



- Currently hangars with non-airport related uses – this shouldn't be allowed.
- How much is Fullerton Airport utilized in comparison to other similar airports?
- Eastern area, further away from the airport, is less influenced by the airport.
- Compatibility of uses in the eastern area – better for airplanes to fly over current industrial uses rather than residential.
- Air easements over eastern areas may affect uses.
- Maximum population in area for safety reason.
- Bicycle and pedestrian usage – multimodal.
- Important to keep the airport.
- Airport should be a financial asset to the City.
- Maximizing financial/economic considerations.

No one from the public wished to comment on this focus area.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee that this focus area should remain.

#### Focus Area B – Commonwealth Corridor

The following comments were received from the Committee:

- South side was deteriorating, lack of business, forgotten area.
- Transitioning from residential to office and personal services.
- Needs a common plan/theme across entire corridor.
- Concern for access in and out of businesses and parking lots.
- Narrow street.
- Add a trolley.
- Landscaping – add a landscape median.
- Preservation of certain buildings important.
- Civic Center area is special.
- West of Euclid – existing affordable housing and older apartments.
- Add Euclid, from the 91 freeway to Malvern to this area.

Public Comments:

- Unifying elements on Harbor and Commonwealth, i.e. street signs, lampposts, etc.
- Safe bicycle access on Commonwealth.
- Preserve the unique character of the area that includes, residential conversion to business opportunities for retail incubator spaces.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee that this focus area should remain.

#### Focus Area C – Orangethorpe Corridor Nodes

Member Buck asked the significance of the separate “nodes”, and Planning Manager Zelinka explained that the area was characterized by small, local retail, and staff was looking at the relationship between the areas.

The following comments were received from the Committee:

- Magnolia and Orangethorpe – new buildings going in.
- Brookhurst and Orangethorpe – prioritize for reinvestment.
- Euclid and Orangethorpe – need for focus.
- Current Redevelopment Area.
- Retail serving southwest area of the City.
- Keep the two “nodes” on the west and call them “Orangethorpe Nodes” and then create a new area which would include the “node” on the east, along with the corridor running along Euclid from the 91 freeway to Malvern.

Public Comments:

- Is the area commute oriented?
- Are businesses intended to enhance local neighborhood or to serve people traveling through the area?

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee that this focus area should remain.

Focus Area D – Harbor Gateway

Member Buck questioned why the residential area between Harbor and Lemon was included, and the area between Harbor and Highland had not been included, and Mr. Zelinka explained that the area between Harbor and Lemon had been included because of its link to the Transportation Center and pedestrian usage. After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee to remove the residential area between Harbor and Lemon from this focus area. The areas along Harbor and Lemon would remain.

The following comments were received from the Committee:

- Would like to see the entire Harbor corridor, from the 91 freeway up to the medical area, treated as a connected piece.
- Include the Civic Center with the Harbor corridor.
- Harbor defines the City.
- Tie all portions of Harbor together.
- Remove residential between Harbor and Lemon, or expand to include east and west residential neighborhoods.
- Lemon is an entry to the City from the freeway – keep in focus area.

Public comment:

- If the General Plan was updated every ten years, and then reviewed every year, how secure would a homeowner or business be in its ongoing use?

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee that this focus area should remain.

In response to the public comment on this item, Mr. Zelinka explained that some items in the General Plan may require amending prior to the next ten year update. The State also required cities to review their General Plans each year.

Member Heusser asked what the purpose of the focus areas was, and why there was a need to have these separate areas identified. Mr. Zelinka clarified that the Focus Areas were not “walled

off" areas, but would identify the areas that were important to the City. These areas may be included in the General Plan as suggested study areas.

Concern was expressed by several Members that the addition of too many focus area would lead to no focus in any of the areas.

### **AGENDA FORECAST**

The next regularly scheduled General Plan Advisory Committee meeting will be November 17, 2008 at 7:00 p.m.

### **STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION**

Chair Stopper expressed a need to have the Committee review the Final Vision Statement as recommended by the GPAC, and the Land Use Focus Areas presentation prior to their being given to the Planning Commission and City Council.

Meetings were scheduled for February 9, 2009 and February 23, 2009.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 9:14 p.m.