



MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

POLICE DEPARTMENT MURAL ROOM

MONDAY

MAY 2, 2011

7:00 P.M.

- CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chair Stopper at 6:07 p.m.
- PRESENT:** GPAC Members Batinich, Bennett, Buck, Chi, Fitzgerald, Harrell, Heusser(arrived at 6:38 p.m.), Lambros, Richmond, Savage, and Stopper
- ABSENT:** Excused: GPAC Members Griffin, Haley, and Jaramillo
Unexcused: None
- STAFF PRESENT:** Director Zelinka, Planning Manager Allen, Executive Assistant Pasillas
- CONSULTANT PRESENT:** RBF Vice President Susan Harden (arrived at 6:32 p.m.), RBF Associate Michelle Kou
- FLAG SALUTE:** Chair Stopper
- MINUTES:** MOTION made by Committee Member Fitzgerald, SECONDED by Committee Member Bennett, and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present, WITH Chair Stopper abstaining, that the Minutes of the April 4, 2011 meeting be APPROVED as written.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

Chair Stopper informed the Committee that Member Durette had resigned, and a brief discussion was held regarding whether the Committee should proactively work towards having her replaced. It was decided that staff would inform the appointing Council Member of the vacancy and the decision would be left to that person.

Chair Stopper introduced new Committee Member Chi, who then gave a brief summary of his background.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Director Al Zelinka explained that the review draft was staff's best work at creating a good platform, and it was up to the GPAC to come up with the final document. He stressed that no offense would be taken by staff or the consultants with any comments made regarding the draft, and emphasized that comments were appreciated.

First working session

Consultant Michelle Kou went over the ground rules that the GPAC had established at their first meeting, and described how the review process would take place. No additional ground rules were added. Ms.

Kou further clarified that the comments the GPAC had submitted had been separated into two categories: grammar, spelling, and minor modifications or clarifications, which would be addressed in the final document, and; topics which would require discussion by the GPAC, which would take place tonight.

A brief discussion was held regarding who would have input on the administrative draft and the GPAC's role in the review process, and staff clarified that the GPAC would review comments made by the other key stakeholders who reviewed the draft document.

Review/Refine

Consultant Susan Harden led the Committee in a discussion of the comments received on the following portions of the administrative draft. Further comments were as follows:

- Focus Area E – Downtown
 - Currently no height limit in C-3 Zone; “maximum” – prefer anticipated maximum, etc. – give general idea to the reader; provide guidance/expectations based on intended character
 - Remove specific restrictions and leave to project review; include
 - Language so that goals/policies can continue and not be changed soon
 - Preserving downtown character
- Focus Area H – North Industrial and Focus Area K – Southeast Industrial
 - Infrastructure friendly for trucks – in and out of the City
 - Alleyway maintenance is important
 - Need to be protective of our limited industrial areas (jobs & taxes)
 - Strengthen language to say industrial is the primary usage, but allow for supporting uses
- Sustainability
 - California's baseline is already higher than other states
 - Language leads towards mandates; need less mandates and more incentive
 - Promote green, but don't require
 - Leave in green, but add other types of jobs, i.e. high tech, R & D, creative arts, etc.
- Role of Government and Use of Government Resources
 - Buy Local program – good concept, but it should be privatized (perhaps Chamber)
 - Expanding Education – why is the City worrying about education; leave it to the schools
 - Okay to work with the schools, but we should not be a part of the decision making process
 - Encourage quality, not necessarily growth
 - Look at language to make sure it doesn't look like the City is taking on financial role in education
- Providing City Incentives
 - Should treat all businesses the same
 - Don't target specific industries
- Use and Expansion of Redevelopment
 - May solve some problems, but sucks up a lot of money
 - Comes with restrictions, caution in using as a tool
 - One of the few ways to keep money in Fullerton
 - Incentive to increase property values in the City
- Implementing Paid Parking
 - Increased hassle factor for people; people won't want to shop downtown
 - Okay for the Fullerton Transportation Center
 - Policy issue for City Council
 - Explore rather than implement
- Using Improvement Districts
 - Concern over taxes

- Voluntary participation is okay
- Partnering with Private Businesses
- Encouraging Development Project Review / Design Review
 - Redundant – already have compatibility with surrounding uses
 - Enhance without being overly restrictive
 - Design review already occurring for certain projects
 - Assist RDRC in reviewing non-preservation zone projects
 - Avoid subjectivity, but don't dictate too much regarding style
 - Don't expand review – only for those that have dictionary review requirement
- Mobility
 - Focusing too much on multi-modal and auto left out
 - How do we add in multi-modal use without penalizing others
 - Bicycle amenities – not mandate
 - “Study” not “establish”
 - Charging stations – not necessary with new technology
 - Define “support”, “encourage”, “promote”
- Housing
 - City shall acquire – City should not be in the business of acquiring property – private Housing Element was already adopted and approved by the state

AGENDA FORECAST

May 16

- Deadline for Committee to provide written comments on
 - The Fullerton Community (6 sub elements)
 - The Fullerton Natural Environment (6 sub elements)
- RBF compiles GPAC comments

May 23 - GPAC Meeting 3 (3 hours)

- Second working session review/refine
 - The Fullerton Community (6 sub elements)
 - The Fullerton Natural Environment (6 sub elements)

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Chair Stopper advised the Committee that he would not be at the May 23 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m.