

The following comments were received from the public:

- Consider bicycle use on Chapman; currently narrow street, include bikeways north and south of the corridor.
- Extend west to include Fullerton High School; heart of education, oldest high school in the City.

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

Focus Area J – Education / Education Supporting

The following comments were received from the Committee:

- Overall area as an education area may be too large – east of Placentia Avenue may not fit in.
- Include all four corners of State College and Chapman in this focus area.
- Bicycle linkage across the 57 freeway; possible bike bridge.
- Link housing to north and east commercial areas.
- Hope University – keep as an education facility; significant historic resource.
- Apartments/condo/Target/retail on east of freeway support the university – students and faculty live and shop there.
- High commuter level at CSUF – high vehicle environment. Pedestrian traffic is mostly on campus. Public safety issues with the large number of vehicles.
- Are there a number of students who take the bus into CSUF/Hope?
- Students park in residential neighborhoods and bring bikes to get around campus.
- Link between Troy High School and CSUF; Troy students have opportunities to take classes at CSUF.

The following comments were received from the public:

- Include Fullerton High School and Fullerton College from Focus Area E into this focus area.

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

Focus Area K – Southeast Industrial

The following comments were received from the Committee:

- Same comments made regarding North Industrial Focus Area apply here.
- Industrial entrance to the City.
- Customers from LA County to San Diego have access to the area via the 57 and 91 freeways; key intersection of freeways.
- Make area more truck friendly.
- Need landscape improvements on Raymond – many visitors enter the City in this area.
- Alleyways – deteriorating, need repaving, no money available for improvements.
- Razor wire being put in is unsightly, does not attract new businesses.
- Higher police presence needed to deter crime.

- Coordination/responsibility share of Raymond with Anaheim – potential for joint meeting.
- Potential for industrial area similar to Palo Alto; attractive, high tech.
- Kimberly and Raymond – nice, high tech looking building.
- Potential for focus area in Anaheim – joint venture, potential for partnership with Placentia as well.
- Bring in employers which can pay higher wages will bring in employees who can afford to live in Fullerton and contribute to the community.
- Example – Research Triangle Park, No. Carolina – attractive, high tech.
- Potential to start program to have new businesses moving into this area help improve the area (alleys, lighting, etc.).
- Look for creative ways to finance improvements.
- Be careful not to discourage businesses from coming to Fullerton; need to find a happy medium.
- Keep out incompatible uses, i.e. schools, churches, especially children.
- Industrial area is continually being considered for uses not welcome in other parts of the City, but those uses are inappropriate here as well.
- Want to hold on to as much industrial area as possible.

The following comments were received from the public:

- Need to keep viable general aviation airport to attract businesses, especially high end businesses.
- Other cities have started to abandon alleyways and give them to the adjacent property owners to maintain.
- Abandoning alleyways may not be feasible in all areas due to configuration.

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

Focus Area L – Chevron-Owned Property in West Coyote Hills

Chair Stopper reminded the Committee of the vote taken at the November 5, 2007 GPAC meeting, wherein the topic of the Chevron-owned property in West Coyote Hills was removed from GPAC discussion.

After Committee discussion, Member Buck made a MOTION to rescind the previous action that restricted discussion of West Coyote Hills, for the purpose of discussion as a focus area. Motion was seconded by Vice Chair Griffin.

After continued discussion, Member Buck MODIFIED his motion to rescind the previous action relating to West Coyote Hills and its component parts. Vic Chair Griffin accepted the modification.

Member Lambros believed there was a need to review the minutes from the meeting where the original motion was made, along with the minutes from subsequent meetings where the motion regarding discussion of West Coyote Hills was clarified.

Member Lambros made a SUBSTITUTE motion to table Member Buck's motion. Motion seconded by Member Batinich.

Discussion was held; several Members believed the November 5, 2007 motion restricted discussion on West Coyote Hills as it related to the Elements being discussed at that time.

Member Lambros' motion FAILED to pass with a vote of 4 in favor and 7 against.

Member Buck MODIFIED his motion to allow discussion of West Coyote Hills and take action in relation to the topic of Focus Areas. Vice Chair Griffin accepted this modification. The motion PASSED with a vote of 10 in favor, 1 against.

