NOTICE OF A SPECIAL MEETING STUDY SESSION
OF THE CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE
CITY OF FOUNTAIN VALLEY
March 31, 2021

In accordance with Section 54956 of the California Government Code, a Special Meeting of the City Council of the City of Fountain for the following:

AGENDA
SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS
Wednesday, March 31st, 2021
6:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER: 6:00 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL / PLANNING COMMISSION ROLL CALL

Council Members: Bui, Constantine, Grandis, Mayor Pro Tem/Vice Chair Harper, Mayor/Chair Vo

Planning Commissioners: Farrell, Lopez, Saad, Tahir, Vice-Chair Osborn, Chair Spear

STUDY SESSION (scheduled to begin at 6:00 p.m.)

1. **GPAC’s Conceptual General Plan Land Use Plan**

A Special Study Session of the City Council and Planning Commission regarding the conceptual General Plan Land Use Map proposed by the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC). This is a scoping meeting to determine if GPAC’s conceptual General Plan Land Use Plan is headed in the right direction before initiation of the environmental analysis in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Concerns and issues with the plan will be identified and factored into the plan and/or into subsequent environmental analysis and studies. This is not a final vote, but a mid-point opportunity to evaluate the direction of the project before embarking on the environmental analysis. City staff will study the preferred Land Use Plan through a programmatic environmental impact report (EIR) and conduct an EIR Scoping Meeting in Spring 2021. The public hearings and actions by each body will occur in late 2021 after the EIR has been completed.
PUBLIC COMMENTS

Persons wishing to speak on Agenda item(s) are requested to identify themselves by completing a blue speaker card indicating the item they want to address and to give the card to the City Clerk prior to the public comment period. Each person will be given up to 3 minutes to speak.

Additional information about the General Plan Update can be obtained on the website at the following link. From the General Plan Update homepage, click on the General Plan Advisory Committee link to view materials for the March 31st meeting and past meetings.

https://www.fountainvalley.org/1282/General-Plan-Update

All interested persons are invited to attend the above study session and be heard at the time and place specified above. Please call the City Clerk at 714-593-4445 for information. Due to Covid restrictions, limited public seating will be available at the meeting; however, the public can also participate remotely via the information provided below.

Remote Meeting Log-In Instructions

Please click the link below to join the webinar:
https://zoom.us/j/93813689556?pwd=Q2JjSFRjWWNqeGNQVkJRTkVd1phdz09
Passcode: 062258
Or iPhone one-tap:
US: +16699009128,,93813689556# or +12532158782,,93813689556#
Or Telephone:
Dial (for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):
US: +1 669 900 9128 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 646 558 8656
Webinar ID: 938 1368 9556
International numbers available: https://zoom.us/u/azDvgak2P

LOCATION:  
Fountain Valley Senior Center  
17967 Bushard Street  
Fountain Valley, CA 92708

Posting Affidavit

I, Rick Miller, City Clerk of the City of Fountain Valley, California do hereby certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing notice of special meeting was hand delivered to each member of the Fountain Valley City Council; posted on the Posting Board at Fountain Valley City Hall; and placed the digital agenda on the city’s website on March 23, 2021.
Joint Meeting of the Planning Commission & City Council

March 31, 2021
CALL TO ORDER

Council Members: Bui, Constantine, Grandis, Mayor Pro Tem/Vice Chair Harper, Mayor/Chair Vo

Planning Commissioners: Farrell, Lopez, Saad, Tahir, Vice-Chair Osborn, Chair Spear
1. INTRODUCTION
What does a general plan address?

