Deerlake project, it has nothing to do with this property. Also, the light standards that are going in on the sidewalk are appropriate and does accommodate equestrians – Council Office was working on that.

9. Stoney Point Ranch operation concern – Jeanne Plumb shared that her understanding is that General Services is now making an assessment of the facilities there. Racheal Ramos- rec & parks is aware of the concessions. Any improvements that are made with the concessionaires stay with the property, i.e. like new corral, etc. I hope that a redesign includes new boarding stables of owners and operators from the area. The existing conditional use bears no resemblance to what is on the property now. Hope NC & equestrians will have input on this when the time comes. Things like access, it is too hard to access the site with trailers, etc. Also have some questions like, who pays for the water?

Frank G. noticed they are working the place pretty hard, speeding cars, very few horses now, only activity seems to be at night when they have their friends over. Jeanne P. share same concerns, wants Council Office to get involved. Property shouldn't be run with an absentee owner, etc. Per Dorothy A, - a lot of people are leaving because their horses are not being properly cared for. Marianne K – I think this should be brought to a higher level – I can find out who oversees General Services, Asset Division. Marianne – Proposed a Motion to send a letter to Councilman Lee, general services, and rec & parks of concerns raised & want to ensure the longevity of that site for horsekeeping/horseboarding. Cari T seconded the motion. Judi D. added the NC has spent a lot of money to help the city buy the property. Carol L. added she is concerned about safety/public safety at the site. Motion approved – All voted yes except Frank G. abstained (will have to recuse himself at Board Mtg on this because lives within 500 feet of property). Marianne added letter should ask what is being assessed and we would like to be kept in the loop on this information.

Public Comment – Karen Schaffer – has been a boarder there for 31 years, does not think the site is in deterioration – actually think it has gotten better so don't think that information is accurate. Most people think Angel is doing a good job managing it- there are always some disgruntled people. There are fewer horses there- Jodi took about 25 horses when she left.

10. Motion to Adjourn – 8:40 p.m.