# Appendix L

## Meeting Minutes



### MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE FULLERTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

MONDAY MARCH 26, 2007 6:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by at 6:25 p.m.

**PRESENT:** GPAC Members Batinich, Bennett, Bushala, Durrette, Fitzgerald, Haley,

Harrell, Heusser, Jaramillo, Lambros, Richmond, and Stopper

**ABSENT:** GPAC Members Buck, Dudley, and Griffin

**STAFF PRESENT:** Acting Director of Community Development Rosen, Acting Chief Planner

Eastman, Senior Planner St. Paul, Assistant City Attorney Barlow, Redevelopment Director Zur Schmiede, Redevelopment Manager Ferrier, Parks & Rec Administrative Manager Loya, Senior Civil Engineer Voronel, Police Department Senior Administrative Analyst Wren, Director of Human Resources Beatty, Library Director Gebelein,

and Clerical Assistant Radding.

**CONSULTANTS** RBF Principal Al Zelinka, RBF Principal Community Planner David

**PRESENT:** Barquist, and RBF Community Planner Suzanne Rynne

**FLAG SALUTE:** Senior Planner St. Paul

MINUTES: None

#### WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Acting Director Rosen welcomed everyone and gave a brief explanation of the General Plan process.

Senior Planner St. Paul introduced himself and the staff in attendance, and the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) members introduced themselves.

#### **PURPOSE & RESPONSIBILITIES**

Senior Planner St. Paul explained the Form 700 that had been provided by the City Clerk, and needed to be completed and returned. He continued by explaining to the public that there was a sign up sheet available where they could sign up to be notified of future General Plan meetings, and he asked the committee members to sign a list with their address, phone number, and email address. There were also public comment cards available for those people that wished to speak during the public comment period.

Senior Planner St. Paul explained the purpose of the GPAC was to review the General Plan with the goal of providing the City decision makers with policy recommendations that support the City's vision for the future. He explained that there would be intensive community involvement in the process, and the committee members would need to be familiar with all the community input throughout the process. Staff would conduct six community meetings to discuss the issues that surround Fullerton and what the community sees for the future of Fullerton. At the conclusion of the meetings, a vision report would be prepared, and the committee members would need to carefully review the report. There would also be meetings regarding land use alternatives which would require feedback from the committee members. A report would be developed from the information collected, which would include the recommended goals and objectives.

#### **BROWN ACT**

Senior Planner St. Paul stated that all meetings held as part of the General Plan Update process would need to be conducted in accordance with the Brown Act. Assistant City Attorney Barlow supplied the Committee Members with a copy of the Brown Act and gave a presentation on the Brown Act. She explained that the Brown Act was about open meetings, open government, and the opportunity for the public to fully participate in the decision making of government and to know what was going on. The Brown Act restricted the ability for committee members to communicate about the tasks that would be assigned to the committee, to open and public communications, in order to provide the public an opportunity to provide their input to the committee at a public meeting. It also required that the committee's discussions and deliberations on the subject matter of the committee were taken in public. The committee members were allowed to talk about the issues with members of the community, and the public had the right to speak to the members.

Assistant City Attorney Barlow continued by explaining that as required by the Brown Act, there would be an opportunity for public comment at each meeting. There would also be an opportunity for public comment on the committee's recommendations. There was a potential for criminal liability if the requirements of the Brown Act were not adhered to. The purpose of the Brown Act was to prevent committee members from making up their mind in some other forum or conversation, rather than with the committee in public. The Brown Act made it a violation of law for the committee members to communicate on the matters within the subject matter of the committee (the General Plan Update) with more than a majority of the body. There were no rules established at this point to determine what a quorum would be, and she strongly urged that no greater number than the established quorum should be communicating with each other. Social events did not count provided specific topics or positions on an issue were not discussed, nor did attending conferences related to the subject matter or attendance at Council meetings. The committee members could communicate with other members on other matters not related to the subject matter.

Assistant City Attorney Barlow also explained that if members received email communication from the City, such as an agenda, it was not recommended that they hit "reply all" and say anything other than maybe "sorry I won't be there". Any other communication regarding the subject matter could be considered a violation of the Brown Act. She recommended using email as a communication tool for individuals only, not groups.

#### **COMMITTEE HANDBOOK**

Suzanne Rynne, RBF Consulting, explained the General Plan Advisory Committee handbook that had been provided to the committee members.

Al Zelinka, RBF Consulting, stated that all of the PowerPoint presentations used during the update process would be posted on the City's website.

#### **GROUND RULES**

Mr. Zelinka worked with the committee to determine the ground rules of the committee. A discussion was held regarding the time and day of the week for the meetings, and it was decided that the meetings would begin at 6:00 p.m., with a goal of finishing by 8:00 p.m., and the day of the week would be determined at a later time and emailed to the members.

Mr. Zelinka continued with a discussion on the voting procedure, simple majority versus other quorums. Assistant City Attorney Barlow explained the difference between simple majority or majority of a quorum. Simple majority makes a quorum as a rule, which meant you could get together and do business, and the normal rule is that the vote is a majority of quorum, which meant the quorum would be eight and the majority would be five. Mr. Zelinka stated that this topic could be discussed in further detail at the next meeting.

Mr. Zelinka held a discussion on attendance requirements. A question was asked regarding what constituted an excused absence. Mr. Zelinka responded that generally it was when you had informed the staff or chairman ahead of time. The committee can determine the standard expected. A question was asked regarding a committee member's ability to contribute ideas and opinions if they would be unable to attend a particular meeting. Assistant City Attorney Barlow responded that it could be provided, but needed to be sent to staff who would then distribute the information at the meeting.

A question was asked regarding the number of meetings, and Mr. Zelinka responded that it would be roughly seven to nine meetings over the next one to two years.

Mr. Zelinka also suggested that committee members keep their cell phones on vibrate during the meeting.

#### INTRODUCTION TO THE FULLERTON GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Zelinka explained that the State of California required each city and county to adopt a General Plan, to identify the community's priorities and vision for the future, for a twenty year time period. The current General Plan was adopted in 1996, and generally every ten years cities go through an update process to reflect current community values, interests, trends, economic conditions, and other changes that had occurred over the past decade.

David Barquist, RBF, was introduced as the project consultant. He gave a brief overview of the General Plan. The General Plan was the policy document used by the City Council and other decision makers within the City.

Mr. Barquist explained that there were seven elements required by state law, some optional elements, and some regional mandates. Fullerton's General Plan contained the following

elements; Introduction (Scope and Authority), Vision (overall goals), Land Use (types, standards for development intensity/density), Circulation (transportation systems – all types), Resource Management (protection of natural resources), Health and Safety (protect the community), Community Services (future need for services in the community), Regional Coordination (coordinate efforts with county, local, and other required bodies), Implementation of Public Participation (how the General Plan is implemented post adoption of the General Plan amendments), Housing (assess housing needs – required State review).

Mr. Zelinka explained that the General Plan Update process would take between eighteen and twenty four months to complete, and completion was expected in summer 2008. A time line illustrating the anticipated schedule was explained. There would be two educational meetings in April, along with the initial community workshop and reception.

#### "HOMEWORK"

Senior Planner St. Paul asked the committee members to review the copy of the General Plan that had been provided to them. He also asked the members to think about their schedules over the next two years. He stated there would be a GPAC meeting on April 23, 2007, from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. to select a Chair and Vice-Chair.

#### CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR WILL BE ELECTED ON APRIL 23, 2007

Senior Planner St. Paul explained the responsibilities of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman. The committee would be run similar to the City Council and Planning Commission. The Chair or Vice-Chair would run the meetings, maintain control of the meetings, ensure the rules of the Brown Act are followed, and encourage participation from the public in attendance.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Harold Flenker, 301 N. Ford, wanted the committee to address the noise in the downtown area after 11:00 p.m., especially on weekends.

Bruce Hostetter, 205 N. Cornell Avenue, was concerned with sustainability, and wanted to ensure that future generations had the same opportunity as the present generation to the resources needed to plan, build, develop, and prosper. He added that every element of the General Plan addressed sustainability.

Jane Rands, 747 Barris Drive, would like the GPAC to consider using a consensus process with a fall back voting threshold of 80% or two-thirds majority. She believed it would increase democracy or discussion and more people go away happy.

Denny Bean, 1529 Yermo Place, wanted to see open space maintained. He felt that traffic, waste, and other issues would be impacted favorably if open space was maintained.

Clara Farris, 540 Jacaranda, was concerned with the downtown area, and would like to see an area that was appropriate for all ages and more family oriented. She was interested in progress, but wanted less focus on the entertainment of the "young urban professionals".

#### **AGENDA FORECAST**

The next regularly scheduled GPAC meeting would be April 23, 2007 from 6:00~p.m. to 7:00~p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the mee	eting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.
	Janelle Pasillas
	Secretary



### MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE POLICE DEPARTMENT MURAL ROOM

MONDAY APRIL 23, 2007 6:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by at 6:05 p.m.

**PRESENT:** GPAC Members Batinich, Bennett, Buck, Bushala, Dudley, Durrette,

Fitzgerald, Griffin, Harrell, Jaramillo, Lambros, Richmond, and Stopper

**ABSENT:** GPAC Members Haley, Heusser

**STAFF PRESENT:** Acting Director of Community Development Rosen, Acting Chief Planner

Eastman, Senior Planner St. Paul, Secretary Pasillas

Council Member Keller was present in the audience.

**CONSULTANTS** 

PRESENT:

RBF Principal Al Zelinka, RBF Principal Community Planner David

Barquist, and RBF Community Planner Suzanne Rynne

**FLAG SALUTE:** Senior Planner St. Paul

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Bushala, SECONDED by

Committee Member Fitzgerald and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present, and with Vice Chairman Griffin and Committee Member Dudley abstaining, that the Minutes of the March 26, 2007 meeting be APPROVED as amended: Page 4, Public Comments, Jane Rands, strike "thought a good concession for the voting majority would be 80% or two-thirds" and replace with "would like the GPAC to consider using a consensus process with a fall back voting threshold of 80% or

two-thirds majority".

#### REVIEW

Senior Planner St. Paul gave a brief presentation where he reviewed the purpose of the General Plan Advisory Committee, and reminded the Committee Members of their responsibilities as members of the Committee.

#### **SELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN**

Al Zelinka from RBF conducted the election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman. Committee Member Joseph Stopper was elected Chairman, and Committee Member Patrick Griffin was elected Vice-Chairman.

#### **DETERMINATION OF GROUND RULES**

#### Meeting Schedule

The Committee discussed what day of the week and time would be convenient for the majority of the members. Motion by Committee Member Batinich, seconded by Committee Member Fitzgerald, setting Monday as the day of the week for GPAC meetings. Passed unanimously.

Motion by Committee Member Harrell, and seconded by Committee Member Dudley, that the GPAC meetings would begin at 7:00 p.m. during the school year and 6:00 p.m. during the summer. Passed unanimously.

#### Voting Procedure

Motion by Committee Member Bennett, seconded by Committee Member Dudley, to establish a simple majority as the approval requirement. Passed unanimously.

Motion by Committee Member Bennett, seconded by Committee Member Griffin, to set a quorum as being the majority of members appointed at that time. Passed unanimously.

Committee Member Harrell asked if, based on the Form 700 the Committee Member's were required to fill out, there would be times, when voting on certain items, when it might bring about a conflict of interest, and should this be addressed as part of the voting procedure. Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that if a Member believed they had a conflict of interest on a particular item then they should address staff and discuss with them and the City Attorney whether there was a conflict. Committee Member Dudley suggested having the City Attorney attend a GPAC meeting and address this issue, and Chairman Stopper agreed with the suggestion.

#### Attendance Requirements

The Committee discussed expected attendance requirements. It was decided that to be excused an absence must be reported to either staff or the Chairman prior to the meeting. Motion by Committee Member Fitzgerald, seconded by Committee Member Bennett, directing the Chairman to contact the appointing City Council Member and report the absences when two non-excused absences had occurred. Passed unanimously.

#### Appropriate Conduct

Conduct was discussed, and the Committee was requested to be respectful of one another, be on time to the meetings, turn off their cell phones prior to the meeting, and address the Committee through the Chairman. The Committee was also reminded that they needed to follow Robert's Rules of Order.

#### STAFF COMMUNICATION

Acting Director Rosen advised the Committee that he had tendered his resignation effective May 17, 2007. He was leaving for a position with the City of Buena Park.

Senior Planner St. Paul advised the Committee that the next meeting would be in June or July. He explained that staff would be holding community outreach meetings and would then compile the information prior to the next meeting. Chairman Stopper requested a meeting in May or early June to discuss amongst the Committee the General Plan in detail and what their responsibilities were. Motion by Committee Member Dudley, seconded by Committee Member Bennett, that staff would schedule a meeting for the Committee to discuss the above in May or early June. Passed unanimously.

Committee Member Lambros asked staff if they could provide a proposed schedule of meetings so that everyone could plan accordingly.

City Council Member Keller thanked the Committee for their work.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

No one from the public wished to speak.

#### **AGENDA FORECAST**

The next regularly scheduled GPAC meeting would be scheduled some time in May or early June, and Committee Members will be notified by staff.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.



## MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE POLICE DEPARTMENT MURAL ROOM

MONDAY JUNE 4, 2007 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:00 p.m.

**PRESENT:** GPAC Members Batinich, Bennett, Buck, Bushala, Durrette, Fitzgerald,

Griffin, Haley, Harrell, Heusser, Jaramillo, Richmond, and Stopper

Committee Member Dudley had resigned.

**ABSENT:** GPAC Members Lambros

**STAFF PRESENT:** Acting Chief Planner Eastman, Senior Planner St. Paul, Secretary

Pasillas

**CONSULTANTS** RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist and RBF Community

**PRESENT:** Planner Suzanne Rynne

FLAG SALUTE: Chairman Stopper

**MINUTES:** Approval of the Minutes of the April 23, 2007 meeting was continued.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There was no one from the public that wished to speak at this time.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

<u>Information and Communication Process - Discussion regarding the process of distributing General Plan information to the GPAC members.</u>

Senior Planner St. Paul explained that there had been concerns expressed by some of the Committee Members regarding their notification of upcoming events having to do with the General Plan update. He explained that in the future members of the Committee would receive the email notifications of upcoming events that went out to the people on the General Plan interest list. He also stated that there was a calendar of events available on the City's website, and also the various PowerPoint presentations were available.

Chairman Stopper asked if a list of the Committee's contact information was available, and Suzanne Rynne from RBF distributed the list. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained to the Committee that care needed to be taken when using the information on the list to avoid any Brown Act violations.

Committee Member Haley asked if the Committee would be updated on the outcomes of the outreach programs, and Senior Planner St. Paul responded that staff could provide an update if the Committee desired. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the intent was to come back to the Committee with a presentation at the conclusion of the community input process, but staff would continue to update the Committee and Community Meeting presentations would also be available on the City's website.

Committee Member Haley asked if the Committee Members would need to attend the various outreach programs, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that it was encouraged, but not required. The Outreach Programs were intended to be informational for the public.

Senior Planner St. Paul explained that the workshops and outreach programs were just beginning, and most likely the workshops would be completed by the time the Committee met again. The information gathered would be prepared in a draft report and issued to the Members before the next meeting, and at the next meeting the Committee would begin their review.

Senior Planner St. Paul explained the function of the GPAC was to review the issues and concerns that came up at the workshops, discuss those concerns in relation to the General Plan Update, and make recommendations to the City Council. The Committee was not at that point yet, but was getting to know one other and understand the process.

Chairman Stopper asked how often the website was updated, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that it was done as quickly as possible, but there were a number of factors were involved, such as staff workload and project deadlines.

Commissioner Member Harrell believed that at the educational series meeting it had been stated that the Committee would meet each month, but so far they were only meeting every other month. Senior Planner St. Paul explained that the GPAC was budgeted for seven to nine meetings total, and it was not possible to meet on a regular basis. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the intent of the GPAC was to be an advisor. Staff would present the information they had acquired to the GPAC. The consultant, RBF, would work within the budget set to prepare the information, and the GPAC work will focus on their advisory duty. The role of the GPAC was not to create the General Plan.

Chairman Stopper did not feel the Committee should be budget driven, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the City Council had directed staff to move forward on time and on budget. To have additional GPAC meetings at this point, prior to the information being collected, would move away from the GPAC's advisory roll. At this point staff was focused on getting the community involved in the process and acquiring information. Committee Member Jaramillo believed that the Committee Members had been appointed by the City Council and it would be in the best interest of the Committee Members to speak with their Council Members and let them know that the GPAC did not want to be budget driven. Committee Member Griffin explained that the GPAC duty was not to do the outreach and collect the information, but to take what staff brought them regarding the public input and give output on that. If the Committee felt more meetings were need then they should speak with the Council about the importance of the budget and not shortchange the project.

Community Outreach Program - Status of Community Outreach Program.

David Barquist from RBF gave a brief PowerPoint presentation on the Community Outreach Program and discussed the schedule.

Committee Member Jaramillo believed that the various youth sports leagues within the City should be contacted. Mr. Barquist explained that they had contacted the YMCA, summer youth programs, schools, and the Boys & Girls Club. Committee Member Jaramillo thought that the key people in the sports leagues should be notified of the outreach programs.

Committee Member Haley asked if the Visioning Charrettes would be the same program but in different areas. Mr. Barquist responded affirmatively and explained that the City had been divided into quadrants and the same program would be presented in each area.

Committee Member Buck suggested the youth group at the library would be a good source of input and Mr. Barquist responded that they had been contacted. Committee Member Buck asked what the definition of "youth" was, and Mr. Barquist responded high school and under.

Mr. Barquist continued the presentation and explained all the various outreach programs that would take place over summer 2007. Senior Planner St. Paul explained that flyers would be distributed to various bike shops for the June 18 meeting, and flyers for all of the outreach programs were placed at the library, posted on the website, and put on the cable channel.

Committee Member Buck suggested that the Hispanic bike riding population was underrepresented as they rode as a means of transportation rather than recreation. Senior Planner St. Paul explained that flyers announcing the Bicycle Element workshops were being distributed in both English and Spanish to markets, shopping centers, and laundromats.

Senior Planner St. Paul explained that the meetings that had taken place had been taped and were shown on the cable channel several times, and the PowerPoint presentations were on the website. The various programs would continue to be added to the website.

Mr. Barquist explained that discussions would be held with the public agencies from other justidictions, including the utilities, along with one-on-one interviews with people the City had identified as representative of the community. Once the outreach programs were complete, RBF would prepare a visioning report, which would be a summary of the information gathered. In fall and winter 2007 Alternative Land Use Charrettes would be held. The purpose of these meetings was to discuss the issues that had been identified, test the ideas, and discover their implications. At the end of the process there would be an open house and reception where the results of the process would be available.

Committee Member Harrell asked if there would be several meetings with the public agencies and Mr. Barquist responded that there would be only one meeting. Committee Member Harrell asked if he believed it possible to resolve all the issues in one meeting and Mr. Barquist responded that it was not the intent to resolve all the issues, only to identify issues of concern.

Committee Member Buck felt it would be good to involve representatives from the other committees in the City, and Senior Planner St. Paul explained that presentations were being made at many of the City's regular committee meetings. Committee Member Buck asked if the major educational institutes and St Judes would be involved and Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that they would be involved with one-on-one interviews and other public forums.

Chairman Stopper stated that several Committee members had specific organizations that they believed needed to be contacted, and he thought it was important to try and include them all in the outreach schedule.

Vice Chairman Griffin asked if the one-on-one interview results would be incorporated into the visioning report, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded affirmatively. Vice Chairman Griffin asked if the information gathered from the interviews would be available for the Committee to review, and Mr. Barquist explained that the purpose of these interviews was to allow these people to freely discus their vision for the City and their organizations. The information would be summarized, but the individuals would not be identified by issue. Vice Chairman Griffin was not sure if this process would address the Committees needs. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the purpose of the one-on-one interviews was not to address specific issues, but to provide honest opinions on various topics.

#### OTHER MATTERS

#### Team Building

Chairman Stopper explained that he had requested this item be added to the agenda so that the Committee could spend some time interacting and getting to know each other. Each Committee Member gave a brief background on their previous experiences with the City.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Paulette Marshall asked how soon items would be posted on the City's website, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that agendas and minutes were posted as they were prepared, but larger items that required more technical expertise would take some time.

Vice Chairman Griffin asked if the calendar was kept up-to-date and Senior Planner St. Paul responded affirmatively. Committee Member Haley asked if the Charrettes were listed on the website and Senior Planner St. Paul responded affirmatively.

Committee Member Haley asked what the quadrants were and Senior Planner St. Paul explained that staff was using Harbor Blvd. and Commonwealth Avenue as the center. Committee Member Haley asked if the meetings would be held in the various areas or at City Hall, and Senior Planner St. Paul responded that the meetings would be held in each area.

Judith Kaluzny asked if the outreach meeting information gathered would be filtered by City staff or RBF. Senior Planner St. Paul responded that there were two types of outreach programs being conducted; the "Charrettes" which were to gather information from various parts of the community, and the "Roadshows" which presented an overview of what the General Plan Update process was about.

Committee Member Harel asked who would be presenting the information to the GPAC, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that it was not known at this time but it would probably be a combination of staff and the consultant (RBF).

Dexter Savage thought that the church groups in the City should also be contacted. Senior Planner St. Paul stated that the interfaith group (FIES) had been contacted and a roadshow had been scheduled.

Public hearing closed.

#### **AGENDA FORECAST**

Senior Planner St. Paul explained that the next regularly scheduled GPAC meeting would be scheduled some time in August or early September, when the information gathered from the various community meetings had been complied, and Committee Members would be notified by staff.

Committee Member Bushala asked if an information-type flyer could be included with the water bill, and Senior Planner St. Paul responded that the City had been doing this and would continue to do so when appropriate. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that a problem with using the water bill was timing, and that bills go to property owners only, not renters.

Committee Member Harrel commented that at one of the meetings various elements of the General Plan were identified, yet they were different than those listed in her handbook. Senior Planner St. Paul clarified that the meeting she was referring to was part of the educational series, not a GPAC meeting, and after the information had been presented to the Committee they would have an opportunity to make a recommendation on the General Plan format.

Committee Member Buck asked if it would be possible to schedule all the future GPAC meetings through the end of the year and Senior Planner St. Paul responded that it would not be possible due to the need to wait for various other steps in the process to be completed.

The next GPAC meeting was scheduled for September 10, 2007 at 7:00 p.m.

#### <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:51 p.m.



### MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MONDAY SEPTEMBER 10, 2007 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:06 p.m.

**PRESENT:** GPAC Members Batinich, Bennett, Buck, Bushala (arrived at 7:12 p.m.),

Durrette, Griffin, Haley, Harrell, Heusser (arrived at 7:19 p.m.), Jaramillo,

Lambros, Savage, and Stopper

**ABSENT:** GPAC Members Fitzgerald and Richmond

STAFF PRESENT: Director Godlewski, Acting Chief Planner Eastman, Senior Planner St.

Paul, Secretary Pasillas

**CONSULTANT** 

**PRESENT:** RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist

**FLAG SALUTE:** Chairman Stopper

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Bennett, SECONDED by

Committee Member Haley and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present, and with Committee Member Savage abstaining, that the Minutes of the April 23, 2007 meeting be APPROVED as written.

MOTION made by Committee Member Griffin, SECONDED by Committee Member Haley and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present, and with Committee Member Savage abstaining, that the Minutes of the June 4, 2007 meeting be APPROVED as written

Acting Chief Planner Eastman introduced John Godlewski, the new Director of Community Development.

Chairman Stopper introduced new GPAC Member Dexter Savage.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Susan Petrella made the following comments:

- She asked if the Draft Vision Report was available to the public online. Senior Planner St. Paul responded that it was available online under "Digital Documents".
- She had attended the Fullerton Collaborative road show and was concerned that not enough time was allowed for brainstorming; she asked if additional meetings would be held. Chairman Stopper stated the he had also attended that meeting, and believed that staff had made note of a request to have a follow-up meeting. Senior Planner St. Paul

responded that there were additional neighborhood meetings planned in the next few months, and there would be meetings scheduled to discuss each Element of the General Plan. The dates of these meetings would be posted to the website when they were known.

Vice Chairman Griffin commented that at the April 23, 2007 meeting it was suggested that the City Attorney attend a GPAC meeting to explain how conflicts of interest should be handled during this process. Chairman Stopper responded by explaining the training that had been provided by the City, and stated he would follow up with staff.

Chairman Stopper asked staff how often the City's website was updated, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that it was updated as information became available, usually within two to three days. Senior Planner St. Paul confirmed that information was added to the website as soon as was possible.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### <u>Community Outreach Program – Status of Community Outreach Program</u>

Senior Planner St. Paul gave an overview of the Community Outreach meetings that had been held, and presented the Draft Visioning Report. This report contained the main "themes" that had been expressed the most during the outreach process, and "words" in the themes that were identified as important by the public during a follow-up meeting (open house). Senior Planner St. Paul explained that the community outreach would continue during the next several months, and gave a timeline for the General Plan Update process.