- 8 required & 6 optional topics/elements
  - Land use
  - Circulation & mobility
  - Housing
  - Open space & recreation
  - Conservation
  - Safety & resiliency
  - Environmental justice
  - Noise
  - Growth management
  - Economic development
  - Community design
  - Sustainability
  - Healthy communities
  - Governance
Fountain Valley’s Future

- Set the stage for beneficial development
- Conduct inclusive and transparent community engagement
- Integrate new state mandates
- Focus on quality of life
## GPAC (General Plan Advisory Committee)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization/Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ramon Galvez-Arango</td>
<td>HCD Advisory Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Cameron <em>(added 3/18)</em></td>
<td>FV Community Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margie Drilling</td>
<td>Measure HH Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Cunneen</td>
<td>FV Elementary School Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Randle</td>
<td>FV Large Business Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Cortez</td>
<td>OC Board of Realtors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Lutke</td>
<td>At-large FV Resident Quadrant 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence F. Alvey Jr.</td>
<td>At-large FV Resident Quadrant 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Alcantara</td>
<td>At-large FV Resident Quadrant 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheri Vander Dussen</td>
<td>At-large FV Resident Quadrant 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Castrey</td>
<td>HB Union High School District Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Coker</td>
<td>FV Chamber of Commerce Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Vo</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Bui</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azzam Saad</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Former GPAC Members: Cheryl Brothers, City Council; Steve Nagel, City Council; Bill Cameron, Planning Commission; Vince Sosa, FV Community Foundation
GPAC Meetings

1. (Dec ‘18) GP overview and opportunity sites
2. (May ‘19) Citywide issues and values
3. (Jul ‘19) Draft GP Vision, RHNA intro, opportunity sites scenario exercise

2020 -- Draft RHNA Allocation/Appeal

4. (Feb ‘21) New RHNA, ADUs, mixed use and inclusionary options, GPAs in process
5. (Feb ‘21) Fiscal issues, draft RHNA strategy, private property concepts, RHNA distribution exercise
6. (Mar ‘21) Fiscal issues, draft Land Use Map, private property owner concepts
Goal for Tonight

• Obtain authorization to move GPAC’s draft Land Use Plan (with or without changes) to the next stage of environmental analysis

• Tonight is **NOT** a final vote, but a mid-point opportunity to evaluate direction of the GP
Study Session

1. Introduction
2. Technical Background
   a. GPAC issues, concerns, vision
   b. RHNA & housing element law
   c. Opportunity sites & GPAC strategy
   d. Fiscal overview
   e. PC/CC questions
3. GP Land Use Map
   a. Private developer presentation
   b. Citywide map of areas not changing
   c. Areas of change
   d. PC/CC questions
4. Public Comments
5. PC/CC Discussion
6. Next Steps
Virtual/In-Person Meeting Protocols
Everyone

- Please remain silent/muted
  *(unless called upon)*

- Zoom - always be aware if your webcam and/or microphone are turned on
  *(avoid disruptions from people talking, typing, or moving around)*
General Public – Question/Comment?

- **In Person:** Please fill out a speaker card and hand it to staff during the meeting or Public Comment period.
- **On Zoom:** Please indicate so in the chat box during the meeting or Public Comment period.
- **Public Comment Period:** During this period, City staff will call out your name so that you may ask questions or provide comments (up to 3 minutes).

PC/CC on Zoom

- Please enter questions or comments in chat box at any time.
- Use the “Raise Hand” feature if you need to talk or respond to a question.
2. STAFF REPORT
TECHNICAL BACKGROUND
Key Issues (Top 10 Ranked by GPAC)

1. Economic development
2. Fiscal sustainability
3. Housing
4. Implementing Crossings SP
5. Community design standards
6. Sustainability
7. Air quality / global warming
8. Governance
9. Healthy communities strategies
10. Infrastructure
Key Values (Top 6 Ranked by GPAC)

1. Fiscally sustainable municipal government
2. Strong education opportunities
3. Diverse housing opportunities
4. Well-maintained neighborhoods
5. Economic prosperity
6. Diverse retail, dining, and entertainment
Learning

Growing

Governance

Living

Working

VISION
Housing Element

- Mandatory state certification
- 8-year planning period (2021 to 2029)
- RHNA | regional housing needs assessment
  - Projected housing demand, based on pent up existing demand and future growth
  - City required to zone suitable land and maintain capacity through 2029
  - The City is NOT required to build housing; that is the job of the for-profit and affordable housing builders
City’s RHNA allocation

- OC area median income (AMI): $103K

- 4,839 | 2021-2029 RHNA
  - 1,307 very low (<50% AMI)
  - 786 low (50-80% AMI)
  - 834 moderate (80-120% AMI)
  - 1,912 above moderate (>120% AMI)

- 2,093 lower income
  (i.e., affordable housing)
What is affordable?

