



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**POLICE DEPARTMENT MURAL ROOM**

**MONDAY** **JANUARY 14, 2008** **7:00 P.M.**

- CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:03 p.m.
- PRESENT:** GPAC Members Batinich, Bennett, Buck, Bushala, Durette, Fitzgerald, Griffin, Haley, Harrell, Heusser, Jaramillo, Lambros, Richmond, Savage, and Stopper
- ABSENT:** None
- STAFF PRESENT:** Director Godlewski, Senior Planner St. Paul, Administrative Assistant Pasillas
- CONSULTANT PRESENT:** RBF Principal Al Zelinka, RBF Community Planner Suzanne Rynne
- FLAG SALUTE:** Chairman Stopper
- MINUTES:** MOTION made by Committee Member Fitzgerald, SECONDED by Committee Member Buck, and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present, that approval of the Minutes of the December 10, 2007 meeting be CONTINUED so as to allow further description of the Coyote Hills discussion to be added.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Diana Bonanno, 4611 Santa Fe Street, commented the City had done extensive public outreach to encourage participation at the community input meetings, and much of the public had expressed interest in Coyote Hills. She was concerned with the GPAC eliminating Coyote Hills from discussion. She gave a brief explanation of what she believed a General Plan should be; State law outlined the content of a General Plan and it should include Land Use. She did not believe Coyote Hills was a project, as indicated by the Committee at a previous meeting, but that it was a land use issue. Ms. Bonanno expressed her opinion that the GPAC recommendation to remove Coyote Hills from discussion was not valid. She would like the Committee to listen to the community's input and incorporate their comments into the General Plan.

Chairman Stopper clarified that the GPAC did not exclude Coyote Hills from discussion; they had excluded the Chevron-owned property only. There were many people living and using Coyote Hills currently, and the Committee had chosen to eliminate discussion of the Chevron-owned property at the time of the discussion. This property could be agendized and discussed at a future meeting if the Committee so desired.

Helen Higgins, 1800 Smokewood Avenue, expressed her opinion that the motion made at the last meeting had occurred as a result of the heavy influence of Pacific Coast Homes, and she believed

the Chevron-owned property in West Coyote Hills should be included in discussion. She stated that it came down to the Committee serving either the developer's interests or the community's desire for a quality way of life. She questioned whose interests the Committee was serving.

Bob Stevenson, 525 Princeton Circle West, stated that some members of the GPAC were inadvertently allowing their good name to be associated with an illegitimate process. He continued by explaining the City's desire to have community input, and he did not believe the Committee had acted in good faith. He urged the Committee Members who did not agree with the vote to eliminate Coyote Hills from discussion to not allow their name to be associated with an illegitimate Committee, and if the Committee did not place on the agenda the West Coyote Hills open space matter, then they should resign.

Matt Leslie, 747 Barris Drive, provided information for the Committee on green building, and encouraged the GPAC to put some type of policy addressing green building in the General Plan. He would like to see Fullerton become a leader in this field. He also commented that he believed the undeveloped areas of Coyote Hills were the last undeveloped tract of land in Fullerton and he encouraged the Committee to bring the topic back to the table.

Committee Member Lambros expressed concern that the Committee's decision to eliminate Coyote Hills from discussion had been taken out of context. The decision was not to eliminate Coyote Hills from the final plan, but to eliminate discussion at that time as the Committee was working on Themes and Topics, which was a broad subject. There was no gag order on Coyote Hills discussion; it had just been eliminated as a discussion item for that night only. The Committee was not shirking its responsibilities; they had just eliminated that topic for that night because it was inappropriate for where they were at in the plan. The General Plan starts out very broad and then narrows to details; the Committee believed they were not at a point where project specific discussions were appropriate. The motion at the time, as he understood it, was to eliminate from discussion for the evening, not from the discussion ever again.

Chairman Stopper clarified that the Committee could vote in the future to include Coyote Hills in a discussion.