#### Review and Discussion of Draft Community Vision Report

Committee Member Buck made the following comments:

- Many of the "words" listed could have several meanings based on the context in which they were used.
- He asked why the bicycle element was not included on this list, and Senior Planner St. Paul responded that it would be discussed separately.
- Believed "education" and "community" should be separate categories.
- Believed "open space and parks" and "sustainability" should be separate categories.
- "Mobility" was too broad of a term it could include automobiles and everything else. He
  would like to see "less dependence on the automobile". Acting Chief Planner Eastman
  explained that the Consultant had purposely deviated from using common terms because
  many of the more common terms carried a preconceived definition, and they wanted to
  encourage the Committee to be creative and not follow preconceived ideology.
- The General Plan was a document of restraints and incentives, and was not a market driven document.
- The Committee needed to identify what the citizens of the City wanted and incorporate those items in their recommendation.

#### Chairman Stopper made the following comments:

 We were collecting themes to collect other data into, and possibly expand on some of them rather than reduce.

- This meeting was the kickoff and now it was time for the GPAC to look at the raw data that
  has come back, and put some type of structure to it, and look at it to see if it seemed
  reasonably okay to where we were at now, but leaving the option open to add to it or
  change it in the future.
- The GPAC should focus on what state they wanted the City to be in twenty years. Some of the items may be unattainable, but the GPAC should focus on the strategy, while still being realistic.

#### Committee Member Harrell made the following comments:

- Asked if "open space" had come up, and Senior Planner St. Paul responded that it had, just not as frequently as other theme words.
- Would like to add "Preservation of Resources" as a theme.
- It would be impossible to mandate that every home be "green", but the City could require new homes and businesses to be energy efficient, and offer incentives.
- Believed that staff had done a considerable amount of work preparing the Draft Vision Report, and the Committee should look to it for guidance.

#### Committee Member Lambros made the following comments:

- The words listed were good, and when listed under a "theme" they had meaning. When listed separately, the "words" were out of context.
- Many things could be done in regards to housing; i.e. minimize lot sizes and increase density to lower housing prices.
- He was confused as to the purpose of tonight's meeting setting up the categories, or arguing for those items he was passionate for.
- He understood that the Committee did not need to identify how their ideas would be funded, but there was still a need to be fiscally responsible and that would eliminate some possibilities.
- He wondered if "resource preservation" might be better labeled "resource management", so as to include finding new sources of water and energy.

Senior Planner St. Paul explained that it was the Committee's task to use these "themes" and "words" to come up with a concise Vision Statement for the General Plan Update. Chairman Stopper asked how these "themes" had come about, and Senior Planner St. Paul explained that these were the most popular/common ideas expressed at the various Community Outreach meetings.

#### Committee Member Haley made the following comments:

- Asked if the Committee's task was to give direction on what they wanted the Vision Statement to be, and Senior Planner St. Paul responded that it was, although the Statement would not be completed tonight.
- Asked if the Consultant could write a Vision Statement based on these "themes", and also
  provide samples of other City's Vision Statements, that the Committee could then edit into
  their own statement. Consultant Barquist responded that he would have a draft available
  at the next meeting.
- "Green" buildings should be looked at.
- Was concerned with global warming and believed it should be addressed during the Update process.

- Asked what the definition of "preservation" was; i.e. resources, zeroscape landscaping, green buildings. Each individual had a different background, therefore their definitions may be different.
- Under "Economic Development" add something about workforce housing / how to keep
  the young adults here in the City. Committee Member Bennett responded that there were
  State mandates on how to implement affordable housing, and these mandates would need
  to be addressed in the Housing Element.
- Use words such as "believes" or "encourages"; i.e. "The City believes energy conservation is important". Words such as these allow for innovation in conservation.

Senior Planner St. Paul clarified that the Vision Statement did not have to be a single sentence. The current Vision Statement was several pages long, but a short statement may be more concise.

Committee Member Savage made the following comments:

- He suggested the Committee look at the current General Plan Vision Statement and see if it was in line with what the Committee wanted, or where it fell short.
- He believed if the Vision Statement was too complex it would not be read or considered.
- The General Plan was strategic to the economics of the City, and to abandon the economics during this update process would be irresponsible. Chairman Stopper responded that the Committee needed to focus on strategy.
- Government policy and mandates in the General Plan, whether it was green buildings or affordable housing, will cost someone money, and this will discourage people from coming into or stay in the City.

Committee Member Bennett made the following comments:

- Asked if the number of people listed as attending the various road shows/workshops were
  different people or could there be duplicates (some people attended more than one
  meeting and may have been double counted). Consultant Barquist responded that he
  would have the numbers available at the next meeting. Senior Planner St. Paul explained
  that the numbers shown for the Rotary Club meetings were accurate, but there may have
  been some duplicates with the workshops. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated the
  Visioning Workshops were accurate, and did not double count.
- Was concerned with using "politically loaded" terms in the Vision Statement, as they could pull the Committee apart.
- Regarding open space if you made Coyote Hills open space, who would pay for the upkeep; if you allowed Chevron to develop part of it and give open space to the community.
- The idea of "green" buildings was a good concept, and sometimes it happened naturally, but he did not think the government should mandate it.

Vice Chairman Griffin made the following comments:

 While reviewing the Draft Vision Report he had identified four things (Coyote Hills, traffic, the downtown, and development versus private property rights) that he believed were expressed as being important throughout the report, and he believed the "themes" presented today covered his items.

- "Sustainability" was a confusing term; it could mean something different in each area. Possibly use "preservation of resources" instead.
- Liked "mobility" as a theme, would like to add a separate theme of "education community", and possibly "growth management" with as a subset of "community design".
- Need to identify themes, and then add what would be under each theme.

#### Committee Member Bushala made the following comments:

- Believed it was a good idea to involve the youth in the update process.
- Did not want to "funnel" the ideas too closely because it would limit creativity in the future.
- "Sustainability" and "green", how they related to "preservation", and what did they really mean.
- Currently there was a mechanism in place that allowed for changes in the General Plan.
- Believed "preservation" could mean we limit the amount of resources we used.
- Questioned whether the City should require "green/smart" buildings in the future.
- Possibly offer incentives to resident's willing to preserve/conserve.

#### Committee Member Jaramillo made the following comments:

- Suggested the Committee use the "themes" as headings that could have many different topics listed underneath, and decide what was important to list under each.
- Open space to her was Coyote Hills; Parks was all of the current parks, where new parks could be located, the need for the various leagues within the City, outside people using our parks; Sustainability could be communities, residential properties, commercial properties, and infrastructure, anything that we need to make sure it lasts.

Matthew Leslie, a member of the public, stated that "sustainability" could be defined in several ways. Some cities required "green" or "smart" buildings and encouraged the use of non-toxic materials and solar power. He wanted to know if the City could require, rather than encourage, this type of building.

#### Committee Member Durrette made the following comments:

- Unless the City could control the housing prices in California, people will continue to move out of state.
- The General Plan was supposed to be an outline, not a specific plan.

#### Committee Member Batinich made the following comments:

- Housing under "growth management and density", which should also incorporate the cost of living in town, low cost housing, Coyote Hills, resources of the City.
- Ideas are good but who will pay for them; i.e. If West Coyote Hills is to be left as open space, and the City buys the property, where will the money come from? Taxpayers. Chairman Stopper responded that the Committee was not to worry about where the money would come from, but rather they should look at this process in the strategic sense. Committee Member Batinich commented that the Committee needed to be realistic in its recommendation to the City Council.

Committee Member Heusser made the following comments:

- She believed that economics needed to play a part in this discussion.
- Asked if the "themes" were the Elements. Consultant Barquist explained that these "themes" were like umbrellas, and were used to capture the entirety of the subject.
- Tonight's discussion placed individual items, such as West Coyote Hills, into specific "themes". She felt it would be better to discuss the "themes" rather than specific projects.

#### Public hearing opened.

#### Susan Petrella made the following comments:

- The General Plan should be Fullerton's highest and best.
- Was not clear; were the "themes" the "elements" of the General Plan. Senior Planner St. Paul responded that they were not. Ms. Petrella asked if the GPAC would identify the elements, and Chairman Stopper responded that they would.
- She sat on the Energy and Resource Management Committee and staff had not made a General Plan presentation to this Committee. Senior Planner St. Paul responded that he would be making contact with that Committee.
- The road shows she had attended were reactive, providing information, rather than allowing proactive participation. Need to allow at least a half day for each session.
- She was Chair of the Arts Committee and believed the Arts were important.
- She would like to see the City as not only the "Education" City, but also the "Arts and Cultural" City.
- Open space could mean a community garden.

#### Jane Rands made the following comments:

The Draft Vision Report was not available to the public. Chairman Stopper responded that
the Draft was available online, and Senior Planner St. Paul added that copies were
available at both the Main Branch Library and the Hunt Branch Library, as well as the
public counter on the second floor of City Hall.

#### Matt Leslie made the following comments:

- He had viewed the draft online, and attended some of the workshops.
- He was happy with the number of people attending these events, but thought it was a small number compared to the population of the City.
- He suggested adding a "sticky note" section on the website. Consultant Barquist responded that a virtual workshop was available on the website, and he would report back at the next meeting as to the number of responses received. Senior Planner St. Paul stated this site had been advertised at least once, and he would look into advertising it again.

#### Barbara Kilponen made the following comments:

- She had attended a Visioning meeting.
- She believed that the majority of themes fell under "quality of life" and suggested the following vision statement: The City of Fullerton is committed to the preservation and enhancement of quality of life.

#### Public hearing closed.

#### **OTHER MATTERS**

#### Future Meeting Schedule

The following dates were set for GPAC meetings:

October 8, 2007 November 5, 2007 December 10, 2007

The meetings would be held at 7:00 p.m. in the Police Department Mural Room.

Chairman Stopper asked for the seating at future meetings to be arranged so that the GPAC did not have their backs to the public.

#### Administrative Comments

Chairman Stopper asked about the visioning workshop that was to be held at Richman School, and whether the information for this meeting was on the City's website. Senior Planner St. Paul responded that Mayor Pro Tem Quirk was working with him to schedule several workshops/road shows in the southern part of Fullerton. They had not yet reserved any dates at Richman School, so the information was not available on the website at this time. This meeting would be added to the website once a location was known.

Chairman Stopper recommended the other GPAC Members keep in contact with their Council Members and update them on the status of these meetings. He believed that because the Council would ultimately approve or modify the GPAC recommendation, it was important for them to understand what took place during the GPAC meetings.

Chairman Stopper clarified the definitions for excused and unexcused absences:

- Excused A Member let staff or the Chairman know in advance of the meeting that they
  would not be in attendance
- Unexcused No show, no notice

If any Member had two or more unexcused absences the Chairman would contact the appropriate Council Member.

Committee Member Heusser requested staff to provide the information that would be discussed prior to the meeting, to allow time for review.

Chairman Stopper asked staff to take the Committee's input from tonight and list the Community Themes that had had been brought up.

Vice Chairman Griffin requested staff provide the "goal" of the meeting, along with the packet of information, so that the Member's could review the material with the "goal" in mind. He would also like to receive an email with the "themes" from the PowerPoint and notes from tonights meeting. Senior Planner St. Paul responded that they should be ready within two to three days.

#### AGENDA FORECAST

The next regularly scheduled GPAC meeting would be October 8, 2007 at 7:00 p.m.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:12 p.m.



### MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE POLICE DEPARTMENT MURAL ROOM

MONDAY OCTOBER 8, 2007 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:01 p.m.

**PRESENT:** GPAC Members Batinich, Bushala, Durrette, Fitzgerald, Griffin, Heusser

(arrived at 7:22 p.m.), Richmond, Savage, and Stopper

**ABSENT:** Excused: GPAC Members Bennett, Buck, Haley, Jaramillo, Lambros

Unexcused: GPAC Member Harrell

**STAFF PRESENT:** Director Godlewski, Acting Chief Planner Eastman, Senior Planner St.

Paul, Secretary Pasillas

**CONSULTANT** RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist, RBF Community

**PRESENT:** Planner Michelle Kou

**FLAG SALUTE:** Chairman Stopper

MINUTES: MOTION made by Vice Chairman Griffin, SECONDED by Committee

Member Savage, and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present and with Members Fitzgerald and Richmond abstaining, that the Minutes of the September 10, 2007 meeting be APPROVED as modified (page 4, last paragraph change "developer" to "development", and page 7, second paragraph, "Richmond" school change to "Richman" school.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Dr. Fred Johnson, 2308 E. Amerige Avenue, spoke of the need to encourage the preparedness of both the City and its citizens during the General Plan update process. He also described the "CERT" program and passed out brochures.

Pete Baron, 1219 W. Baker, spoke of wanting to see his neighborhood like it was in the 1950's and 1960's. He believed the idea of a "block community" should be looked at during the update process.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### Overview of Process

David Barquist, RBF, gave a brief presentation of the update process. He explained that the end product would be a comprehensive policy document that was reflective of the community's concerns. The process of getting to that point would be a public process that would involve numerous discussions. A schematic of the process was shown and the steps described.

Chairman Stopper asked Mr. Barquist to describe the process that went on during the community charrette's. Mr. Barquist stated that the visioning report that had been provided to the Members at the last meeting was a summary of all the previous community meetings. At these community meetings, there was an open forum discussion and then an opportunity for the individuals to anonymously list what they considered the treasures, challenges, and visions for Fullerton. They were also given an opportunity to attempt a draft of a vision statement. Chairman Stopper clarified that RBF had taken the raw input and created the vision report, and Mr. Barquist confirmed that everything listed in the report was from the community input.

Committee Member Richmond asked who had divided the items into topics and themes, and Mr. Barquist responded that RBF did the preliminary draft that would then be discussed by the Committee.

Committee Member Heusser believed that the words listed by the community members at these charrette's could be taken out of context since there was not additional description. Mr. Barquist responded that they had spoken with the community members at these meetings and taken additional notes to help them understand the context.

Committee Member Batinich asked if people had signed their names to the sticky notes and Mr. Barquist responded that they had not. Committee Member Batinich asked if there could be duplicate ideas listed because the same people attended several meetings. Mr. Barquist did not believe this was a problem, and that people were good at self-regulating themselves and only participating at one meeting. Committee Member Savage commented that there appeared to be a community activist group that had attended every community meeting to voice their opinion. He wanted to know how their opinion was separated from the others or weight placed on it. Mr. Barquist stated that the groups had not been identified to them, and that none of the ideas had been weighted or ranked.

Committee Member Durrette believed that the number of people who had attended these events were not representative of the City. She had concern with such a small group of citizens putting together the topics and themes, and wanted to know if this was typical in other cities. Mr. Barquist explained that it wasn't typical, nor was it unusual. Smaller communities tended to have more community involvement. He also explained that a scientific, non-biased telephone survey was being prepared to gain additional opinions.

Committee Member Bushala commented that when he participated in the 1986 General Plan update the participation in the process was about the same.

Chairman Stopper believed that staff was working diligently to try and reach out to the community, and there could be a variety of reasons for the lack of involvement. Mr. Barquist added that approximately 120 unique individuals had attended the various meetings and they hoped to survey approximately 500 with the telephone survey.

Chairman Stopper invited members of the public to offer Public Comment on this item.

Mr. Baron had attended some of the community meetings and did not like the methodology used. He believed the questions and answers needed to be more specific.

Ginger Britt, 2838 Birch Place, would like to see events held at each of the schools. She believed it would be good to notify the parents and get them involved, especially now that school was in session.

Judith Kaluzny, 400 N. Malden, suggested asking the public in attendance tonight if they had gone to more than one charette, and Chairman Stopper responded that this was not the time to take surveys.

#### Definition of Sustainability

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that this item had been added to the agenda based on a discussion at the previous GPAC meeting, and a draft definition was presented to the Committee. Sustainability was a broad topic that encompassed many items and issues, and he hoped to help the community develop a mutual understanding of what the concept of sustainability meant to they could use that definition in future discussions. He requested each Committee Member to give their definition and thoughts on sustainability.

Committee Member Richmond believed the definition presented was too wordy. He also did not understand the need to use the words "current" and "future" in the definition since this update was only for the next ten years.

Committee Member Bushala commented on the many uses of the word. He would like to address the word in the context of planning for the future with sustainable development, using sustainable building materials and not wasting valuable natural resources such as clay, concrete, and gypsum.

Committee Member Batinich compared the City to a family and discussed meeting the basic needs of the City, water, maintenance of the City and schools, etc., while remaining realistic and balanced. He also believed it was important to ensure there was enough funding to meet these needs.

Committee Member Savage discussed building a foundation for sustainability. He believed it was important to encourage business growth in Fullerton so as to attract more business and professional people to the City. He believed that this type of person would provide more money for cultural activities and charity, and also they tended to have good property management. If the City paid more attention to this group of people it would bring more money into the community to support other activities.

Committee Member Heusser liked the definition that had been provided on the "Topic & Themes" chart – Meeting present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

Committee Member Fitzgerald agreed with Committee Member Savage and Committee Member Heusser, and believed there was not enough discussion on the economic growth part of the equation. She did not believe the City could remain how it was today and remain sustainable. She wanted to see a reasonable and balanced plan.

Committee Member Durrette liked the draft definition.

Vice Chairman Griffin also was comfortable with the draft definition.

Chairman Stopper stated that he had "googled" sustainability earlier in the day and came up with a definition similar to Committee Member Heusser. He suggested "Be good stewards of the resources available to us so they will be here for future generations". He also liked the draft definition.

Committee Member Bushala liked the draft definition but wanted to add "architectural design" or "maintenance-free design" to it. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that at this point the Committee was not trying to fine tune the definition, just come up with a general, conceptual definition and understanding.

Chairman Stopper invited members of the public to offer Public Comment on this item.

Bruce Hostetter, a member of the public, stated that to him sustainability was a broad subject. In response to Committee Member Savage's comment, he stated that responsible development encouraged responsible businesses to move to our community, since those were the businesses making the investment and commitment to green building. He continued by explaining that when you thought of sustainability, generally it had to do economics, the environment, and society and the people. One perspective that needed to be looked at was can you afford it. In the sustainable perspective you needed to look at the life cycle cost; if I put more money in this building now, maybe in three to five years it will pay back. Everyone benefits from reduced resource consumption, and the definition continually changes. He believed that a model for sustainability was nature, and discussed the zero waste movement. In nature had no landfills, everything was used in someway. Sustainability was a large subject, and in addition to the things mentioned things like environmentally friendly procurement, i.e. is the paper we use recycled, transportation, i.e. the type of vehicles the City uses, needed to be looked at.

Mr. Johnson wanted to see survivability added to the topics, and the City have a better preparation for disaster.

Ms. Kaluzny stated , in response to Committee Member Savage's comments, that the last time the City cut the red tape was in December 2002 when they abolished Conditional Use Permits (CUP's) for restaurants in the downtown area. It was now costing the City over one million dollars above what taxes brought in. There were a number of restaurants washing their mats into the public water ways. Another downfall was more restaurants moved to Fullerton and drove up the lease prices so that other, "normal", businesses could not afford to move into the area.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman concluded this topic with a recap of key words mentioned, and stated that sustainability was not the end product but ongoing, therefore requiring change.

#### Review/Discussion of Revised Themes

Mr. Barquist discussed the "Topic Area" chart that had been provided to the Committee. He asked the Committee to review each one and determine if it accurately represented the treasurers, challenges, and visions that had been presented in the draft visioning report. He then asked the Committee to use post-it notes to add any other topics that they believed needed to be represented.

At the conclusion of this activity, Mr. Barquist explained that he would record these comments and provide them to the Committee at the end of this week, so that they would have a starting point for the next meeting.

#### **AGENDA FORECAST**

The next regularly scheduled GPAC meeting would be November 5, 2007 at 7:00 p.m., at which the Committee would receive an update on the outreach process, finalize the themes and topics, and review / discuss the draft Vision Statement.

An additional meeting was scheduled for December 10, 2007 at which the Committee would draft the General Plan structure. From December 2007 through summer 2008 the Committee would work on land use alternatives and the draft General Plan element revisions.

#### STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

#### Update on Outreach Activities

Mr. Barquist gave an overview of the various outreach programs that had been held so far, and proposed future events.

Committee Member Heusser suggested that the Mayor announce the survey during the City Council meeting since those meetings were televised to the public.

Chairman Stopper invited members of the public to offer Public Comment on this item.

Ms. Kaluzny suggested sending flyers home through the schools, and Barbara suggested adding a notice in the water bill.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman advised the Committee that, based on a previous Committee discussion, the City Attorney was available to attend the next meeting and discuss conflicts of interest if they so desired. He explained that as individuals they needed to decide any conflict of interest issues and that the City Attorney was available to them.

Chairman Stopper wanted the City Attorney at the next meeting to ensure that all questions were answered. Committee Member Fitzgerald, Savage, and Bushala all believed that is was unnecessary to have the City Attorney at the meeting and that individuals could contact the City Attorney if they so desired. It was decided to wait until the next meeting and see if all Committee Members had their questions resolved.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman gave an update on the Housing Element. He explained that there was a regional housing requirement and the process was very stringent as it related to the State. The City was going out for RFP's, and as soon as the contract had been awarded the Housing Element would be brought to the GPAC for review. The State required receipt of the update of the Housing Element for their review by June 2008.

Chairman Stopper clarified that the Housing Element would need to go before both the Planning Commission and the City Council for approval prior to being sent to the State, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman confirmed the process. He added that the State was very specific in its requirement and the City hoped to move forward quickly. Director Godlewski commented that staff would move forward as quickly as possible.

#### Number of Website hits for on-line survey

Mr. Barquist stated that five people had participated in the online survey.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:11 p.m.



## MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE POLICE DEPARTMENT MURAL ROOM

MONDAY NOVEMBER 5, 2007 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:04 p.m.

**PRESENT:** GPAC Members Batinich, Bennett, Buck, Bushala, Durrette,

Fitzgerald, Griffin, Haley, Harrell, Heusser (arrived at 7:11 p.m.),

Jaramillo, Lambros, Richmond, Savage, and Stopper

ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Director Godlewski, Senior Planner St. Paul, Clerical Assistant III

Radding

**CONSULTANT** 

RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist, RBF Principal

**PRESENT:** Community Planner Al Zelinka

FLAG SALUTE: Chairman Stopper

MINUTES: Voting members present unanimously APPROVED the Minutes of the

October 8, 2007 as modified: page 1, paragraph 2 and page 2, paragraph 8, change "Barey" to "Baron"; page 3, paragraph 4, remove "using or"; page 5, paragraph 6, change "house" to "housing"; insert annotation of invitation for public comment preceding the eighth paragraph, page 2, the second paragraph, page 4 and the third

paragraph, page 5.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Katie Dalton, Fullerton Heritage, asked the Committee to consider adding a separate Historic Element to the General Plan. She stated that she had attended several recent Charrette Meetings and heard a broad group of people express interest in preserving the historic character of the community. Continuing, Ms. Dalton noted that significant strides in preservation had been accomplished throughout the City during the last 10-15 years which resulted in several award winning projects, preservation of the downtown core, Residential Preservation Zones, 17 National Register buildings, 80 landmark properties and the identification of 80-100 potential landmark and significant buildings. She closed her remarks by suggesting that the geographic, economic and cultural backgrounds of the City of Fullerton were similar to other Southern California cities that had taken this step.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### Discussion of Revised Themes and Topics

Senior Planner St. Paul discussed the schedule and format for the upcoming series of Neighborhood Meetings that would be conducted at the Senior Center and various schools and churches. These meetings were designed to facilitate the acquisition of input at a local focus level from within the community. He noted that the 13 Community Themes (Themes) reviewed and finalized during this meeting would be the basis to direct topic discussions during the Neighborhood Meetings.

Consultant Barquist assured the members that if topics were raised during the Neighborhood Meetings that did not align with the themes, the topics would be brought back to the Committee members for consideration. He then explained the process recently undertaken to obtain feedback from the Parks and Recreation Commission. This process provided comments with regard to themes that had both direct and indirect relevance to Parks and Recreation.

The Committee proceeded to review each theme and engaged in discussion regarding edits to the definition and topics.

Addressing the Theme of Economic Development, Chairman Stopper suggested removing the phrases "certain types" and "and its labor force" from the definition. Vice Chairman Griffin felt that "and its labor force" should be retained in order to include those persons that travel to Fullerton for employment, but do not reside in the community. He also spoke in support of including specific language within this theme to reflect the benefit that sales tax generating businesses contribute toward the General Fund revenue for the City of Fullerton. Member Lambros supported striking "certain types" from the phrase "growth in certain types of jobs" and including additional language concerning the importance of the business tax base.

Member Buck recommended comments regarding the beneficial resources available to the business community through the educational institutions in Fullerton.

Member Batinich submitted a topic discussed by the Committee at an earlier meeting to be listed under this theme: "City and schools should share long term development ideas to be mutually beneficial."

During review of Sustainability, Member Buck expressed an opinion that transportation should be included as a topic to encourage less dependence upon the use of automobiles. Member Bennett raised concerns that promoting walking or bicycling may result in social engineering. Member Lambros interjected that developing work force housing was a method to promote a reduction in auto usage without directly engineering that result.

Vice Chairman Griffin believed that the existing definition of Sustainability had been refined during the last meeting of the Committee and well represented the points agreed upon.

The Committee then examined the theme of Open Space and Natural Resources at length and with significant discussion to understand the implications of terms including "passive", "active" and "natural" as they applied to the definition and topics in the content of this theme.