### Annual Income

- **<$64K**
- **$64-$102K**
- **$102-$124K**
- **>124k**

### Income Category

- very低
- low
- moderate
- above moderate

### Maximum Affordable Rent

- **$1,600**
- **$2,550**
- **$3,100**

### Maximum Affordable Home Price

- **$273K**
- **$466K**
- **$580K**

Sources: Both: 2020 HCD Income Limits; Market rates 2020: Apartments.com (rental); Zillow (owner)
Assumptions: Rental 30% income max, 2-bedroom units; Owner: 10% down payment, 1.1% property tax, 4% APR
How to accommodate RHNA

- Existing/proposed projects *(Prado Family Homes)*
- Vacant and underutilized land *(state default density presumes zoning of 30 du/ac has the capacity to accommodate lower income)*
- Accessory dwelling units *(ADUs)*
- Mixed-use *(limited to 50% of capacity due to rezoning)*
Consequences of non-compliance

- More frequent updates of housing element
  (4-year update cycle instead of every 8 years)

- Increased legal liability
  (Attorney General may bring suit to compel compliance, with fines of at least $10K to a maximum of $100K/month)

- Loss of local control
  (Open to lawsuit by private parties due to GP inadequacy; may be compelled to approve certain housing projects)

- Ineligibility for grant funds
  (Some state funding programs may require compliance)
OPPORTUNITY SITES

- Mile Square Plaza
- Golden Triangle
- Miller
- South Island
- Harbor Shpg Ctr
- 16650 Harbor
- Southpark
- Warner Square
- Fountain Center Plaza
- Crossings SP
- Smith Farms
- SE Corner of Talbert/Magnolia
- Talbert Village
- Boomer SPEC & Plavan Shpg Ctr
- Slater Investments
- Metalcrafters

17 sites
183 acres

Original (2018)
Added (2020/21)
How to accommodate RHNA

- **Vacant and underutilized land**
  - 30 du/ac presumed by state law to have the capacity to accommodate lower income housing

- **Suitable sites**
  - Appropriately zoned or rezoned for housing
  - If vacant, no more analysis needed
  - If underutilized, need evidence of likelihood to transition to housing by 2029
    - Property owner interest
    - Market evidence of turnover with higher zoning
    - Existing vacancy
Outreach & Analysis

- Opportunity sites survey/bus tour (2019)
- Development interviews (2019)
- Chamber Business Roundtable (2019)
- Mayor’s Breakfast (2019)
- Property owner interviews (2019-2021)
- Market study (2019 with 2021 updates)
- Infra/Transportation study (2019)
OPPORTUNITY SITES (Viable)

- Southpark
- Metalcrafters
- Golden Triangle
- Miller
- South Island
- Harbor Shpg Ctr
- Mile Square Plaza
- SE Corner of Talbert/Magnolia
- Slater Investments
- Warner Square
- Smith Farms
- Crossings SP
- Fountain Center Plaza

10 sites
142 acres

Capacity for housing by 2029

No desire to change
Challenge

- Accommodate 4,839 units on 10 sites (142 acres), and maintain this capacity through 2029 while addressing the City’s key issues/values/vision

- GPAC’s solutions
  - New General Plan designations
  - Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)
  - Inclusionary housing requirements
New GP Designations

Very High Density Residential
(up to 40/65 du/ac)
40/65 density maximums vary by levels of affordability

Mixed Use 1 (up to 65 du/ac)
Mixed Use 2 (up to 40 avg du/ac)
Very High Density Residential