Committee Member Lambros believed the motion was open to interpretation as the minutes read "Ms. Fitzgerald introduced a motion to withdraw the topic of the Chevron-owned property in the West Coyote Hills area from the GPAC discussion", and he interpreted "the discussion" to mean the discussion the Committee was engaged in that night, not anything broader than that. He wanted to get clarity from his peers.

Chairman Stopper stated the topic was not on the agenda for this meeting, but it could be included on a future agenda if the Committee so desired.

Committee Member Bushala stated that the item had been included on the December 10, 2007 agenda and discussion was held to clarify the vote. The Committee had determined it was not to put a gag order on Coyote Hills.

Committee Member Fitzgerald believed the item was on the current agenda under approval of the Minutes of the December 10, 2007 meeting.

Chairman Stopper moved the discussion on to the approval of the Minutes of the December 10, 2007 meeting.

Committee Member Fitzgerald requested staff include the discussion that was held at the November 2007 meeting in the Minutes. The Committee had been advised by the City Attorney that legally there was not a problem, but the Committee had not made that determination. She believed adding the discussion would help everyone understand what was done.

Chairman Stopper agreed that the Committee had not made a legal decision and the minutes were incorrect.

A MOTION was introduced by Member Fitzgerald to CONTINUE approval of the Minutes from the December 10, 2007 meeting to the next meeting to allow staff to add the details of the discussion, and SECONDED by Committee Member Buck. The MOTION was PASSED unanimously.

Committee Member Jaramillo agreed with Committee Member Lambros' description of the vote. She believed the topic would be addressed during the Open Space discussion.

Member Buck, Member Durette, and Member Bushala offered minor corrections to several words on page two of the December 10, 2007, which staff would make prior to approval at the next meeting.

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Senior Planner St. Paul explained that tonight the Committee would be working to complete the Draft Vision Statement, along with an update of the Housing Element, and an initial discussion of the General Plan structure.

RBF Consultant Rynne explained that the Draft Vision Statement that staff had provided was a compilation of the comments from the previous meeting. The Statement was set up in three sections; a Context Statement which addressed yesterday and today, a Vision Statement which addressed the future, and a Principles section which elaborated on the Vision Statement.

Chairman Stopper suggested that, in addition to the Statement drafted by staff, the Committee should also review the Statements drafted by Committee Member Haley and Committee Member Heusser. He then opened discussion.

Member Haley explained she had worked with a group of Fullerton residents, and together they had compared the Draft Vision Statement staff had provided with Vision Statements from other cities. They had determined three sections were needed; the section titled "Our City" provided a brief history of Fullerton, the "Vision" section encompassed the ideas that had come from previous GPAC and community meetings, and then a section to explain the "Guiding Principles".

Member Heusser explained that she had based her draft on the Vision Statement provided by the consultant at the previous meeting, and had added some of the Committee's comments.

The Committee proceeded to review the Statements and engaged in discussion regarding which format should be used.

Member Bennett commented that he believed more people would read the statement if it was short and easy to read. He thought the bullet points belonged in various elements rather than the Vision Statement. Member Bennett introduced a MOTION to adopt the revised Vision Statement as written by staff, and the MOTION was SECONDED by Member Fitzgerald.

Member Bushala disagreed with Member Bennett and liked the statement provided by Member Haley. He believed her statement provided an outline of the “roadmap” (General Plan) and explained what was important to Fullerton.

Member Savage agreed with Member Bennett and explained that, as a Planning Commissioner who referred to the General Plan often, the more complex the document the more problematic it would be to make any changes.

Member Jaramillo also believed Member Haley’s draft to be too long, although she like the “Our City” section as it was.

Member Haley commented the intent of the Vision Statement was to tell you what the General Plan would be. A developer would only read what was applicable, i.e. the Land Use section, and staff would look at the items mentioned in the statement for their analysis when preparing the staff report.

Member Savage thought Member Haley’s Statement included mandates and a statement should not mandate the City to do something without knowing the socio and economic impacts of the action. He gave the example of “meets national planning standards for pedestrian and bike-friendly features” and questioned what they were and would the average person know what they were. Member Haley reiterated that she only intended her draft as a starting point and was open to making changes.

