The tenth meeting (a regular meeting) of the GPAC began at 7:07 p.m. and was called to order by Chairman Klein. GPAC Member Robert Pope led the Pledge of Allegiance. In the event Chairman Klein would need to leave the meeting, GPAC Member Mark Shear was selected to serve as Chair Pro Tem.

GPAC Members in attendance included: Dave Brown, Michael Friedman, Alan Horwitz, Gary Klein, Michael Kaplan, Peter Kraut, Kim Lamorie, Robert Lia, Mireille Neumann, Robert Odello, Melissa Olen, Robert Pope, Mark Shear and Candice Weber. GPAC members not present included: Britt Aaronson, Dana Ashton, Amber Gendein, Marvin Lopata, Jolie Pfahler and Peter Valk.

City staff present included Maureen Tamuri, Tom Bartlett, Isidro Figueroa and Elizabeth Parker as well as Assistant City Attorney Lawrence Permaul. Consultant team members in attendance included Joe Power with Rincon Consultants and Erik Justesen and Diane Bathgate with RRM Design Group.

Tom Bartlett discussed the upcoming GPAC meeting schedule and revised approach to reviewing the individual General Plan Elements in order to keep the project on schedule and budget. From now on, more complete elements will be presented to the GPAC that incorporate recommended changes for discussion.

A copy of the slide presentation for this meeting may be viewed on the City’s website.

Public Comments
Opportunity for public comments was provided and four persons came forward to speak:

- Elizabeth Stevens, Calabasas Highlands resident, expressed her opinion that clustering should not be allowed in HM designated areas. She believes that clustering maximizes density and does not support goals of more open space.
• Nancy Rothenberg, Calabasas Highlands HOA President, expressed opposition to development clustering policies. She believes that clustering encourages more residential units and less open space.

• Toby Keeler noted that clustering can be useful in certain situations and when performance standards are met. Not used properly, clustering can become a “density bonus reward” for building on otherwise unbuildable land.

• Steve Hess, an Agoura resident, spoke in opposition to clustering policies, stating an opinion that clustering is a strategy intended for flat land, not hillside areas. He recommended simply relying on a performance based approach to address site conditions.

Written correspondence was submitted by:

• Erik B. Pontoppidan, Elsa Pontoppidan, Erik J. Pontoppidan, Janice Pontoppidan, David Schilder, and Lynn Schilder (letter dated January 13, 2008) requested that the General Plan designation for their property along Las Virgenes Road be for single-family housing.

• Norman Buehring, President, Community Association of Saratoga Hills and Board (letter dated January 17, 2008) expressed opposition to a land use designation of multi-family residential on the current pet kennel site due to hillside and intensity concerns.

**GPAC Meeting No. 9 Summary**
The meeting summary for the December 6, 2007 GPAC meeting was reviewed. Language to clarify the context for discussion of the Westside Village Concept was revised/added:

*After discussion and based on application of a guiding principle, for the time-being, to not consider RHNA contributions as an essential factor, the consensus of the GPAC was to recommend moving forward with the proposed Westside Village concept with the following revisions:*

The meeting summary was approved as revised.

**Continued Review of Safety Element**
Joe Power initiated review of the Hazardous Materials and Disaster Response objectives and policies of the Safety Element. Discussion of goals and individual policies was conducted. After discussion of each policy, the following recommendations were supported by GPAC consensus through a show of hands (added text is shown in italics, and deleted text in strike-outs).
Hazardous Materials Objective:
Protect life and property from the potential short- and long-term adverse effects of the transportation, storage, treatment, and disposal of hazardous materials within the Calabasas General Plan study area consistent with the definition of acceptable risks outlined in Table VI-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary Recommendation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E.1</strong> Manage activities within the City of Calabasas that transport, use, store, or dispose of hazardous materials in a responsible manner which protects public health, and safety, and the environment.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E.2</strong> Promote the availability of safe and legal options for the management of hazardous wastes generated by businesses and households within and adjacent to the City.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E.3</strong> Promote community education and understanding of sound management practices for the storage, handling, use, and disposal of hazardous household materials.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E.4</strong> Enforce the requirement that industrial facilities and construction sites have adequate Hazardous Materials Handling and Spill Response Plans to ensure that the goals of pollutant control are consistent with the City's public safety needs and the General Plan's water quality objectives.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disaster Response Objective:
Maintain a system of emergency services and disaster response preparedness which will save lives, protect property, and facilitate recovery with a minimum of social disruption following minor emergencies, as well as major catastrophic events.

| **F.1** Expand access and resources through coordination and participation | 14 | - |
| **F.2** Coordinate planning activities with adjacent jurisdictions to promote the provision of quality medical and emergency medical care facilities and to identify and revise possible unnecessary constraints on their development. | 14 | |

Continued Review of Land Use Element
Follow-up items regarding the Land Use Element were addressed under this portion of the agenda, including an update on the Las Virgenes vision poster, revised land use map, policies A.5 and A.8 (originally discussed at the December 6 GPAC meeting), other policies not yet covered and definitions of land use designations.
Erik Justesen reviewed updates to the Las Virgenes vision poster made in response to GPAC, Planning Commission and City Council comments.