- **New designation**
- **Intent:** help accommodate City’s RHNA allocation while incentivizing the development of affordable housing
- **Density ranges**
  - 30 to 40 du/ac without additional affordable housing (*beyond potential 15% inclusionary*)
  - Up to 65 du/ac with 50%+ affordable housing
Very High Density Residential

- Park Landing: 35/ac
- Buena Park: 58/ac
- Hayward Park: 67/ac
- Granite Court, Irvine
- San Mateo
A mixed-use designation can achieve several community aspirations:

1. Walkable, pedestrian-friendly
2. Activity/gathering areas
3. Public open space
4. Efficient land use/shared facilities
5. Long-term rise in property values
6. Revitalization of infill locations
7. Increased transit usage
8. Fiscally positive land use while achieving housing goals
Mixed Use 1 (MU-1)

- Sites **smaller** than 5 acres
- Standard allowance:
  - 65 units per acre
  - 10%+ of ground floor for commercial/office
  - Max FAR: 1.9, *excluding structured parking*
  - Max height: 5 stories / 52 ft
- Intent: make redevelopment of infill parcels more economically feasible (higher costs due to structured or subterranean parking)
Examples of MU-1 Dev’t

Stella Marina Del Rey
- 244 du
- 9 KSF retail
- 3.9 ac

Malden Station Fullerton
- 200 du
- 5 KSF retail
- 2.6 ac

63/ac

78/ac
Mixed Use 2 (MU-2)

- **Sites** 5 acres or larger
- **Standard allowance:**
  - 40 du/ac averaged over the entire project site
  - Single family attached and multifamily
  - 20%+ of ground floor for commercial/office
    - 55 du/ac average 30%+ commercial/office
  - Maximum FAR: 2.2
  - Max height: 6 stories / 62 ft
- **Intent:** allow a wide variety of product types while controlling project magnitude
Examples of MU-2 Dev’t

- **Bolsa Row**
  - 200 du
  - 150 hotel
  - 60 KSF retail
  - 6.0 ac
  - 33/ac avg
  - Westminster

- **Concar Passage**
  - 931 du
  - 40 KSF retail
  - 14.5 ac
  - 64/ac avg
  - San Mateo
Special Mixed-Use Standards

- Interest from property owners and development community to increase max density from 65 to 100 du/ac
- GPAC concluded additional density acceptable when mixed-use projects are not near single family homes in the City
- Applies to Warner Square & Boomers opportunity sites
Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)

- City seeing substantial interest in ADUs (89 apps in 2019-2020); more interest than HCD’s “safe harbor” assumptions (110 for 8 yrs)

- Ultimate capacity 26K ADUs; City projecting 989 ADUs by 2029
Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)

- Potential to provide independent living for adult children and aging parents, or others in need of affordable housing

- Land is already paid for, allowing ADUs to be affordable little to no public subsidy
Inclusionary Housing

Exploring the *potential* to adopt inclusionary housing
CA jurisdictions with some form of inclusionary housing program/policy
Inclusionary Housing Features

Common features

– 10% to 15% lower income housing
– Require affordability for 30+ years
– Increasingly mandatory (require vs encourage)
– Must build + at least one alternative
  • Fee
  • Land dedication
  • Off-site construction
  • Acquisition and rehab of existing units
Inclusionary Housing Benefits

- Ensures some affordable housing is built over the next 8 years
- Addresses City’s requirement to maintain capacity through 2029
  - Reduces remaining lower income RHNA,
  - which reduces the pressure on remaining sites,
  - which reduces the need to rezone land as market rate development occurs
Inclusionary Housing Concerns

- Increases market rate housing prices
- Increases complexity of housing projects
- All future projects would be eligible for density bonus and development standard concessions (per state law)
## Housing Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Assumed Density</th>
<th>Affordability Capacity by Income Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned/Entitled</td>
<td>19.94</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Very Low: 45  Low: 4  Mod: -  Abv Mod: 94</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prado Family Homes</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>Very Low: 45  Low: 4  Mod: -  Abv Mod: 1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Serena</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Very Low: -  Low: -  Mod: -  Abv Mod: 12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moiola</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Very Low: -  Low: -  Mod: -  Abv Mod: 74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starfish</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>Very Low: -  Low: -  Mod: -  Abv Mod: 7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft GP Land Use Map Changes

