

March 11, 2021  
 6:00 p.m.  
 Zoom Meeting

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call

GPAC members: P= Present (10) | A= Absent (5) | Ch = Chair | VCh = Vice Chair

P	Michael Vo Mayor	P	Margie Drilling Measure HH Committee	A	Karl Lutke At-large FV Resident Quadrant 1
P	Ted Bui City Council	A	Jim Cunneen (Ch) FV Elementary School Board	P	Clarence F. Alvey Jr. At-large FV Resident Quadrant 2
P	Azzam Saad Planning Commission	P	Paula Coker FV Chamber of Commerce Board	P	Robert Alcantara At-large FV Resident Quadrant 3
A	Ramon Galvez-Arango HCD Advisory Board	P	Emily Randle FV Large Business Rep.	P	Sheri Vander Dussen (VCh) At-large FV Resident Quadrant 4
A	Vince Sosa FV Community Foundation	A	Matt Cortez OC Board of Realtors	P	Bonnie Castrey HB Union HS District Rep.

General Public: approximately 20 members of the public were also in attendance.

3. Status Update

The consultant team recapped the updated project schedule and briefly reviewed the topics discussed during GPAC Meeting 5.

4. New Business

A. Fiscal Land Use Discussion

- i. The consultant refamiliarized the GPAC with the citywide revenues and expenditures presented during the previous meeting.
- ii. Next, the consultant introduced three common multi-family product types (townhouse, mixed-use flats, and multifamily wrap; with the latter two examples also including commercial components as mixed-use projects. For each example, approximate assessed value per acre, estimated property tax per acre, sales tax per acre, and the gross/net revenue generated per acre was illustrated both with and without the inclusion of affordable housing. The higher intensity of the multifamily wrap product allows it to generate at least double the amount of net revenue compared to townhouse and mixed-use flats.
- iii. The discussion transitioned a comparison of estimated revenue generated by existing commercial development and the three proposed product types and the per-acre net revenue of the three product types compared to stand-alone commercial and stand-alone hotel developments. The consultant emphasized that the per-acre net revenue of commercial development represents an average of existing commercial; individual businesses could exceed this amount by a substantial margin. While a hotel use is far

and away the best from a fiscal perspective and commercial uses perform better, on average, compared to mixed-used multifamily projects, the City must take into consideration the state's requirement to accommodate its RHNA allocation. Fortunately, the multifamily wrap and multifamily wrap mixed-use projects would appear to generate comparable net revenues compared to average stand-alone commercial.

**B. Public Comments**

- i. Rick – does not believe that high density residential and mixed use are desirable product types in Fountain Valley; posits that adding high density will decrease the quality of life for local residents.
- ii. Tanni – concerned about school capacity, especially since the school district is selling off property (Moiola)
  - a) City staff and consultant responded that school capacity impacts are considered and coordination is conducted with schools, with City staff noting that the City is required to consider school impacts mitigated by development impact fees per state law. [GPAC made additional comments later in the meeting (see 4.F)].
- iii. Ahmad – comments that proactive planning is important to avoid issues further down the road; cites homeless issues in Santa Ana and Anaheim that were facilitated by shortsighted planning many years ago.

**C. GPAC Comments – no comments made.**

**D. Land Use Map & Opportunity Sites**

- i. The consultant introduced and described three new land use designations, Very High Density Residential, Mixed Use 1, and Mixed Use 2. All three designations are intended to accommodate the RHNA by encouraging higher-density development and the construction of affordable units. The two Mixed Use designations are applied separately depending on the size of the parcel and bring the added benefit of non-residential development.
- ii. Next, the consultant walked through revised development tables that consider HCD's guidance on counting ADUs towards the RHNA. With this guidance, the City may not count as many ADUs as it had previously planned, placing additional emphasis on the opportunity sites. The tables were followed by a walkthrough of each site and description of the revised development scenarios, which were a blend of the GPAC's voting results from Meeting 5, input from property owners, and staff concepts.
- iii. The consultant then displayed a map of the current General Plan land uses, followed by a map showing only the areas where change is proposed. Finally, the proposed Draft General Plan land use map illustrates the designations citywide with areas of change updated to reflect their proposed change.
- iv. A representative for the Warner Square site presented the development concept for the site. It includes 184 total units (100 units per acre) and 6,690 square feet of non-residential uses.

**E. Public Comments**

- i. Cesar – How will the city promote affordable housing?
    - a) The consultant noted that development standards and incentives are intended to encourage development of affordable units; inclusionary ordinance is still possible, but not adopted yet.
  - ii. Tanni – house abuts Smith Farms; Smith leases property from Callen family. Has the Callen family been consulted?
    - a) The consultant noted that Smith Farms site was added to the roster later in the process; the City added that no applications have been submitted for redevelopment of the Smith Farm site.
  - iii. Ahmad – what are infrastructure requirements for future developments?
    - a) The City comments that infrastructure will be explicitly evaluated in the next EIR stage, with some consideration given during the preliminary land use planning stage.
  - iv. Rick – noted that Warner/Brookhurst property is better suited for high density; located adjacent to Mile Square Park w/ golf amenities.
- F. GPAC Comments
- i. Bonnie (HB Union HS District) – speaking on schools (high schools): significant capacity exists for FVHS, Westminster, and Ocean View. Interdistrict transfer rates are currently very high and that a large portion of growth could likely be accommodated simply by reducing future transfers.
- G. Motion by Castrey and second by Bui to accept the land use plan as presented by staff with the following modifications:
- i. Change the land use designation on the property located at 16650 Harbor Blvd to allow higher density residential use. GPAC did not specify the exact density or land use designation but Staff would recommend that either the MU-1 or HDR would be appropriate in this location.
  - ii. Allow a higher residential density than currently contemplated in MU-1 designation (65 du per acre) that would allow up to 100 du/ac. Staff given the flexibility to create the technical mechanism to accommodate the motion (e.g. overlay, new land use designation).
- H. Schedule and Next Steps
- i. The consultant reviewed the project schedule and highlighted key dates in the future.
    - a) Joint Planning Commission and City Council meeting on March 31 to authorize staff's environmental analysis of draft land use plan.
5. Public Comments
- A. Ryan Guthrie (Holland Partner Group; representative for Boomers site redevelopment) – would like to present plan to City in coming weeks; wrap MU project (destination project) w/ similar density as Slater and Warner Square. Mr. Guthrie indicated that he would also

like for his property to be considered for densities above 65 units per acre given the presentation made on the Warner property.

- i. The GPAC did not re-consider the vote to accommodate the request but did wish to communicate to the Planning Commission and City Council that they would be open to considering the request.
  - B. Kim Constantine – noted that 5 GPAC members are absent; believes that meetings are too important to miss.
6. Committee Comments
- A. Margie Drilling – requested additional information on prospective Boomers development prior to going to PC/CC presentations. Staff explained that this was not possible given the schedule unless GPAC desired to continue the item to March 18. GPAC did not wish to rush a decision and felt comfortable allowing the item to be presented on March 31<sup>st</sup> (See the public comments section above).
7. Adjournment to Next Meeting (TBD)
- A. GPAC Meeting #7 | Location: TBD | Time: TBD

ATTACHMENTS / LINKS

- None