Vice Chairman Griffin commented the City Council would look at the socio and economic comments.

Member Batinich suggested the Committee not make a decision tonight, but rather take time to review both and make a decision at the next meeting.

Member Richmond reminded the Committee of Tom Dalton’s comment at the previous meeting, that the statement needed to be more concise, and he agreed with that opinion. The statements were all saying the same thing.

Member Durette questioned when anyone would read the General Plan. She believed it needed to be concise or people would not read it. Member Bushala stated that developers would read the General Plan and it was important to let the developers know that if they came to Fullerton and wanted to change the General Plan, they should read the General Plan and understand what was important to the City.

Member Harrell concurred with Member Bushala, and believed it concise, to the point, and had good clarity. She liked the layout and thought it worked well.

Member Lambros commented that both versions basically said the same thing; Member Haley’s version gave more specifics, and staff’s version was broad and allowed room for interpretation.

Member Bennett commented that Member Haley’s version could be a prescription for litigation because a person could pick out any item in that statement and state the developer had not lived up to it.

Vice Chairman Griffin suggested the Committee decide which format to use, and then discuss the details. He would like to use Member Haley’s format, but make some changes.

Following continued discussion on the topic a MOTION to CALL THE QUESTION was made by Member Savage and SECONDED by Member Fitzgerald.

Member Buck stated he had helped work on Member Haley's statement and believed it was brief in context of a four-inch document, and provided something to work with. He doubted anyone would sue the City over a Vision Statement. He suggested the Committee vote on which style they would like, and the possibly a small group of Members could work on the statement prior to the next meeting.

Member Bennett reiterated his MOTION; to accept staff's revised Draft Vision Statement.

The motion FAILED to pass by a vote of 5 in favor, 9 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Committee Member Haley introduced a MOTION to determine the format of the Vision Statement either as written by staff or as submitted by her, i.e. three sections, and Vice Chairman Griffin SECONDED the MOTION.

Vice Chairman Griffin clarified the Committee was voting on format only, and discussion continued on what formats they were speaking of. The two format choices were determined to be either three sections (Our City, Our Vision, and Our Guiding Principles) or a format consisting of a Context Statement and a Vision Statement.

Member Haley WITHDREW her MOTION, and Vice Chairman Griffin made a SUBSTITUTE MOTION to choose one of the two formats mentioned. Member Bushala SECONDED the motion. This substitute motion was WITHDRAWN.

Member Buck introduced a MOTION to use Member Haley's draft as a working document, in words and format, and Vice Chairman Griffin SECONDED the MOTION. The MOTION was PASSED by a vote of 9 in favor, 5 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Discussion continued on the contents of the statement.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the following paragraphs would be listed under the heading "Our City":

Paragraph One: "Fullerton is a city with a small-town feel, a culturally and ethnically diverse population, and a strong sense of community. We cherish our history while welcoming newcomers and being invigorated by them."

Paragraph Two: "Since its beginnings as an agricultural economy built on citrus production and rail transportation, settlers have created distinctive neighborhoods that reflect different eras in this region's growth. Fullerton's hills and flatlands are now covered with family homes, schools and parks in place of orange groves, but our original town site, with its mature trees and thoughtfully preserved historic structures, still points to our legacy."

It was the consensus of the Committee that the following opening paragraph and bullet points would be listed under "Our Vision":

"Based on our shared heritage and community values, the following statement expresses our aspirations for the next decade and beyond to enhance the quality of life for all.