- Very High Density Residential (Up to 65 du/ac)
- High Density Residential (15 to 30 du/ac)
- Mixed Use 1 (Up to 65 du/ac)
- Mixed Use 2 (Up to 40 du/ac avg)
- Low Medium Density Resid (up to 10.8 du/ac)
- Specific Plan (increase from 490 to 1,100 units)
## Housing Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Assumed Density</th>
<th>Affordability Capacity by Income Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned/Entitled</td>
<td>19.94</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Sites (1)</td>
<td>141.7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Triangle</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16650 Harbor</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Farms</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller Property</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner Square (1)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slater Investments</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boomers (1)</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Shopping Ctr</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southpark</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossings SP</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Warner Square & Boomers have both requested densities at 100 du/ac, which would add 510 to the overall total (which would become 4,597) and 77 to the lower income capacity (which would become 1,709).
## Housing Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Assumed Density</th>
<th>Affordability Capacity by Income Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned/Entitled</td>
<td>19.94</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Sites</td>
<td>141.7</td>
<td>6 to 65</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADUs</td>
<td>citywide</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion free assumption

**Conservative Capacity**
- ADUs built 2013-2017: 22
- Assumption factor x 5: 110
- Affordability factor: 90%
- Lower income ADUs: 99

**Theoretical Maximum Capacity**
- Single family parcels: 12,575
- Multifamily units: 4,296
- Capacity per state law: 26,224
- Capacity at 10%: 2,622

### Too aggressive for HCD

**Trend-Based Capacity for Affordable**
- ADUs permits 2018-2020: 76
- **Projected ADUs 2021-2029**: 989
- Affordability factor: 75%
- **Projected affordable ADUs**: 740

### After discussions with HCD
OPPORTUNITY SITES & ADUs

- Metalcrafters
- Golden Triangle
- Miller
- South Island
- Mile Square Plaza
- Boomers SPEC & Plavan Shpg Ctr
- SE Corner of Talbert/Magnolia
- Slater Investments
- Warner Square
- Smith Farms
- Warner Square
- Talbert Village
- Warner Square
- Crossings SP
- Southpark
- Harbor Shpg Ctr

10 sites | 142 acres

- 4,087 housing units on opportunity sites
- 1,632 capacity for affordable
- 989 ADU citywide (740 affordable)
Housing Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Assumed Density</th>
<th>Affordability Capacity by Income Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned/Entitled</td>
<td>19.94</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Sites</td>
<td>141.7</td>
<td>6 to 65</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADUs</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CAPACITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,093</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>328</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With these numbers, the City can accommodate its RHNA allocation and meet City’s long-term Vision and goals.

Note: numbers increase slightly if the City moves forward with special mixed-use standards (100 du/ac; increase 510 units) and inclusionary zoning (15%; increase 237 units).

On the Warner Square & Boomers opportunity sites, both properties have requested densities at 100 du/ac, which would add 510 to the overall total (which would become 4,597) and 77 to the lower income capacity (which would become 1,709). This would increase the overall housing capacity total to 5,729 and lower income capacity to 2,498.
Fiscal Overview

- General Plan fiscal analysis
- How to address structural budget shortfall when Measure HH expires in 2037
- Long-term perspective
City Budget: FY21 Revenue

Sales Tax 43%
Property Tax 40%
Fees for Services 9%
Other Miscellaneous Revenue 4%
Franchise Fees 4%
Water Fund 3%
Intergovernmental (OCTA) 3%
Transient Occupancy Tax 2%
Gas Tax Fund 1%
Other Transfers 0%

General fund only
City Budget: FY21 Spending

- Police: 38%
- Fire: 25%
- Public Works: 17%
- Administration: 9%
- Community Services: 6%
- Planning and Building: 3%
- Nondepartmental: 3%

General fund only
Fiscal Overview

- Fiscal implications
  - Medium and high density housing
  - Mixed use development