Member Heusser observed that several comments were listed pertaining to Coyote Hills and wondered why Coyote Hills was an item for discussion under the topic of Open Space. Extensive discussion among the member examined the characteristics of Coyote Hills with the following points raised:

- Coyote Hills incorporated both privately-owned property and City-owned property.
- The City-owned public portion of the Coyote Hills area, which included the nature reserve and the trail system, was utilized by many residents and non-residents.
- The future of the privately-owned property was of political and global importance in the community.
- Sustainability was a consideration.
- Public perception of Coyote Hills often equated this area with "Open Space"

Member Haley felt that, because the matter of Coyote Hills had not yet been through the political process, it was inappropriate for the Committee to take a position. She noted that it was the role of the Committee to provide policy direction to the City through the General Plan and this issue was too specific.

Member Harrell stated that she believed most people in the community identified Coyote Hills as "open space" despite the fact that was private property. She felt that the City had the ability to determine the future zoning and use of the area. Thus, the topic should be left in the theme. Member Harrell also raised the idea that "open space" may be applicable to a vacant lot in a more densely populated portion of the community, such as downtown, where it could be developed into use as a park.

Member Fitzgerald recognized that the parcel of land referred to as Coyote Hills was of significant importance to residents of Fullerton. However, she felt the matter was an important issue within the scope of the City Council rather than as a General Plan topic. Thus, she would prefer to speak generally about Open Space. She suggested that a motion to withdraw the topic from the discussion would facilitate more expedient progress toward addressing "open space" within the General Plan, by not spending time on it during each GPAC meeting.

Chairman Stopper suggested that the GPAC should continue to engage in dialogue pertaining to Coyote Hills in order to properly define the issues that applied to the General Plan content.

Member Fitzgerald introduced a MOTION to withdraw the topic of the Chevron-owned property in the West Coyote Hills area from the GPAC discussion. The MOTION was SECONDED by Member Bennett.

Following continued discussion on the topic a MOTION to CALL THE QUESTION was made by Member Savage and SECONDED by Member Durrette. The MOTION was PASSED by a vote of 10 in favor and 5 opposed. Discussion was closed. A vote was then called on the MOTION to withdraw the topic of the Chevron-owned property in the West Coyote Hills area from GPAC discussion. The MOTION was CARRIED by a vote of 10 in favor and 5 opposed.

Chairman Stopper opened discussion regarding the relevance of "parks" as a topic within the theme of Open Space and Natural Resources. Member Buck requested staff clarify the terms "active" and "passive" as they related to park planning and whether a park could be considered "open space". Senior Planner St. Paul responded that "open space" could be an active park. Consultant Barquist added that "open space" could be either public or private property and

"active" or "passive". Director Godlewski expanded the explanation by providing examples that a privately-owned golf course could be considered "open space", because it provided visual relief as well as active relief. Habitat could be considered "open space" as it provided visual relief, although the public could not actually enter the area. Continuing, he explained that "active" indicated the opportunity for organized recreation; such as ball fields. Hillshire Park was given as an example of a "passive space".

Member Haley remarked that "active" was a broad definition that in some General Plans may include barbeque areas and picnic benches.

Discussion continued regarding whether parks, both "active" and "passive", should be included in the definition of Open Space and Natural Resources.

Senior Planner St. Paul addressed the Committee to ascertain if they wished to continue discussion on the themes or move on to other agenda items and continue the theme discussion to a later meeting. The Committee determined that discussion would continue through completion of the 13 Themes and, due to time limitations, the remaining items on the agenda would be carried over to a subsequent agenda.

No edits were submitted for the Theme of Community Activity.

Member Lambros recommended that "Library" should be included in the Topics portion of the Cultural Resources Theme.

The Theme of Civic Participation was addressed by Member Fitzgerald who commented that the topic of "Public Partnership" should be expanded to read "Public/Private Partnerships".

Chairman Stopper and Vice Chairman Griffin suggested that the definition of the Civic Participation Theme would become more concise by removing the phrase "The qualitative characteristics of the community". The definition would read "How community members and groups interact with one another."

Member Buck stated that "civic" referred specifically to government and felt it would be most accurate to state "Civic and Community" as the theme.

During a discussion of the Community Design theme, Member Bennett encouraged discussion to explore the benefit of having a central community center location. Members Buck and Fitzgerald advised that the City Council had actively considered the potential redesign of the Civic Center area including the existing Senior Center.

Member Buck opened discussion of the Historic Resources theme by suggesting that the definition should be expanded to include "parks".

Member Haley expressed her support for adding a Historic Element to the General Plan to recognize the historic resources in the community. Referencing the Mills Act, she stated that providing a Historic Element could help residents recognize the assets that were present and assist with maintaining those assets. Member Fitzgerald pointed out that "Preservation" was listed as a Topic within the theme of Historic Resources.

Following a brief discussion regarding whether trees could be included in the historic classification, Director Godlewski was asked if there was an existing City policy. He responded that, as a "Tree City", Fullerton did have specific policy set by City Council with regard to trees.

Chairman Stopper opened discussion on the theme of Community Safety. The Committee determined that the definition should be edited to read "Physical safety of the public including crime prevention, emergency services and seismic safety design."

During discussion of the Community Health theme, Member Fitzgerald proposed that the definition be expanded to incorporate the "overall health" of community members.

Member Buck suggested that the phrase "using various modes of transportation" be added to the definition of Mobility.

The Committee then considered the theme of Community Services. Vice Chairman Griffin posed the concept that "Community Activities" and "Community Services" could be blended rather than presented as independent themes. There was consensus among the members that combining these themes was appropriate.

Chairman Stopper invited discussion of the Community Development theme. Vice Chairman Griffin began by correcting the definition "The tools and processes the City will use to accommodate and manage growth and development" to read "uses". Chairman Stopper suggested replacing the term "tools" with "resources".

Member Heusser observed that there was an opportunity to combine the theme of Community Design with Community Development and invited feedback. Member Fitzgerald and Chairman Stopper were in support of combining the themes. Member Haley agreed and suggested adding the topic of landscape design. Member Savage supported the inclusion of landscape design and remarked that rising density increased the importance for landscaping considerations.

At this time Chairman Stopper invited public comment.

Jane Ranz, resident, stated that she would like to see the topic "locally-owned small business" added to the theme of Economic Development and Sustainability. She suggested that it would be beneficial to specifically encourage locally-owned small businesses to promote both living and working within the City.

Public Comment closed.

#### **AGENDA FORECAST**

The next regularly scheduled GPAC meeting would be at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, December 10, 2007. Subsequent meetings would be at 7:00 p.m. on the following dates: January 14, February 11 and March 10, 2008.

#### STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Addressing questions regarding the release of information pertaining to upcoming meetings, Senior Planner St. Paul agreed to post supporting materials with future agendas as information was made available on the City web site. He advised that information advertising the upcoming

series of Neighborhood Meetings would be distributed in flyers and published in local newspapers.

Chairman Stopper encouraged all Members to keep City Council members informed.

Member Fitzgerald inquired about the number of online surveys that had been received. Consultant Barquist agreed to provide an update at the next GPAC meeting. Senior Planner St. Paul stated that questions for the telephone survey were being formulated with the assistance of the CSUF Research Center.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Kim Radding
Clerical Assistant III



#### MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

#### POLICE DEPARTMENT MURAL ROOM

MONDAY DECEMBER 10, 2007 \_ 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:05 p.m.

**PRESENT:** GPAC Members Batinich, Bennett, Buck, Bushala, Durrette, Fitzgerald,

Griffin, Haley, Harrell, Heusser (arrived at 7:06 p.m.), Jaramillo,

Lambros, Richmond, Savage, and Stopper

ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Director Godlewski, Senior Planner St. Paul, Housing Programs

Supervisor Morad, Administrative Assistant Pasillas

**CONSULTANT** RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist, RBF Community

**PRESENT:** Planner Suzanne Rynne

**FLAG SALUTE:** Chairman Stopper

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Richmond, SECONDED by

Committee Member Fitzgerald, and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present, that the Minutes of the November 5, 2007 meeting be

APPROVED as written.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Janet McNeil provided the Committee with a handout titled "Suggestions for rethinking the GP structure", and discussed several items she believed should be included in the General Plan.

#### **POINT OF ORDER**

#### Take action on November 5, 2007 GPAC vote

Chairman Stopper commented that over the past few weeks' questions had been raised about the appropriateness of the motion that was passed at the November 15, 2008 meeting, with regard to the removal of the Chevron private property in West Coyote Hills from further GPAC discussion. He asked Member Fitzgerald if that was how she had intended the motion, and she confirmed it was.

Chairman Stopper believed the questions that had been raised had focused on whether this was or was not a valid vote on an agenda item. He explained the GPAC operated under the State of California laws which included the Brown Act. The Brown Act prohibited action to be taken on items not on the agenda. Chairman Stopped had done some research and found that Coyote Hills had been on the agenda under discussion item number one, Discussion of Revised Themes and

Topics. Also, in supporting handouts which had been provided by City staff prior to that meeting, it clearly denoted West Coyote Hills multiple times under an item called "Theme, Open Space, Parks & Recreation". It was during the theme discussion period that Member Fitzgerald made the motion and the Committee voted. Chairman Stopper requested staff to display a spreadsheet he had prepared which he believed would help the Committee understand their choices.

Member Savage asked Chairman Stopper if he had voted for or against this motion, and Chairman Stopper responded that he had voted against the motion because he believed it was premature in the discussion. He did not believe the Committee was far enough down the path to not process it.

Member Haley questioned whether a revisit of an item that was on a previous agenda, according to Robert's Rules, had to be brought up by one of the people who voted in the affirmative. Chairman Stopper clarified this was not a reconsideration at this point. He requested the Committee look at the four options he had put together, and indicated that reconsideration was the third option on his list.

Chairman Stopper explained the options as he saw them; 1. Agree the subject of that vote was in that agenda and take no further action. 2. The Committee does not agree, and there were some options that could be taken, or if the Committee did not want to take a position they could go to option three. 3. Reconsideration by the Committee. 4. Hand the item over to the City Attorney for his review and opinion. The Committee could also choose to use several of the options.

Member Bennett believed the Committee did in fact have enough documentation in the agenda for them to take action. He believed it was properly agendized, the vote was taken in an appropriate manner, and he wanted to move on with the current agenda. Chairman Stopper confirmed he was in support of option one, and Member Bennett responded affirmatively.

Chairman Stopper requested other Committee Members to voice their opinion on how they would like to proceed.

Member Savage asked if this Point of Order discussion would be available to all the Committee Members on other votes that may be taken as they went through the process, or was this just a one time Point of Order that Chairman Stopper had brought up on a vote that he did not like the outcome of. Chairman Stopper responded that he did not Chair the Committee based on his preferences, or whether he liked or disliked the outcome of a vote.

Member Richmond believed the subject was moot. The Committee had voted to cutoff the talk at that time because it was going to drag out all night. That was all they had cut off; it was a vote to cut off all the talking on one specific area.

Member Bennett wondered if it would be appropriate, to head off any legal challenge to this vote, to make a motion that the Committee reaffirms their vote of last month that excludes from discussion for GPAC purposes the Chevron property located in West Coyote Hills.

Member Lambros struggled with understanding why there was a necessity for action when staff had not indicated anything improper had taken place. He had seen the topic written about in the newspaper, that the Committee had supposedly taken an illegal vote, and he had a conversation with the City Attorney because people were stating the Committee had done something illegal. Based on his conversation with the City Attorney he was very comfortable with the action taken. He did not think they should be reacting to outside opinions so much as finding out from staff if there was anything improper in our vote.

Director Godlewski clarified that the City Attorney's response to staff was if the item was not on the agenda there needed to be another vote. In light of Chairman Stopper's explanation and review of the agenda, and his finding that it was on the agenda and part of the discussion, then the action, was consistent with the Rules of Order and that there was no further discussion necessary.

Vice Chairman Griffin stated that Chairman Stopper had approached him over the weekend to ask his opinion on the topic. He explained he had worked in this field for 27 years, worked with City Councils, put together agendas for Council meetings, made sure that the Minutes were correct, etc., and he believed it was very clear that the action taken in November was action taken on information that was before the Committee that evening. There was not a question in his mind that proper action was taken, and they had done nothing illegal or incorrect according to the Brown Act. This was his opinion, and he wanted to voice it publicly that he did not see any reason for the questioning, the information was contained in their written packet of information, Coyote Hills was mentioned several times in that documentation, there was no reason why the Committee could not take the action they took at the November meeting.

Member Buck asked for clarification on exactly what was voted on, and Chairman Stopper responded that the vote was in the Minutes that had just been approved, on page three; "Member Fitzgerald introduced a motion to withdraw the topic of the Chevron-owned property in the West Coyote Hills area from the GPAC discussion". Member Buck was not clear on what that meant; he wanted to know if it meant for all of the meetings in the future one could never mention the word Coyote Hills again. Chairman Stopper responded that it did not, just the Chevron-owned property in West Coyote Hills. He believed it was different than Coyote Hills, which was a particular piece of property, private property, which was owned by Chevron.

Member Buck asked if that meant they were not to refer to this specific piece of property throughout the remainder of this process, and Chairman Stopper responded that would be the condition they would be operating under, unless it was voted otherwise to change that motion.

Member Lambros believed the context of the motion was being lost. The Committee had been discussing what Themes and Topics would go into the Plan, and there were numerous topics discussed. This was not the specific plan or final draft, just a discussion of what topics they would like to put in the plan. So along came a specific topic that started to get a lot of attention, and the group made a statement, that in discussing Themes and Topics it seemed inconsistent to have a project specific discussion. Member Lambros would support a motion to have no project specific discussions at this point in the General Plan update process, regardless of what project it was. We were talking about Themes and Topics, and in that context maybe it helped everybody understand, so they could move on. He, as one member of the Committee, and he believed there were others, did not view the motion as a gag order on that topic from ever coming up here again, but in an appropriate forum, not in an inappropriate part of the planning process.

Sunbie Harrell commented that looking at what led up to this discussion was when the consultant had the papers displayed with all the post-it notes and so forth. There were quite a few post-it notes mentioning Coyote Hills, which was the community's input, and her concern was now the Committee was going to arbitrarily ignore that or vote it down. She believed this item needed to be re-voted on and clearly stated. She was confused on whether the vote was to eliminate the topic just for the night, or if it was forever during this entire process; were they not to mention "Coyote Hills" or "Chevron-owned property", those words, at any discussions in the future. This was an item the community had expressed interest in, and she did not want to ignore that portion of input from the community.

Chairman Stopper believed that was what the vote was for; the vote was to eliminate the topic from their discussion, eliminate discussion about that private piece of property in West Coyote Hills. When he had done his research, he found that West Coyote Hills, in the General Plan today, was that large piece of land in Fullerton, north of Rosecrans, west of Euclid, and bounded by boundaries with other cities to the north and west. There were housing developments, existing there for sometime on that property. That was what the City called, in the General plan today, West Coyote Hills. There was in fact a West Coyote Hills map and element in the General Plan today. There was also a Master Plan associated with the Chevron property in Coyote Hills, which was a subset of that, in the General plan today. He believed that the motion would be interpreted as they would not have any further discussion about the Chevron property in West Coyote Hills. That did not eliminate discussions about that piece of Fullerton which was called West Coyote Hills, as described above.

Member Durrette clarified they were talking about a privately owned piece of property, owned by Chevron, not an area of the City, and those were two separate things.

Member Heusser believed the paper did a disservice when it reported it as "Coyote Hills, in relation to open space, will not be discussed". It was presented the display board as open space. Coyote Hills, and the interpretation from at least one person on this Committee, was that Coyote Hills was all open space. The intent was that Coyote Hills would not be discussed as open space. When you discussed open space, Coyote Hills would come up, all the parks would come up, and the private property might come up, so Coyote Hills may be discussed, whether it is in relation to open space or housing, circulation, or resource management, because its part of the City. The way it was presented, as she saw it, was they were deciding it was open space and it was sitting there as open space, all five hundred acres, and she did not think that was what they wanted to do. She thought it was an excellent motion and it was very clear.

Dexter Savage stated that, absent the City Attorney saying they had done something wrong, he saw no reason to correct it. He believed the confusion was not Coyote Hills, but that Coyote Hills had become synonymous with the project, and what was discussed at the last meeting was a project. He would agree with Member Lambros and vote to not discuss any projects that were going on in the City of Fullerton. He did not want to go through this process on every motion, as it took considerable time and the Committee did not have a lot of extra time.

Member Jaramillo had heard people referring to the property as privately-owned, and in the minutes Consultant Barquist had said that open space could be privately or publicly owned, so she did not understand why they were getting into Coyote Hills being Chevron property. It could be considered or drawn out in generalizations in the Plan as open space, or hopefully our vision of open space, but the privately owned discussion did not make sense. It was owned by Chevron, but so were other properties, such as one or two of the golf courses, and we considered them open space. She understood it was not definite open space, but I did not understand why it could not be out there for discussion like it was in the previous General Plan.

Member Batinich commented that the Committee had voted, and they could be here through the next General Plan if this came up every time a situation was put to a vote. Either the Committee stayed with the vote, or moved on, but they needed to do something. They did not have that much time to discuss every detail of every situation that came up, they had already voted on this and it was not an illegal vote.

Member Bushala did not understand the motion to be a gag order on discussion of Coyote Hills as it related to Themes and Topics. He believed the motion was to table that discussion as it related to Themes and Topics, because possibly it did not belong in that category. There would be an opportunity in the future to discuss some of the important items related to Coyote Hills, and he would like to move on.

Member Harrell asked for clarification, that this was not a gag order, and this topic would be open in the future; she did not want to be silenced if she said Chevron property in Coyote Hills.

Chairman Stopper stated there was no time dependency put on the motion, therefore it stood in perpetuity until such time there was a different motion to change it. It was not a motion for that instance only; it was a motion for the GPAC and would stand in perpetuity until the Committee changed it. If it was not changed, it would stand in perpetuity. That is what the motion was, there was no time domain in the motion itself, it did not state just now, tonight, November 5. It was openended, which meant perpetuity.

Chairman Stopper asked the will of the Committee, and Vice Chairman Griffin stated he did not believe they had taken any missteps, it was a legal vote, and they needed to move forward. Chairman Stopper asked if there were any objections, there were none, so discussion on this item was closed.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

## Present and discuss Draft vision statement

RBF Community Planner Suzanne Rynne explained the Draft Vision Statement had been developed using words and statements that the community had listed at the various charette's and community meetings. She asked the Committee to think about whether this statement reflected the words of the community, what words or phrases they believed should be a part of the vision statement, what should be added, and what should be changed.

Committee Member Bennett suggested striking the words "the needs of" in the third sentence.

Vice Chairman Griffin was concerned with the language in the same sentence; he did not believe you could "respect" a thing and suggested using the word "respond".

Committee Member Buck questioned the purpose of the Vision Statement, and thought it best to describe things as they were. He gave the example of "community-driven", yet only 150 residents out of 130,000 had participated in the General Plan outreach programs.

Committee Member Fitzgerald commented many companies write their mission statements in the present tense what they would want to be in an ideal world. She thought that stating items as if they had been accomplished would help you to accomplish them.

Committee Member Buck believed that speaking of the present was fine for a mission statement, but a General Plan Vision Statement was supposed to speak of the future.

Committee Member Batinich suggested "Fullerton embraces its heritage, active lifestyle, and cultural diversity".

Committee Member Bushala thought the draft statement was too generic. He would like to see the things that make Fullerton unique, such as the significant buildings and parks, included in the statement. He believed the statement needed to include words that described Fullerton today, and also described what Fullerton was striving for, sustainable design.

Committee Member Heusser liked the Santa Paula and Arizona samples that had been provided to the Committee. She thought the statement should use words from the charrette's that make Fullerton stand apart, such as education, medical, and topography/hills. She also believed the statement should begin with some description that would draw you in, and then move on to the vision.

Vice Chairman Griffin agreed with Committee Member's Heusser and Bushala, and suggested this statement may need to be different than the typical vision statement. He suggested the possibility of having two parts to the statement; what make Fullerton unique today, and what we want Fullerton to be in the future.

Committee Member Savage wanted to include descriptions that would capture some of the excitement of Fullerton, and describe what set the City apart from other Orange County cities.

Committee Member Harrell suggested including some action verbs, or words such as "seek to ensure" or "provide. She liked Ms. McNeil's examples.

Committee Member Haley thought the draft statement tried to say everything in as few words as possible. She believed the statement needed to be expanded.

Committee Member Richmond liked the words "heritage", "diversity", "recreation", "transportation", and "education". He also liked the last sentence in the draft statement.

Chairman Stopper commented that the statement needed to reflect an eclectic community. He believed some of the City's strengths were the hospital, education facilities, the airport, and the arts. He also would like to see something included that made referenced to the caring community and the over one hundred non-profit organizations that cared for people both in and out of the community.

Committee Member Bushala also agreed that the arts needed to be included.

Committee Member Lambros wanted to look for terms that embraced the ideas without listing each idea. He suggested terms such as "small town atmosphere" or "honor heritage".

Committee Member Buck thought that education was not given enough prominence in the statement if Fullerton was supposed to be an education community. He also commented that accountability was not mentioned.

At this point the Committee decided to have staff and the consultant's compile the suggestions from tonight's meeting and forward them to each Committee Member. Committee Member's could then use this information to create a vision statement. Director Godlewski stated that staff would work to get the information to the Member's before the holiday closure.

Public hearing opened.

Susan Petrella made the following comments:

- Fullerton was known for arts and culture also, and they needed to be prominent
- She questioned why Committee Member's were not looking at the information that had been gathered at the various community outreach meetings
- She asked why the common words from the outreach meetings were not included in the Draft Vision Statement
- She believed the Committee should not be generating a new vision statement, but instead they should look at the public comments. She thought the statement should be created in a way so the community participants would recognize their words.
- She like Ms. McNeil's comments

Chairman Stopper clarified that each Committee Member had been provided copies of the various community meeting inputs.

Ms. McNeil commented that the first sentence of the draft statement contained "...community-driven principles..." but did not describe them. She believed the statement needed to be broken down into several sections.

Dave Musante made the following comments:

- Should talk about the past and also about what was going on today in Fullerton.
- Take out "is built" in the first sentence and substitute "should continue".
- Add items that are important today such as green buildings and open space.
- Many people believe there is too much development in Fullerton and more deliberation is needed before projects are approved.

Tom Dalton made the following comments:

- The draft statement was too long. He believed it needed to be more concise.
- Historical preservation was very prominent in the community meetings, yet it was not mentioned in the draft statement.

Public hearing closed.

## Housing Element discussion

RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist explained that the Housing Element of the General Plan had recently been added to RBF's contract. The Housing Element was unique in that State review and certification were required. The State-wide housing goal was to provide decent housing and a suitable living environment for every California family.

Mr. Barquist continued by explaining the Housing Element was one of seven State-required elements of the General Plan, and must include provisions for housing at a variety of income levels. The City would complete the Housing Element, send it to the State for review, make any necessary changes, and return it to the State for certification. The Housing Element was required to be certified by the State no later than June 30, 2008.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers were explained and the 2006-2014 allocations were discussed. Mr. Barquist explained the Housing Element would be updated every five years, but the goal now was to establish a plan that would meet the growth needs by 2014.

Committee Member Buck asked what would happen if the City did not meet the number of units needed, and Mr. Barguist explained that there were still questions as to whether the City could be

punished in some way. Director Godlewski added to be eligible for State funds there needed to be a Housing Element in place. Financial sanctions against City's had also been threatened.

Mr. Barquist continued, and explained the five phases of the review process:

- Review the existing plan
- Public participation
- Draft Housing Element
- Environmental Review
- Housing Element Adoption

In order to meet the deadline, staff believed the process needed to be complete by the end of March 2008.

Vice Chairman Griffin commented the RHNA numbers were indicated the City had to zone sufficient property to that the private sector could development the land and meet the RHNA needs. The City was not required to build / provide housing to meet these needs. Mr. Barquist added the City could choose to use CDBG monies or other funds to meet some of the need if they desired.

Committee Member Lambros asked if the biggest impediment to meeting the RHNA numbers was land availability or community support. Mr. Barquist responded that several items went into meeting the numbers such as the cost of land, affordability of the housing, and the desire to live in this community. Committee Member Lambros asked if density needed to increase to make housing more affordable, and Mr. Barquist responded there was no simple answer; it would depend on what the community wanted.

Chairman Stopper stated there was much to do in a short amount of time. He suggested the Committee meet more than once a month, and requested staff to inform the Committee of the schedule as soon as possible so additional meetings could be scheduled.

Committee Member Lambros requested staff provide the Committee Members with a list of items discussed at this meeting related to the Vision Statement.

## Initial discussion regarding general plan structure

- Explanation of a general plan structure
- Discuss how themes and topic relate to design
- Explanation and example of policy

This discussion was continued until the January 14, 2008 meeting.

Public comment opened.

Judith Kaluzny commented that the information provided to the Committee was still not available to the public; she had checked the City's website prior to the meeting and was not able to find the material. She believed the issue on the vote at the previous meeting may not have come up if the public had access to the same information the Committee received.

Director Godlewski stated the information would not be put on the website until the Committee Members had received their packets. The information for this meeting had been put on the City's

website this morning. Senior Planner St. Paul added the agenda, draft Vision Statement, and PowerPoint presentation were available to the public on the website.

Kathleen Rhee believed that the comments being made were too long. Chairman Stopper clarified that it was a large Committee, and they needed to allow everyone time to speak.

Public comment closed.

## **AGENDA FORECAST**

The next regularly scheduled GPAC meeting will occur at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, January 14, 2008. Subsequent meetings will occur at 7:00 p.m. on the following dates: February 11 and March 10, 2008.

## STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Senior Planner St. Paul clarified staff would provide the Committee with notes from this meeting's discussion of the draft Vision Statement, and a proposed schedule for the Housing Element. He stressed the need for the Committee to stay on schedule with the agenda.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the mee	ting was adjourned at 9:18 p.m.	
	Janelle Pasillas	_
	Administrative Assistant	



## POLICE DEPARTMENT MURAL ROOM

MONDAY JANUARY 14, 2008 \_ \_ 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:03 p.m.

PRESENT: GPAC Members Batinich, Bennett, Buck, Bushala, Durrette, Fitzgerald,

Griffin, Haley, Harrell, Heusser, Jaramillo, Lambros, Richmond, Savage,

and Stopper

ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Director Godlewski, Senior Planner St. Paul, Administrative Assistant

**Pasillas** 

CONSULTANT PRESENT:

RBF Principal Al Zelinka, RBF Community Planner Suzanne Rynne

FLAG SALUTE: Chairman Stopper

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Fitzgerald, SECONDED by

Committee Member Buck, and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present, that approval of the Minutes of the December 10, 2007 meeting be CONTINUED so as to allow further description of the

Coyote Hills discussion to be added.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Diana Bonanno, 4611 Santa Fe Street, commented the City had done extensive public outreach to encourage participation at the community input meetings, and much of the public had expressed interest in Coyote Hills. She was concerned with the GPAC eliminating Coyote Hills from discussion. She gave a brief explanation of what she believed a General Plan should be; State law outlined the content of a General Plan and it should include Land Use. She did not believe Coyote Hills was a project, as indicated by the Committee at a previous meeting, but that it was a land use issue. Ms. Bonanno expressed her opinion that the GPAC recommendation to remove Coyote Hills from discussion was not valid. She would like the Committee to listen to the community's input and incorporate their comments into the General Plan.

Chairman Stopper clarified that the GPAC did not exclude Coyote Hills from discussion; they had excluded the Chevron-owned property only. There were many people living and using Coyote Hills currently, and the Committee had chosen to eliminate discussion of the Chevron-owned property at the time of the discussion. This property could be agendized and discussed at a future meeting if the Committee so desired.

Helen Higgins, 1800 Smokewood Avenue, expressed her opinion that the motion made at the last meeting had occurred as a result of the heavy influence of Pacific Coast Homes, and she believed

the Chevron-owned property in West Coyote Hills should be included in discussion. She stated that it came down to the Committee serving either the developer's interests or the community's desire for a quality way of life. She questioned whose interests the Committee was serving.

Bob Stevenson, 525 Princeton Circle West, stated that some members of the GPAC were inadvertently allowing their good name to be associated with an illegitimate process. He continued by explaining the City's desire to have community input, and he did not believe the Committee had acted in good faith. He urged the Committee Members who did not agree with the vote to eliminate Coyote Hills from discussion to not allow their name to be associated with an illegitimate Committee, and if the Committee did not place on the agenda the West Coyote Hills open space matter, then they should resign.

Matt Leslie, 747 Barris Drive, provided information for the Committee on green building, and encouraged the GPAC to put some type of policy addressing green building in the General Plan. He would like to see Fullerton become a leader in this field. He also commented that he believed the undeveloped areas of Coyote Hills were the last undeveloped tract of land in Fullerton and he encouraged the Committee to bring the topic back to the table.

Committee Member Lambros expressed concern that the Committee's decision to eliminate Coyote Hills from discussion had been taken out of context. The decision was not to eliminate Coyote Hills from the final plan, but to eliminate discussion at that time as the Committee was working on Themes and Topics, which was a broad subject. There was no gag order on Coyote Hills discussion; it had just been eliminated as a discussion item for that night only. The Committee was not shirking its responsibilities; they had just eliminated that topic for that night because it was inappropriate for where they were at in the plan. The General Plan starts out very broad and then narrows to details; the Committee believed they were not at a point where project specific discussions were appropriate. The motion at the time, as he understood it, was to eliminate from discussion for the evening, not from the discussion ever again.

Chairman Stopper clarified that the Committee could vote in the future to include Coyote Hills in a discussion.

Committee Member Lambros believed the motion was open to interpretation as the minutes read "Ms. Fitzgerald introduced a motion to withdraw the topic of the Chevron-owned property in the West Coyote Hills area from the GPAC discussion", and he interpreted "the discussion" to mean the discussion the Committee was engaged in that night, not anything broader than that. He wanted to get clarity from his peers.

Chairman Stopper stated the topic was not on the agenda for this meeting, but it could be included on a future agenda if the Committee so desired.

Committee Member Bushala stated that the item had been included on the December 10, 2007 agenda and discussion was held to clarify the vote. The Committee had determined it was not to put a gag order on Coyote Hills.

Committee Member Fitzgerald believed the item was on the current agenda under approval of the Minutes of the December 10, 2007 meeting.

Chairman Stopper moved the discussion on to the approval of the Minutes of the December 10, 2007 meeting.

Committee Member Fitzgerald requested staff include the discussion that was held at the November 2007 meeting in the Minutes. The Committee had been advised by the City Attorney that legally there was not a problem, but the Committee had not made that determination. She believed adding the discussion would help everyone understand what was done.

Chairman Stopper agreed that the Committee had not made a legal decision and the minutes were incorrect.

A MOTION was introduced by Member Fitzgerald to CONTINUE approval of the Minutes from the December 10, 2007 meeting to the next meeting to allow staff to add the details of the discussion, and SECONDED by Committee Member Buck. The MOTION was PASSED unanimously.

Committee Member Jaramillo agreed with Committee Member Lambros' description of the vote. She believed the topic would be addressed during the Open Space discussion.

Member Buck, Member Durrette, and Member Bushala offered minor corrections to several words on page two of the December 10, 2007, which staff would make prior to approval at the next meeting.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Senior Planner St. Paul explained that tonight the Committee would be working to complete the Draft Vision Statement, along with an update of the Housing Element, and an initial discussion of the General Plan structure.

RBF Consultant Rynne explained that the Draft Vision Statement that staff had provided was a compilation of the comments from the previous meeting. The Statement was set up in three sections; a Context Statement which addressed yesterday and today, a Vision Statement which addressed the future, and a Principles section which elaborated on the Vision Statement.

Chairman Stopper suggested that, in addition to the Statement drafted by staff, the Committee should also review the Statements drafted by Committee Member Haley and Committee Member Heusser. He then opened discussion.

Member Haley explained she had worked with a group of Fullerton residents, and together they had compared the Draft Vision Statement staff had provided with Vision Statements from other cities. They had determined three sections were needed; the section titled "Our City" provided a brief history of Fullerton, the "Vision" section encompassed the ideas that had come from previous GPAC and community meetings, and then a section to explain the "Guiding Principles".

Member Heusser explained that she had based her draft on the Vision Statement provided by the consultant at the previous meeting, and had added some of the Committee's comments.

The Committee proceeded to review the Statements and engaged in discussion regarding which format should be used.

Member Bennett commented that he believed more people would read the statement if it was short and easy to read. He thought the bullet points belonged in various elements rather than the Vision Statement. Member Bennett introduced a MOTION to adopt the revised Vision Statement as written by staff, and the MOTION was SECONDED by Member Fitzgerald.

Member Bushala disagreed with Member Bennett and liked the statement provided by Member Haley. He believed her statement provided an outline of the "roadmap" (General Plan) and explained what was important to Fullerton.

Member Savage agreed with Member Bennett and explained that, as a Planning Commissioner who referred to the General Plan often, the more complex the document the more problematic it would be to make any changes.

Member Jaramillo also believed Member Haley's draft to be too long, although she like the "Our City" section as it was.

Member Haley commented the intent of the Vision Statement was to tell you what the General Plan would be. A developer would only read what was applicable, i.e. the Land Use section, and staff would look at the items mentioned in the statement for their analysis when preparing the staff report.

Member Savage thought Member Haley's Statement included mandates and a statement should not mandate the City to do something without knowing the socio and economic impacts of the action. He gave the example of "meets national planning standards for pedestrian and bike-friendly features" and questioned what they were and would the average person know what they were. Member Haley reiterated that she only intended her draft as a starting point and was open to making changes.

Vice Chairman Griffin commented the City Council would look at the socio and economic comments.

Member Batinich suggested the Committee not make a decision tonight, but rather take time to review both and make a decision at the next meeting.

Member Richmond reminded the Committee of Tom Dalton's comment at the previous meeting, that the statement needed to be more concise, and he agreed with that opinion. The statements were all saying the same thing.

Member Durrette questioned when anyone would read the General Plan. She believed it needed to be concise or people would not read it. Member Bushala stated that developers would read the General Plan and it was important to let the developers know that if they came to Fullerton and wanted to change the General Plan, they should read the General Plan and understand what was important to the City.

Member Harrell concurred with Member Bushala, and believed it concise, to the point, and had good clarity. She liked the layout and thought it worked well.

Member Lambros commented that both versions basically said the same thing; Member Haley's version gave more specifics, and staff's version was broad and allowed room for interpretation.

Member Bennett commented that Member Haley's version could be a prescription for litigation because a person could pick out any item in that statement and state the developer had not lived up to it.

Vice Chairman Griffin suggested the Committee decide which format to use, and then discuss the details. He would like to use Member Haley's format, but make some changes.

Following continued discussion on the topic a MOTION to CALL THE QUESTION was made by Member Savage and SECONDED by Member Fitzgerald.

Member Buck stated he had helped work on Member Haley's statement and believed it was brief in context of a four-inch document, and provided something to work with. He doubted anyone would sue the City over a Vision Statement. He suggested the Committee vote on which style they would like, and the possibly a small group of Members could work on the statement prior to the next meeting.

Member Bennett reiterated his MOTION; to accept staff's revised Draft Vision Statement.

The motion FAILED to pass by a vote of 5 in favor, 9 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Committee Member Haley introduced a MOTION to determine the format of the Vision Statement either as written by staff or as submitted by her, i.e. three sections, and Vice Chairman Griffin SECONDED the MOTION.

Vice Chairman Griffin clarified the Committee was voting on format only, and discussion continued on what formats they were speaking of. The two format choices were determined to be either three sections (Our City, Our Vision, and Our Guiding Principles) or a format consisting of a Context Statement and a Vision Statement.

Member Haley WITHDREW her MOTION, and Vice Chairman Griffin made a SUBSTITUTE MOTION to choose one of the two formats mentioned. Member Bushala SECONDED the motion. This substitute motion was WITHDRAWN.

Member Buck introduced a MOTION to use Member Haley's draft as a working document, in words and format, and Vice Chairman Griffin SECONDED the MOTION. The MOTION was PASSED by a vote of 9 in favor, 5 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Discussion continued on the contents of the statement.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the following paragraphs would be listed under the heading "Our City":

Paragraph One: "Fullerton is a city with a small-town feel, a culturally and ethnically diverse population, and a strong sense of community. We cherish our history while welcoming newcomers and being invigorated by them."

Paragraph Two: "Since its beginnings as an agricultural economy built on citrus production and rail transportation, settlers have created distinctive neighborhoods that reflect different eras in this region's growth. Fullerton's hills and flatlands are now covered with family homes, schools and parks in place of orange groves, but our original town site, with its mature trees and thoughtfully preserved historic structures, still points to our legacy."

It was the consensus of the Committee that the following opening paragraph and bullet points would be listed under "Our Vision":

"Based on our shared heritage and community values, the following statement expresses our aspirations for the next decade and beyond to enhance the quality of life for all.

## Fullerton will be a City which:

- values and provides quality public safety services including emergency services, crime prevention and hazard mitigation
- enjoys a vibrant economy, benefiting from its "education city" resources and its diverse business base.
- encourages economic diversity and creation of new jobs
- encourages growth in its tax base to support our city services and ensure adequate infrastructure
- has an increasing choice of accessible, affordable and desirable housing options which enable our children, workforce families and young professionals to make their homes here, and our seniors to remain here
- is committed to environmental sustainability in planning, design, policy and practice.
- values and protects its heritage; strives to preserve historic buildings and neighborhoods; embraces high aesthetic standards for new architecture and urban design.
- encourages civic participation by the full spectrum of its community and reflects its concerns in official planning and decision-making
- offers a variety of transportation options
- supports community health with recreational resources, well-maintained parks, preserved open spaces, and public programs to encourage healthy lifestyles
- preserves its character by supporting community efforts dedicated to cultural activities, civic engagement, social concerns, health and safety issues, and other aspects of our quality of life"

It was the consensus of the Committee that the following paragraphs would be the third paragraph and closing statement under the heading "Our City":

"Today our small town feel is preserved in a 21st century city that provides the best in economic diversity, higher education, health services, arts and culture. Our residents value their active, healthy lifestyle and the environmental attributes and resources that support it.

This is Fullerton's heritage."

At this time Chairman Stopper invited public comment.

Zoot Velasco, Director of the Muckenthaler Cultural Center, expressed a desire to see tourism addressed in the General Plan. He suggested ideas such as ride a train from Los Angeles to come see a play, ride a horse, or visit a museum in Fullerton. He enjoyed the "Mom & Pop" business, the horse trails, and the attention to heritage shown in Fullerton. He believed that keeping the tax

base statement in the Vision Statement it would open the City to people parceling the large lots into smaller lots and more "big box" stores, and ultimately doing a disservice to Fullerton.

Judith Kaluzny discussed the December 2002 Ordinance which had called for a vibrant downtown, the changes that were made, and the negative impact those changes had on the City. She would like to see sustainable rather than vibrant used in the Vision Statement.

Jane Rands discussed what a sustainable economy could be to the City; money put in to local businesses, residents shopped the local businesses, and therefore the money did not leave the City. She believed it was important to keep sustainable economy in the Vision Statement.

Matthey Leslie, 747 Barris Drive, expressed his opinion that details did matter. He believed the General Plan needed to be pedestrian and bike friendly, and encourage the use of human-powered transportation. He also believed sustainability was important.

Public Comment closed.

Chairman Stopper suggested the Committee reach a motion to accept what was completed at tonight's meeting, and then move on at the next meeting.

Member Buck wanted to reserve the decision on the items discussed during Public Comments (tax base, sustainability, and pedestrian-bike friendly).

Discussion was held on how to best approve the work done tonight, while allowing for modification at the next meeting. Member Lambros made a MOTION to approve the language as developed tonight as the first Committee draft, and Member Haley SECONDED the MOTION. The MOTION PASSED unanimously.

#### AGENDA FORECAST

The next regularly scheduled GPAC meeting will occur at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, February 11, 2008. A subsequent meeting will occur at 7:00 p.m. on the following dates March 10, 2008.

## STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Senior Planner St. Paul provided the following dates for the Committee's information:

- January 29, 2008 Housing Policy Review (rescheduled from last month)
- February 20, 2008 Housing Element Community Workshop (Senior Center) Two meetings that day, 5:30 p.m. for stakeholders, 7:00 p.m. public workshop

Committee Member Durrette expressed concern with the Committee's inability to get through the complete agenda at each meeting, and suggested scheduling an extra meeting to allow the Committee an opportunity to catch up.

Chairman Stopper commented that due to the size of the GPAC, and the importance of letting each Member express their opinions, each item open for discussion could take some time. He asked staff to put an item on the next agenda to allow the Committee an opportunity to discuss the addition of a "catch-up" meeting.

Committee Member Buck asked staff the status of the survey, and Senior Planner St. Paul responded that he was currently working with Dr. Robinson at CSUF Research Center, and the anticipated ready date was mid to late February 2008.

Committee Member Savage stated he would be absent from the February 11, 2008 meeting

Chairman Stopper requested staff provide the information for the next meeting as soon as they had it ready; Director Godlewski confirmed that the Committee desired to have the information sent "piece meal", and Chairman Stopper confirmed.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:21 p.m.	
	Janelle Pasillas
	Administrative Assistant



## **POLICE DEPARTMENT MURAL ROOM**

MONDAY **FEBRUARY 11, 2008** 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:01 p.m.

GPAC Members Batinich, Bennett (arrived at 7:07 p.m.), Buck, Bushala, PRESENT:

Durrette, Haley, Jaramillo, Richmond, and Stopper

Excused: GPAC Members Fitzgerald, Griffin, Heusser, Savage

Unexcused: GPAC Members Harrell, Lambros. ABSENT:

Director Godlewski, Senior Planner St. Paul, Administrative Assistant **STAFF PRESENT:** 

Pasillas

**CONSULTANT PRESENT:** 

RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist, RBF Community

Planner Michelle Kou

Chair Stopper FLAG SALUTE:

**MINUTES:** MOTION made by Committee Member Bennett, SECONDED by

> Committee Member Haley, and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present, that the Minutes of the December 10, 2007 meeting

be APPROVED as written.

MOTION made by Committee Member Durrette, SECONDED by Committee Member Bennett, and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present, that the Minutes of the January 14, 2008 meeting be APPROVED as amended: page 7, third paragraph, change to

"...important to keep sustainable economy in the Vision Statement."

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Denny Bean, 1529 Yermo Blvd. provided the Committee with information on open space and the significance of Coyote Hills. Senior Planner St. Paul stated he would scan the letter provided by Mr. Bean and forward it to the Committee Members.

#### DISCUSSION ITEMS

Chair Stopper explained that the agenda distributed for the meeting contained a "Point of Order" item that should not have been included. MOTION by Member Bennett, SECOND by Member Durrette, to eliminate the "Point of Order" item from the agenda, PASSED 8-1 in favor.

## **Draft Vision Statement**

Senior Planner St. Paul provided a recap of the previous meetings discussion on the Vision Statement, and asked the Committee if the draft provided reflected their vision.

Member Buck suggested hyphenation of the words "small town" and "21<sup>st</sup> century" in the third paragraph under the "Our City" section.

Member Bushala "family homes" in the second paragraph under "Our City" be changed to "homes".

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee to make the changes suggested by Mr. Buck, and, due to the low attendance at this meeting, address any other changes to the first two sections of the Vision Statement at the next meeting.

Member Bennett provided the Committee with a draft of the "Our Guiding Principles" section he had prepared, and explained the edits he had made.

Member Buck suggested changing "education city" to "education community" and removal of the quotes. It was the consensus of the Committee to make this change.

Discussion was held on the use of the word "sustainability", and what it really meant. The Committee also discussed AB32 and a recent court decision regarding the inclusion of "global warming" and "carbon footprint" in a General Plan. It was the consensus of the Committee to delay the decision on this paragraph until staff and the consultant were able to provide more detailed information to the Committee.

The Committee continued discussion of the last three paragraphs under the heading of "Our Guiding Principles", and it was the consensus of the Committee to leave the title of the third paragraph as "Mobility", which the Committee believed included walking.

It was the consensus of the Committee to change "education city" under the heading "Our Guiding Principles" to "education community", and remove the quotation marks, PASSED 6-3 in favor.

At this point the Committee decided to delay the final vote on the Draft Vision Statement until the next meeting.

Public hearing opened.

Tom Dalton, Fullerton Heritage, commented that he would like to see the word "standards" left in paragraph eight, under "Our Vision". The City had standards, which they used, and he believed this should be left in. Member Bushala agreed with this comment.

Public hearing closed.

The following item was heard out of order.

## Housing Element Update

Mr. St. Paul stated the deadline to have the Housing Element to City Council was June 2008.

Dave Barquist, RBF, presented the timeline for the Housing Element. He explained the outreach to the community and stakeholders, which were required, included a workshop and meeting on February 20, 2008. A questionnaire was provided to the Committee which would mirror the discussion at the outreach programs, and Mr. Barquist requested the Committee either email their responses or return the questionnaire at the next meeting. During March staff would review the

past performance of previous Housing Elements and a summary of the outreach programs would be provided to the Committee. Staff planned to complete the draft policy in April 2008. In May 2008, the Planning Commission and City Council would review the GPAC's recommendations, and the document would go to the HCD for their review, which could last up to sixty days. In July 2008 the policy would come back to the City Council for revisions.

Member Haley asked what the City's RHNA numbers were, and Mr. St. Paul responded he would find out and email the information to the Committee Members.

Mr. Barquist explained to the Committee the quick pace of the Housing Element process, and stated there would be two meetings, March 10, 2008 and April 7, 2008, in which to complete. Chair Stopper suggested an additional meeting may need to be added on March 24, 2008 to complete the process.

Public hearing open.

There was no one from the public who wished to speak.

Public hearing closed.

## General Plan Structure

Mr. Barquist provided an overview of the General Plan structure and discussed the elements which were required by law, as well as those elements which were optional. In addition, Mr. Barquist defined "goal", "policy", and "program", and provided examples of translating a theme into policy.

Member Bennett did not believe the workshops were representative of Fullerton as a whole, and asked staff when the unbiased telephone survey would be conducted. Mr. St. Paul stated staff was working with RBF and Cal State Fullerton (CSUF) to finalize the questions, and the survey should be ready in approximately one month. CUSF would conduct the survey, and make 400-500 calls, over the course of two weeks. It was anticipated the results would be available by the time the GPAC completed the Housing Element.

Member Haley asked the status of the Coyote Hills project, and Director Godlewski responded that the environmental document was almost complete, but it would be several months before an application was submitted.

Member Buck asked if the Committee could create an element that was not listed for inclusion in the General Plan, and Mr. Barquist responded it was up to local discretion. Chair Stopped stated the City Council had added a Bicycle Element. Mr. St. Paul commented if the Committee believed an element should be added, they could add it, subject to the approval of the Planning Commission and City Council.

Public hearing opened.

Judith Kaluzny asked for clarification on the purpose of the unbiased survey. She wanted to know if the information gathered at the charettes would be disregarded in favor of the survey responses. She questioned the purpose of the holding the charettes if the survey responses would hold precedence.

Member Bennett believed the intent of the survey was to determine how much interest the community had in a particular topic. Chair Stopper believed all information collected would be combined into the General Plan update, not just some of the information.

Denny Bean again discussed Coyote Hills, and informed the Committee of the signatures that had been collected by the Friends of Coyote Hills. He offered to provide these signatures to the Committee.

Katy Dalton, was please to hear the information gathered would be treated equally. She believed the people who had attended the charettes were actively involved in the community, and it would be good to have a broad perspective. She encouraged the GPAC to add an element to address preservation on a larger scale, not just as it related to housing.

Public hearing closed.

## AGENDA FORECAST

The next regularly scheduled GPAC meeting will occur at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, March 10, 2008. Subsequent meetings will occur at 7:00 p.m. on April 14, May 12, and June 9, 2008.

## STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Senior Planner St. Paul reminded the Committee of upcoming meetings, the Housing Element workshop on February 20, 2008, and the possibility of an additional GPAC meeting being added on March 24, 2008, if needed.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 8:57 p.m.



## POLICE DEPARTMENT MURAL ROOM

MONDAY MARCH 10, 2008 \_ \_ 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:02 p.m.

**PRESENT:** GPAC Members Bennett, Bushala, Durrette, Fitzgerald, Griffin, Haley,

Harrell (arrived at 7:09 p.m.), Heusser (arrived at 7:20 p.m.), Jaramillo,

Lambros, Richmond, Savage, and Stopper

**ABSENT:** Excused: GPAC Members Batinich and Buck

Unexcused: None

STAFF PRESENT: Director Godlewski, Senior Planner St. Paul, Housing Programs

Supervisor Morad, Administrative Assistant Pasillas

**CONSULTANT** 

PRESENT:

RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist, RBF Community

Planner Michelle Kou

**FLAG SALUTE:** Chair Stopper

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Richmond, SECONDED by

Committee Member Haley, and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present, and with Members Fitzgerald, Griffin, Lambros, and Savage abstaining, that the Minutes of the February 11, 2008 meeting

be APPROVED as written.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist gave an overview of the Housing Element workshops that were held on February 20, 2008, and RBF Community Planner Michelle Kou provided details on the information derived from the workshops.

Chair Stopper asked if the themes that had come up were typical similar to those in the surrounding cities, and whether anything obvious was missing or added. Mr. Barquist explained the themes were in line with the surrounding cities, with quality of life and sustainability appearing to be important topics. The theme of education appeared to be more prominent in Fullerton.

Vice Chair Griffin asked if overcrowding, garage conversions, and lack of property maintenance would be addressed through the Housing Element, and Mr. Barquist responded that overcrowding must be addressed in the Housing Element, although the solution may be stated simply, such as "active Code Enforcement".

Member Bennett asked about the RHNA numbers, and Mr. Barquist provided an overview of the RHNA allocations and what would be required. He also explained that the City would be required to review the number of units required on the last General Plan and what was actually completed.

Member Lambros asked if both sale and rental units counted and Mr. Barquist responded affirmatively. Member Lambros then asked if the City would be given credit for housing stock produced in 2006-2008, and Mr. Barquist responded credit would be given.

Member Haley asked when units were counted and Mr. Barquist stated they were officially counted when occupancy was given.

Member Lambros asked if an assisted living facility would be counted, and Director Godlewski clarified that student housing, assisted living and hospital beds did not count towards meeting this requirement.

Member Durrette asked how a one person household would fit in and Mr. Barquist explained a dwelling unit was one roof top.

Vice-Chair Griffin reiterated his comment on the community's concerns in regards to garage conversions and rental property conditions and asked if those concerns would be addressed as a sub-category. Mr. Barquist stated the Housing Element could have a sub-category such as "Code Enforcement" to cover this type of concern.