Fullerton will be a City which:

- values and provides quality public safety services including emergency services, crime prevention and hazard mitigation
- enjoys a vibrant economy, benefiting from its "education city" resources and its diverse business base.
- encourages economic diversity and creation of new jobs
- encourages growth in its tax base to support our city services and ensure adequate infrastructure
- has an increasing choice of accessible, affordable and desirable housing options which enable our children, workforce families and young professionals to make their homes here, and our seniors to remain here
- is committed to environmental sustainability in planning, design, policy and practice.
- values and protects its heritage; strives to preserve historic buildings and neighborhoods; embraces high aesthetic standards for new architecture and urban design.
- encourages civic participation by the full spectrum of its community and reflects its concerns in official planning and decision-making
- offers a variety of transportation options
- supports community health with recreational resources, well-maintained parks, preserved open spaces, and public programs to encourage healthy lifestyles
- preserves its character by supporting community efforts dedicated to cultural activities, civic engagement, social concerns, health and safety issues, and other aspects of our quality of life”

It was the consensus of the Committee that the following paragraphs would be the third paragraph and closing statement under the heading “Our City”:

“Today our small town feel is preserved in a 21st century city that provides the best in economic diversity, higher education, health services, arts and culture. Our residents value their active, healthy lifestyle and the environmental attributes and resources that support it.

This is Fullerton's heritage.”

At this time Chairman Stopper invited public comment.

Zoot Velasco, Director of the Muckenthaler Cultural Center, expressed a desire to see tourism addressed in the General Plan. He suggested ideas such as ride a train from Los Angeles to come see a play, ride a horse, or visit a museum in Fullerton. He enjoyed the “Mom & Pop” business, the horse trails, and the attention to heritage shown in Fullerton. He believed that keeping the tax

base statement in the Vision Statement it would open the City to people parceling the large lots into smaller lots and more “big box” stores, and ultimately doing a disservice to Fullerton.

Judith Kaluzny discussed the December 2002 Ordinance which had called for a vibrant downtown, the changes that were made, and the negative impact those changes had on the City. She would like to see sustainable rather than vibrant used in the Vision Statement.

Jane Rands discussed what a sustainable economy could be to the City; money put in to local businesses, residents shopped the local businesses, and therefore the money did not leave the City. She believed it was important to keep sustainable economy in the Vision Statement.

Matthey Leslie, 747 Barris Drive, expressed his opinion that details did matter. He believed the General Plan needed to be pedestrian and bike friendly, and encourage the use of human-powered transportation. He also believed sustainability was important.

Public Comment closed.

Chairman Stopper suggested the Committee reach a motion to accept what was completed at tonight’s meeting, and then move on at the next meeting.

Member Buck wanted to reserve the decision on the items discussed during Public Comments (tax base, sustainability, and pedestrian-bike friendly).

Discussion was held on how to best approve the work done tonight, while allowing for modification at the next meeting. Member Lambros made a MOTION to approve the language as developed tonight as the first Committee draft, and Member Haley SECONDED the MOTION. The MOTION PASSED unanimously.

### **AGENDA FORECAST**

The next regularly scheduled GPAC meeting will occur at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, February 11, 2008. A subsequent meeting will occur at 7:00 p.m. on the following dates March 10, 2008.

### **STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION**

Senior Planner St. Paul provided the following dates for the Committee’s information:

- January 29, 2008 Housing Policy Review (rescheduled from last month)
- February 20, 2008 Housing Element Community Workshop (Senior Center)  
Two meetings that day, 5:30 p.m. for stakeholders, 7:00 p.m. public workshop

Committee Member Durette expressed concern with the Committee’s inability to get through the complete agenda at each meeting, and suggested scheduling an extra meeting to allow the Committee an opportunity to catch up.

Chairman Stopper commented that due to the size of the GPAC, and the importance of letting each Member express their opinions, each item open for discussion could take some time. He asked staff to put an item on the next agenda to allow the Committee an opportunity to discuss the addition of a “catch-up” meeting.

Committee Member Buck asked staff the status of the survey, and Senior Planner St. Paul responded that he was currently working with Dr. Robinson at CSUF Research Center, and the anticipated ready date was mid to late February 2008.

Committee Member Savage stated he would be absent from the February 11, 2008 meeting

Chairman Stopper requested staff provide the information for the next meeting as soon as they had it ready; Director Godlewski confirmed that the Committee desired to have the information sent "piece meal", and Chairman Stopper confirmed.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:21 p.m.

---

Janelle Pasillas  
Administrative Assistant