- Net revenues
- Market rate and mixed-income
- Existing net revenues
Sales Tax per Acre

Note: Cross-hatching represents mixed-income development
Net Revenue per Acre

Note: Cross-hatching represents mixed-income development
Net Revenue Comparison

[Chart showing net revenue comparison for different types of developments: Rowhouse/Townhouse, Mixed-use Flats, Multifamily Wrap, Res., Multifamily Wrap, Mixed. The chart differentiates between New Development, Theoretical Existing Commercial, and Theoretical Vacant Site.]
New Development Comparison

Net Revenue per Acre

- Rowhouse/Townhouse
- Mixed-use Flats
- Multifamily Wrap, Res.
- Multifamily Wrap, Mixed
- Stand-alone Commercial
- Stand-alone Hotel

Stand-alone Hotel has the highest net revenue per acre, followed by Multifamily Wrap, Mixed, Multifamily Wrap, Res., Mixed-use Flats, and Rowhouse/Townhouse.
PC / CC
QUESTIONS
3. STAFF REPORT
GP LAND USE MAP
Proposed Development
Ground floor non-residential: 20%
Non-Residential: 17,600 SF

Base Density: 65 du/ac (442 units)
W/Affordable: 82 du/ac (556 units)
Lower Income Units: 0
Areas of No Change

Areas of Change
All other areas are NOT proposed for change
Draft GP Land Use Map Changes

- Low Density Residential (Up to 5 du/ac)
- Low Medium Density Residential (Up to 10.8 du/ac)
- Medium Density Residential (Up to 15 du/ac)
- High Density Residential (Up to 30 du/ac)
- Very High Density Residential (Up to 65 du/ac)
- Mixed Use 1 (Up to 65 du/ac)
- Mixed Use 2 (Up to 40 du/ac avg)
- Local Commercial (Up to 0.35 FAR)
- Office Commercial (Up to 0.50 FAR)
- General Commercial (Up to 0.50 FAR)
- Commercial Manufacturing (Up to 0.60 FAR)
- Public Facilities
- Flood Control Channel
- Open Space
- Golf Course
- Park
- Specific Plan
Golden Triangle – Proposed

Prospective Development
Designation: VHDR
Site Size – 2.3 acres
Assumed Density: 50 upa
Total Units – 115
Affordable Units – 115
16650 Harbor Blvd – Proposed

Prospective Development
Designation: MU-2 / VHDR
Site Size – 3.6 acres
Assumed Density: 50 upa
Total Units – 180
Affordable Units – 180
Smith Farms – Proposed

Prospetive Development
Designation – LMDR
Site Size – 4.2 acres
Assumed Density – 6 upa
Total Units – 25
Affordable Units – 3
**Prospective Development**
Designation – HDR  
Site Size – 18.6 acres  
Assumed Density – 22 upa  
Total Units – 400  
Affordable Units – 60
Warner Square – Proposed

Prospective Development
Designation – MU-1
Site Size – 1.8 acres
Assumed Density – 65-100 upa
Total Units – 100-200
Affordable Units – 15-30
Non-Res – 10% ground flr
Warner Square – Owner Concept

Proposed Development
Residential Mix: 83%
Non-Residential: 17%
Non-Res SF: 6,690

Assumed Density: 100 du/ac
Total Units: 184
Lower Income Units: unknown
Slater Investments – Proposed

Prospective Development
Designation – MU-1
Site Size – 3.34 acres
Assumed Density – 65 upa
Total Units – 217
Affordable Units – 32
Non-Res – 10% ground flr
Prospective Development
Designation – MU-1
Site Size – 3.34 acres
Assumed Density – 65 upa
Total Units – 217
Affordable Units – 32
Non-Res – 10% ground flr

Slater: 3.34 acres, 256 units (77 du/ac with density bonus), 5,000 SF restaurant w/ 2,000 SF patio
Boomers – Proposed