The following comments were received from the Committee:

- Was there an existing development agreement for West Coyote Hills?
- Why wasn't Open Space a focus area?
- West Coyote Hills is a private property, with a single property owner – why have its own Focus Area. This is the only focus area with a single property owner.
- Other focus areas are also private property.
- Last large piece of open space – deserves the attention of being a focus area.
- Goal of the General Plan is to look at areas in the City and establish policy; it would be negligent of the GPAC to ignore this property.
- This area has already had intense focus, what is the point of making it a focus area.
- Criteria for a focus area was described as “areas that are currently experiencing transition or anticipate transition, areas that include special community resources, areas providing a variety of development options or market interest, areas exhibiting potential for enhancement of reinvestment”; this area fully meets all of the criteria.
- None of the other focus areas have an approved Specific Plan.
- If West Coyote Hills is included as a focus area, the GPAC will be acting like the Planning Commission. It is not the GPAC's job to determine how land is to be developed.
- Public needs to express their desires for this property to the Planning Commission and City Council, not the GPAC.
- Potential legal ramifications of picking on one piece of privately-owned property.
- Is it appropriate to be making comments now on a project that is pending approval?

The following comments were received from the public:

- Need to work with other cities – last large open space in No. Orange County, need to preserve for future generations.
- Visitors from surrounding cities come to Fullerton for open space.
- Coyote Hills should be a focus area; significant in size, outcome will impact the whole community, vast changes since last General Plan (i.e. higher density and increased traffic), improves and protects unique attributes, hills can provide opportunities for destination point in Fullerton, educational, economic asset.
- Should not be concerned if an application is in process as the Committee was not concerned about applications in process in other focus areas.
- Sustainability, contour grading, fire protection – things to think about that were not considered in the past.
- Has the area and its density been considered in the Housing Element?
- What is the need in Fullerton?
- 1977 Specific Plan 2A did not convey entitlements.

- Coyote Creek Watershed Master Plan – County of Orange, Army Corp of Engineers, etc. say this is the most significant piece of land within watershed.
- Industrial employers look for places that consider health and wellbeing of their employees; this area offers recreational opportunities.
- Economic necessities – creating a recreational hub.
- Natural area to be explored and enjoyed.
- Look at the bigger picture for the whole City and the impacts of the focus areas on the City as a whole.
- Help serve the decision-making process through the General Plan; what are the needs in the City, opportunities that the focus area represents. Look at the focus area as a framework.
- Looking at Coyote Hills as a focus area is necessary; similar to including important pieces in whole City's health.
- Coyote Hills should be a focus area – General Plan allows citizens to direct to City officials what should occur.
- Coastal Sage Scrub “park” – unique ecosystem, endangered, thoughts on that resource have changed since 1970's.
- Balance needed – open space, university, industry, etc.
- Residents move here for open space, want balance.
- Property has already been graded, drilled.
- Open space is part of what attracts businesses – quality of life for employees.
- Need to get the best out of the area – as much open space as possible.
- Property has a rich history.
- Changes since 1070's.
- Preserve Coyote Hills as open space.
- Citizens have requested Coyote Hills be a focus area, the Committee should consider it a focus area. Include boundary along Rosecrans, Gilbert, outside Chevron property, backbone trails.
- This will be the only focus area that has an approved specific plan and development agreement. Specific Plan amendment in application process has included a lot of public input. Nature preserve and an endowment to preserve are included.

Member Buck made a MOTION to include the Chevron-Owned Property at West Coyote Hills as a Focus Area. The motion was seconded by Member Jaramillo. The motion carried 6-4, with Member Lambros abstaining.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee to continue discussion of this focus area to the next meeting.

Chair Stopper addressed other Focus Area items that were still outstanding.

- MOTION by Member Bushala, seconded by Member Buck to include the residential area west of Harbor Blvd. to Highland Avenue in the Harbor Gateway Focus Area, passed unanimously.
- MOTION by Member Buck, seconded by Member Bushala to include the area up to Malvern Avenue in the Orangethorpe Corridor Nodes Focus Area, passed unanimously.
- Creeks – it was decided that creeks would be addressed under the Natural Resources and Fullerton Built Environment sections.

AGENDA FORECAST

The next General Plan Advisory Committee meeting will be held December 15, 2008 at 7:00 p.m.

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Mr. St. Paul provided the Committee with an outline of the proposed General Plan structure, and Mr. Zelinka provided a brief overview. More discussion would be held at the next meeting.

Chair Stopper reminded staff of the Committee's request to review their presentation prior to it being presented to the Planning Commission and/or City Council.

Mr. St. Paul advised the Committee that Ethics Training was required of all Members, and the next training was scheduled at the beginning of 2009.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 10:50 p.m.