

**January 20, 2022 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. 6:44 p.m. by Linda V.

Committee Members present:

Linda and Andre van der Valk

Jim Van Gundy

Jeff Hammond

Marianne King

Dorothy Allison

Judith Daniels

Carey Tri

Carol Lucas

Vicki Briskman

Absent:

Mark Levinson – excused?

Frank Geraty - Excused

Quorum? – Yes

2. Stakeholder/Public Comment –

Judi D – Selection season has started, you can go on to the CNC website to register for your ballot, etc.

Linda V. – found out that the Fern Ann Falls earth damn failed going back to the stable. Equestrians could get stranded there.

3. Approval of Minutes – Linda V. – We'll do October, November, and January next month.
4. Project Presentation – DIR-2021-10278, 10279 / ENV-2021-10280 – 9201 Winnetka Request to demolish existing movie theater building, fitness center, soda & yogurt shop (140,000 sf), and construct 3 industrial/warehouse buildings with a total floor area of up to 273,500 sf.

Applicant representatives - Brad Rosenheim, Gary Werner, Doug Henrichs of HPA Architecture.

Gary W. presented a power point presentation. Main highlights – theater closed March 2020, theater industry not doing well due to streaming services, etc. Went over ownership and zoning & entitlement history of the 27 acre property. Strong demand for light industrial buildings, such as studio production, warehousing. Use is consistent with the land use designation. The existing commercial uses fronting Winnetka and south adjoining property under the same ownership are not a part of the project. The buildings will be flexible in order to allow for multiple tenants. Building setbacks will be approx.. 62 feet from Prairie, 55 feet from Oso, and 70 feet from south property line. There will be 6 access points for vehicles & trucks. Driveway off of Winnetka (in between commercial uses) will only be used for vehicles. There will be a loading and truck courtyard area in center of the 3 buildings with parking spaces and landscaping around the perimeter of the site (similar to existing layout). The site will be secured with gates and fencing. There will be 548 parking spaces to accommodate most intense use. There are 195 trees on site which all must be removed due to the extent of grading involved to demolish and clear the site for new development. 219 trees will be planted. Doug H. presented elevations, design info.

Questions –

Marianne K. –

Asked questions below which was also emailed to the applicant rep including additional questions from LUC members via Linda V. after the meeting so they can review and get back to us.

1. **Removal of all trees & shrubs unacceptable.** Tree report is incomplete without arborist recommendation for tree preservation, protection, potential relocation. Want to see an earnest effort to protect healthy mature trees along the north and west landscape buffer including the 4 large pine trees at rear SW corner and the keep the shrubs along the south property line. Also consider

relocating some of the Canary Island Date Palms at the main corners of the site or building.

2. **Fence around site.** Plans indicate 6' high wrought iron fence around site, then reads 8' tall metal tubing fence. What is planned? Fence will be highly visible. Show on plans where fence is proposed including the east property line (looks like it is located in middle of fire lane).
3. **Rooftop Solar Panels?** Show on plans where rooftop solar is planned, such as on the south building, etc.
4. **Screen rooftop mechanical equipment.** Show all rooftop equipment including HVAC's to ensure parapet will screen equipment. Currently parapet only 1 – 2 feet high.
5. **Transformers.** Show where proposed on site plan. Should be underground, not above ground.
6. **10 solid metal vehicle gates?** Site seems overly fortified with all the vehicle gates. How might these affect on-site circulation? Will there be visitor parking? If so, where?
7. **Pedestrian pathways.** Need to show the pedestrian path of travel on site and how connects with frontage. Currently looks like people would have to walk in the parking lot aisle.
8. **Sign Plan.** Would like to see a conceptual sign plan for the site.
9. **14' screen wall – remove from plans**
10. **Lighting plan.** Would like to see exterior light plan for site, including pole lights and height. Should all incorporate dark sky lighting features.
11. **Dedication.** Application indicates there is a 2 foot dedication on Prairie, 1 foot on Oso but not shown on site plan (i.e. existing P/L and new P/L. Is this information correct? Is there a BOE referral form? Will any street widening or improvements be required? Please specify.
12. **Entitlement.** If exempt from CPC-CU process, is there a EIR certification that was submitted to planning for this case for the EZ Zone?
13. **Truck ingress/egress at Winnetka driveway.** Is this necessary? How might this impact flow of traffic at Winnetka? Heavily used during peak time. South adjacent property has driveway in close proximity, hard to turn left when someone turning right from Winnetka driveway. Residential across from commercial. Should try to keep trucks off Winnetka?

Jeff H. – Have any of the spaces been leased? A- No, not at this point.

Vicki B – Concerned with traffic on Prairie and Mason – is really congested right now, trucks in the middle of the street, could be a trucker nightmare. A – per Brad – think it has to do with the buildings they are serving (i.e. they are older, don't have adequate space on-site space for trucks – this project will have central

area for trucks on-site, so any queuing or congestion would occur on site. Per Vicki, the issue is these trucks have to use Prairie to get to the site, Prairie is congested now with trucks. A- per Brad, I think the 6 access points will help with that. LADOT approved the plans and driveways.

Carey T – Does there have to be an environmental impact statement on this? A – per Gary – There will be a mitigated negative declaration submitted to the city in a couple weeks and will include a traffic analysis. Trip generation will be less than theater. Carey noted traffic before was cars, now it will be trucks. Also, don't see why so many well established trees would be destroyed, think that deserves a closer look.

Judi D- Is the three buildings that was approved on the south property still going to take place? A- per Brad, that project will probably not be going forward. Will adjacent commercial parking be shared or will it be separate and per code? A- per Gary, they will all have their own parking per code, no shared parking. What if there is a more intense use, will there be enough parking? A- Yes, parking will be provided for most intense use permitted (i.e. 548 spaces) however you could have someone lease with a less intense use at which time parking area can be re-stripped, etc.