Prospective Development
Designation – MU-2
Site Size – 6.8 acres
Assumed Density – 37-100 upa
Total Units – 250-680
Affordable Units – 37-102
Non-Res – 20% ground flr

Huntington Beach

LDR

GC

LDR
**Proposed Development**

Ground floor non-residential: 20%
Non-Residential: 17,600 SF

Base Density: 65 du/ac (442 units)
W/Affordable: 82 du/ac (556 units)
Lower Income Units: 0
Prospective Development
Designation – MU-2
Site Size – 16.7 acres
Assumed Density – 36 upa
Total Units – 600
Affordable Units – 90
Non-Res – 20% ground flr
Southpark – Proposed

Prospective Development
- Designation: MU-2
- Site Size: 35.4 acres
- Assumed Density: 28 upa
- Total Units: 1,100
- Affordable Units: 550
- Non-Residential: 20% ground flr
Crossings SP – Proposed

Prospective Development
Site Size – 49 acres
Assumed Density – 22 upa
Total Units – 1,100
Affordable Units – 550
Non-Res – 50 percent
Draft GP Land Use Map

- Low Density Residential (Up to 5 du/ac)
- Low Medium Density Resid (Up to 10.8 du/ac)
- Medium Density Residential (Up to 15 du/ac)
- High Density Residential (Up to 30 du/ac)
- Very High Density Residential (Up to 65 du/ac)
- Mixed Use 1 (Up to 65 du/ac)
- Mixed Use 2 (Up to 40 du/ac avg)
- Local Commercial (Up to 0.35 FAR)
- Office Commercial (Up to 0.50 FAR)
- General Commercial (Up to 0.50 FAR)
- Commercial Manufacturing (Up to 0.60 FAR)
- Public Facilities
- Flood Control Channel
- Open Space
- Golf Course
- Park
- Specific Plan
## Buildout Conditions - Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft FV GPU</th>
<th>Residential Uses</th>
<th>Non-Residential Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Conditions (Dec 2020)</td>
<td>19,391</td>
<td>18,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Plan</td>
<td>24,467</td>
<td>23,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth (2021-2045)</td>
<td>5,076</td>
<td>4,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Special MU Standards (1)</td>
<td>+510</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 15% Inclusionary (2)</td>
<td>+237</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. On the Warner Square & Boomers opportunity sites, both properties have requested and GPAC has recommended densities up to 100 du/ac, which would add 510 units to the overall total.

2. If the City moves forward with an inclusionary housing requirement, the lower income units will become in addition to the assumed densities for a number of opportunity sites, and would add 237 units to the total.

- Address 4,839 RHNA through 2029
- More likely buildout through 2045
- Position the City for fiscal sustainability
- Pursue City Vision and Values
4. PUBLIC COMMENTS
Public Comments

- If you have already requested to talk, please wait for City staff to call out your name.
- You should then unmute yourself and will have up to 3 minutes to ask questions and/or provide comments.
- If you have not already requested to talk, please use the “Raise Hand” feature and wait to be called upon.
5. PC / CC DISCUSSION & DIRECTION
General Consensus & Input

- GPAC Strategy to accommodate RHNA and meet City’s vision/values
  - New GP designations (VHDR, MU-1, MU-2) applied to opportunity sites
  - Special Mixed-Use Standards (100 du/ac)
  - Inclusionary Zone (15% lower income on new residential projects)

- Input before proceeding with draft Land Use Plan / Buildout for analysis in an EIR
6. NEXT STEPS & ADJOURNMENT
Key milestones 2021

- Start EIR (esp. tech studies)
- Prepare draft GP policies
- Additional outreach and public review
- Draft EIR & HCD certification
Get involved and stay connected

- **Electronically**
  - E-blasts: sign up via FV Notify Me
  - Web: [www.fountainvalley.org/1282/General-Plan-Update](http://www.fountainvalley.org/1282/General-Plan-Update)
  - Email: planning.building@fountainvalley.org
  - Social Media:
    - Twitter: @fv_cityhall
    - Facebook: @fountainvalleycalif
    - Instagram: fvproud
THANK YOU!