Mr. Barquist provided a summary review of the State's requirements for the Housing Element. He also briefly discussed SB 520, AB 2348, and AB 2634 and advised the Committee he would provide these documents to staff for inclusion on the City's website. Staff would be providing the Committee with a copy of the existing Housing Element Goals and Policies and Mr. Barquist urged the Committee to read these documents and become familiar with them as they would be used at the next meeting.

The Committee discussed inclusion of "indigent" homeless, and Housing Programs Supervisor Morad informed the Committee of the upcoming Kennedy Commission workshop on April 3, 2008, at which they would discuss policy for counting the homeless population. Mr. St. Paul indicated he would scan the invitation and email it to the GPAC Members.

Public hearing opened.

Judith Kaluzny commented on the infill development around the Transportation Center. She believed the infill conflicted with the quality of life, and there was a need for balance.

Linda Tang, Kennedy Commission, discussed the April 3, 2008 workshop at which they hoped to identify what numbers to use when accounting for the homeless.

Public hearing closed.

## **AGENDA FORECAST**

The next regularly scheduled GPAC meeting will occur at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, April 14, 2008. Subsequent meetings will occur at 7:00 p.m. on May 12, and June 9, 2008. Discussion was held

regarding a special meeting to be held on April 21 or 28 if it was need to complete the Housing Element on time.

## STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Members Haley and Savage would not be attending the April 14, 2008 meeting.

Member Durette stressed the importance of completing the Housing Element in a timely manner so as not to hold up the process.

Mr. St. Paul informed the Committee of the March 18, 2008 "Sustainability 101" presentation that would be made at the City Council meeting and invited the Members to attend.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 8:47 p.m.



## POLICE DEPARTMENT MURAL ROOM

MONDAY APRIL 14, 2008 \_ 7:07 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7: p.m.

PRESENT: GPAC Members Batinich, Buck, Bushala, Fitzgerald, Griffin, Harrell, Heusser

(arrived at 7:22 p.m.), Lambros, Richmond, Savage and Stopper

Excused: GPAC Members Bennett, Durrette, Haley and Jaramillo

**ABSENT:** Unexcused:

STAFF PRESENT: Director Godlewski, Senior Planner St. Paul, Housing Programs Assistant

Chavez, Administrative Assistant Pasillas

**CONSULTANT** RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist, RBF Community Planner

PRESENT: Michelle Kou

**FLAG SALUTE:** Chair Stopper

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Savage, SECONDED by Committee

Member Fitzgerald, and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present,

that the Minutes of the March 10, 2008 meeting be APPROVED as written.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

No one from the public wished to speak.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Senior Planner St. Paul opened the discussion and explained the various documents the Committee had been provided. RBF Principal Community Planner Barquist provided definitions of some of the terms used within these documents.

RBF Community Planner Kou provided a summary of the Major Themes that had been derived from the community outreach meetings and reviewed the Needs Analysis, Resources and Constraints Analysis, Review of Past Performance, and the Policy Framework.

After Committee discussion on the Policy Areas, the consensus of the Committee was to make the following additions/deletions:

- Under "New Production" include comment (2) "Land Use, Location and Linkages".
- Under "Conservation and Rehabilitation" include comment (8) "Policy Development and Planning".
- Under "Design and Livability" include "existing and new housing".

 Under "Access to Housing Opportunities" include comment (1) "Housing Availability and Affordability", and comment (9) "Funding and Partnership Opportunities". Also include the topic of "providing rental assistance".

After Committee discussion on the Policy Discussion Areas, the consensus of the Committee was to make the following additions/deletions:

- Under "Housing Availability and Affordability" add "very low" and "extremely low" to "Family Housing for low income".
- Under "Land Use, Location and Linkages" add "locating childcare opportunities near multi-family housing".
- Under "Redevelopment and Infill" change "Encourage 2<sup>nd</sup> unit development" to "opportunity for 2<sup>nd</sup> unit development where appropriate".

The Committee agreed to continue the discussion of Policy Discussion Areas, beginning with "Special Needs Groups" at their next meeting.

Public hearing opened.

Linda Tang, Kennedy Commission, commented that is was not necessary to mandate developers build childcare facilities, but suggested a policy to encourage development of childcare facilities near housing.

Jane Reiffer linked housing to childcare in the way that housing was linked to employment. She also would like to include other "necessary conveniences", such as neighborhood markets, pharmacies, etc. so that people did not have to drive for everyday necessities.

Wanda Schaffer stated that childcare was needed to assist single moms who work, or were going to school or other training in order to get off of welfare.

Judith Kaluzny commented on the amount of money spent to "socialize" the downtown area, and the ongoing costs to the City, yet concern was being expressed with "socializing" childcare. She questioned the priorities of the City.

Public hearing closed.

Member Lambros clarified that the Committee was not saying they did not value childcare, but that it should be addressed on an incentive basis rather than mandated.

## **AGENDA FORECAST**

An additional GPAC meeting was scheduled for Monday, April 21, 2008 at 7:00 p.m. The next regularly scheduled GPAC meeting will occur at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, May 12, 2008. A subsequent meeting will occur at 7:00 p.m. on June 9, 2008,

## STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

None.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 9:16 p.m.



## POLICE DEPARTMENT MURAL ROOM

MONDAY APRIL 21, 2008 \_ 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:03 p.m.

**PRESENT:** GPAC Members Batinich, Bennett, Buck (left at 7:42 p.m.), Durrette, Fitzgerald,

Griffin, Harrell, Haley, Heusser (arrived at 7:18 p.m.), Jaramillo, Lambros

(arrived at 7:08 p.m.), Richmond and Stopper

**ABSENT:** Excused: GPAC Members Bushala and Savage

Unexcused: None

STAFF PRESENT: Director Godlewski, Senior Planner St. Paul, Housing Programs Assistant

Chavez, Administrative Assistant Pasillas

**CONSULTANT** 

PRESENT:

RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist, RBF Community Planner

Michelle Kou

FLAG SALUTE: Chair Stopper

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Richmond, SECONDED by Committee

Member Jaramillo, and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present and with Members Bennett, Durrette, and Haley abstaining, that the Minutes of the

April 14, 2008 meeting be APPROVED as written.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Judith Kaluzny informed the Committee that tomorrow, April 22, 2008, was Earth Day.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Chair Stopper requested staff provide an explanation as to the impact a new policy would have on City staff. Director Godlewski explained the two documents staff relied on; the General Plan which established the City's goals, and the Zoning Code which was used to implement those goals. A General Plan which had general goals and policies was best for staff to work with.

Senior Planner St. Paul opened the discussion and reviewed the previous meetings discussion on the first three items of Handout B – Policy Discussion Areas.

After Committee discussion on the remaining Policy Areas, the consensus of the Committee was to make the following additions/deletions:

- Under "Land Use, Location and Linkages" remove "Childcare with housing" and add "childcare opportunities and non-profits" under "Housing with Amenities".
- Under "Special Needs Groups" include "senior housing" and "social disability" with the "Other Special Needs".

- Under "Governmental Constraints and Incentives" make the following changes:
  - o Remove "Flexible zoning", "First time homebuyer program", "Fee scale for infrastructure", and "Inclusionary Housing Program".
  - Move "Good designs for high rises" and "Set high standards for architectural design" to the Land Use Element
  - Combine "Fee/processing waivers and/or concessions" and "Menu of incentives for developers" into one item.
  - Add "Continue to explore buyer-assisted mortgage opportunities".
- Move "Sustainable Design" out of the Housing Element and locate in another element.
- Under "Housing Conditions" make the following changes:
  - o Change "Rehab of existing multi-family" to "Rehab of existing housing units".
  - o Change "How to deal with overcrowding" to "Investigate reasons for overcrowding".
  - Remove "Address displacement"
  - o Combine "Affordability covenants with rehabbed units", "Rehab loan programs", "Neighborhood based programs", and "Rehab of hotel/motel for residential uses".
- Under "Policy Development and Planning make the following changes:
  - o Under "Policy for mixed income development" add "...in a new master-planned community".
  - Add an item "Encourage home ownership
- Under "Funding and Partnership Opportunities" make the following changes:
  - o Under "Focus on local service organization participation" and "Joint venture with SCUF/Large Employers" add "...on a case-by-case basis" to both.
  - Remove "Balance underwriting of market with natural market dynamics" and replace with "Encourage staff to continue to watch market dynamics and provide education to homeowners".

Public comments opened.

Beverly Shubert, Childcare Connections, urged the Committee to include "Childcare appropriately colocated with affordable housing" as an item. She believed that childcare near housing would allow parents to work and become self-sufficient.

Linda Tang, Kennedy Commission, wanted the Committee to look at housing opportunities for all income levels. She did not believe the City was meeting the needs for the low and extremely low income groups.

Public comments closed.

## **AGENDA FORECAST**

The next regularly scheduled GPAC meeting will occur at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, May 12, 2008. A subsequent meeting will occur at 7:00 p.m. on June 9, 2008,

#### STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Mr. St. Paul stated staff would provide the Committee with a Draft Housing Policy in approximately two weeks, and encouraged the Committee to review the document prior to the next meeting.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 9:23 p.m.



## POLICE DEPARTMENT MURAL ROOM

MONDAY MAY 12, 2008 \_ 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:04 p.m.

**PRESENT:** GPAC Members Batinich, Bennett, Durrette, Fitzgerald, Griffin, Harrell,

Haley, Heusser (arrived at 7:25 p.m.), Jaramillo, Lambros (arrived at

7:09 p.m.), Richmond, Savage and Stopper

**ABSENT:** Excused: GPAC Members Buck and Bushala

Unexcused: None

STAFF PRESENT: Director Godlewski, Senior Planner St. Paul, Housing Programs

Supervisor Morad, Administrative Assistant Pasillas

CONSULTANT PRESENT:

RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist, RBF Community

Planner Michelle Kou

FLAG SALUTE: Chair Stopper

MINUTES: MOTION made by Vice Chair Griffin, SECONDED by Committee

Member Bennett, and CARRIED unanimously by voting members present, and with Member Savage abstaining, that the Minutes of the

April 21, 2008 meeting be APPROVED as written.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

 Denny Bean provided the Committee Members a handout and discussed Coyote Hills History.

- Zoot Velasco urged the Committee to address increasing tourism within the City during the update process.
- Jane Rands requested an opportunity to address the Committee on the Housing Element prior to any final decisions being made.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Senior Planner St. Paul opened the discussion and reviewed the Draft Housing Policy Program. He explained that the Committee was to review the document and make any changes they would like made prior to the document going to the Planning Commission.

Chair Stopper led the Committee through each Policy item, and asked for feedback or comments.

Public comments.

The following comments were made after Policy Action 3.1:

- Jane Rand spoke of the need to use strong language, i.e. mandate or require rather than encourage, in the Policy Themes.
- Linda Tang commented that the past performance report indicated that the City had not met its previous goals, and the Committee needed to address these goals.

The following comments were made at the end of the GPAC's discussion:

- Jane Rand again addressed the need for strong language. She also discussed the need
  to keep jobs in the City, and commented that non-residential land could be open space
  and she did not want it converted to residential use.
- Matt Leslie discussed the importance of water efficiency, also agreed with the Committee's decision to remove sustainability from the Housing Element.
- Judith Kaluzny discussed in-fill development and the claustrophobic feeling it would create, particularly in the downtown area.
- Jane Reifer spoke of the need to keep balance between jobs and housing in the City, and also urged the Committee to not let new housing take over the historical areas.
- Linda Tang asked if the public would be able to review the draft before the Planning Commission made their decision, and Mr. St. Paul responded the draft would be placed on the City website when the Planning Commission agenda was posted.

After Committee discussion on the Housing Element Policy Program, the consensus of the Committee was to make the following additions/deletions:

- Remove Policy Theme Area F: Sustainable Design
- Policy Action 1.1: Change last sentence to read "Adequate sites at 30 du/ac shall be provided to accommodate affordable units.
- Policy Action 1.3: In the first sentence add the word "affordable" prior to "housing development". In the second sentence, after "...programs and procedures", the sentence will change to "...to identify methods by which low, very low, and moderate housing developments could be processed in a more expeditious manner".
- Policy Action 1.4: Remove "Encourage and" from the title. In the fourth sentence, remove "encourage and", and end the sentence after "...appropriate sites".
- Policy Action 1.5: In the title, change "Encourage" to "Facilitate". In the second sentence remove "encourage and". In the third sentence change "encourage" to "facilitate"
- Policy Action 1.8: In the second sentence, add "as appropriate" after "the City shall encourage".
- Policy Action 1.9: In the second sentence, change "...are commonly limited with fixed incomes..." to "...generally have limited resources...".
- Remove Policy Action 1.10 Housing for Special Needs
- Policy Action 1.12: In the first section change "is" to "its".
- Policy Action 1.16: Support Community housing Development Organization (CHDO) Projects should be Policy Action 1.14... In two locations change "CHDO\*s" to "CHDO's".
- Policy Action 1.15: Change "...development second units." to "...development of second units."
- Policy Action 2.1: In the second sentence, change "...continue preservation..." to "...continued preservation..."
- Policy Action 2.2: in the title change "Pro-Active" to "Proactive", and add "Areas" after "Housing". Remove extra periods at end of paragraph.

- Policy Action 2.5: In the first sentence, after "...housing quality,..." add "condition and use", and remove "the continued quality of".
- Policy Action 2.7: In the first sentence, correct the spelling of "Richmond Park" to "Richman Park".
- Remove Policy Action 2.8 Encourage Sustainability and Green Building Practices (energy efficiency addressed in Policy Action 3.1)
- Policy Action 2.9: In the first sentence, change "families" to "households", and reword/clarify the paragraph by adding "if Redevelopment or Federal funds are involved" and "where required by law".
- Remove Policy Action 3.2 Encourage Mixed-Income Development (duplication of Policy Action 1.6).
- Policy Action 3.3: In first sentence, change "...housing cause undue..." to "...housing causes undue...". The GPAC requested staff to add additional wording at the end of the paragraph by adding "and reduce..."
- Remove Policy Action 3.4 Consideration of Child Care
- Policy Action 3.5: In the first sentence, change "...understands the quality..." to "...understands that quality..."
- Policy Action 3.6: In the first sentence, change "...housing develops to encourage..." to "...housing developers to encourage..."
- Policy Action 4.1: In the title, change "Continued Monitoring Housing Units..." to "Continued Monitoring of Housing Units..." In the first and second sentences, change "...142 deed-restricted..." to "...existing deed-restricted..."
- Policy Action 4.2: In the first sentence, change "...and guarantee the rights..." to "...and guaranteeing the rights..."

MOTION by Committee Member Durrette to accept the Policy Statements as modified and forward them to the Planning Commission, SECONDED by Committee Member Fitzgerald, and CARRIED unanimously by Members present.

## AGENDA FORECAST

The next regularly scheduled GPAC meeting will occur at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, July 14, 2008.

## STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Mr. St Paul advised the Committee that the June meeting would be cancelled to allow staff time to work on the next element. He asked the Committee if they would be interested in scheduling a meeting for July to hear a presentation on sustainability presented by Bruce Hostetter, and it was the consensus of the Committee that they would like to hear Mr. Hostetter's presentation, along with any similar presentations from differing views.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 10:06 p.m.



## POLICE DEPARTMENT MURAL ROOM

MONDAY JULY 14, 2008 \_ 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:06 p.m.

PRESENT: GPAC Members Bennett, Buck, Fitzgerald, Griffin, Harrell, Haley,

Heusser, Jaramillo, Lambros (arrived at 7:11 p.m.), and Stopper

Excused: GPAC Members Batinich, Bushala, Durrette, Richmond,

ABSENT: Savage

Unexcused: None

STAFF PRESENT: Director Godlewski, Senior Planner St. Paul, Administrative Assistant

**Pasillas** 

CONSULTANT PRESENT:

None

**FLAG SALUTE:** Chair Stopper

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Haley, SECONDED by

Committee Member Harrell, and CARRIED unanimously by voting members present that the Minutes of the May 12, 2008 meeting be

APPROVED as written.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### Sustainability 101 - Presentation by Bruce Hostetter

Mr. Hostetter, representing the Orange County Chapter of the U.S. Green Building Council, and a citizen of Fullerton, provided the Committee with information on what "sustainability" meant, and how it could be applied throughout the City. He suggested ways the Committee could incorporate the idea of sustainability in the General Plan, and answered questions from the Committee Members and the public.

## Outline of remaining General Plan update process.

Senior Planner St. Paul discussed the next steps in the General Plan Update process and answered the following questions from the Committee and the public:

- Chair Stopper questioned when the elements to be included in the General Plan would be decided, and Director Godlewski responded it would be approximately six months. Staff and the consultant, RBF, were currently reviewing the information gathered at the previous GPAC meetings, as well as the public meetings that had been held.
- Member Haley asked if staff had received comments back from Housing & Community Development (HCD) on the Housing Element which has been submitted. Mr. St. Paul responded that they had not received any comments, and explained HCD had received the report in early July and had 60 days to respond. Staff did not anticipate receiving comments until September 2008.
- Member Buck asked when the results of the telephone survey would be available, and Mr. St. Paul stated Cal State Fullerton (CSUF) was currently compiling the information and developing the report.
- Katie Dalton, a member of the public, urged the Committee to add Historic Preservation
  as an element in the General Plan, and asked how she should proceed to continue urge
  the Committee in this directions. Chair Stopper responded to Ms. Dalton and
  encouraged her to continue speaking at GPAC meetings, along with speaking to staff
  and the City Council.
- Member Buck asked how the decision would be made as to which Elements to include in the General Plan, and Director Godlewski explained that staff and the Committee would look at each topic and decide if it fit in under one of the required Elements, or if they needed to create a separate Element.
- Matt Leslie, a member of the public, asked when the Bicycle Element survey results would be available, and Mr. St. Paul explained that the survey was still open, but would be closed soon and the results compiled.

#### Finalize Vision Statement (as time permits)

Mr. St. Paul introduced the Revised Draft Vision Statement, and the Committee discussed the "Sustainability" bullet-point.

After discussion, the consensus of the Committee was to separate "Sustainability - economic and environment" into two, separate bullets. The Economic Sustainability bullet would read as follows:

Economic Sustainability - It is essential to the future we envision that our local economy remain strong.

MOTION by Committee Member Haley, SECONDED by Committee Member Buck to use the following sentence for Environmental Sustainability:

Environmental sustainability will be pursued through the adoption of up-to-date environmental policies to ensure the present and future generations live healthier lives and do not inherit costly, energy-inefficient systems and structures.

Motion FAILED TO PASS with a vote of 5-5.

The following members of the public spoke:

- Susan Petrella agreed with the separation of economic and environmental sustainability.
   She also would like to see a stronger statement on the arts and cultural community in the Vision Statement.
- Matt Leslie liked the statement proposed by Member Haley, but suggested adding "polluting" after "energy-inefficient".
- Ginger Brett like the separation of economic and environmental sustainability, but would like to see the Committee make a stronger statement and use "will be reflected in" instead of adoption.
- Gene Hiegel suggested staff type the changes to the Vision Statement as they were being made by the Committee, so all could view the changes.

After Committee discussion, the following motion was made.

MOTION by Committee Member Fitzgerald, SECONDED by Committee Member Bennett to use the following sentence for Environmental Sustainability:

Environmental sustainability will be reflected in the use of up-to-date environmental policies to ensure the present and future generations live healthier lives and do not inherit costly, energy-inefficient systems and structures.

Motion CARRIED 8-1, with Member Buck abstaining.

## AGENDA FORECAST

The next regularly scheduled GPAC meeting will occur at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, August 25, 2008 at the Fullerton Library. Possible dates for future meetings were discussed, and Mr. St. Paul suggested September 29, November 3, and December 8.

## STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Member Heusser believed that the City's connection regionally had been left out of the General Plan, and urged the Committee to address the topic during future discussions.

Member Fitzgerald requested Chair Stopper allow comments from the public prior to any decision being made by the Committee.

Director Godlewski informed the Committee that a new Planning Manager, Al Zilenka from RBF, had been hired, and would begin working for the City on July 28, 2008.

#### <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 9: p.m.



## POLICE DEPARTMENT MURAL ROOM

MONDAY AUGUST 25, 2008 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:04 p.m.

PRESENT: GPAC Members Batinich, Bennett, Buck, Bushala, Durrette, Griffin,

Haley, Harrell, Heusser, Jaramillo, Richmond, Savage, and Stopper

**ABSENT:** Excused: GPAC Members Fitzgerald and Lambros

Unexcused: None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Director Godlewski, Senior Planner St. Paul, Administrative Assistant

Pasillas

**CONSULTANT** RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist and RBF

**PRESENT:** Community Planner Michelle Kou

FLAG SALUTE: Chair Stopper

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Haley, SECONDED by

Committee Member Harrell, and CARRIED unanimously, with Committee Member Savage abstaining, that the Minutes of the July

14, 2008 meeting be APPROVED as written.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### General Plan Update Schedule

RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist reviewed the anticipated GPAC schedule, from the current meeting through City Council approval in January 2010. Mr. Barquist also advised the Committee of comments that had been received from the State on the Housing Element. RBF was currently working on responses to those comments, and would provide a revised version of the Housing Element, along with the State comments and City's responses, to the Committee at its next meeting.

Discussion was held regarding the presentation of the Housing Element to the Planning Commission, and why a lined out version was provided to the Commission rather than the final document. It was the consensus of the Committee that only the final document should move forward, and appendices could be provided with the various drafts. Director Godlewski explained that the document staff had originally presented to the GPAC was intended to meet

GPAC Minutes August 25, 2008

State law, and that document had been provided to the Planning Commission to help them better understand the thought process and how the changes were made.

Public Comments.

Katie Dalton stated it would be helpful to have a GPAC discussion prior to presentation of the Updated General Plan to the Planning Commission.

Denny Bean suggested staff type in individual edits to items being discussed so that when Committee discussion was complete a final version would be available.

After general discussion, no action was taken.

## General Plan Structure

Mr. Barquist distributed a General Plan Guidelines CD to the Committee, and discussed the guidelines, and the structure that would be followed during the update process.

Public Comments.

Katie Dalton asked when the appropriate time would be to push for a separate Historic Preservation Element, and Director Godlewski responded the table of contents for the General Plan would be addressed at the September 29, 2008 meeting.

After general discussion, no action was taken.

## Finalize Vision Statement

Staff provided the Committee with the most recent draft of the Vision Statement, and Member Bennett also provided a draft copy that he believed reflected where the Committee had left off.

After Committee discussion and modifications, the following motion was made.

MOTION by Committee Member Bennett, SECONDED by Vice Chairman Griffin that the following would be the Vision Statement of the General Plan:

## I. Our City

Fullerton is a city with a small-town feel, a culturally and ethnically diverse population, and a strong sense of community. We cherish our history while welcoming newcomers and being invigorated by them.

Since its beginnings as an agricultural economy built on citrus production and rail transportation, settlers have created distinctive neighborhoods that reflect different eras in this region's growth. Fullerton's hills and flatlands are now covered with family homes, schools and parks in place of orange groves, but our original town site, with its mature trees and thoughtfully preserved historic structures, still points to our legacy.

Today our small-town feel is preserved in a 21st -century city that provides the best in economic diversity, higher education, health services, arts and culture. Our residents value their active, healthy lifestyle and the environmental attributes and resources that support it.

This is Fullerton's heritage.

#### II. Our Vision

Based on our shared heritage and community values, the following statement expresses our aspirations for the next decade and beyond to enhance quality of life for all.

## Fullerton will be a city which:

- values and provides quality public safety services including emergency services, crime prevention and hazard mitigation
- enjoys a vibrant economy, benefiting from its education community resources and its diverse business base
- encourages economic diversity and creation of new jobs
- encourages growth in its tax base to support our city services and ensure adequate infrastructure
- has an increasing choice of accessible, affordable and desirable housing options which enables our children, workforce families and young professionals to make their homes here, and our seniors to remain here
- is committed to environmental sustainability in planning design, policy and practice
- values and protects its heritage; strives to preserve historic buildings and neighborhoods; embraces high aesthetic standards for new architecture and urban design
- encourages civic participation by the full spectrum of its community and reflects its concerns in official planning and decision-making
- offers a variety of transportation options
- supports community health with recreational resources, well-maintained parks, preserved open spaces, and public programs to encourage healthy lifestyles
- preserves its character by supporting community efforts dedicated to cultural activities, civic engagement, social concerns, health and safety issues, and other aspects of our quality of life; and
- maximizes its resources through joint planning with other agencies and jurisdictions.

## III. Our Guiding Principles

The following principles, derived from our vision for Fullerton, will guide our General Plan process. They are touchstones for our Plan's goals, strategies and policies. As guidelines and points of reference, they tie actions to aspirations.

- Change will be harmonized with the elements of Fullerton's history and character that we value.
- Growth will be considered in the context of community needs and its contribution to our quality of life.
- Economic Sustainability It is essential to the future we envision that our local economy remain strong.
- Environmental Sustainability will be reflected in the use of up-to-date environmental
  policies to ensure the present and future generations live healthier lives and do not
  inherit costly, resource-inefficient systems and structures.

GPAC Minutes August 25, 2008

- Mobility options of every kind will be of prime consideration in the planning of buildings, streets and paths, traffic patterns, and development of the transit center.
- Balance and equity will be sought in business development, in points of view considered in our planning processes, in housing inventory that serves all of our community, in civic participation, and in decisions that could affect aspects of our quality of life.
- Our identity as an education community and a city with distinctive neighborhoods, heritage and culture will be reinforced in plans and programs that affect how we view ourselves and are viewed by others.

