



Appendix D: GPAC Land Use Discussion



Appendix D: General Plan Advisory Committee Land Use Discussion

The General Plan Advisory Committee discussed the current General Plan Land Use policy program and provided suggested revisions and additions.

DRAFT



Yorba Linda General Plan

This page intentionally left blank.

DRAFT



GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE LAND USE COMMENTS

November 27, 2012

III. GPAC DISCUSSION OF GENERAL PLAN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS PROCESS

Mr. Dale requested input from the Committee regarding its preferences and concerns as they relate to commercial land uses in the City. He addressed categories of land uses, noting that the two fiscal "winners" for cities are hotel and retail uses. Assumptions will be developed for residential land uses for the analysis.

Discussion followed regarding entertainment-related land uses, restaurant-related land uses and their effect on complimentary uses, existing hotels in the City and related revenues generated, factoring in the quality of the hotel, classifying hotel uses, the importance of keeping in mind that the General Plan is a forward-looking document, the starting point and identification of current data and evaluating various scenarios.

Mr. Dale addressed the process and various sources of available data, identifying niches to attract people to the remaining development areas to recuperate leakage, developing "destination" areas, office and industrial uses being driven by employment growth and focusing on choices that will have the biggest economic benefits for the City. He detailed areas of economic benefits in addition to revenues generated.

Ensuing discussion followed regarding keeping geography in mind, subareas in the City with the highest priorities for future commercial and industrial development, opportunities for refurbishing and encouraging upgrading existing worn areas, additional restaurants and evaluating unsuccessful retail areas in the City.

Discussion followed regarding opportunities for rezoning in order to increase chances of success, site-specific issues for consideration, the need to create a critical mass for various uses and the importance of measuring resident sensitivity to the various uses.

Ensuing discussion followed regarding existing competing areas and facilities, the importance of restaurants and location, the possibility of considering different use of space for use efficiency, working with the School District to share use of facilities for

City-related activities, developing creative ways for generating revenue and identifying appropriate locations.

Discussion followed regarding new developments for mixed and niche uses, prioritizing the issues to be considered, the possibility of focusing on office buildings to facilitate jobs for residents of Yorba Linda, making Yorba Linda a "ship-to-site" operation and the status of businesses in Savi Ranch.

Members were encouraged to list their issues of priority regarding what land uses and where.

Committee Member Nathaniel Behura commented regarding the possibility of providing a map in order to evaluate areas for potential developments.

Committee Member Ryan Bent suggested showing the various categories with their appropriate revenue generation potential.

Committee Member William Gorman addressed the possibility of inquiring from existing business why they have chosen to do business in Yorba Linda or why they have not. He reported on parking lots and use of existing parks, the success of food trucks and the need to work with companies to get other companies to increase business in the City. He noted a need to find unique ways to attract businesses to the City.

Committee Member Mary Carbone noted that the City is built out, that she would place hotels and entertainment at the bottom of the priority list, spoke against developing a movie theater in Yorba Linda, and stated a number of pending retail uses currently under development. She suggested enhancing the downtown (old town) area and commented in support of more office spaces in the City. She indicated the low probability of a high-end restaurant being developed in the City.

Committee Member Peggy Huang suggested creating a niche commercial development and the possibility of considering other forms of entertainment rather than a movie theater.

Committee Member Cheri Hansen felt that there should be an evaluation of existing facilities and conditions within the City and consideration of Savi Ranch as an entertainment destination.

Committee Member Marilyn Adams commented on the possibility of developing an "old town", existing valuable sites and making adjustments and changes so that they become thriving "mega" centers. She addressed the importance of maintaining open spaces and upscale housing and considering what surrounding communities desire.

Committee Member Karalee Watson addressed the area at Imperial Highway and Yorba Linda and the need to reevaluate the entire area for new possibilities and opportunities.

Committee Member Robert Lyons addressed the need for more office space and felt that the City has adequate restaurants and does not need a movie theater. He stated the he would like to know what revenue the City needs, since the City is relatively healthy at this time.

Committee Member Lindon Baker felt the need to use caution in changing or deviating from the original concept of Yorba Linda being a bedroom community. He noted the need for remodeling the aging housing stock and updating existing structures and centers.

Committee Chair James Pickel felt that development in Yorba Linda is context-driven. He did not see a need for another hotel in Yorba Linda, commented on opportunities in Savi Ranch, changes in businesses and industries and the benefits of increasing the number of offices in Yorba Linda to serve existing residents and establishing niche retail, industrial and restaurants.

Committee Member Cheri Hansen addressed the golf course which was supposed to generate revenue for the City but has not. She felt that it needs to be evaluated carefully.

Discussion followed regarding the need for "tweaking" the existing General Plan.

