

Granada Hills North Neighborhood Council Planning and Land Use Management Committee

Monday, August 17, 2009

GHNNC office 11139 Woodley Ave, Granada Hills, CA 91344

Anne Ziliak called meeting to order at 1:40 PM

Present: Barbara Iversen, Ralph Kroy, Bill Lillenberg, Wayde Hunter, Josh Jordahl, Jan Subar, Agnes Lewis and Anne Ziliak

Absent: Bill Hopkins

PLUM Committee minutes July 20, 2009 accepted with correction to add Agnes Lewis to those present at the meeting.

APCNV-2008-2705-ZC-ZAA: 11582 Longacre: 5 SINGLE FAMILY LOTS AND ZONE CHANGE FROM A1-1 TO RE40. ZAA-AREA, HEIGHT, YARD, AND BUILDING LINE ADJMNTS < 20% SLIGHT MODIFICATIONS.

The applicant was asked to submit a new map, so the case is delayed.

CPC-2009-569-CU-ZV-GB: ENV-2009-570-EAF:16601 RINALDI: TRADE SCHOOL WITH DORMITORY CONDITIONAL USE ZV-ZONE VARIANCE GB-GREEN BUILDING

Waiting for the applicant to schedule a community meeting.

Installation of an Above Ground Facility (AGF) Ref. No. 2009001087: Sesnon Boulevard and Orozco Street.

Called the applicant representative and have not received a reply.

Installation of an Above Ground Facility (AGF) Ref. 2009001084/Balboa Blvd 250ft North of Woodley Ave.

Called the applicant representative for the T-Mobile site and have not received a reply. The request is to install a new wooden pole on the East side of Balboa with a meter.

There are no wooden poles on the East side of Balboa North of Woodley. The Committee will request a more detailed plan and ask the applicant representative to come and discuss this application and the Sesnon/Orozco site.

ZA-2004-2065: Co-location on existing wireless facility disguised as a monopalm located at 16201 Woodley Ave.

When this site was originally approved we wanted full palm fronds to provide better screening than the other older monopalm cell sites and this was not the outcome. Now this new application will add more antennas to those existing and several parabolic dishes underneath the last layer of palm fronds.

Rationale: The plans provided do not give a detailed design. The existing camouflage is inadequate and the proposal for the additional antenna and parabolic dishes will not provide enough screening.

Motion: That the GHNNC recommend denial of the co-location on existing wireless facility disguised as a monopalm located at 16201 Woodley Ave as proposed as it does not provide adequate screening of the proposed additional equipment.

Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for LA Aqueduct Filtration Plant to add a new 10-million-gallon concrete disinfection tank (154ft wide X 300ft long X 35ft deep) and connecting pipelines.

Currently the filtration plant has a 3-million-gallon tank that holds filtered water for use as emergency backup use. The DWP want to replace it with a 10-million-gallon tank. A hearing will be held in October.

Information that the MND provided did not have enough design details such as the height the tank would be above ground, if this project would increase the amount of chlorine that would be stored on the site and the camouflage (landscaping) that would be provided. After discussion, we decided to submit questions and request clarification and when we review the responses we can make a recommendation to the GHNNC Board.

Discussion on Planning and Code Enforcement issues: Guest Speaker Phillip Hess

Mr. Hess attended our meeting to discuss some recent actions on cases within Council District 12 that may have detrimental impact on future projects proposed. He feels that we need to pay more attention to what happens after a project is approved because many conditions can be changed out of the public view without public input.

Even the mitigation monitoring program under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) can be ignored.

When a project is approved the mitigation monitoring report clearly spells out what is required and at what point the mitigation is required and we must watch this carefully. Otherwise a project can move forward in violation of CEQA.

Discussed the gap between the approval of a project and the enforcement of the conditions. Gave the example of our closed equestrian trail system. One possible solution would be to give the Planning Department authority to enforce. Another solution is to require a monitoring committee for each project that is selected by those most impacted and write this into the permit approval.

Discussed what communities might do to get the mitigations that they were assured to get when a project was approved. Gave the example of the Aliso Canyon Project and our concern that the conditions/mitigations approved are not being implemented. Building and Safety Department when asked had no idea what conditions/mitigations exist.

One way to force completion of required mitigation could be to enlist the Neighborhood Prosecutor at our local LA Police Department or to attend the Building and Safety Commission meetings to make the issue public.

Ongoing Business:

Review of code enforcement/conditions of approval for home/project sites within the GHNNC boundaries.

Public Works investigation division was notified and a case was started. As of this meeting we still have not received any reply yet.

Condition and access of the Public Equestrian Trail System within the GHNNC Boundaries:

Councilman Smith's office is trying to get some more direction from the City Attorney's office.

Discussion and consideration of any new or old information available on BFI/Allied/Republic Waste at Sunshine Canyon Landfill.

A joint Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting is planned for Tuesday, August 18, at 6:30PM at the GHNNC office. This will be the last meeting that GHNNC will have any official representation. Councilman Smith appointed four new people to the new joint City/County CAC and County Supervisor Antonovich will also be appointing people.

Committee Member Comment:

We received a new application to allow the sale of refrigerated alcoholic beverages at the Chevron Station located at Balboa and Rinaldi. We will review this at our next meeting.

Discussed the comment made at the July Board meeting regarding the regularly scheduled meeting time for the PLUM Committee. A GHNNC Stakeholder and a few GHNNC Board Members felt that we should be holding our meetings during the evening instead of the afternoon. All members were asked if they available/prefer to meet during the evening. They all agreed that the current meeting time was preferable.

Public Comment on non-agenda items: None

Adjourned at 5:40 PM