Jim V – Will access still be provided to the south adjoining property from the site southwest corner as previously approved? A – Yes.

Linda V – Why are you asking for 3 new buildings – why aren't you using the entitlement you already have for 3 buildings on the south property? A- per Brad, the southern lot is now being leased for surface parking and is no longer available.

Carol L. – Lunch area/trellis - Plans look like these are located in the parking spaces, this may be a problem.

Dorothy A - Will access to the existing commercial only be from Winnetka? Will Prairie still be open? A – yes, access to commercial will be from Winnetka and the Prairie driveway closest to the commercial.

5. Letter to Councilman Lee due to no response from the Planning Dept. to the CNC letter requesting clarification/transparency in how affordable housing project are being processed (i.e. when administrative, when formal written determination) and what part of Specific Plan is consider objective or subjective, etc.

Marianne K- So none of the 3 people the letter was emailed to (Bertoni, Webber, Lamb responded? Per Linda, that's correct, no one responded.

Vicki B- Suggest we cc the 3 people on the letter to the Councilman.

Linda V – any objection to sending the letter to the Councilman? No objection.

6. Letter to Councilman Lee regarding condition of bridle trails in Chats and who is in charge of maintenance and a request for “no bicycles” on the bridle path along Brown’s Creek between Devonshire & Rinaldi and four other locations along the trails.

Linda V- someone complained to Myrka as well as CD12, trees need to be trimmed there (understand that was done) and there is PVC pipe exposed on bridle trail and regularly floods the trail. Missing signs along the trail.

Beth (caller) – said she Myrka pulled through and got those trees trimmed but continue to be concerns with broken pipes, large rocks/boulders now exposed between Variel & Canoga, not good for horse feet.

Jeanne P- shared same concerns with Rec & Parks Commission, plus decompose granite cover on trail is all gone (either compacted or washed away) along Chatsworth Street and Rinaldi after decades, I personally showed this to Mr Brian (yamagucci?), senior supervisor, he was very sympathetic but it has been 2 months now, we have a contact if CNC wants to write a letter- overall, its been 3 years we have been working on trail maintenance item, 2 years on the tree trimming, we had to hound the council office to come up with some money to get this done. Hannah Lee said she cant find anyone to do the maintenance now, which is scary for the horse riders. We pay horse license fees that are supposed to go entirely to maintenance.

Vicki B – this raises the concern that a lot of people don’t license their horses, if they did, we would have more funding for maintenance.

Carey T – can the issue about licenses the horses to increase funding for maintenance be put in our newsletter? Linda V –good point- we’ll turn that over to Jim V.

Linda V- Is Rec & park supposed to maintain the Brown Canyon trail? Per Jeannie- she was told that Rec & parks “lost the contract to the Browns Canyon trail”

Linda V- Motion to send letter to Councilman Lee regarding issues except for tree trimming – Marianne/Vikki seconded - no objections.

7. Equestrian concerns/updates by Jeanne Plumb –

Deerlake Highlands is still under Katheryn Bargers jurisdiction. We are following through on getting trail system built. The equestrian trail center will be built way at the top of Deerlake, will be about 2 years before that is done. Also there is a hearing coming up regarding the deerlake sewer system, they are changing plans which appears will intrude under the oak trees along the 118 near twin lakes. I'm awaiting a plan showing that. Concern is also if sewer system would affect browns canyon wash, etc. Bargers office does not have jurisdiction on the equestrian center – that will be on the Green property and will hook up directly with Porter Ranch trails that are being built. The equestrian center was supposed to start being built this month but I don't see any activity. Also, the trails at Stoney Point estates with the gates and obstacles I'm trying to get removed, the court date has been postponed until March. Last note, the Porter Ranch horse staging area approved in the 70's is supposed to be built by the PR development company but the land is supposed to be provided by the city. The Planning Dept is working on utilizing vacant land east of Sierra Canyon High School, by DWP underground tank- is a nice level piece of land and direct access to the trail system. I support this area and hope if comes up that CNC will too.

8. General Discussion on Land use and Equestrian Issues –

Marianne K – just want to share that I've been paying attention to the Santa Susana Estates project- I am familiar with the conditions such as tree preservation, etc. which looks like that is fine but not sure the equestrian trail system looks right. For example, the trail along Bee Canyon is sloped, not level, and the easement trail between the homes in the middle only goes part way. Also, there are some obstructions within the 10 foot with vehicle access to the rear equestrian pads, like one lot has a utility pole in the way. I contacted BOE & B&S so waiting for those items to be resolved but will watch closely and update accordingly.

Linda V – why aren't the utility poles underground? Marianne – not sure, good question, should be, especially in high fire hazard areas - I haven't researched that, sometimes there are general conditions that state underground if feasible.

Jeff H. – if feasible just means developers use that as a get out of jail free card.

Talked about projects that continue to get approved and not make the street improvements (like the church at De Soto and Chatsworth) or provide underground utilities when it is feasible, it's just greed. Discussed making sure

the CNC keep an eye on that, insist those conditions are included in the entitlement at the get go.

Linda V. – Also, we may need to brace ourselves for more apartments, church across from Trader Joes, Melody Acres, the car lot, etc.

Jeff H. – is travel lodge full yet? Per Vicki, no, only half full, they still have to retrofit the rest of the rooms.

Jeff H – also there is a piece of vacant city land on Mason, across from Mason park, that sticks out into Mason. The city has owned this for 7 years, have all the land to make the improvements but they won't do it. Linda V- maybe we should add that item to the next LUC or Board Agenda.

9. Motion to Adjourn – 8:20 p.m.