



The eleventh meeting (a regular meeting) of the GPAC began at 5:50 p.m. and was called to order by Chairman Klein. GPAC Member Brit Aaronson led the Pledge of Allegiance. The GPAC meeting summary for January 17, 2008 was approved without change.

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

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

Assistant City Attorney Larry Permaul reminded the GPAC to make sure to identify any potential conflicts of interests, such as property or businesses owned within 500 feet of a potential open space acquisition site. A member may not participate in an action that may affect the individual's financial interests pursuant to State law.

A copy of the slide presentation for this meeting may be viewed on the City's website. In addition, copies of the four draft General Plan Elements discussed are posted on the website.

**Public Comments**

Opportunity for public comments was provided and two persons came forward to speak:

- Emma Wilby expressed concern regarding the FAR intensities of 0.5, 0.75 and 1.0 and asked to consider lowering the intensity standards. An FAR of 0.5 may be too much next to existing homes.

- Toby Keeler stated the importance of keeping existing General Plan policies protecting biotic resources and relating to hillside mountainous and hillside management.

### Continued Review of Land Use Element

#### *Planned Development Designation*

Joe Power provided an update regarding the Planned Development (PD) designation proposed for two sites in the Las Virgenes Vision Plan area now labeled as Las Virgenes Site 1 (Pontoppidan) and Las Virgenes Site 2 (Messenger). The two draft site designations include the following:

##### Las Virgenes Site 1:

- Single Family - 2.5 acres (maximum of 6 du/ac)
- Multiple Family - 2.5 acres (maximum of 16 du/ac)
- Park - 2.5 acres

##### Las Virgenes Site 2:

- Commercial (retail, office & residential) - approximately 10 acres at 0.4 FAR maximum
- Residential - approximately 10 acres
  - Single Family - maximum of 6 du/ac
  - Multiple Family - maximum of 16 du/ac
- Open Space - approximately 57 acres

Some members of the GPAC expressed the desire for an opportunity to review this information again before the General Plan is adopted. The policies will be part of the review of the complete Draft General Plan scheduled for an upcoming GPAC meeting and also will be reviewed during the public hearing process, including Planning Commission and City Council consideration. Tom Bartlett noted that the maximum density for the multiple family land use category (16 versus 20 du/ac) and RHNA compliance will be revisited as part of the upcoming Housing Element discussion. Joe Power clarified that the Community Design Element will provide additional policies for the PD areas. In addition, a minimum percentage of residential uses will be included in the Mixed Use requirements. As presently proposed, the Mixed Use requirements allow a maximum density of 20 du/ac for residential components of mixed-use projects.

#### *Development Clustering Policy*

Joe Power reviewed existing General Plan policy C.9 regarding clustering of development and no changes were recommended. The existing clustering guidelines were also proposed to remain unchanged. Tom Bartlett read policy C.9 in its entirety and briefly reviewed other references in the existing General Plan regarding the use of clustering, such as for protection of biotic resources.

The GPAC supported carrying forward the existing policy language for use in the updated General Plan. When asked, no hands were raised with objections to this recommendation.

**Review of Open Space Element**

Joe Power described the revised format for GPAC review of General Plan Elements whereby updated draft Elements are furnished ahead of the meeting for review. Comments are solicited at the meeting and identified revisions to the Elements will be incorporated into a complete Draft General Plan for GPAC review prior to consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council.

A copy of the updated draft Open Space Element was provided to the GPAC prior to the meeting accompanied by a comparison of existing and proposed objectives and policies. Key updates to the Open Space Element include:

- Clarified distinction between “open space” and “vacant land”
- Increased open space target from 3,000 acres to 3,500 acres
- Added reference to and map of specific possible acquisition areas (HM designated properties)
- Added significant ridgelines map

Figure III-2, Potential Acquisition Areas for Open Space Designations, was brought forward first to isolate discussion on this figure and to allow GPAC members to recuse themselves, as needed, due to potential conflicts of interest. GPAC Members Brown, Dornfest, Lamorie and Neumann recused themselves and left the room during the discussion of the potential open space acquisition sites. GPAC Members Michael Friedman and Alan Horwitz were not present for discussion of the Open Space Element and arrived later to participate with the discussion of the Conservation Element.

The following comments were provided on the Open Space Element:

Page	Policy	Comment/Recommendation
III-11		Figure III-2, Potential Acquisition Areas for Open Space Designations, should clarify title of figure (broaden to include more than acquisition), but there were no recommendations for changes to the map
III-10		Figure III-1, Designated Open Space, indicate applicable jurisdictions/ownership as well, especially to distinguish public versus private ownership, and add OS-R site northwest of De Anza Park
III-2		Table III-1, Open Space Acreage and Ratios, distinguish types of open space and uses
III-3		Figure III-3, Significant Ridgelines, add the ridgeline along the east side of Mulholland and the ridgeline west of De Anza (the portion within the City)
III-4		Revise language in second paragraph to reflect more equal importance between acquisition and maintenance
	III-1	Add “annexations”
	III-2	Add “and habitat linkages”
III-5		Add fuel modification reference under protection of public health and safety heading
	III-3	Add policy to partner with adjacent jurisdictions for open space acquisition/development right retirement

	III-4	Various concerns about the language of this policy were voiced, with some believing the wording is too strong and other saying it is too weak; ultimately, it was determined that this and other “open space” policies regarding clustering could be deleted since this is covered in the Land Use Element
	III-16	After discussion, the consensus was to delete this and other policies referencing clustering except for the primary clustering policy in the Land Use Element

