



MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

LIBRARY MEETING ROOM

MONDAY

JUNE 13, 2011

7:00 P.M.

- CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chair Stopper at 7:08 p.m.
- PRESENT:** GPAC Members Bennett, Buck, Griffin, Haley, Harrell, Heusser, Jaramillo, Lambros, Richmond, Savage, and Stopper
- ABSENT:** Excused: GPAC Member Batinich, Chi, and Fitzgerald
Unexcused: None
- STAFF PRESENT:** Director Zelinka, Planning Manager Allen, Executive Assistant Pasillas
- CONSULTANT PRESENT:** RBF Vice President Susan Harden, RBF Associate Michelle Kou, RBF Associate Laura Stearns, Esq., RBS Sr. Associate/Director of Technical Studies Eddie Torres
- FLAG SALUTE:** Chair Stopper
- MINUTES:** MOTION made by Committee Member Richmond, SECONDED by Committee Member Haley, and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present, with Members Bennett, Griffin, and Lambros abstaining, that the Minutes of the June 6, 2011 meeting be APPROVED as written.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Presentation/discussion of Zoning Diagnostic background, intent, anticipated sections and preliminary recommendations

RBF Associate Laura Stearns, Esq. explained the relationship between the General Plan and zoning, different approaches to zoning, and the steps involved in the zoning update process. She explained that the Zoning Code needed to be updated in the following circumstances: the zones no longer relate to the General Plan; current zoning is a barrier to investment; the current procedures are too complicated and time consuming; there is insufficient guidance on findings which increases the possibility of lawsuits; and critical standards are hidden in obscure sections and/or the definitions. A brief background on the origin of zoning and various regulatory approaches was provided.

Ms. Stearns explained the three phase process that was being suggested: 1. Immediate – relatively minor text changes or things that need to be accomplished in order to comply with state law; 2. Comprehensive Update – items that require public outreach and/or policy direction from the Planning

Commission and City Council; and 3. Changes after the Downtown Core and Corridor Specific Plan is adopted – technical changes.

Presentation/discussion of Climate Action Plan background, intent, anticipated sections and preliminary recommendations

RBF Sr. Associate/Director of Technical Studies Eddie Torres explained the reasons for a Climate Action Plan (CAP) including the addition of legal defensibility to the General Plan and its EIR, as well as providing a streamlined review process related to greenhouse gas impacts for future projects. He described the CAP requirements as well as the Climate Action Strategies. He clarified that no new goals or policies would be added to the CAP beyond those identified in the General Plan. The CAP was still being prepared and could only be finalized with the completion of the traffic analysis as solidification by the GPAC of the goals and policies.

After discussion, the Committee requested to know how the CAP would be reviewed. Planning Manager Allen explained that the CAP would be circulated for public review along with the Draft Program EIR. The GPAC could provide comments individually as members of the public during the review process. Alternatively, a sub-committee of the GPAC could be formed to review the CAP, or the GPAC could hold an additional meeting to review the CAP. It was anticipated that the document would be available for review in July or August.

AGENDA FORECAST

- June 20 Cancelled – Items combined with June 13 agenda
- June 27 Review of revised Parts I through III of The Fullerton Plan with recommendation for preparation of Public Review Draft

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee to start the June 27 meeting at 6:00 p.m. rather than the proposed 7:00 p.m.

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Committee Member Harrell asked for clarification on the previous meetings discussion of indicators and Planning Manager Allen explained that staff, based on the Committee’s discussion, was looking at using the 12 items in the General Plan Vision Statement under “Fullerton will be a City which:”, along with the CSUF telephone survey, as indicators, which seemed to address the quality of life issues emphasized by the Committee. These indicators would be reviewed periodically to see if any changes needed to be made.

Committee Member Buck asked if the General Plan would be approved before the Bicycle Master Plan, and Ms. Allen clarified that it was a separate document and the policies would be rolled into the General Plan as both were going through the process at the same time and would be approved concurrently.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Stopper adjourned the meeting at 8:44 p.m.