Motion CARRIED unanimously.

#### STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Senior Planner St. Paul informed the Committee that staff would be meeting with representatives of the various schools in the City to see what their needs were in regards to the Bicycle Element.

Mr. St Paul had received the results of the telephone survey, but had not yet reviewed them; therefore the results would be presented to the Committee at the next meeting. Member Buck urged staff to release the results as soon as possible.

Public Comments.

Shirley Gregg asked why the interviews had been conducted in English and Spanish, but not Korean, and Mr. St Paul responded that Korean translators were available if needed. Ginger Britt stated there were 64 languages available through the survey center.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 9:25 p.m.



#### **FULLERTON MAIN LIBRARY, OSBORNE ROOM**

MONDAY SEPTEMBER 29, 2008 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:10 p.m.

PRESENT: GPAC Members Bennett (left at 9:15 p.m.), Buck, Bushala (arrived at

7:26 p.m.), Griffin, Haley, Heusser, Jaramillo, Lambros (arrived at 7:18

p.m.), Savage, and Stopper

ABSENT:

Excused: GPAC Members Batinich, Durrette, Fitzgerald, Harrell, and

Richmond

Unexcused: None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Planning Manager Zelinka, Senior Planner St. Paul, Administrative

Assistant Pasillas

**CONSULTANT** RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist and RBF

**PRESENT:** Community Planner Michelle Kou

FLAG SALUTE: Chair Stopper

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Savage, SECONDED by

Committee Member Bennett, and CARRIED unanimously, that the Minutes of the August 25, 2008 meeting be APPROVED as written.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Denny Bean spoke on the need to add "English only" to the City's signage Code. Al Zelinka, Planning Manager, commented that the Code was silent in terms of language, and Chair Stopper requested staff consult the City Attorney to see if it could be changed to require "English only".

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### CSUF General Plan Telephone Survey Results

The general consensus of the Committee was that the survey appeared to be a good representation of the people in the City and their views on the topics surveyed. There were no big surprises, and it would be good for the Members to keep these results in mind when working on the General Plan Update.

Member Heusser asked how the people contacted for the survey compared with the actual population of the City, and Senior Planner St. Paul explained that the CSUF Survey Center had used scientific methods to complete the survey.

GPAC Minutes September 29, 2008

Chair Stopper believed that community meetings tended to attract activists, and these survey results were closer to a sample of the general population.

Public Comments.

No one from the public wished to comment on this topic.

After general discussion, no action was taken.

#### City responses to HCD Draft Housing Element comments

Dave Barquist, RBF Principal Community Planner, reviewed the comments that had been received from the State, and the responses that had been provided by the City. The spirit and intent of the Housing Element that had originally been submitted to the State remained; the responses merely added clarification.

A question was asked about the wording of the response in Policy Action 1.1, and Michelle Kou, RBF Community Planner, explained that staff planned to reword the section to add more clarity.

Vice Chair Griffin suggested adding language encouraging the identification of grant opportunities to Policy Actions 1.6 and 1.7. Staff and the Committee agreed with the suggestion.

Discussion was held regarding Policy Action 4.4, and whether it was necessary to specify zones, could it be changed to commercial zones, could they just say "residential" or "commercial" zones. Mr. Barquist explained the zoning listed would need to accommodate the housing requirements if a developer wanted to build; the City was not required to actually build the housing.

Public Comments.

After general discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee to accept staff's comments, with the changes mentioned above.

#### Working draft of General Plan Land Use Focus Areas

Mr. St. Paul explained the Draft Land Use Focus Areas map that was provided to the Members. Staff was requesting the Members to look at the map and the questionnaire, and return the completed questionnaire to staff prior to the October 29, 2008 meeting. Mr. Zelinka additionally explained that the provided map was a starting point and staff was looking for input from the Committee and community, and then would use the information to develop land use alternatives, specific plans, etc.

No one from the public wished to comment on this topic.

After general discussion, no action was taken.

#### Community Open House - October 29, 2008 - Senior Center

Mr. St. Paul invited the Committee Members to the Community Open House where the Land Use Focus Areas would be further explored with people from the community.

#### **Public Comments**

Janet McNeil questioned how the public would be invited to the Community Open House, and Mr. St. Paul responded that he would contact schools, churches, post in on the City's website and the cable channel. He also asked the Committee and public for any other suggestions they may have.

Ginger Britt commented on the long lead time needed by the schools to disseminate information.

Kathy Dalton asked when the Committee would be talking about specific topics, such as historic preservation.

Matt Leslie expressed concern with the amount of public outreach being done, and suggested advertising at the train station.

Mr. St. Paul explained the many ways he had tried to get public involvement. Mr. Zelinka commented that the broader the issue, the harder it was to get the public involved. When a discussion was project specific, the public usually got involved.

#### **AGENDA FORECAST**

The next regularly scheduled General Plan Advisory Committee meeting will be November 3, 2008 at 7:00 p.m. A meeting is also scheduled for November 17, 2008.

#### STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Mr. St. Paul and Mr. Zelinka discussed the General Plan organization and the need to make it an integrated plan that would be used by all departments, not just the Planning Department. Mr. St. Paul reviewed the GPAC's anticipated schedule.

Mr. Zelinka explained that the Community Development Department had been working on creating a vision statement for their Department. This statement would be used during performance evaluations and employees would be able to demonstrate how they had contributed towards the department's vision.

Chair Stopper expressed a desire to have a meeting in early 2009, and it was decided a meeting would be scheduled at the November 3, 2008 GPAC meeting.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 9:35 p.m.



# MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE FULLERTON MAIN LIBRARY, OSBORNE ROOM

MONDAY NOVEMBER 3, 2008 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:10 p.m.

PRESENT: GPAC Members Buck, Griffin, Haley, Harrell, Heusser, Lambros

(arrived at 7:20 p.m.), Richmond, Savage, and Stopper

ABSENT: Excused: GPAC Members Batinich, Bennett, Bushala, Durrette,

Fitzgerald, and Jaramillo

Unexcused: None

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Manager Zelinka, Senior Planner St. Paul, Administrative

**Assistant Pasillas** 

**CONSULTANT** RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist and RBF

**PRESENT:** Community Planner Michelle Kou

**FLAG SALUTE:** Chair Stopper

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Savage, SECONDED by

Committee Member Heusser, and CARRIED unanimously, that the Minutes of the September 29, 2008 meeting be APPROVED as

written.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

No one from the public wished to speak at this time.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Senior Planner St. Paul introduced the discussion; staff and the consultants were requesting the Committee's input regarding the Draft Land Use Focus Areas. Comments received at the Land Use Futures Open House were also provided to the Committee.

Member Savage suggested the addition of a separate Focus Area that would include the creeks, or including them in their respective Focus Areas.

#### Focus Area A - Airport Industrial

The following comments were received from the Committee:

- Maintain large lots, across all industrial areas.
- Maintain industrial integrity do not allow other uses.

#### GPAC Minutes November 3, 2008

- Currently hangars with non-airport related uses this shouldn't be allowed.
- How much is Fullerton Airport utilized in comparison to other similar airports?
- Eastern area, further away from the airport, is less influenced by the airport.
- Compatibility of uses in the eastern area better for airplanes to fly over current industrial uses rather than residential.
- Air easements over eastern areas may affect uses.
- Maximum population in area for safety reason.
- Bicycle and pedestrian usage multimodal.
- Important to keep the airport.
- Airport should be a financial asset to the City.
- Maximizing financial/economic considerations.

No one from the public wished to comment on this focus area.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee that this focus area should remain.

#### Focus Area B - Commonwealth Corridor

The following comments were received from the Committee:

- South side was deteriorating, lack of business, forgotten area.
- Transitioning from residential to office and personal services.
- Needs a common plan/theme across entire corridor.
- Concern for access in and out of businesses and parking lots.
- Narrow street.
- Add a trolley.
- Landscaping add a landscape median.
- Preservation of certain buildings important.
- Civic Center area is special.
- West of Euclid existing affordable housing and older apartments.
- Add Euclid, from the 91 freeway to Malvern to this area.

#### Public Comments:

- Unifying elements on Harbor and Commonwealth, i.e. street signs, lampposts, etc.
- Safe bicycle access on Commonwealth.
- Preserve the unique character of the area that includes, residential conversion to business opportunities for retail incubator spaces.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee that this focus area should remain.

#### Focus Area C – Orangethorpe Corridor Nodes

Member Buck asked the significance of the separate "nodes", and Planning Manager Zelinka explained that the area was characterized by small, local retail, and staff was looking at the relationship between the areas.

The following comments were received from the Committee:

#### GPAC Minutes November 3, 2008

- Magnolia and Orangethorpe new buildings going in.
- Brookhurst and Orangethorpe prioritize for reinvestment.
- Euclid and Orangethorpe need for focus.
- Current Redevelopment Area.
- Retail serving southwest area of the City.
- Keep the two "nodes" on the west and call them "Orangethorpe Nodes" and then create a
  new area which would include the "node" on the east, along with the corridor running
  along Euclid from the 91 freeway to Malvern.

#### **Public Comments:**

- Is the area commute oriented?
- Are businesses intended to enhance local neighborhood or to serve people traveling through the area?

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee that this focus area should remain.

#### Focus Area D – Harbor Gateway

Member Buck questioned why the residential area between Harbor and Lemon was included, and the area between Harbor and Highland had not been included, and Mr. Zelinka explained that the area between Harbor and Lemon had been included because of its link to the Transportation Center and pedestrian usage. After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee to remove the residential area between Harbor and Lemon from this focus area. The areas along Harbor and Lemon would remain.

The following comments were received from the Committee:

- Would like to see the entire Harbor corridor, from the 91 freeway up to the medical area, treated as a connected piece.
- Include the Civic Center with the Harbor corridor.
- Harbor defines the City.
- Tie all portions of Harbor together.
- Remove residential between Harbor and Lemon, or expand to include east and west residential neighborhoods.
- Lemon is an entry to the City from the freeway keep in focus area.

#### Public comment:

• If the General Plan was updated every ten years, and then reviewed every year, how secure would a homeowner or business be in its ongoing use?

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee that this focus area should remain.

In response to the public comment on this item, Mr. Zelinka explained that some items in the General Plan may require amending prior to the next ten year update. The State also required cities to review their General Plans each year.

Member Heusser asked what the purpose of the focus areas was, and why there was a need to have these separate areas identified. Mr. Zelinka clarified that the Focus Areas were not "walled

GPAC Minutes November 3, 2008

off" areas, but would identify the areas that were important to the City. These areas may be included in the General Plan as suggested study areas.

Concern was expressed by several Members that the addition of too many focus area would lead to no focus in any of the areas.

#### **AGENDA FORECAST**

The next regularly scheduled General Plan Advisory Committee meeting will be November 17, 2008 at 7:00 p.m.

#### STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Chair Stopper expressed a need to have the Committee review the Final Vision Statement as recommended by the GPAC, and the Land Use Focus Areas presentation prior to their being given to the Planning Commission and City Council.

Meetings were scheduled for February 9, 2009 and February 23, 2009.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 9:14 p.m.



MONDAY NOVEMBER 17, 2008 7:00 P.M.

**FULLERTON MAIN LIBRARY, OSBORNE ROOM** 

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:03 p.m.

PRESENT: GPAC Members Batinich, Bennett, Buck, Bushala, Durrette, Griffin,

Haley, Harrell, Heusser, Lambros, Richmond, Savage, and Stopper

ABSENT: Excused: GPAC Member Fitzgerald & Jaramillo

Unexcused: None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Community Development Director Godlewski, Planning Manager

Zelinka, Senior Planner St. Paul, Administrative Assistant Pasillas

CONSULTANT

PRESENT:

RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist and RBF

Community Planner Michelle Kou

FLAG SALUTE: Member Bushala

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Savage, SECONDED by

Committee Member Richmond, and CARRIED unanimously, that the Minutes of the November 3, 2008 meeting be APPROVED as

amended:

 Page 2, Focus Area B, Public Comments, third item – add "Preserve the unique character of the area that includes..."

 Page 3, Focus Area D, first paragraph – change to read "...area between Harbor and Lemon was included, and the area between Harbor and Highland was not included..."

 Page 4, Staff/Committee Communication – change to read "expressed a need..."

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Bob Stevenson provided the Committee with a letter that had been sent to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from the Friends of Coyote Hills, and briefly discussed the contents of the letter.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Planning Manager Zelinka explained the purpose of the discussion tonight, where the Committee was at in the update process, and how all the discussions would come together.

#### Focus Area E – Downtown

The following comments were received from the Committee:

- Commercial parcels on the east side of Harbor and the south side of Commonwealth –
  potential to include in Downtown area and not in Transportation Center area; character of
  these areas is more similar to Downtown.
- Move south boundary by Transportation Center to Santa Fe.
- South west corner by Harbor (old juice factory) potential to include this with the Transportation Center instead may be future parking for Transportation Center.
- Downtown issues of safety and security are not the same by the high school and college
   possibly remove these areas from the Downtown area.
- City has little control over the high school and college, may not be any value in putting these in the Downtown focus area.
- Density and activity level increase as Chapman crosses Berkeley characterizes the entrance to the Downtown keep in this focus area.
- Keeping schools in this focus area will focus intentional development across from the schools.
- Residential areas currently included in this area, potential to include residential area north of Chapman (Jacaranda area).
- Keep focal point at Commonwealth and Harbor and make focus area a radius from focal point.
- Potential to overlap focus areas (i.e. Downtown and Transportation Center).
- Linkage between Transportation Center, Civic Center, and Downtown need connections, mobility.
- Downtown should be a specific plan.
- Downtown focus area to include Transportation Center specific plan area since it will be approved prior to General Plan completion – allow for connections between the two areas.
- Pedestrian friendly is key to the Downtown.
- Set Downtown center as Harbor and Commonwealth intersection, look at pedestrianshed radius off of that point to define Downtown.
- High school and college taken into consideration because of pedestrian use and connections should include residential neighborhoods as well.
- Use Commonwealth corridor and ¼ mile from corridor.

#### The following comments were received from the public:

- Neighborhood northwest of Harbor/Chapman is becoming a young family neighborhood, and they are walking more to the Downtown. Include this area to increase pedestrianfriendly connections to the Downtown.
- Better pedestrian connectivity look at pedestrian shed of ¼ mile from activity nodes, and this is how far people are willing to walk. Pedestrian connections across Chapman need improvement; currently dangerous intersections.
- Address incompatible development, low scale residential and triplexes next to larger buildings currently.
- High school and college are not subject to approval of the city, why were they included in this focus area.
- Is there a preservation zone in this focus area.
- Natural break in activity is at Ford.
- Intent to preserve historical resources and/or scale of development in the focus area.

- Neighborhoods are similar in age and scale all the way to Euclid potential to extend focus area out to Euclid.
- Encouraging pedestrian, bicycle, and horse access to Downtown area will encourage people to use the Downtown businesses.
- Reassure people that issues outside the boundaries of the Downtown focus area will also be addressed.
- What Fullerton does will affect La Mirada.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee that this focus area should remain.

#### Focus Area F – Transportation Center

The following comments were received from the Committee:

- Linkage to Downtown pedestrian friendly.
- Maintain open space in front of the depot, open plaza, historic buildings.
- Proposed train museum land is too valuable for this use.
- Overlap Downtown Focus Area and the Transportation Center Focus Area because of linkages.
- This area provides one of the biggest assets to the City, and an opportunity to comply
  with SB 375 and the new green house gas legislation/requirements; help reduce vehicle
  miles traveled.
- Parking for Transportation Center is important.
- Train museum will create a destination for visitors, similar to the Sacramento train museum.
- Move boundary further south to include recent development align with the Redevelopment area.
- Do not want to see buildings similar to large apartment buildings in this area.
- Include some open space requirements (public or private), design standards, height standard, and visual relief.

The following comments were received from the public:

- Open plaza in front of the train depot will be needed to move pedestrians in and out and also create a framed view of the depot – coordinate with current activity.
- Need to plan enough parking for the Transportation Center, and integrate it with entertainment, residential, and evening activity to utilize the same parking.
- Increased bus flow through the Transportation Center will reduce the need for parking; current bus area is not well laid out or labeled.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee that this focus area should remain.

#### Focus Area G – North Harbor Corridor

The following comments were received from the Committee:

- Elks Lodge is already developed should this be included in the focus area.
- Challenges high use of recreational trails, consider where these cross major streets, i.e. harbor, Bastanchury, and Euclid.
- Extend west boundary on Bastanchury to Euclid trails west of Harbor.

- Focus area contains expansion of medical center logical.
- Extend focus area west to railroad track, include existing medical building.
- Link Fullerton Towers and south to the Downtown natural break between south node and north node.
- Keeping all medical uses within the one focus area is logical.
- Transportation and security considerations for medical uses.
- North on Harbor there are more existing medical and office uses extend the boundary of this focus area north to the City limits.
- Possible scenic corridor along harbor.
- Possibly add a separate trail focus area.

The following comments were received from the public:

- Aesthetic value of this corridor green hillsides and nice looking medical buildings.
   Maintain green hillsides as open space.
- Open hillside creates visual break between business areas.
- Fullerton loop crossing under Harbor is dangerous. Need more defined trail from dam to courthouse – easy to get lost on current trail.
- Harbor separates trails into east and west.
- Crossing Harbor for pedestrians, etc. needs to be improved.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee that this focus area should remain.

#### Focus Area H - North Industrial

The following comments were received from the Committee:

- Include the northeast and southeast corners of Imperial and Harbor existing commercial/retail.
- Important to maintain large lot sizes in the industrial areas.
- Retail should serve industrial areas uses should be appropriate for area.
- Largest economic drivers on the north side of the City.
- Economic development considerations of Beckman property try to bring in another manufacturer with similar needs.
- City is starting to lose technology manufacturers and their employees.
- Take advantage of universities in the area resource for technology/industrial.
- Possible industrial zone with a retail overlay.
- Remove this focus area concerned with speculation for development of retail and/or housing.
- Take retail out of this focus area (north side of Imperial).
- Keep this focus area and put in strong policies to keep industrial use.
- The need to retain industrial uses is inherent in the previous comments from the GPAC.
- What is currently industrial should stay industrial economic development team needs to find the highest and best industrial use/company to come in.
- Remove wording about the alternative uses from the description.

The following comments were received from the public:

GPAC Minutes November 17, 2008

• Transitioning land to retail and housing will equal loss of large industrial lots/resource, which currently locates jobs near homes and generates employment.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee that this focus area should remain.

#### **AGENDA FORECAST**

The next General Plan Advisory Committee meeting will be held December 1, 2008 at 7:00 p.m.

#### STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Member Bennett asked staff for information on feedback received regarding the letter to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from the Friends of Coyote Hills that had been brought up during public comment, and Mr. St. Paul responded that he was not aware of any, but would get back to the GPAC with the information.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 9:25 p.m.



#### **FULLERTON MAIN LIBRARY, OSBORNE ROOM**

MONDAY DECEMBER 1, 2008 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:05 p.m.

**PRESENT:** GPAC Members Batinich, Buck, Bushala, Durrette, Griffin, Haley,

Heusser, Jaramillo, Lambros (arrived at 7:15 p.m.), Savage, and

Stopper

**ABSENT:** Excused: GPAC Member Bennett, Fitzgerald, and Richmond

Unexcused: Harrell

**STAFF PRESENT:** Community Development Director Godlewski, Planning Manager

Zelinka, Senior Planner St. Paul, Administrative Assistant Pasillas

**CONSULTANT** RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist and RBF

PRESENT: Community Planner Michelle Kou

**FLAG SALUTE:** Chair Stopper

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Heusser, SECONDED by

Committee Member Durrette, and CARRIED unanimously, that the Minutes of the November 17, 2008 meeting be APPROVED as written.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

The Committee continued their discussion of the Focus Areas.

#### Focus Area I - Chapman Corridor

The following comments were received from the Committee:

- South-west corner of Nutwood and Commonwealth has historic, mid-century buildings; potential for adaptive reuse.
- Overlapping of focus areas to be considered take focus area on Chapman all the way to the 57 freeway, possibly across the freeway.
- Include all four corners of State College and Chapman in this focus area.
- Extend the focus area to the west to include Fullerton High School.
- Include Hope University campus in the east end of the corridor.

The following comments were received from the public:

- Consider bicycle use on Chapman; currently narrow street, include bikeways north and south of the corridor.
- Extend west to include Fullerton High School; heart of education, oldest high school in the City.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee that this focus area should remain.

#### Focus Area J – Education / Education Supporting

The following comments were received from the Committee:

- Overall area as an education area may be too large east of Placentia Avenue may not fit in.
- Include all four corners of State College and Chapman in this focus area.
- Bicycle linkage across the 57 freeway; possible bike bridge.
- Link housing to north and east commercial areas.
- Hope University keep as an education facility; significant historic resource.
- Apartments/condo/Target/retail on east of freeway support the university students and faculty live and shop there.
- High commuter level at CSUF high vehicle environment. Pedestrian traffic is mostly on campus. Public safety issues with the large number of vehicles.
- Are there a number of students who take the bus into CSUF/Hope?
- Students park in residential neighborhoods and bring bikes to get around campus.
- Link between Troy High School and CSUF; Troy students have opportunities to take classes at CSUF.

The following comments were received from the public:

• Include Fullerton High School and Fullerton College from Focus Area E into this focus area.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee that this focus area should remain.

#### Focus Area K – Southeast Industrial

The following comments were received from the Committee:

- Same comments made regarding North Industrial Focus Area apply here.
- Industrial entrance to the City.
- Customers from LA County to San Diego have access to the area via the 57 and 91 freeways; key intersection of freeways.
- Make area more truck friendly.
- Need landscape improvements on Raymond many visitors enter the City in this area.
- Alleyways deteriorating, need repaying, no money available for improvements.
- Razor wire being put in is unsightly, does not attract new businesses.
- Higher police presence needed to deter crime.

- Coordination/responsibility share of Raymond with Anaheim potential for joint meeting.
- Potential for industrial area similar to Palo Alto; attractive, high tech.
- Kimberly and Raymond nice, high tech looking building.
- Potential for focus area in Anaheim joint venture, potential for partnership with Placentia as well.
- Bring in employers which can pay higher wagers will bring in employees who can afford to live in Fullerton and contribute to the community.
- Example Research Triangle Park, No. Carolina attractive, high tech.
- Potential to start program to have new businesses moving into this area help improve the area (alleys, lighting, etc.).
- Look for creative ways to finance improvements.
- Be careful not to discourage businesses from coming to Fullerton; need to find a happy medium.
- Keep out incompatible uses, i.e. schools, churches, especially children.
- Industrial area is continually being considered for uses not welcome in other parts of the City, but those uses are inappropriate here as well.
- Want to hold on to as much industrial area as possible.

The following comments were received from the public:

- Need to keep viable general aviation airport to attract businesses, especially high end businesses.
- Other cities have started to abandon alleyways and give them to the adjacent property owners to maintain.
- Abandoning alleyways may not be feasible in all areas due to configuration.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee that this focus area should remain.

#### Focus Area L – Chevron-Owned Property in West Coyote Hills

Chair Stopper reminded the Committee of the vote taken at the November 5, 2007 GPAC meeting, wherein the topic of the Chevron-owned property in West Coyote Hills was removed from GPAC discussion.

After Committee discussion, Member Buck made a MOTION to rescind the previous action that restricted discussion of West Coyote Hills, for the purpose of discussion as a focus area. Motion was seconded by Vice Chair Griffin.

After continued discussion, Member Buck MODIFIED his motion to rescind the previous action relating to West Coyote Hills and its component parts. Vic Chair Griffin accepted the modification.

Member Lambros believed there was a need to review the minutes from the meeting where the original motion was made, along with the minutes from subsequent meetings where the motion regarding discussion of West Coyote Hills was clarified.

Member Lambros made a SUBSTITUTE motion to table Member Buck's motion. Motion seconded by Member Batinich.

GPAC Minutes December 1, 2008

Discussion was held; several Members believed the November 5, 2007 motion restricted discussion on West Coyote Hills as it related to the Elements being discussed at that time.

Member Lambros' motion FAILED to pass with a vote of 4 in favor and 7 against.

Member Buck MODIFIED his motion to allow discussion of West Coyote Hills and take action in relation to the topic of Focus Areas. Vice Chair Griffin accepted this modification. The motion PASSED with a vote of 10 in favor, 1 against.

The following comments were received from the Committee:

- Was there an existing development agreement for West Coyote Hills?
- Why wasn't Open Space a focus area?
- West Coyote Hills is a private property, with a single property owner why have its own Focus Area. This is the only focus area with a single property owner.
- Other focus areas are also private property.
- Last large piece of open space deserves the attention of being a focus area.
- Goal of the General Plan is to look at areas in the City and establish policy; it would be negligent of the GPAC to ignore this property.
- This area has already had intense focus, what is the point of making it a focus area.
- Criteria for a focus area was described as "areas that are currently experiencing transition or anticipate transition, areas that include special community resources, areas providing a variety of development options or market interest, areas exhibiting potential for enhancement of reinvestment"; this area fully meets all of the criteria.
- None of the other focus areas have an approved Specific Plan.
- If West Coyote Hills is included as a focus area, the GPAC will be acting like the Planning Commission. It is not the GPAC's job to determine how land is to be developed.
- Public needs to express their desires for this property to the Planning Commission and City Council, not the GPAC.
- Potential legal ramifications of picking on one piece of privately-owned property.
- Is it appropriate to be making comments now on a project that is pending approval?

