



The sixth meeting (a regular meeting) of the GPAC began at 7:03 p.m. and was called to order by Chairman Klein. GPAC Member Dave Brown led the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

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 and Steve Svete with Rincon Consultants and Erik Justesen and Diane Bathgate with RRM Design Group.

**GPAC Meeting No. 5 Summary, GPAC Schedule & Workshop Overview**

The meeting summary from the July 25, 2007 GPAC meeting was reviewed. Some clarifications were requested regarding sports fields and mixed use discussions. The meeting summary was approved with the requested changes.

Joe Power reviewed the proposed GPAC schedule for the upcoming months. Review of General Plan Elements will occur at meetings scheduled for October 18, November 1, November 25, December 6 and January 10. Dana Ashton requested that GPAC discussion be concise and kept on point. Jolie Pfahler asked that adequate time at each meeting be provided for public comments.

Erik Justesen provided a brief overview of the public workshop held on August 16, 2007. A written summary of the workshop was provided to the GPAC prior to the meeting and a copy was also posted on the City's website for access by the public.

**General Plan Themes and Overarching Policies**

The draft Vision provides overarching themes and policies for the General Plan Update. Several drafts of the Vision have been presented for comment at GPAC meetings and workshops. Comments received have been incorporated into the current draft of the Vision circulated to the GPAC prior to the meeting.

Discussion focused on the second goal statement under Environmental Responsibility. Using a show of hands, 11 GPAC members supported the 9/20/07 version of the Vision and 4 GPAC members preferred additional rewording. The following General Plan Vision is recommended by the GPAC:

### **Key Themes That Frame the 2030 General Plan**

- **Environmental Responsibility** – preservation/enhancement of natural resources and living within the limits imposed by available resources
- **Community Character** – protection of Calabasas’ special character
- **Quality of Life** – maintaining an outstanding quality of life for Calabasas residents

### **Environmental Responsibility Goals**

1. Recognize that the area’s natural environment is a critical community asset.
2. Place the highest priority on protection and stewardship of designated open space and acquisition of additional land for designation as open space.
3. Minimize the environmental impacts of development, including impacts to landscape and viewsheds, through excellent community and project design.
4. Minimize the environmental impacts of City activities by making environmental sensitivity a key consideration in the provision of municipal services and facilities.
5. Become a municipal role model in addressing global environmental issues.

### **Community Character Goals**

1. Provide guidelines for public and private development that recognize, maintain, and enhance the scenic beauty afforded by Calabasas’ natural environment.
2. Define and preserve the character of established residential neighborhoods.
3. Facilitate appropriately-scaled infill development in existing commercial districts.
4. Facilitate design that provides neighborhood and communitywide meeting places and encourages public interaction.
5. Provide a balanced transportation system that facilitates a variety of ways to move through the community and emphasizes neighborhood and environmental protection.

### **Quality of Life Goals**

1. Encourage a high level of citizen involvement in shaping the community’s future.
2. Provide municipal infrastructure and services that are responsive to the community’s needs and priorities.
3. Preserve and enhance areas of visual, cultural, historical, archaeological, and urban design significance.
4. Provide recreational and cultural activities and facilities that meet community needs and preferences.
5. Provide for a variety of housing types that meet the needs of Calabasas citizens in a manner consistent with the City’s environmental responsibility and community character goals.
6. Facilitate high quality economic development that meets the community’s employment and service needs in a manner consistent with the City’s environmental responsibility and community character goals.

### Land Use Map

This section of the meeting focused on potential land use changes to the existing General Plan Land Use Map. Potential changes were compiled based on feedback from public workshops, GPAC discussion and staff recommendations. The land use map on the last page of this summary identifies the locations and nature of the discussed changes (for easier viewing, please use zoom function or print as an 11" x 17" exhibit).

Joe Power noted that a few of the potential changes were presented in response to the RHNA (Regional Housing Needs Assessment) and sports fields needs. Assistant City Attorney Larry Permaul provided an overview of Housing Element requirements and explained some of the risks associated with not complying with RHNA requirements as well as self certification of a Housing Element. Questions were asked by GPAC members regarding existing cities in LA County that have self-certified their housing elements. This information was not available, but should be provided at a future meeting.

The vast majority of property within Calabasas is not recommended for any change in land use designation. A summary of all of the changes by land use was presented and approximately two percent of all land within the City is being considered for a revised designation. Overall, the amount of land designated for open space will increase. Also the amount of commercial land will decrease, and housing densities will increase on some properties.

Seventeen specific areas or sites were discussed. The proposed changes were the result of prior workshops and discussions at GPAC meetings. Eight of the areas are presently outside the City boundaries and would require future annexation.

