General Plan Update Process

Four Phases over 21 months (January 2007-September 2008)

- **Phase 1:** Public outreach, assessment, and land use alternatives development
- **Phase 2:** General Plan Policy/Element Development
- **Phase 3:** General Plan Update Completion
- **Phase 4:** Development Code Update
Community Input & Feedback Tools

- Six GPAC meetings
- Two public workshops
- Two-Day visioning charrette
- Community telephone survey
- Stakeholder discussions/interviews
- Fourth of July booth
- City website
Work Products To Date

- Issue reports assessing current conditions, opportunities, & constraints
- Development concepts for several focus areas
- GPAC-recommended community vision statement
- GPAC-recommended land use map
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What We’ve Heard To Date

- Residents generally like Calabasas the way it is.
- Open space preservation and environmental protection are top priorities for the community.
- Different areas of the City have different characteristics that residents wish to maintain.
- “Infill” development is preferable to “greenfield” development.
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Draft General Plan Key Themes

• 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
Considerations for Land Use Map

- Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)
- Sports facility demand
RHNA Requirements

Very Low (0-50% MFI) 137 units
Low (51-80% MFI) 86 units
Moderate (81-120% MFI) 93 units
Above Moderate (>120% MFI) 205 units

Total 521 units

“Affordable” = Very Low & Low
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>“Affordable” Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malibu Hills Rd Sr. Housing (approved 2006)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Pacific (approved August 2007)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Approved</strong></td>
<td>146</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer Property (environmental review)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahin Tract (environmental review)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabasas Inn (3/07 application)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Proposed</strong></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Approved and Proposed</strong></td>
<td>339</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other Potential Housing Sites

**Current General Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Potential Units (approximate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Messenger (designated CR/RR)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>50-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Pet Kennel Site (designated R-MF)</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontopiddian (designated R-SF)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>40 (net increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM properties</td>
<td>+/- 1,500</td>
<td>40-150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant residential lots (designated R-SF, RR, RC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>331-491</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Overall Housing Potential

### Current General Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Units</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>331-491</td>
<td>19-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>641-801</strong></td>
<td><strong>108-112</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RHNA “requirement”**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>521</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assumes that the Rancho Pet Kennel, Messenger, and Pontopiddian sites are built with 10% affordable. Other sites cannot facilitate affordable units.
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Sports Facility Demand

- According to 2003 survey, 75% of residents believe more sports fields needed
- According to GP survey, 81% of residents ID improving youth recreation facilities as very or somewhat important
- To meet demand at buildout of the current General Plan (as identified in Parks and Recreation Master Plan), needs include:
  - 10 soccer fields
  - 1 baseball field
  - 1 softball field
- Existing school sites can accommodate 4-8 additional soccer fields
- Landfill site provides best long-term opportunity to meet sports field needs
Acres Where Land Use Changes Contemplated

Only 2.2% of lands in City being considered for change.
Current v. GPAC-Recommended Map
Land Use Breakdown*

* Breakdown within existing City limits
Potential Annexations - No Land Use Change

County/Zuckerman Property

- 303 acres in unincorporated L.A. County
- Currently vacant & designated HM
- Possible site for future annexation & development of 1-2 sports fields (OS-R designation)
- Site suggested at August public workshop
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Landfill Site

- 400 acres currently in unincorporated L.A. County
- Currently designated OS-R
- Landfill closure in approximately 2022
- Possible site for sports complex, other recreational facilities, and designated open space
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Potential Mixed Use Districts

City Hall/Office Site

- 28 acres currently designated B-PO
- Currently developed with 360,000 sf business park
- MU designation suggested at August public workshop
- With MU designation, maximum theoretical development potential of about 1.2 million sf (FAR of 1.0)
Gelsen’s Site

- 9.7 acres currently designated C-R
- Currently developed with about 80,000 sf of retail & office
- With MU designation, maximum theoretical development potential of about 400,000 sf (FAR of 1.0)
Calabasas Inn Site

- 5.4 acres currently designated B-PO & developed with the Calabasas Inn
- 116,364 sf of existing development
- With MU designation, theoretical maximum of 235,000 sf
- Application for 75 MF units (5 affordable) currently being processed
Calabasas Road Mixed Use Site

- 33.4 acres currently designated Commercial-Retail
- Currently developed with 574,000 sf of office/retail
- Possible extension of existing MU district south of Calabasas Road
- With MU designation, maximum theoretical development potential of about 1.4 million sf (FAR of 1.0)
Craftsman’s Corner

- 65.5 acres in L.A. County (Hidden Hills SOI)
- Currently designated B-BP & developed with 990,000 sf of existing office/business park
- With MU designation, maximum theoretical development potential of about 2.8 million sf (FAR of 1.0)
- Possible performing arts & live/work space
- Freeway overpass connecting to Calabasas Road needed
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Dollinger Site

- 12 acres, currently vacant and designated B-LI
- Possible redesignation to CR
- Proposal for shopping center/GP amendment currently pending
- Some westside residents have expressed interest in retail development
Pontopiddian Site

- 7.8 acres currently designated R-SF and developed with 3 SF residences
- Currently surrounded by higher intensity uses
- R-MF designation (max of 20 du/acre) meets RHNA “affordability” criteria
- Under R-MF designation, maximum theoretical development potential of about 150 units
Public Comments on Draft Land Use Map

- Too many decisions are driven by RHNA.
- East and west sides of Calabasas are not being treated equally.
- The General Plan should be community driven, not City Council driven.
What’s Next?

- October 17 - City Council consideration of draft land use map
- October-January – GPAC meetings to develop General Plan elements
- January-February – PC/CC consideration of draft General Plan
- February-April – preparation of DEIR
- June – General Plan adoption