The following comments were received from the public:

- Need to work with other cities last large open space in No. Orange County, need to preserve for future generations.
- Visitors from surrounding cities come to Fullerton for open space.
- Coyote Hills should be a focus area; significant in size, outcome will impact the whole community, vast changes since last General Plan (i.e. higher density and increased traffic), improves and protects unique attributes, hills can provide opportunities for destination point in Fullerton, educational, economic asset.
- Should not be concerned if an application is in process as the Committee was not concerned about applications in process in other focus areas.
- Sustainability, contour grading, fire protection things to think about that were not considered in the past.
- Has the area and its density been considered in the Housing Element?
- What is the need in Fullerton?
- 1977 Specific Plan 2A did not convey entitlements.

- Coyote Creek Watershed Master Plan County of Orange, Army Corp of Engineers, etc. say this is the most significant piece of land within watershed.
- Industrial employers look for places that consider health and wellbeing of their employees; this area offers recreational opportunities.
- Economic necessities creating a recreational hub.
- Natural area to be explored and enjoyed.
- Look at the bigger picture for the whole City and the impacts of the focus areas on the City as a whole.
- Help serve the decision-making process through the General Plan; what are the needs in the City, opportunities that the focus area represents. Look at the focus area as a framework
- Looking at Coyote Hills as a focus area is necessary; similar to including important pieces in whole City's health.
- Coyote Hills should be a focus area General Plan allows citizens to direct to City officials what should occur.
- Coastal Sage Scrub "park" unique ecosystem, endangered, thoughts on that resource have changed since 1970's.
- Balance needed open space, university, industry, etc.
- Residents move here for open space, want balance.
- Property has already been graded, drilled.
- Open space is part of what attracts businesses quality of life for employees.
- Need to get the best out of the area as much open space as possible.
- Property has a rich history.
- Changes since 1070's.
- Preserve Coyote Hills as open space.
- Citizens have requested Coyote Hills be a focus area, the Committee should consider it a
  focus area. Include boundary along Rosecrans, Gilbert, outside Chevron property,
  backbone trails.
- This will be the only focus area that has an approved specific plan and development agreement. Specific Plan amendment in application process has included a lot of public input. Nature preserve and an endowment to preserve are included.

Member Buck made a MOTION to include the Chevron-Owned Property at West Coyote Hills as a Focus Area. The motion was seconded by Member Jaramillo. The motion carried 6-4, with Member Lambros abstaining.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee to continue discussion of this focus area to the next meeting.

Chair Stopper addressed other Focus Area items that were still outstanding.

- MOTION by Member Bushala, seconded by Member Buck to include the residential area west of Harbor Blvd. to Highland Avenue in the Harbor Gateway Focus Area, passed unanimously.
- MOTION by Member Buck, seconded by Member Bushala to include the area up to Malvern Avenue in the Orangethorpe Corridor Nodes Focus Area, passed unanimously.
- Creeks it was decided that creeks would be addressed under the Natural Resources and Fullerton Built Environment sections.

#### **AGENDA FORECAST**

The next General Plan Advisory Committee meeting will be held December 15, 2008 at 7:00 p.m.

#### STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Mr. St. Paul provided the Committee with an outline of the proposed General Plan structure, and Mr. Zelinka provided a brief overview. More discussion would be held at the next meeting.

Chair Stopper reminded staff of the Committee's request to review their presentation prior to it being presented to the Planning Commission and/or City Council.

Mr. St. Paul advised the Committee that Ethics Training was required of all Members, and the next training was scheduled at the beginning of 2009.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 10:50 p.m.



#### **FULLERTON MAIN LIBRARY, OSBORNE ROOM**

MONDAY DECEMBER 15, 2008 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:08 p.m.

**PRESENT:** GPAC Members Batinich, Bennett, Bushala, Fitzgerald, Griffin, Haley,

Harrell, Heusser, Jaramillo, Richmond, Savage, and Stopper

ABSENT: Excused: GPAC Members Buck, Durrette, and Lambros

Unexcused: None

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Godlewski, Planning Manager

Zelinka, Senior Planner St. Paul, Administrative Assistant Pasillas

CONSULTANT PRESENT:

RBF Community Planner Michelle Kou

FLAG SALUTE: Chair Stopper

MINUTES: MOTION made by Vice Chair Griffin, SECONDED by Committee

Member Batinich, with Committee Member Fitzgerald abstaining, CARRIED unanimously, that the Minutes of the December 1, 2008

meeting be APPROVED as written.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Susan Bolger spoke on the importance of trees in the City, including how they are pruned and the birds that were attracted to the various types of trees. She would like to see the City prune as little as possible, leave the trees looking more natural, and disturb the birds as little as possible.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

The Committee continued their discussion of the Focus Areas.

Member Savage made the following comments regarding the Development Agreement between the City and Chevron.

- The City had entered into the Development Agreement with Chevron in 1977 in exchange for the Gilbert right-of-way, Bob Ward Park, and greenbelt areas.
- The Specific Plan had been created to "lock in" zoning and building codes for the developer.
- May need alterations to the original agreements to ensure compliance with Federal law.
- The Agreement has not been contested.

GPAC Minutes December 15, 2008

Member Savage stated he did not think this area should be included as a Focus Area. He recommended a Chevron PowerPoint presentation that had been shown at a community meeting approximately five years ago, and was available on the City's website.

Chair Stopper clarified that the Chevron-owned property in West Coyote Hills had been added as a Focus Area at the last GPAC meeting.

Committee discussion was held regarding a new discussion and vote on whether to include this item, and it was decided that the previous decision to include the Chevron-owned property in West Coyote Hills as a Focus Area would stand.

#### Focus Area L – Chevron-Owned Property in West Coyote Hills

The following comments were received from the Committee:

- Right-of-way up Gilbert, Robert E. Ward Park, greenbelt area given to City in exchange for Specific Plan and Development Agreement in 1977.
- New Federal laws may require alteration of Specific Plan.
- Development Agreement has not been contested.
- This area has already received a lot of focus.
- City has already made a deal.
- It is private property, consider private property rights.
- Specific Plan has been in effect for approximately 30 years, could be another 30 years before development happens, what will ultimately be approved is unknown.
- Mission statement should be used across the board for new development, etc.
- Consider that the City has already accepted land for streets and park.
- High level of community interest in this area it should be discussed.
- Primary focus of the community is on open space many pros and cons should be looked at in the context of the process, not project.
- Treat it as a focus area, not a project; do not change policy for approval process.
- Open space has been an issue since 1972 and a group of people have been working to preserve this open space since then retain the integrity of the master plan.
- Plan is currently being negotiated zoning is a gift.
- Should be developed in a rural manner, not clustered housing like Amerige Heights. No sidewalks, curbs, gutters, streetlights, massive grading. R-1-20 zoning.
- Allow people to enjoy the open space.
- Possibility of using a small piece of land for a green cemetery.
- Should adhere to mission statement.
- Development here is in the hands of the Planning Commission.
- What is Chevron willing to do for the community?
- Park that is going to be maintained forever how many people visit the area and how many people would be utilizing the park?
- Preserve and protect significant natural features, i.e. five vista points, ridges, natural grading.
- Develop trail system that will be integrated with the City's existing trail system.
- Maintain largest amount of open space that is fiscally responsible, and make it accessible to the public as soon as possible.
- Further develop Ward Park, integrate with trail system.
- Support greenbelt concept secure additional open space through clustering of homes.

- Plan should emphasize open space.
- Should be green irrigated, sustainable development, use green building methods.
- Focus area should not be used to slow down development approval process.
- Could be used in conjunction with the University.
- Accessibility to trails is important don't cut it off with a gated neighborhood.
- Work done by activists and Chevron over the last 30 years is appreciated develop a plan that tries to be agreeable with both sides.
- Larger lots for key areas views, greenbelt concept with clusters helps continue a sense
  of community.
- R-1-20 and R-1-30 bring affluent neighbors who could participate in community, charities, and other organizations.
- Include Laguna Lake and Clark Park in this focus area.

#### The following comments were received from the public:

- Chevron presents a balanced plan.
- Maintain open space in perpetuity.
- Non-native plants can cause fires to occur uses native plants.
- Development creates higher likelihood of exposure and sources of ignition.
- Irrigated areas would have to be maintained, i.e. mowed, etc.
- Landslides naturally occur in the area.
- West Coyote Hills illustrates ideas of desired use.
- Balancing open space with density, using greenbelts for transition, trails, species protection, nature center.
- Model for sustainable development and conservation education.
- Make Chevron a partner with the City for the nature center.
- Chevron to provide adequate trails, establish trust to build out trails and maintain them.
- City needs to decide to move forward, and provide access for people who want to use the space.
- Area around reservoir/tanks is a good place for stables.
- Would like to see Chevron plan implemented, giving public access to about 50% of the land, which will be maintained.
- Trails and nature center create a respect for the environment and the history of the land through educating people.
- Family-oriented project wildlife education.
- California gnatcatcher and cactus wren habitat this project would help those populations.
- Change boundary of focus area to include Laguna Lake and Clark Park.
- Use land for education/research with the University.
- Coastal sage scrub currently in the area is going to become extinct.
- Focus on the park not on the buildings.
- Remediation plan should be included in case there is a need to clean up the land in the future (i.e. previous gas, oil uses)

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee that this focus area should remain.

Mr. St. Paul explained that, based on the comments received, a Draft Focus Area Report would be prepared and provided to the Committee.

#### **Draft General Plan Outline Handout**

Planning Manager Zelinka provided the Committee a draft General Plan Outline and explained the proposed structure.

Member Fitzgerald questioned why childcare had been included when the GPAC had decided at a previous meeting not to include it.

Member Haley asked if mansionization and some type of tree language could be included, and Mr. Zelinka responded affirmatively.

Vice Chair Griffin asked what was meant by "Community Service Finance" under "The Fullerton Economy" meant, and Mr. Zelinka explained it was the cost of City services, i.e. financing services to the community.

Member Harrell asked if "Open Space", as listed under "The Fullerton Natural Environment", was a mandatory element, and Mr. Zelinka explained the State required the City's Open Space Element to document open space resources and other natural resources that are part of undeveloped and undeveloped spaces, i.e. parks, creeks, etc.

Member Bushala commented on the issue of noise and the importance of addressing the topic.

#### **AGENDA FORECAST**

Mr. St. Paul explained that the Final Vision Statement and the Land Use Focus Areas would be presented to the Planning Commission in late January 2009. Staff would provide the Planning Commission presentation to the GPAC prior to the meeting. The next General Plan Advisory Committee meeting will be held in February. Staff would notify the Committee when a meeting date was scheduled.

#### STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Mr. St. Paul reminded the Committee that Ethics Training was required of all Members, and the next training was scheduled for January 15, 2009 in the Council Chambers at 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Zelinka asked the Committee for clarification on the "Economic Sustainability" definition in the Vision Statement, and suggested the following: Economic Sustainability is essential to a local economy that remains strong into the future. This change was agreed to by the Committee.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 8:56 p.m.



#### **FULLERTON MAIN LIBRARY, OSBORNE ROOM**

MONDAY FEBRUARY 23, 2009 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:07 p.m.

PRESENT: GPAC Members Bennett, Buck, Fitzgerald, Griffin, Haley, Harrell,

Heusser, Richmond, and Stopper

ABSENT: Excused: GPAC Members Batinich, Bushala, Durrette, and Savage

Unexcused: Jaramillo

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Godlewski, Planning Manager

Zelinka, Senior Planner St. Paul, Administrative Assistant Pasillas

CONSULTANT PRESENT:

None

**FLAG SALUTE:** Chair Stopper

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Fitzgerald, SECONDED by

Vice Chair Griffin, CARRIED unanimously, that approval of the Minutes of the December 1, 2008 meeting be continue to the next

meeting.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Denny Bean spoke on the Chevron property in West Coyote Hills.

Jane Rands suggested the public be given an opportunity to speak after staff has made their report on an item, but prior to the Committee's discussion so that the public input could be considered during the discussion.

MOTION made by Committee Member Fitzgerald, SECONDED by Committee Member Richmond, CARRIED unanimously, that public comment would be held prior to the Committee's discussion of an item.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### PC/CC Final Comments and considerations of Vision Statement and Focus Areas

Bob St. Paul, Senior Planner, recapped the Planning Commission and City Council review of the Vision Statement and Focus Areas, and indicated that Council had approved both as recommended by the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC).

GPAC Minutes February 23, 2009

After brief discussion, no action was taken.

#### State Bill (SB) 375

Al Zelinka, Planning Manager, provided the Committee with a brief overview of SB 375. State law now required cities to develop plans to reduce green house gas emissions, including such things as having housing centered near public transportation, higher density housing, and increased public transportation options.

Member Lambros provided additional detail and clarified that SB 375 was not simply addressing Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), but total emissions.

Director Godlewski explained that the GPAC had set the tone with the focus areas identified, and staff would work with the goals and policies to accommodate the dictates of AB 32 and SB 375.

A member of the public suggested looking at affordable housing near public transportation, and Director Godlewski confirmed that housing integration was part of SB 375.

After Committee discussion, no action was taken.

#### Review and discuss Draft General Plan Structure Outline handout (12-15-09)

Mr. St. Paul reviewed the "Fullerton Plan" outline which had been provided to the Members at the last meeting. He asked the Committee if they had any comments on the direction staff had taken; the Committee had no comment. Mr. St. Paul continued by explaining Part II was organized into four primary elements; The Fullerton Built Environment, The Fullerton Economy, The Fullerton Community, and The Fullerton Natural Environment. He again asked the Committee if there were any missing topics or other changes needed.

#### Public Comments.

A member of the public asked if accountability was separate or included under each item, and Mr. Zelinka responded that it would be identified throughout the plan, and Part III would package it all together.

Chair Stopper questioned why Childcare had been included under The Fullerton Community, when the GPAC had previously voted to remove this topic, and Member Fitzgerald confirmed that it had, but questioned what Human Services included. Mr. Zelinka responded that Human Services would possible include items such as assisted living facilities and food for the hungry. Member Fitzgerald believed that Aging in Place and Childcare should be included under Human Services.

Chair Stopper asked what Technology included, and Mr. Zelinka responded it would include items such as fiberoptics (INET), telecommunication programs, and even recruiting technology-type businesses. Chair Stopper suggested a more meaningful title to clarify the topic better.

A member of the public commented on the need to include police technology, i.e. traffic monitoring technology, and new police computer technology.

GPAC Minutes February 23, 2009

Member Buck commented on the need to include Education Community, not just Education, as it represented the sum of all the parts related to education within the City. He also commented that Community should include getting more people involved in active living within the City.

Member Lambros believed the list was broad and included many people within the City. He commented that churches and social organizations (i.e. Rotary Club) were not included.

Chair Stopper asked if the mandatory elements had been included in the outline, and Mr. St. Paul responded affirmatively.

A member of the public, Jeff Townsend, asked where the Police Department, Fire Department, and paramedics were included, and Mr. Zelinka responded they were integrated throughout the General Plan, under such items as Infrastructure & Services and Hazards.

Member Lambros asked about hospitals and medical facilities, and Mr. Zelinka explained they would be included under community services.

A member of the public, Matt Leslie, asked if Childcare and Aging in Place would affect everyone, whereas Human Services would be a collection of services that would not necessarily affect everyone. Mr. Zelinka responded that Human Services could affect everyone, i.e. homelessness – we may not be homeless right now, but we could be at some point.

A member of the public asked if the various service organizations would be listed, and Director Godlewski responded they would be lumped together as one item, with examples listed.

MOTION made by Committee Member Bennett, SECONDED by Committee Member Richmond, CARRIED unanimously, that the proposed outline be approved with the changes mentioned.

#### General Plan Policy Development

Mr. Zelinka explained the Policy Development Matrix that had been provided to the GPAC, and explained that staff had attempted to organize the community's input around four master topics under the outline.

Mr. Zelinka proposed the GPAC break into four groups, and each group would take one master element to work on, after which the team would report back to the GPAC and public, and the full GPAC would work together to come up with the final draft document.

Vice Chair Griffin asked if the Committee did not want to take this approach, then how would it be done. Mr. Zelinka explained that staff would then work it out and bring it back to the GPAC for their and the publics input.

Chair Stopper acknowledged that it would be more work for the GPAC, but it would save time overall.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee to have staff provide the Committee with a complete draft outline, one week before the meeting, to allow them ample time to review. Then, at the next meeting, the Committee could decide how they wanted to proceed. This would also allow those Members not at this meeting an opportunity to provide input.

#### **AGENDA FORECAST**

The next meeting was scheduled for March 16, 2009.

#### STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Mr. St. Paul advised the Committee that staff had received comments back on the Housing Element, and that staff was working with the consultants and HCD to respond. Chair Stopper requested the Committee be given an opportunity to review the final document prior to its going forward to the City Council.

Mr. St. Paul informed the Committee the future GPAC agendas and supporting documents would be sent via email. Hard copies would be sent only for very large document, or at the request of a Committee Member.

Member Buck asked the status of the Bike Element, and Mr. St. Paul responded that staff was working on it, and it would go to the Bicycle Users Sub-Committee for review prior to its coming before the GPAC.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 8:55 p.m.



#### **FULLERTON MAIN LIBRARY, OSBORNE ROOM**

MONDAY MARCH 30, 2009 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:10 p.m.

**PRESENT:** GPAC Members Batinich, Bennett, Durrette, Fitzgerald (7:22 p.m.),

Griffin, Haley, Heusser, Lambros (7:22 p.m.), Richmond, Savage, and

Stopper

ABSENT:

Excused: GPAC Members Buck, Bushala, Harrell, Jaramillo

Unexcused: None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Community Development Director Godlewski, Senior Planner St. Paul,

Administrative Assistant Pasillas

CONSULTANT PRESENT:

RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist

FLAG SALUTE: Chair Stopper

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Haley, SECONDED by

Committee Member Savage, CARRIED unanimously, that approval of the Minutes of the December 1, 2008 meeting be APPROVED as

written.

MOTION made by Committee Member Richmond, SECONDED by Committee Member Haley, CARRIED unanimously, that approval of the Minutes of the February 23, 2009 meeting be APPROVED as

written.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### Review and discuss the Draft General Plan Structure Outline

Senior Planner St. Paul described the Draft General Plan Outline Structure, and the detail that had been added since the previous meeting. Staff was requesting the GPAC's comments on the Outline, and also a recommendation to forward the Outline to the Planning Commission for their review and approval.

RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist explained that staff was looking for the GPAC's overall thoughts, any topics they believed needed clarification, and their thoughts regarding the range of scope and/or content for each topic.

The following comments were received from the Committee (and staff responded where appropriate):

#### **Urban Design:**

- Another hurdle for developers.
- Projects already go before the RDRC and PC, why make it more difficult.
- What do we gain? (guideline for developers/homeowners saying the City wants quality developments and what our expectations are)
- The function of government is to keep us safe, not manage every detail (covers the overall way we see the community, not the details).
- Vague, subjective, not mandatory.
- Reluctant to put subjective language in a document that is supposed to set the rules.
- Include under "Land Use" rather than a separate element (stronger emphasis, might get lost under Land Use).
- Difficult to legislate good taste.
- This would give staff a tool to help maintain the character of the neighborhood for plans that are approved over the counter (creates a goal for basic design standards; may expedite over the counter process because developer's will know exactly what the City is looking for).
- This would protect the property rights of surrounding property owners.
- This would put the planning staff in charge rather than the RDRC or PC which are made up of citizens.
- There is an advantage of having a developer go through the planning cycle more than once a better, quality product.
- Combine Urban Design and Growth Management.
- Urban Design is not to manage growth, but rather to encourage quality development.
- Urban Design addresses aesthetics, whereas Growth Management addresses the compatibility of the infrastructure with growth.
- Already covered under the current General Plan.
- Adding new language to make a stronger statement to the long-term strategy.
- Provides language for planners to use against private property owners; rules and guidelines strong enough to protect the surrounding property owners.
- Urban Design should be included; everyone must work together, the character and values of Fullerton need to be respected.
- Urban Design is a statement of the overarching value.
- Would be concerned if Urban Design, as it is now, was used at the counter by the planners; it needs to be more specific.
- Will become clearer once policies and goals are added.
- Rename "Growth Management".

The following comments were received from the public:

- Agree with staff developers prefer to have the guidelines up front.
- Projects can still go to RDRC and/or PC for refinement.

Assertive way of letting residents/developer's know what is expected.

After discussion on "Urban Design", it was the consensus of the Committee to have staff incorporate the comments from tonight's meeting and bring it back before the Committee at the next meeting. The Committee also expressed an interest in reviewing plans with "Urban Design" included.

#### Mobility

No comments were received from the Committee or public.

#### Fullerton Economy

• Need to see development and revitalization details before a decision was made (staff would add additional details for the Committee's review).

#### Fullerton Community

- Do not believe that "not all segments of the City population have an opportunity to participate"; the City reaches out to everyone, and everyone can participate. Should not be included.
- State in the affirmative i.e. "through meetings, cable television, etc. we encourage community participation."
- Keep it positive i.e. "The City will continue to make outreach efforts."
- All citizens are invited to participate, but may not want to, or may not feel comfortable doing so.
- "Education" needs to be coordinated with the schools since they are ultimately responsible.
- The library system is included under Education; need to support the library and there is not enough about it under Education.
- Include "passive recreation" (i.e. the lot at the corner of State College and Bastanchury) under Parks and Recreation.
- Why is Education included in the General Plan; the school districts are not a function of local government.
- The library system should be included as an education resource.
- There are opportunities in the City for education that do not involve the schools.
- Fullerton is becoming more recognizable as an education city; needs to be included in the General Plan, but maybe not here.
- This section is more negative than the other sections; needs to be more positive and consistent with the other sections.
- Child Care opportunities already exist in the City; i.e. YMCA, Boys and Girls Club.
- A previous GPAC discussion had come to the consensus that child care was not to be a separate item, but possible addressed under Public Health or Education.
- List topics in a priority order, rather than alphabetically; i.e. Public Safety first.
- Use "partnership" for things the City can not control; i.e. Education.
- Regional Coordination should be included under Community Development (will be carried throughout the General Plan, not as a separate item).
- Public Safety needs to include local, regional and state coordination.
- Public Health does not recognize the health services available in the City.

Need to address equestrians under Parks and Recreation.

The following comments were received from the public:

- Some citizens may not be involved due to issues such as their work schedule, no available childcare, etc.
- People remark on the small number of people involved, it could be more.
- Opportunity to get people involved in the Richman area, but they may not want to be involved in a high level of decision making.
- Education needs to address those things the City can have an impact on; i.e. physical health, before and after school activities, the library system as an educational support.
- Leave Child Care as a separate item.

#### Natural Environment

- The City operates as the water supplier; need to identify the subsets associated with the water supply.
- Some statements appear to be political statements; would like to see more of what the City can actually do.
- Scenic corridors in relation to the connectors; i.e. Bastanchury, Valencia.
- Reflect the real risks and tone down the language.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee to review the revised Draft General Plan Structure Outline at the next meeting, prior to staff taking it to the Planning Commission and City Council for approval.

#### AGENDA FORECAST

The next meeting was scheduled for April 27, 2009 at 7:00 p.m. in the Fullerton Main Library.

#### STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

None.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.



#### **LIBRARY MEETING ROOM**

MONDAY APRIL 4, 2011 \_ 7:07 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Griffin at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: GPAC Members Bennett, Buck, Fitzgerald, Griffin, Haley, Heusser, Lambros,

Richmond, and Savage

ABSENT: Excused: GPAC Members Batinich, Durrette, and Jaramillo and Stopper

Unexcused: GPAC Members Chi and Harrell

**STAFF PRESENT:** Director Zelinka, Planning Manager Allen, Executive Assistant Pasillas

CONSULTANT PRESENT:

RBF Vice President Susan Harden, RBF Associate Michelle Kou

FLAG SALUTE: Vice Chair Griffin

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Savage, SECONDED by Committee

Member Heusser, and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present, and with Committee Member Haley abstaining, that the Minutes of the April 27, 2009

meeting be APPROVED as written.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Denny Bean, Friends of Harbors, Beaches, and Parks, spoke on the need to have a "green" General Plan.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Community Development Director Al Zelinka explained where the General Plan Update process was at now, and how we had reached this point. RBF Associate Planner Michelle Kou elaborated on the public outreach, visioning charettes, surveys, and committee/commission meetings that had been held to get input.

RBF Vice President Susan Harden discussed The Fullerton Plan, and explained the review process and Administrative Draft that had been provided to the GPAC. She went over the proposed review schedule and explained how the Draft was organized. Ms. Harden also explained that they had tried to look at every policy and make sure it was either neutral or supportive of every other policy.

#### **Public Comments**

- Denny Bean commented on the need to keep historical reference in the document; Ms. Harden explained that it was addressed under Open Space and also Historical Preservation.
- Judith Kaluzny asked if this document would apply to the Fullerton Transportation Center plans that were currently underway; Ms. Harden responded that the FTC project had its own Specific Plan and site specific guidelines, but it was covered under the existing General Plan.

Committee Member Buck asked if the Bicycle Plan related to "Complete Streets" policy and Ms. Harden responded that it did, as it was a state requirement. The Bicycle Users Sub-Committee would be reviewing the Bicycle Element sometime in April.

