



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

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

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, Diane Bathgate with RRM Design Group, and Karen Warner with Karen Warner Associates.

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 two persons came forward to speak:

- Anthony Pecoraro submitted written recommendations regarding preservation of existing affordable housing as a means to reduce negative fiscal impact to the city in providing affordable units.
- Michael Friedman stepped down from his seat as a GPAC member and announced a potential conflict of interest based on representation of his client, the Chaghouri Family Trust. The Chaghouri Family Trust owns a 23-acre property in Calabasas near Calabasas Road and Calabasas Parkway, above the fire station. Mr. Friedman promoted the importance of open space and urged the City to consider purchasing the majority of the site (possibly 22 acres) for open space purposes with the rezoning of a small portion to another use. Mr. Friedman stated his intention to

recuse himself from any GPAC discussions that would materially affect this property.

Overview of Housing Element Issues and Requirements

Karen Warner with Karen Warner Associates provided a presentation covering Housing Element requirements and related issues specific to Calabasas including:

- What is the Housing Element?
- Benefits of HCD Approval
- Calabasas Housing Needs
- RHNA and Densities
- Multi-Family Housing Photo Examples

The Housing Element primarily includes the following four major components:

- Housing Needs Assessment
- Evaluation of Constraints to Housing
- Identification of Residential Sites
- 5 Year Program Strategy to Address Needs

The Housing Element addresses the City's regional housing needs (from the Regional Housing Needs Assessment - RHNA) and is required to undergo review by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for statutory compliance. Benefits of compliance with State requirements include:

- Presumption of legally adequate Housing Element in courts
- If courts invalidate the Housing Element, the City's authority to issue building permits/grant discretionary actions may be suspended until brought into compliance and fulfill stipulations
- Maintain discretionary review over affordable housing projects
- Maintain eligibility for State housing and other funds

The need for affordable housing in Calabasas was explained. People in the workforce (teachers, nurses, police officers, retail workers, childcare providers) cannot afford to live in Calabasas. Affordable housing is also needed for special needs households (senior citizens, disabled persons, single-parent households) as well as for children of long-time Calabasas residents. Affordability gap analysis was provided for both rental and ownership housing.

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) establishes housing allocations for cities through the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). The RHNA sets forth a city's quantified number of dwelling units needed to meet regional affordable housing needs. Tom Bartlett noted that the City of Calabasas participated in this process and was successful in reducing the number of units allocated for Calabasas from 870 units to 521. Earlier this year, the SCAG adopted regional housing share for Calabasas are shown in the table below.

Regional Housing Needs for Calabasas

Income Level	2007 Income (4 person household)	No. of Units	Percent
Very Low (<50% AMI)	\$37,000	137 units	26%
Low (51-80% AMI)	\$59,200	86 units	17%
Moderate (81-120% AMI)	\$67,800	93 units	18%
Above Moderate (>120% AMI)	> \$67,800	205 units	39%
Total		521 units	100%

Photos and profiles of several existing affordable housing projects in California were shared.

GPAC questions included providing the dwelling units per acre of successful affordable projects in Calabasas and what are the best ways to keep affordable housing affordable. Assistant City Attorney Larry Permaul explained the City’s practice regarding deed restricted affordable units. The difference in value when an affordable unit is sold goes into a City administered “Affordable Housing Trust Fund”, but it has been difficult to keep up with inflation. Discussion also addressed inclusionary versus in-lieu fee requirements for affordable housing. In-lieu fee payments go into the City’s Affordable Housing Trust Fund for use in affordable housing programs and projects.

It was noted that very little good land remains for potential development and efforts should focus on redevelopment or recycling of existing development. Conversion of existing units is possible for a credit of up to 25% of the RHNA requirement – however, this requires affordability covenants for 30 years which can be very expensive. In addition, secondary units offer some limited potential where a city can demonstrate a consistent history of them; however, second units may cause issues in some neighborhoods. Regardless, the state mandates ministerial review for such units.

When designed well, some condominium projects can look like single-family homes. It was also suggested to identify where low income folks are living now to help formulate ideas for the future.

Can residential units from mixed-use projects be applied against RHNA requirements? Yes, but often it is difficult to prove to HCD that existing development will likely recycle within the time frame of the Housing Element, and this is very likely the case with existing development in Calabasas.

A future GPAC meeting will address the Draft Housing Element.