GPAC discussion ensued, including:
• Need to allow flexibility to address geotechnical issues
• Should outline the method for governing uses
• Concern with multi-family residential on Pontoppidan site – maybe look for other opportunity sites for MF within Calabasas
• Records should reflect that the GPAC has differing opinions on the vision plan (the vote from the last meeting showed 8 GPAC members in support of moving forward out of 13 members in attendance)
• Make sure to address additional traffic due to increased intensity

Potential environmental effects, including traffic, from proposed land use designations will be fully evaluated in the General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR). In addition, a lower intensity (single-family residential) option for the Pontoppidan site will be evaluated as a project alternative in the EIR. For the Pontoppidan and Messenger sites, a Planned Development (PD) land use designation is proposed to allow for more strenuous review and site-tailored regulations with additional guidance from the Community Design Element.

Joe Power walked through updates to the currently proposed Land Use Map based on input received to date. Some discussion ensued regarding relative land use intensities on the west and east sides of town and how implementation of a Planned Development designation might work, as well as the pros and cons of development clustering. No further comments were provided on the map.

Discussion of goals and individual policies for the Land Use Element was conducted. After discussion of each policy, the following recommendations were supported by GPAC consensus through a show of hands (added text is shown in italics, and deleted text in strike-outs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary Recommendation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.5 Promote a citywide open space system consisting of 3.0 acres per 1,000 population of active recreational land and 3,500 acres of protected natural open space. The whose location and size should represents an extensive network of protected areas with a high degree of continuity and a systematic order of purpose, including resource conservation, recreation, and protection of public safety.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**A.8** Discretionary development projects are permitted the basic development intensity of their site as indicated on the General Plan Land Use Map (see Table II-1 of the Land Use Element) if the proposed project is consistent with general plan goals, objectives, approaches, and relevant policies and performance standards as provided in the Municipal Code. Development intensities greater than the basic development intensity outlined in Table II-1 may be permitted, up to the maximum development intensity identified in Table III-1, only if the impacts of the proposed development are less than those identified in “Maximum Acceptable Development Impacts” table of the Municipal Code.

**A.9** The following provisions shall apply to lands for which a valid development agreement exists that pre-dates adoption of the Calabasas General Plan....

**A.10** All development agreements adopted after the adoption of the Calabasas General Plan shall be consistent with the provisions of the General Plan in place at the time the development agreement was adopted.

### Residential Single Family (R-SF)
- Basic Land Use Intensity: 2 du/ac
- Maximum Land Use Intensity: 6 du/ac; 12 du/acre for senior residential projects.
- Anticipated Maximum Population Intensity: 16.8 persons per acre (2.8 persons per household x 6 du/ac)

### Residential Multiple Family (R-MF)
- Basic Land Use Intensity: 2 du/ac, 0.2 FAR for visitor serving uses
- Maximum Land Use Intensity: 16 du/ac; 0.2 FAR for visitor serving uses
- Anticipated Maximum Population Intensity: 36.8 persons per acre (2.3 persons per household x 8 du/ac)

*There was a recommendation to increase the maximum intensity to 20 du/ac in order for areas designated Residential Multiple Family to be eligible for credit to satisfy RHNA affordable housing requirements per HCD policies. Seven GPAC members voted to keep the existing 16 du/ac maximum land use intensity and 6 GPAC members voted to adjust the maximum intensity to 20 du/ac.*

### Residential Mobile Home (R-MH)
- Basic Land Use Intensity: 2 du/ac
- Maximum Land Use Intensity: 8 du/ac
- Anticipated Maximum Population Intensity: 18.4 persons per acre (2.3 persons per household x 8 du/ac)
### Business Limited Intensity (B-LI)
- **Allowed Uses:** Limited retail and commercial services, restaurants, nurseries, *convalescent facilities* and business and professional offices.
- **Basic Land Use Intensity:** Floor Area Ratio of ≤ 0.2
- **Maximum Land Use Intensity:** Floor Area Ratio of ≤ 0.2

### Business Retail (B-R)
- **Allowed Uses:** General retail, markets, commercial services, restaurants, automotive repair and service, hardware and home improvement, durable goods sales, commercial recreation, and automotive sales.
- **Conditionally Allowed Uses:** multi-family residential *(maximum of 16 du/ac)*
- **Basic Land Use Intensity:** Floor Area Ratio of ≤ 0.2
- **Maximum Land Use Intensity:** Floor Area Ratio of ≤ 0.4