Committee Member William Gorman addressed the need to facilitate circulation within the City.

Committee Member Nathaniel Behura addressed impacts of various projects, limited access to SaviRanch and the need to evaluate ingress and egress of the area, noting that it has a lot of potential.

Committee Member Cheri Hansen commented on problems with access into and out of Savi Ranch and considering how business and new developments affect existing neighborhoods.

Discussion followed regarding creating feasible and desirable developments.

Mr. Dale expressed his appreciation to the Committee for its input and reported that these will be incorporated into a report to be presented at an upcoming Committee meeting.

January 29, 2012

III. GPAC DISCUSSION OF GENERAL PLAN HOUSING ELEMENT PROCESS

A summary of the identified multi-family rezone sites was presented to the GPAC. Ms. Warner noted that these sites can be used to accommodate the 2013-2021 RHNA need, provided the sites are still available.

**May 20, 2013
6:30 – 9:00PM
YORBA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER**

III. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF DRAFT 2014-2021 HOUSING ELEMENT AND RECCOMENDATION TO PLANNING COMMISSION

Staff introduced Ms. Karen Warner, the city's Housing Element consultant who presented a brief powerpoint presentation

Ms. Warner provided an overview of the existing 2008-2014 Housing Element including prior actions by the City Council in the review and adoption of the current element. Ms. Warner describe key highlights of the existing policy program, including;

- Assistance in development of Villa Plumosa
- Habitat for Humanity construction of three ownership units
- Transfer of 26 RDA-owned units to non-profit purchaser
- Affordable Housing Agreement with OHDC to purchase foreclosure condos
- Adoption of changes to multi-family zoning
- Adoption of multi-family Design Guidelines
- Rezoning of 14 sites identified in the current Housing Element
- Entitlement processing for 69 affordable rental units on rezoned sites in Savi Ranch
- Provision of Housing Rehabilitation Grants (53 lower income
- Mortgage assistance to six moderate-income first-time homebuyers
- Adoption of Zoning for Special Needs Housing
- Adoption of Density Bonus, waivers and incentives for affordable housing consistent with state law

Ms. Warner provided the Committee with an overview of the Housing Element rezone sites indicated in the current housing element policy program and explained to the Committee that these sites have be rezoned and, if they are not currently entitled with project applications, the sites can be utilized to meet the needs for the 2014-2021 planning period.

Ms. Pam Stoker provided an overview of the elimination of Redevelopment in the City of Yorba Linda. Ms. Stoker described the challenge of losing the primary source of funding for affordable housing in the City and its effect on future programs and policy implementation. Ms. Stoker described potential future funding options, including a new

Housing Asset Fund, asset proceeds use (land, loan repayments, etc.) and potential state legislative actions.

Committee Member Bent ask for clarification that the draft's sites inventory was identical to the existing policy in the current housing element and the programs and analysis was essentially and redrafting of existing policy and not a full re-write of the document.

Chair Pickel asked the public for their comments

Ms. Stephens addressed the Committee asking the strawberry fields as a potential library site will affect the housing sites needs of the Housing Element.

Ms. Stephens asked about the impact of Cielo Vista and Esperanza Hills developments. Mr. Harris explained that the proposed projects are in the County's jurisdiction and will be approved by the County. If and when annexation occurs, an annexation agreement will be developed to address many of the public service issues inherent in the annexation process. Mr. Harris explained it is very early in the annexation discussion and it will take much time before these issues are fully addressed. Mr. Harris explained that the City has a keen interest in the process and will ensure the City's interest are fully vetted in the process

Ms. Stephens had a question on on Goal Five related to about board and care facilities and if they can count. Ms. Warner explained that they don't count as part of the new construction objectives and are separate from the construction needs.

Ms. Walker(sp). Addressed concern over discussing future policy consider adjacent jurisdictions as it relates to the location of affordable housing. Ms. Walker also voiced concern about the distribution of affordable housing throughout the community and not just in the west side of the community.

Ms. Spendenberg(sp) expressed concerns at Prospect and Yorba Linda Boulevard projects at 4 story building heights take into consideration of existing single-family one story. She asked if this was taken into consideration. Mr. Rehmer explained that the design issues are considered during the design review process and will address adjacency issue among others.

**June 17, 2013
6:30 – 9:00PM
YORBA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER**

III. GPAC REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF GENERAL PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT POLICY PROGRAM

Committee Member Hansen said that many of her initial comments on the goals/policies were clarification questions and that in some cases she preferred the original policies over the revised policies proposed by Staff. She asked for clarification on what is meant by “higher order policy statement.” Mr. Barquist responded that the note is meant refer to creating a more general, not specific policy that is overarching or more global in context. Committee Member Hansen asked for the purpose of creating more generalized policies. Mr. Barquist responded that having more general policies allows the policies to remain applicable/relevant even if conditions (such as fiscal conditions) change over time.