Committee Member Buck asked if the Administrative Draft was available for the public's review and Ms. Harden explained that it was not. After the GPAC finished their review there would be a 45-day public review process. Director Zelinka added that it was not a secret, but the purpose of the Administrative Draft was for staff and Committee review.

Ms. Kou explained the review process and the electronic and hard copy "bookmark" review worksheets that were provided for Committee members to provide comments. She further explained that comments could be hand written and either scanned and emailed to staff, or they could be mailed in or dropped off at City Hall. Comments needed to be received by staff no later than April 18, 2011.

Director Zelinka explained that the GPAC would be done with their recommendations in June, but Committee Members were encouraged to be present at the public workshops, the Committee/Commission review meetings, and the Planning Commission and City Council approval meetings.

#### AGENDA FORECAST

#### April 18

- Deadline for Committee to provide written comments on:
  - o Introduction/Part I-The Fullerton Vision
  - The Fullerton Built Environment (7 sub elements)
  - o The Fullerton Economy (2 sub elements)
- RBF compiles GPAC comments

#### May 2 - GPAC Meeting 2

- First working session
- Review/refine
  - Introduction/Part I-The Fullerton Vision
  - The Fullerton Built Environment (7 sub elements)
  - o The Fullerton Economy (2 sub elements)

#### STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

None.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Vice Chair Griffin adjourned the meeting at 8:25 p.m.



#### POLICE DEPARTMENT MURAL ROOM

MONDAY MAY 2, 2011 \_ 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chair Stopper at 6:07 p.m.

PRESENT: GPAC Members Batinich, Bennett, Buck, Chi, Fitzgerald, Harrell,

Heusser(arrived at 6:38 p.m.), Lambros, Richmond, Savage, and Stopper

**ABSENT:** Excused: GPAC Members Griffin, Haley, and Jaramillo

Unexcused: None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Director Zelinka, Planning Manager Allen, Executive Assistant Pasillas

PRESENT: Michelle Kou

**FLAG SALUTE:** Chair Stopper

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Fitzgerald, SECONDED by Committee

Member Bennett, and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present, WITH Chair Stopper abstaining, that the Minutes of the April 4, 2011 meeting be

RBF Vice President Susan Harden (arrived at 6:32 p.m.), RBF Associate

APPROVED as written.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

CONSULTANT

#### None

Chair Stopper informed the Committee that Member Durrette had resigned, and a brief discussion was held regarding whether the Committee should proactively work towards having her replaced. It was decided that staff would inform the appointing Council Member of the vacancy and the decision would be left to that person.

Chair Stopper introduced new Committee Member Chi, who then gave a brief summary of his background.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Director Al Zelinka explained that the review draft was staff's best work at creating a good platform, and it was up to the GPAC to come up with the final document. He stressed that no offense would be taken by staff or the consultants with any comments made regarding the draft, and emphasized that comments were appreciated.

#### First working session

Consultant Michelle Kou went over the ground rules that the GPAC had established at their first meeting, and described how the review process would take place. No additional ground rules were added. Ms.

Kou further clarified that the comments the GPAC had submitted had been separated into two categories: grammar, spelling, and minor modifications or clarifications, which would be addressed in the final document, and; topics which would require discussion by the GPAC, which would take place tonight.

A brief discussion was held regarding who would have input on the administrative draft and the GPAC's role in the review process, and staff clarified that the GPAC would review comments made by the other key stakeholders who reviewed the draft document.

#### Review/Refine

Consultant Susan Harden led the Committee in a discussion of the comments received on the following portions of the administrative draft. Further comments were as follows:

- Focus Area E Downtown
  - Currently no height limit in C-3 Zone; "maximum" prefer anticipated maximum, etc. give general idea to the reader; provide guidance/expectations based on intended character
  - o Remove specific restrictions and leave to project review; include
  - Language so that goals/policies can continue and not be changed soon
  - o Preserving downtown character
- Focus Area H North Industrial and Focus Area K Southeast Industrial
  - o Infrastructure friendly for trucks in and out of the City
  - Alleyway maintenance is important
  - Need to be protective of our limited industrial areas (jobs & taxes)
  - Strengthen language to say industrial is the primary usage, but allow for supporting uses
- Sustainability
  - o California's baseline is already higher than other states
  - o Language leads towards mandates; need less mandates and more incentive
  - Promote green, but don't require
  - Leave in green, but add other types of jobs, i.e. high tech, R & D, creative arts, etc.
- Role of Government and Use of Government Resources
  - Buy Local program good concept, but it should be privatized (perhaps Chamber)
  - Expanding Education why is the City worrying about education; leave it to the schools
  - o Okay to work with the schools, but we should not be a part of the decision making process
  - o Encourage quality, not necessarily growth
  - Look at language to make sure it doesn't look like the City is taking on financial role in education
- Providing City Incentives
  - Should treat all businesses the same
  - Don't target specific industries
- Use and Expansion of Redevelopment
  - o May solve some problems, but sucks up a lot of money
  - o Comes with restrictions, caution in using as a tool
  - One of the few ways to keep money in Fullerton
  - Incentive to increase property values in the City
- Implementing Paid Parking
  - Increased hassle factor for people; people won't want to shop downtown
  - Okay for the Fullerton Transportation Center
  - Policy issue for City Council
  - Explore rather than implement
- Using Improvement Districts
  - Concern over taxes

- Voluntary participation is okay
- · Partnering with Private Businesses
- Encouraging Development Project Review / Design Review
  - Redundant already have compatibility with surrounding uses
  - Enhance without being overly restrictive
  - Design review already occurring for certain projects
  - o Assist RDRC in reviewing non-preservation zone projects
  - Avoid subjectivity, but don't dictate too much regarding style
  - o Don't expand review only for those that have dictionary review requirement
- Mobility
  - Focusing too much on multi-modal and auto left out
  - How do we add in multi-modal use without penalizing others
  - o Bicycle amenities not mandate
  - o "Study" not "establish"
  - Charging stations not necessary with new technology
  - o Define "support", "encourage", "promote"
- Housing
  - City shall acquire City should not be in the business of acquiring property private Housing Element was already adopted and approved by the state

#### **AGENDA FORECAST**

#### May 16

- Deadline for Committee to provide written comments on
  - The Fullerton Community (6 sub elements)
  - The Fullerton Natural Environment (6 sub elements)
- RBF compiles GPAC comments

#### May 23 - GPAC Meeting 3 (3 hours)

- Second working session review/refine
  - The Fullerton Community (6 sub elements)
  - The Fullerton Natural Environment (6 sub elements)

#### STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Chair Stopper advised the Committee that he would not be at the May 23 meeting.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m.



#### LIBRARY MEETING ROOM

MONDAY MAY 23, 2011 \_ 6:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Director Zelinka at 6:13 p.m.

PRESENT: GPAC Members Batinich, Bennett, Buck, Fitzgerald, Haley, Harrell (arrived at

6:21 p.m.), Heusser, Jaramillo, Lambros (arrived at 6:35 p.m.), and Richmond

ABSENT: Excused: GPAC Members Chi, Griffin, Savage and Stopper

Unexcused: None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Director Zelinka, Planning Manager Allen, Executive Assistant Pasillas

CONSULTANT PRESENT:

RBF Vice President Susan Harden, RBF Associate Michelle Kou

FLAG SALUTE: Dir

Director Zelinka

MINUTES:

MOTION made by Committee Member Fitzgerald, SECONDED by Committee Member Heusser, and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present, with Committee Member Haley abstaining, that the Minutes of the May 2, 2011

meeting be APPROVED as written.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Denny Bean asked where the public could read what had been done to date, and Director Zelinka explained that this was an administrative draft only, intended for GPAC and staff review. Once the GPAC and staff had finished their review a public review draft would be released. He provided those in attendance who were interested a copy of the administrative draft on CD.

Judith Kaluzny commented on the letter she had provided the GPAC on Business Improvement District's (BID's), and reiterated her belief that BID's were inappropriate in this document.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

RBF Associate Kou explained that no comments had been received on Chapters 18, 19 and 20 so those would not be included in tonight's discussion.

#### Review/Refine

Consultant Susan Harden led the Committee in a discussion of the comments received on the following portions of the administrative draft. Further comments were as follows:

- Chapter 10 Public Safety
  - Officer sensitivity training
    - Get Police Department input

- State requirements for training already in place
- Community confidence building
- Changing positions within PD.

#### Chapter 11 – Public Health

- Relation to land planning
- County Health & Schools providing social services like this.
- Biking / Walking applicable planning
- o School Relationship
- Focus on items that are the responsibility of the City
- Home-based businesses visitors create impact on neighborhood.
- Second hand smoke ordinance
- o "No smoking" @ Laguna Lake improved the environment
- Narrow scope & make more General Statements
- Suggestion to remove A14.2 14.4 and A14.12 14.15; vote: 9 yes/1 no
- Move items to Land Use Element
- Location/siting
- Relationship to neighborhoods
- o Leave smaller Public Health Element
- Seeing more Collaboration re: City & Public Health moving into the future may see
- Promote amenities within walkable distance
- o General language
- Secondhand smoking
- Food disparities
- P14.2 positive wording "not reduce obesity"

Motion by Member Bennett to remove Chapter 11 in its entirety, seconded by Member Haley failed to pass with a 5-5 vote.

Motion by Member Fitzgerald to delete A14.2-4 and A14.12-15, seconded by Member Bennett passed with a 9-1 vote.

- Chapter 12 Parks and Recreation
  - P.15.6 Concerns re: encouraging private businesses in public parks
  - Big League Dreams example of private venture creates park
  - Park ratio 'where economically feasible"
  - o Is this an ordinance?
  - Policy or action

  - "In all areas" reward

#### Clarify

- City only?
- Incl. County and schools?
- Chapter 13 Arts and Culture
  - Cooperating/supporting/encouraging
  - o City's role
  - Public art
  - Developer impact
  - o Plan, but not mandate
  - Public / Private venture to encourage art participation
  - Schools, library, community services already have some City leadership in art part.
- Chapter 14 Education
  - Vocational education (A17.3)
  - Vocational institutes (private)

- Clarify to talk about City's role in attracting these institutions
- Chapter 15 Community Involvement
  - o Information in water bill not getting to renters/tenants
  - Civics education City staff are resources available?
  - o Other organizations available for this
  - Speakers
  - A18.9 Remove subjective requirement as to how much outreach is needed; leave as open forum
  - Don't create another process
  - o City Council's responsibility to listen to people's comments & make decision
  - Early communication input better
  - o P18.2 & P18.11 → combine/merge
  - o Action re: threshold for development with additional outreach
  - Increasing notification radius
  - o Outreach not just to "stakeholders", but to greater community
  - o Newspaper, cable, phone system other avenues for information
  - Nexus between developer fee's and processing cost
- Chapter 16 Water
  - o P20.8 "encourage", not "require"
- Chapter 17 Air Quality and Climate Change
  - A20.8 Include language "as appropriate"
  - A20.7 don't need
  - o A20.5 plastic bags
  - o Accommodate NEV use
  - Incentives not necessary
  - o P21.3 conflicting with top
  - P21.3 Carbon offset program what would incentive be?
  - o P22.1 "Encourage" participating in regional efforts

#### **AGENDA FORECAST**

June 2 – Email Part III Implementation

June 6 – Next meeting at 7:00 p.m. at the Main Library to review Part III

#### STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

None.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Director Zelinka adjourned the meeting at 8:35 p.m.



#### LIBRARY MEETING ROOM

MONDAY JUNE 6, 2011 \_ 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chair Stopper at 7:06 p.m.

PRESENT: GPAC Members Batinich, Buck, Chi, Fitzgerald, Haley, Harrell, Heusser,

Jaramillo, Richmond, Savage, and Stopper

**ABSENT:** Excused: GPAC Members Bennett, Griffin, and Lambros

Unexcused: None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Director Zelinka (arrived at 8:25 p.m.), Planning Manager Allen, Executive

**Assistant Pasillas** 

**CONSULTANT** 

**PRESENT:** RBF Vice President Susan Harden, RBF Associate Michelle Kou

FLAG SALUTE: Chair Stopper

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Fitzgerald, SECONDED by Committee

Member Batinich, and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present, with Committee Members Chi, Savage, and Stopper abstaining, that the Minutes of

the May 23, 2011 meeting be APPROVED as written.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Judith Kaluzny informed the Committee that she would no longer be reporting on GPAC meetings for the Observer.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### Part III – Implementation Strategy

RBF Vice President Susan Harden led a discussion on the Implementation Process, explaining the four proposed steps. During discussion the following comments were made:

- Making work at a time when we should be reducing work
- Adding more bureaucracy
  - Planning Manager Allen clarified that the Annual Progress Report was required by the state, and the other reports would assist staff in completing this report. These reports would also help to ensure that the decisions made were being guided by the General Plan.
- Perhaps a checklist could be made
- Like the reports want to see what the City does is reflective of the General Plan
- Don't want the General Plan to just sit on a shelf
- Like the bi-annual assessment and giving the community an opportunity to have input
- Who is included in the Annual Employee Performance Reviews

- Ms. Harden clarified it would include all staff, but maybe as a part of the discussion rather than included on the review form
- Keep the annual reviews at the department head level

Ms. Harden reviewed the tracking tools and chart and the key implementation tools, and the following comments were made:

- What did "new zoning designation to be created mean"
  - o Ms. Allen clarified that they were new designations that had been included in the General Plan, but were not currently included in the zoning code
- Under "Public Land Parks and Recreation" what did Oil-Gas mean
  - Ms. Harden explained that more information on the zoning implementation tools would be provided at the next meeting
- Perhaps a checklist could be made for use by the developer, staff, Planning Commission, and the City Council
- How long did staff have to review a submittal
  - Ms. Allen responded 30 days

Ms. Harden led a discussion on the Community Participation Opportunities and the following comments were made:

- Participation in Arbor Day
- Create place online to have other opportunities listed
- Should not be included as part of the General Plan other organizations should provide this information (Chamber, Neighbors United for Fullerton)
- Description of decision making process where community can get involved
- Focus on items that will help the City implement the General Plan, less on items that only benefit the individual
- Narrow the focus to items relating to helping the City, citizenship, civic activity; put other information on the website
- Information strays outside the boundaries of the General Plan

Motion by Member Savage to remove this section in its entirety, seconded by Member Batinich.

Motion amended by Member Savage to eliminate everything but the heading and allow staff to start anew based on tonight's discussion, seconded by Member Batinich, passed with a 9-2 vote.

Ms. Harden explained what indicators were and provided several samples. After discussion the following suggestions for indicators were made:

- Three categories physical, economic, and social
- Quality of life
- Improved business climate
- Business longevity
- Marked bike lanes/trails
  - Safe routes to schools
  - Accident rates decrease
- Substandard housing environmental complaints
- Community Preservation perception, i.e. number of complaints, maintenance issues
- Cancer numbers
- Road conditions and City infrastructure maintenance

- Business diversity downtown
- Traffic/uses/impacts around colleges, educational community, events, etc.
- Number of living wage jobs
- Strategic versus tactical indicators
- Diversity/integration/belonging

Ms. Harden provided a brief overview of staff's technical edits and the Appendices.

#### **AGENDA FORECAST**

June 13	Review of Climate Action Plan and Zoning Diagnostic
June 20	Cancelled – Items combined with June 13 agenda
June 27	Review of revised Parts I through III of The Fullerton Plan with recommendation for preparation of Public Review Draft

#### **STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION**

Director Zelinka commented that he had just attended an affordable housing study session with the Council.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 8:57 p.m.



#### LIBRARY MEETING ROOM

MONDAY JUNE 13, 2011 \_ 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chair Stopper at 7:08 p.m.

PRESENT: GPAC Members Bennett, Buck, Griffin, Haley, Harrell, Heusser, Jaramillo,

Lambros, Richmond, Savage, and Stopper

ABSENT: Excused: GPAC Member Batinich, Chi, and Fitzgerald

Unexcused: None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Director Zelinka, Planning Manager Allen, Executive Assistant Pasillas

**CONSULTANT**PRESENT:

RBF Vice President Susan Harden, RBF Associate Michelle Kou, RBF Associate Laura Sterns, Esq., RBS Sr. Associate/Director of Technical Studies

**Eddie Torres** 

**FLAG SALUTE:** Chair Stopper

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Richmond, SECONDED by Committee

Member Haley, and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present, with Members Bennett, Griffin, and Lambros abstaining, that the Minutes of the June

6, 2011 meeting be APPROVED as written.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

<u>Presentation/discussion of Zoning Diagnostic background, intent, anticipated sections and preliminary recommendations</u>

RBF Associate Laura Stearns, Esq. explained the relationship between the General Plan and zoning, different approaches to zoning, and the steps involved in the zoning update process. She explained that the Zoning Code needed to be updated in the following circumstances: the zones no longer relate to the General Plan; current zoning is a barrier to investment; the current procedures are too complicated and time consuming; there is insufficient guidance on findings which increases the possibility of lawsuits; and critical standards are hidden in obscure sections and/or the definitions. A brief background on the origin of zoning and various regulatory approaches was provided.

Ms. Stearns explained the three phase process that was being suggested: 1. Immediate – relatively minor text changes or things that need to be accomplished in order to comply with state law; 2. Comprehensive Update – items that require public outreach and/or policy direction from the Planning

Commission and City Council; and 3. Changes after the Downtown Core and Corridor Specific Plan is adopted – technical changes.

<u>Presentation/discussion of Climate Action Plan background, intent, anticipated sections and preliminary recommendations</u>

RBF Sr. Associate/Director of Technical Studies Eddie Torres explained the reasons for a Climate Action Plan (CAP) including the addition of legal defensibility to the General Plan and its EIR, as well as providing a streamlined review process related to greenhouse gas impacts for future projects. He described the CAP requirements as well as the Climate Action Strategies. He clarified that no new goals or policies would be added to the CAP beyond those identified in the General Plan. The CAP was still being prepared and could only be finalized with the completion of the traffic analysis as solidification by the GPAC of the goals and policies.

After discussion, the Committee requested to know how the CAP would be reviewed. Planning Manager Allen explained that the CAP would be circulated for public review along with the Draft Program EIR. The GPAC could provide comments individually as members of the public during the review process. Alternatively, a sub-committee of the GPAC could be formed to review the CAP, or the GPAC could hold an additional meeting to review the CAP. It was anticipated that the document would be available for review in July or August.

#### AGENDA FORECAST

June 20 Cancelled – Items combined with June 13 agenda

June 27 Review of revised Parts I through III of The Fullerton Plan with recommendation for preparation of Public Review Draft

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee to start the June 27 meeting at 6:00 p.m. rather than the proposed 7:00 p.m.

#### STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Committee Member Harrell asked for clarification on the previous meetings discussion of indicators and Planning Manager Allen explained that staff, based on the Committee's discussion, was looking at using the 12 items in the General Plan Vision Statement under "Fullerton will be a City which:", along with the CSUF telephone survey, as indicators, which seemed to address the quality of life issues emphasized by the Committee. These indicators would be reviewed periodically to see if any changes needed to be made.

Committee Member Buck asked if the General Plan would be approved before the Bicycle Master Plan, and Ms. Allen clarified that it was a separate document and the policies would be rolled into the General Plan as both were going through the process at the same time and would be approved concurrently.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 8:44 p.m.



#### LIBRARY MEETING ROOM

MONDAY JUNE 27, 2011 7:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chair Stopper at 6:11 p.m.

PRESENT: GPAC Members Batinich, Bennett, Chi, Griffin, Haley, Harrell (arrived at 6:54

p.m.), Heusser, Jaramillo, Lambros, Richmond, Savage (arrived at 7:00 p.m.),

and Stopper

**ABSENT:** 

Excused: GPAC Members Buck, Chi, Fitzgerald, and Lambros

Unexcused: None

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Manager Allen, Sr. Planner St. Paul, Executive Assistant Pasillas

CONSULTANT PRESENT:

RBF Vice President Susan Harden, RBF Associate Michelle Kou

**FLAG SALUTE:** Chair Stopper

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Richmond, SECONDED by Committee

Member Haley, and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present, that

the Minutes of the June 13, 2011 meeting be APPROVED as written.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Ms. Harden described the review process that would be used and advised the Committee that there would be no discussion on the Housing Element since it had already been approved by the state, and also on the Bicycle Element as it was currently being reviewed by the Bicycle Users Sub-Committee.

The following comments were received from the individual Member's:

Batnich- document is still wordy, needs to be more concise/consolidated

Richmond- would like to discuss Airport Focus Area. Needs to talk about connectivity to Southwest Fullerton

Jaramillo- generally okay with the draft

Bennett- draft is much better than the last, addressed role of government and social engineering Heusser- good job of pulling comments together, would like to discuss Parks & Rec later, needs more emphasis on the library, would like to review the Climate Action Plan

Haley- good job synthesizing, provides more flexibility for decision makers

Griffin- good job listening to the committee on the role of government, good consistency throughout the document

Stopper- concur with the Committee, would like to address Housing Element- policy action terminology

not consistent with rest of the General Plan. When the City updates the Housing Element, it should be consistent with the new GP and include concise policies and actions.

The following comments were received in a section-by-section discussion:

Introduction- no comments

Vision

include connectivity to Southwest Fullerton to the Airport Focus Area

Chapter 1: Community Development and Design- no comments

Chapter 2: Housing

- PA3.21 Proactive Code Enforcement- also include the Zoning Code
- PA3.16- typo, should refer to PA 3.1
- PA3.24- regarding sustainability/green, should be consistent with the rest of the General Plan when the City updates the Housing Element
- Chair Stopper noted that the policy actions are wordy and should be more concise to be consist with the rest of the General Plan

Chapter 3: Historic Preservation

- Public Comment- Katie Dalton- will review actions and see if they include items that would have been addressed with previous P4.5 and P4.6. May have more comments during public review.
   Process for historic areas is already established through the Zoning Code and would not like to see Fullerton move backwards.
- Planning Manager Allen- intent is for preservation zones in the Zoning Code to remain in place
- Committee would like to add old P4.9 Retrofits back in.

Chapter 4: Mobility

 P5.14 Fair Share of Improvements- Planning Manager Allen clarified that this only applies to new development, not remodels, City's existing fee program would continue, does not apply to single family dwellings

Chapter 6: Growth Management- no comments

Chapter 7: Noise

Chapter 8: Economic Development

- P9.9- Privatization of Services- revert language to original with new beginning consistent with policies... remove "finding"
- P9.11 Reduce Barrier to Investment- Bennett would like to remove "quality of life...", Haley disagreed, Griffin thought language as-is is good/good gut check, Savage agrees with Bennett, majority vote- leave as is
- P10.10- combine with P10.9 Business Incubators, remove "low-income" and add language about providing information

Chapter 10: Public Safety- no comments

Chapter 11: Public Health- no comments

Chapter 12: Parks and Recreation

- City already meets its parks standard of 4 acres/1,000 people; Parks and Rec staff would like to increase the standard to 5 acres/1,000 people
- Clarify in policy what parks/land is included in the count
- Committee feels the standard shouldn't be changed until its impacts are understood, should be a City Council discussion
- Revise policy to stay at 4 acres/ 1,000 people.
- Chris Heusser will provide comments on Exhibit 13 after the meeting.

Chapter 13: Arts and Culture

P16.6- include accessible by all to library system policy

Chapter 14: Education- no comments

Chapter 15: Community Involvement- no comments

Chapter 16: Water- no comments

Chapter 17: Air Quality and Climate Change- no comments

Chapter 18: Integrated Waste Management- no comments

Chapter 19: Open Space and Natural Resources

• Revise P24.7 to not include urban civic plaza

Chapter 20: Natural Hazards- no comments

Part III: Implementation

- Committee has concerns with staff's capacity to report so much
- Quarterly report is unnecessary
- Monthly report should only be when activity occurs, coordinate with monthly council review report
- Bi-Annual Assessment- use same questions as in 2008 as the baseline
- Indicators- some data can be collected through other means besides the community survey
- Action Plan-
- P. 206 CERT Program- could CERT team members become new trainers- Staff to check
- P.213 Car sharing pilot program (i.e. community car or "zip" car)
- Library has no short term action Plan

Provide matrix for summary of changes to GPAC; do not include for Planning Commission review

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

Motion by Member Savage to approve the Administrative Draft of The Fullerton Plan and its conversion into the Public Review Draft for review and consideration by the public, the City's committees and commissions, Planning Commission and City Council, seconded by Member Bennett, carried unanimously by voting members present.

#### **AGENDA FORECAST**

Ms. Allen explained that the work of the GPAC was completed at this time and there were no other meetings scheduled at this time. She encouraged the GPAC members to attend the various meetings as the General Plan update moved through the process.

Chair Stopper clarified that the work of the GPAC would not be completed until the General Plan Update had been approved by the City Council and the Council disbanded the GPAC.

#### STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Chair Stopper asked if a copy of the Public Review Draft would be provided to the GPAC and Ms. Allen stated that the Committee would receive the Draft as well as a matrix showing the changes made.

Member Haley asked what the Planning Commission would receive for their review and Ms. Allen explained that they would receive the Public Draft Document as well as the minutes from the GPAC meetings.

Chair Stopper asked if the EIR would be completed before the Update went to the Planning Commission and Ms. Allen clarified that the Planning Commission would be reviewing the document over the course of two meetings; the first meeting would be during the comment period of the EIR and the second after the comment period had closed. No action would be taken by the Planning Commission until they had received both documents.

#### <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.