After each change was described and discussed, an informal polling of GPAC members by a raise of hands was conducted to ascertain a general consensus regarding the level of support for each presented revision. The results of this exercise are summarized below.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>Preliminary Recommendation</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
City Hall/Office Site	Existing City Hall site and surrounding business park at Las Virgenes Road and Mireau Road	Change from B-PO (Business – Professional Office) to MU (Mixed Use)	13	3	-
County/Zuckerman Property	North of 101 Freeway between Las Virgenes Road and Los Hills Road	Change from HM (Hillside Mountainous) to OS-R (Open Space – Recreation) and consider for annexation	14	2	-
Landfill Site	North of 101 Freeway and Lost Hills Road	Change from HM (Hillside Mountainous) to OS-R (Open Space – Recreation) and consider for annexation	16	-	-
Dollinger Site	Southeast corner of 101 Freeway / Lost Hills road	Change from B-BP (Business – Business Park) to CR (Commercial – Retail) (Absentions: Brown, Klein)	12	2	2

Agoura Road Annexation Area	Area between Agoura Road and 101 Freeway in Los Angeles County	Keep B-BP (Business – Business Park) designation and consider for annexation	16	-	-
Pontopiddian	Approximately 8 acres west of Las Virgenes Road	Change from R-SF (Residential – Single Family) to R –MF (Residential Multi-Family)	10	5	-
Messenger Site 1/ Messenger Site 2	East of Las Virgenes Road at Agoura Road	Keep CR (Commercial – Retail) and RR (Rural Residential) designations, respectively, and delete UH (Urban Hillside) extension	16	-	-
Public Facilities Site	West side of Lost Hills Road north of Juan Bautista de Anza Park	Change from PF-I (Public Facilities – Institutional) to OS-RP (Open Space – Resource Protection)	15	1	-
Lincoln Properties	14.4 acres south of West Calabasas Road	Change from B-LI (Business - Limited Intensity) to OS-RP (Open Space – Resource Protection)	16	-	-
HM Annexation Site	North of Calabasas southern boundary and west of Calabasas Highlands	Change from HM (Hillside Mountainous) to OS-RP (Open Space – Resource Protection) and consider for annexation	16	-	-
School Annexation Site	A.C. Stelle Middle School Site	Keep PF-I (Public Facilities – Institutional) and consider for annexation	16	-	-
Gelson’s Site	Along Mulholland Highway near Mulholland Drive	Change from CR (Commercial – Retail) to MU (Mixed Use) and annex any remnant portions (i.e., parking)	12	4	-
Old Town Annexation Site	Eastern area within City of Los Angeles	Keep B-OT (Business – Old Town) and consider for annexation	16	-	-
Calabasas Mixed Use Site	Between Calabasas Road and 101 Freeway	Change from CR (Commercial – Retail) to MU (Mixed Use)	14	2	-
Craftsman Corner	North of 101 Freeway in Los Angeles County west of Hidden Hills	Change from B-BP (Business – Business Park) to MU (Mixed Use) with requirement of a Specific Plan, and consider for future annexation	13	1	-
Calabasas Inn Site	Along south side of Park Sorrento	Change from B-PO (Business – Professional Office) to MU (Mixed Use) (Absentions: Aaronson, Brown, Klein, Neumann)	9	3	4
Mountain View Estates & Mount Calabasas	Two existing residential neighborhoods north of 101 Freeway in County of Los Angeles	Keep current designations and consider for annexation	11	-	-

Note: Not all informal polling results add up to the 16 GPAC members present, as not everyone a raised a hand on all items.

**Public Comments & Next Meeting**

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

- Melissa Olen, Environmental Commissioner, commented that it seems too many decisions are being driven by the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers. Buying existing homes to meet affordable housing requirements should be considered. She is concerned with converting the Pontoppidian property to multi-family designation as it is one of the last rural properties in the area.
- Donna Lane from Calabasas View is concerned that housing and commercial uses are being unfairly designated for the west side of Calabasas. The east and west sides of town are not being treated equitably and the quality of development should be improved.
- Lynn Tracy with the Stonecreek Board of Directors noted that the City should not be a “buffer” for developers and clarified that the Shea project and Stonecreek should not be characterized as multi-family.
- Elizabeth Stephens wants to ensure that the General Plan Update is a community driven versus City Council driven plan and that the performance aspects of the current General Plan area maintained. She requested that public comments be heard prior to votes on items.

Tom Bartlett noted that Planning Commissioner and GPAC member Dave Brown has been honored as the recipient of the Citizen Planner Award by the California Chapter of the American Planning Association.

Initiation of review of General Plan Elements is planned for the next GPAC meeting.

Submitted by:

-----  
Gary Klein, Chairman