### Review of Conservation Element

A copy of the updated draft Conservation Element was provided to the GPAC prior to the meeting accompanied by a comparison of existing and proposed objectives and policies. GPAC Members Freidman and Horwitz arrived and participated in the discussion of this Element. The following comments were provided:

Page	Policy	Comment/Recommendation
IV-1		Provide more global setting for introductory paragraphs. GPAC consensus was to delete “facing southern California” and replace “residents” with “generations” in first paragraph. <i>[Differences of opinion were expressed, consensus resulted in recommendation of a more global approach.]</i>
IV-1		Revisit second bullet under general goals to perhaps replace “define limits” with “minimize resource consumption”
IV-1		Change objective language from “maintain” to “enhance”
IV-2		Replace “facilitate restoration of” with “enhance” and delete “throughout the remaining open spaces”
IV-2		Replace “preservation of viable habitat areas that are of sufficient size and location to sustain” with “promoting the continued existence of growth and native...”
	IV-1	Insert “flora and fauna” after “endangered”
	IV-2	Consult with biologists and revisit “measureable reduction in species diversity”
	IV-4	Consider deleting preface regarding public safety concerns; there was substantial discussion on this point, with no consensus; consultant team to craft language
IV-3		Add new policy addressing setbacks or buffers for sensitive habitats including riparian woodland setbacks <i>[may also need a related policy for stream setbacks in Safety Element]</i>
IV-3		Add existing Policy C.4 regarding construction activity impacts back with modifications to make more general
	IV-9	Consider “expand the” instead of “maintain an” inventory of City street trees
IV-7		Add a policy addressing pedestrians or augment an existing policy to specify walking as a means of transport
	IV-17	Reconsider using LEED as a benchmark
	IV-24	Delete “feasible”

IV-11		Replace “grading of slopes” with “alteration of natural landforms” in last sentence of the second paragraph under “General Plan Approach”
	IV-25	Add “or natural landform alteration” and replace “encouraged” with “required”
	IV-28	Revise to encourage highest attainment of LEED standards
IV-14		Add policy to create incentives for higher LEED attainment to encourage greater energy efficiency
	IV-29	Consider public bicycle program Add coordination with other jurisdictions on system of bicycle lanes Add bullet addressing provisions for alternative fuels for vehicles
	IV-31	Consider allowing roof top structures such as evaporative cooling systems and solar panels
	IV-34	Provide infrastructure for fueling alternative vehicles
	IV-39	Replace “require” with “encourage” and delete “where feasible” Consider reinstating some of prior policy 1.4

**Review of Parks, Recreation and Trails Element**

A copy of the updated draft Parks, Recreation and Trails Element was provided to the GPAC prior to the meeting accompanied by a comparison of existing and proposed objectives and policies. The following comments were provided:

Page	Policy	Comment/Recommendation
TBD	TBD	Insert language addressing basketball needs in community
X-1		In second paragraph, add reference to King Gillette and insert “multiple” before homeowner association
X-1		In third paragraph, delete “even with the sensitive nature of Calabasas’ environment” and after community residents add “in harmony with the sensitive nature of Calabasas’ environment”
X-2		Insert “As of 2008” at beginning of fourth paragraph
X-3		Confirm possible existing joint use agreement for Chaparral Elementary School and check on future opportunities at Lupin Hill School
X-4		In Table X-1, mention Brandon’s Village within Gates Canyon Park (a park within a park)
X-5		For Table X-5, “delete YMCA and Camp Calabasas on site” and consider revising asterisked note to mention possible future annexation of school sites
X-6		Revise language regarding the TSC pool to acknowledge that there are two pools and a teaching pool
	X-5	Consider deleting “only to the extent that there are adequate long-term revenues to support them and”
X-9		Consider adding “restrooms” to first paragraph
	X-8	Include Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy and State Parks as agencies to coordinate with in trail development
	X-12	Add “public easements”

X-11		Add policy to pursue alternative funding sources such as state, federal and private grants
X-11		Consider policy of reduced fees for Calabasas residents or limiting certain programs to Calabasas residents
	X-19	Consider deleting “only to the extent that there are adequate long-term revenues to support them and”

**Review of Cultural Resources Element**

A copy of the updated draft Cultural Resources Element was provided to the GPAC prior to the meeting accompanied by a comparison of existing and proposed objectives and policies. The following comments were provided:

Page	Policy	Comment/Recommendation
XI-2		Delete “to the north of the project area” in third paragraph and double-check description of events.
XI-3		Delete “Many of these were developed as gated communities, reflecting the desire of new residents to transform lifestyles from those in the rapidly urbanizing San Fernando Valley” in last paragraph.
XI-5		Delete “and ongoing community development in the Old Town area” in last paragraph
	XI-4	Replace the term “deposits” with “resources”
XI-7		Under Objectives, consider different wording than “involving everyone” to perhaps “inviting broad segments of the community”
XI-7		Replace reference “existed for ten years” to “existed since 1997” in last paragraph.
XI-9		For Figure II-5, Areas of Potential Historic Sensitivity, highlight the area near Mureau Road due to Portola Expedition significance. Also add the homestead house where the Mountains Restoration Trust headquarters is sited.

**Meeting Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m. The next GPAC meeting is scheduled for February 21.

Submitted by:

-----  
Gary Klein, Chairman