### Business Professional Office (B-PO)
- **Allowed Uses:** Business, professional, and medical offices, and ancillary service functions.
- **Basic Land Use Intensity:** Floor Area Ratio of ≤ 0.2
- **Maximum Land Use Intensity:** Floor Area Ratio of ≤ 0.5

### Business Park (B-BP)
- **Allowed Uses:** Broad range of office and light industrial.
- **Basic Land Use Intensity:** Floor Area Ratio of ≤ 0.2
- **Maximum Land Use Intensity:** Floor Area Ratio of ≤ 0.6

### Old Town (B-OT)
- **Allowed Uses:** Variety of office, retail, and commercial services.
- **Conditionally Allowed Uses:** multi-family residential *(maximum of 16 du/ac)*
- **Basic Land Use Intensity:** Floor Area Ratio of ≤ 0.2
- **Maximum Land Use Intensity:** Floor Area Ratio of ≤ 1.0
### Mixed Use (MU)
- **Allowed Uses:** Broad range of office, retail, and commercial uses as well as high intensity residential uses.
- **Basic Land Use Intensity:** Floor Area Ratio of \( \leq 0.2 \)
- **Maximum Land Use Intensity:** Floor Area Ratio of \( \leq 0.6 \)
  - 0.5 FAR, 0.75 FAR or 1.00 FAR depending on location
- **Include a minimum FAR for residential**
- **Maximum Land Use Intensity for Residential:** 20 du/ac
- **Add visitor-serving uses**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Facilities- Institutional (PF-I)
- **Allowed Uses:** Broad range of governmental, public, and quasi-public uses.
- **Maximum Land Use Intensity:** Shall be as they existed or as they were approved by the City (or Los Angeles County or California Coastal Commission as appropriate within unincorporated areas) as of the date of the adoption of the General Plan. Facilities established subsequent to the General Plan shall be determined on a case-by-case basis consistent with the provisions of Table VIII-3, the “Maximum Acceptable Development Impacts” table of the Municipal Code.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Facilities- Recreational (PF-R)
- **Allowed Uses:** Active and passive recreational opportunities on lands held by public agencies.
- **Maximum Land Use Intensity:** Shall be as they existed or as they were approved by the City (or Los Angeles County or California Coastal Commission as appropriate within unincorporated areas) as of the date of the adoption of the General Plan. Facilities established subsequent to the General Plan shall be determined on a case-by-case basis consistent with the provisions of Table VIII-3, the “Maximum Acceptable Development Impacts” table of the Municipal Code.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hillside Mountainous (HM)
- **Basic Land Use Intensity:** 1 du/40 ac
- **Maximum Land Use Intensity:** 1du/10 ac; or 1/du per existing buildable legal lot.
- **Anticipated Maximum Population Intensity:** 0.28 persons per acre (2.8 persons per household x 1 du/10 ac)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rural Residential (RR)
- **Basic Land Use Intensity:** 1 du/10 ac
- **Maximum Land Use Intensity:** 1du/ac; or 1/du per existing buildable legal lot.
- **Anticipated Maximum Population Intensity:** 2.8 persons per acre (2.8 persons per household x 1 du/ac)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rural Community (RC)
- Basic Land Use Intensity: 1 du/10 ac
- Maximum Land Use Intensity: 2du/ac; or 1/du per existing buildable legal lot.
- Anticipated Maximum Population Intensity: 5.6 persons per acre (2.8 persons per household x 2 du/ac)

| 14 |  - |

### Open Space – Recreational (OS-R)
- Primary purpose is the provision of active and passive recreation.
- Maximum Land Use Intensity: One dwelling unit per lot of record.

| 13 |  - |

### Open Space – Resource Protection (OS-RP)
- Primary purpose is the protection of public health and safety, preservation of sensitive environmental resources, or resource management.
- Maximum Land Use Intensity: 1du/160 ac; or 1/du per buildable legal lot, whichever is greater.

| 12 | 1 |

[1 abstention: Michael Friedman]

### Planned Development (PD) - proposed
- Applies to Pontoppidan and Messenger site to allow more tailored zoning
  - Pontoppidan: single family, multiple family and park
  - Messenger: commercial (retail and/or office), single or multiple family
- Allowable intensities: consistent with commercial-retail, single family and multiple family designations.

Some support of the PD concept was expressed. Additional information regarding implementation was requested. No vote was taken.

|  - |  - |

Please note that not all votes add up to the same total as not all GPAC members raised hands for all items. Due to time constraints, discussion of development clustering policies in the Land Use Element was continued to the next GPAC meeting.

**Meeting Adjournment**
The meeting adjourned at 10:42 p.m. The next GPAC meeting is scheduled for February 7.

Submitted by:

Gary Klein, Chairman