Continued Review of Safety Element

Joe Power initiated review of Safety Element objectives and policies where consideration ended on November 1. 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):

Preliminary Recommendation	Yes	No
<p>Safety Element Purpose: To reduce the potential risk of death, injuries, property damage, and the economic and social dislocation resulting from hazards such as <i>fires, floods, earthquakes, landslides, and other hazards.</i></p>	16	-
<i>Geology and Seismicity</i>		
<p>Objective: Minimize the potential for loss of life, physical injury, property damage, and social disruption resulting from seismic groundshaking and other geologic events.</p>	16	-
<p>A.1 Incorporate adequate mitigation measures into proposed development projects to achieve an acceptable level of risk, as defined in Table VI-1, from potential seismic hazards resulting from ground motion or fault rupture.</p>	16	-
<p>A.2 Facilitate rapid physical and economic recovery following an earthquake or geologic disaster through the early identification of potentially hazardous conditions and implementation of effective standards for seismic design of structures.</p> <p><i>A.2A Emphasize prevention of physical and economic loss associated with earthquake, geologic disaster or wildland fire through early identification of potentially hazardous conditions prior to approval of projects.</i></p> <p><i>A.2B Facilitate rapid physical and economic recovery following an earthquake, geologic disaster or wildland fire through early investigation of the event and implementation of effective new standards for design of structures.</i></p>	12	2
<p>A.3 Emphasize avoidance of <i>Discourage</i> development within potential landslide areas and areas with severe soils limitations as the City's preferred management strategy, and as a higher priority than attempting to implement engineering solutions.</p>	12	3
<p>A.4 Where engineering solutions to slope stability constraints are required, implement landform grading programs so as to recreate a natural hillside appearance to the extent feasible.</p>	12	3

A.5 Prohibit the use of engineering solutions undertaken pursuant to Policy A.4 above, as an impetus for increasing the allowable intensity of a development site.	16	-
<i>Stormwater Management and Flooding</i>		
Objective: Minimize the potential for loss of life, physical injury, property damage, and social disruption resulting from flooding consistent with the definition of acceptable and unacceptable risks outlined in Table VI-1.	16	-
B.1 Incorporate adequate mitigation measures into proposed development projects to achieve an acceptable level of risk, as defined in Table VI-1, from potential flooding hazards.	16	-
B.2 Emphasize avoidance of Discourage development within flood hazard areas and encourage retention of natural drainage as the City's preferred management strategy, and as a higher priority than attempting to implement engineering solutions.	16	-
B.3 Ensure that new flood control and drainage facilities as well as improvements to existing facilities are consistent with the General Plan's environmental protection standards.	16	-
B.4 Within discretionary development projects subject to General Plan consistency findings, prohibit incremental downstream increases in runoff from the development. For discretionary development projects, limit new impervious surfaces to those that will not individually or cumulatively increase harmful runoff into natural stream channels downstream.	13	2
B.5 Setbacks should be sufficient from streambeds to anticipate future streambank erosions.	11	5
<i>Fire Hazards</i>		
Objective: Minimize the potential for loss of life, physical injury, property damage, and social disruption resulting from urban and wildland fires consistent with the definition of acceptable and unacceptable risks outlined in Table VI-1.	16	-
C.1 Promote fire prevention as the City's preferred management strategy; facilitate programs aimed at the prevention of fires.	16	-
C.2 Emphasize avoidance of development, limitations on development intensity, and sensitive siting of structures within hazardous fire areas as a higher priority than the destruction of significant biological resources to create fire breaks and fuel modification areas to protect new development. Discourage development and encourage sensitive siting of structures within hazardous fire areas as	16	-

<i>higher priorities than attempting to implement fuel modification techniques that would adversely affect significant biological resources.</i>		
C.3 Minimize the biological impact of fuel modification activities to that which is necessary to achieve the level of safety identified in Table VI-1.	16	-
C.4 C.3 Require that new development within areas subject to wildland fires is designed and sited in a manner which minimizes the threat of loss from wildland fire.	14	2
C.5 C.4 Ensure that new development within areas subject to wildland fires is designed so as to facilitate access by firefighting equipment and maintain adequate evacuation routes for residents.	16	-
C.6 C.5 Restrict Do not permit development within areas which do not have adequate water pressure or fire flows until sufficient pressure and fire flows can be reliably provided.	10	5

Please note that not all votes add up to 16 as not all GPAC members raised hands for all items. Due to time constraints, discussion of remaining sections (Hazardous Materials and Disaster Response) of the Safety Element was continued to a future GPAC meeting.

GPAC Meeting No. 7 Summary

The meeting summary for the November 1, 2007 GPAC meeting was reviewed and approved without change.

Meeting Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m. Reconsideration of a westside, mixed-use village concept and continued review of General Plan Elements is planned for the next GPAC meeting on December 6.

Submitted by:

Gary Klein, Chairman