

April 22, 2021  
 6:00 p.m.  
 Zoom Meeting

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call

GPAC members: P= Present (11) | A= Absent (4) | Ch = Chair | VCh = Vice Chair

P	Michael Vo Mayor	P	Margie Drilling Measure HH Committee	P	Karl Lutke At-large FV Resident Quadrant 1
P	Ted Bui City Council	P	Jim Cunneen (Ch) FV Elementary School Board	A	Clarence F. Alvey Jr. At-large FV Resident Quadrant 2
P	Azzam Saad Planning Commission	P	Paula Coker FV Chamber of Commerce Board	A	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
P	Tracy Cameron FV Community Foundation	A	Matt Cortez OC Board of Realtors	P	Bonnie Castrey HB Union HS District Rep.

General Public: approximately 37 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 6. City Staff also reviewed the presentation given at the joint Planning Commission and City Council meeting on March 31<sup>st</sup> and relayed the direction to find additional opportunity sites and reduce proposed densities citywide.

4. New Business

A. Land Use Map / Opportunity Sites

- i. The consultant introduced revised land use designations (Very High Density Residential and Mixed Use), which were amended based on Planning Commission and City Council feedback. The revisions generally reduced density overall and introduced building height limitations for Mixed Use based on proximity to residential zoning.
- ii. The consultant presented the revised land use plan, which merged Planning Commission and City Council Feedback with the initial GPAC plan. A portion of the Warner/Newhope Specific Plan (Los Caballeros Sports Village) was added as an opportunity site and allows for a density reduction across the previously identified sites. The revised plan accommodates the RHNA allocation.

Finally, the consultant highlighted the results of preliminary infrastructure and roadway analysis. The City's water, sewer, and stormwater systems are in good condition and have the capacity to accommodate the cumulative growth projected by the City Council's revised plan. The roadway analysis focused on the Northbound 405 ramp at Euclid and the Southbound 405 ramp at Ellis. Despite the significant development proposed in the

immediate vicinity, both onramps are anticipated to operate at level-of-service (LOS) C/D or better during peak morning and afternoon hours. LOS C and D equate to minimal/minor delays in terms of traffic congestion.

5. Public Comments

- A. Steve Edwards: revised plan does not make Warner Square redevelopment feasible, ultimately a step backwards for several sites. Warner Square is the perfect site for the type of high-density mixed-use projects that the City needs to accommodate RHNA and achieve fiscal sustainability. Urges GPAC to consider a revised LU plan.
- B. Kiwanis FV (Brian G): original GPAC plan was well thought out; new plan makes a number of redevelopment sites unfeasible at proscribed densities.
- C. Memory Bartlett (FV Chamber of Commerce): echoes sentiment that original plan is the best path forward for the City to achieve fiscal sustainability. Smaller sites like Warner Square and Slater Investments do not benefit under revised plan. The City should be looking to attract young professionals who are hired by FV companies, spend money at FV businesses, and help grow the community.
- D. Peggy Tabas (Slater Investments): asks GPAC to reject revised LU plan. Revised plan severely restricts the options for future development. Other alternatives would be luxury townhomes or garden townhomes, but these would have been pursued if they were attractive alternatives. Proximity to major employers in FV makes site attractive for young professionals. On-site commercial will serve future residents as well as existing residents in the adjacent neighborhoods.
- E. Eileen Asahi (FV resident): concerned with parking for proposed residential units. Parking is already challenging in many areas of the City.
- F. George Sakioka: how does proposed residential affect existing uses on the site? Is an overlay applied to those areas? Would the existing uses no longer be allowed then?
  - i. B James: RHNA requires demonstrated capacity, so land use and zoning would be changed to allow a mixture of housing and non-residential. An existing use would be allowed to stay, but the proposed designation would allow for redevelopment to a mixture of residential and non-residential in the future.
- G. Ryan Guthrie (Holland): Encourages GPAC to consider higher density on many sites, including Boomers. How will EIR evaluate each site – highest allowed?
  - i. C Drukker: PC/CC have final say for what densities/intensities are used in technical analysis.
- H. Vince Sosa (FV resident): echoes sentiment that original GPAC plan was well vetted and the best alternative.
- I. Michael Heinrich (Slater Inv. architect): 35 du/ac would be almost impossible given the proposed mixed use land use designation.
- J. Jaye Towne: opposed to proposed density in general.

- K. Rafik Albert: urges City to hold off on restrictive land use densities until all project information is available.
  - L. Peggy Tabas: proposed development (65 du/ac) would have adequate parking for residential and non-residential uses.
  - M. ME Esquer (FV resident): State mandate may be unfair, but if it is required then the more dispersed alternative is favorable. Parking is a concern, but ADUs are potentially a bigger issue. Additional households in low density neighborhoods would add more cars to already crowded streets. Would like to see higher density on concentrated sites and fewer ADUs.
  - N. Memory Bartlett: concentrated density is preferable. Need to offer more affordable housing options to attract younger people to support local businesses. Hotel is not a good option.
  - O. August Lascola (FV resident): opposed to high density and conversion of non-residential.
6. Committee Comments
- A. Jim Cunneen: Parking must be addressed, ADUs are a viable alternative, high density housing would change the character of the community, and RHNA allocation is unfair.
  - B. Sheri Vander Dussen: would like to bring proposed projects (Slater, Warner Square, Boomers) back to the table at full strength. Allow the PC/CC to evaluate them as viable alternatives.
  - C. Margie Drilling: not a proponent of high density, but fighting the State is a losing battle. Some opportunity sites have legitimate potential. Concerned with Southpark SP because remainder has built out as industrial and opportunity site is zoned for industrial.
  - D. Emily Randle: large employers in the City want to attract the best and brightest. Proposed plan will help the City attract the next generation of residents and employees. City's that do not continue to innovate and evolve do not thrive.
  - E. Azzam Saad: need to think of future generations. There is not enough housing for our children and the expansion of freeway onramps and travel lanes will support proposed growth. We cannot waste the vertical resource [density] by limiting development.
7. Committee Deliberation and Action
- A. A roll call vote was conducted to recommend a 15% inclusionary ordinance to the Planning Commission and City Council.
    - i. Passes 9-2
      - a) GPAC Members in favor: Vo, Bui, Saad, Cameron, Coker, Randle, Lutke, Vander Dussen, and Castrey
      - b) GPAC Members opposed: Drilling and Cunneen
  - B. Margie Drilling made a motion for a modified land use plan
    - i. Blend of GPAC original and PC/CC as revised below:
      - a) Smith Farms – no change
      - b) Miller – no change
      - c) Crossings – GPAC original

- d) Los Cab – as presented today
- e) 16650 Harbor – GPAC original
- f) Golden Triangle – GPAC original
- g) Harbor Shopping Center – PC/CC revised
- h) Southpark – leave 1 area to fulfill original SP buildout (remove northern set of parcels but defer to property owner)
- i) Warner Square – GPAC original
- j) Slater Investments – GPAC original
- k) Boomers – GPAC original
- ii. Motion passes 8-3
  - a) GPAC Members in favor: Vo, Bui, Cameron, Drilling, Coker, Randle, Vader Dussen, and Castrey
  - b) GPAC Members opposed: Saad, Cunneen, and Lutke
- C. Karl Lutke – why are specific sites being called out for change?
  - i. B James – helps staff prepare revised buildout figures.
- D. Tracy Cameron – encourages GPAC to attend joint session on April 28.
- 8. Adjournment to Next Meeting (TBD)
  - A. GPAC Meeting #8 | Location: TBD | Time: TBD

ATTACHMENTS / LINKS

- None