Refer to Attachment A for Committee discussion on the individual goals and polices.

LAND USE ELEMENT (GPAC DISCUSSION ITEMS)	Notes/Comments
<i>Goal 4 High quality urban design that unites the City into a comprehensive entity, provides community gathering areas, and contributes to City pride and identity.</i>	<p>Staff recommended revision: <i>Goal 4: Community urban design that contributes to the preservation and enhancement of character and identity in Yorba Linda.</i></p> <p>Suggested revision is acceptable (Baker, Lyons, Hansen, Gorman) Would like to include uniformity or consistency across the whole city to reflect “comprehensive entity” (Adams) Uniformity or comprehensive could be addressed in the policies (Barquist) Would like to see semi-rural or rural instead of urban (Watts) Why was “City pride” removed? Is it too subjective to measure? (Bent) Remove “urban” and leave as “community design” (Watts)</p>
Policy 4.1 Require that all structures be constructed in accordance with the City's building and other pertinent codes and regulations; including new, adaptive reuse, and renovated buildings.	Committee agreed this policy should be deleted.
Policy 4.2 Ensure high quality community design image through the City design review process.	<p>Staff recommended revision: <i>Policy 4.2: Utilize the City's design review process to address community design considerations.</i></p> <p>Include unified City, comprehensive feel or other language to ensure new development is consistent with existing (Adams) Agree with Adams. (Bent) Policy is redundant, should be deleted (Carbone)</p>

LAND USE ELEMENT
(GPAC DISCUSSION
ITEMS)

Notes/Comments
<p>How does the design review process exist today? Is it a policy or a code and what mechanisms make sure design review happens? Could delete policy if design review is required by some other means (Baker) Keep policy for consistency purposes, but be brief. Design review is mentioned in the Zoning Code. (Rakochoy) Keep policy as revised (Lyons) Policy reflects an important value of the city. Change to “to maintain comprehensive community design considerations” (Hansen) Ok with revised policy (Carbone) Use “address”, not “maintain” because recently adopted standards are different than previous and hold design to a higher standard (Lyons) Keep “address” and add “comprehensive” (Hansen) Consultant to look at compacting language (Watts) How is comprehensive defined in planning terms? (Adams) Comprehensive means encompasses the whole city, everything in the General Plan could be comprehensive (Bent)</p>
<p>Policy 4.3 Implement the comprehensive landscape program for major arterials, intersections and City entry points as established in the City's Landscape Design Manual.</p> <p>No comments. Leave as is.</p>
<p>Policy 4.4 Stimulate improved citywide landscaping through public acceptance of limited area landscape maintenance districts in western areas of the City where landscape improvements and maintenance currently are provided for through the General Fund.</p> <p>Staff recommendation: Revise policy to a generalized statement related to landscaping’s relationship to urban design</p> <p>How does this policy relate to new landscape districts? (Hansen) What is the charge of the newly appointed landscape maintenance committee? Would they have recommendations for this policy? (Lyons) Policy refers to trying to expand the LMAD into the western part of the City. Delete this policy because it is not relevant based on economic conditions anymore (Rakochoy) Delete policy (Lyons) Not enough information to make a decision on the policy (Hansen) Include a general policy instead. Include safety considerations (Gorman) Is Policy 4.4 already covered in Policy 4.3? (Adams) Policy 4.4 is the way to implement Policy 4.3. Keep Policy 4.4 but make it more general (Bent) Remove this policy and replace with new policy (Carbone) Agree with Carbone (Baker, Watts) Are the “limited area landscape” areas smaller than those included in Policy 4.3 and should be kept in? Remove “urban” and “western” (Adams)</p>

LAND USE ELEMENT
(GPAC DISCUSSION
ITEMS)

Notes/Comments

	<p>Make Policy 4.3 more general to encompass 4.3 and 4.4 (Bent) Agree with Bent (Gorman) Policy 4.4 advocates for creating a separate district, which should not happen. Make more general (Rakochoy)</p>
<p>Policy 4.5 Emphasize attractive and functional urban design in new development.</p>	<p>Committee agreed this policy should be deleted.</p>
<p>Policy 4.6 Allow for the consideration, through the Area Plan designation, of changes in the permitted use and increases in the development density and residential intensity to accommodate the development of spaces and places for people to gather as a community in the Community Core area, provided that the uses are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Compatible with adjacent uses; •Contribute economic and social benefits to the City; •Exhibit a distinctive level of architectural design and site planning merit; •Incorporate streetscape and other public urban design amenities which contribute a high quality image and benefit the community. 	<p>Delete this policy (Baker) Condense the policy. Call it the Town Center Specific Plan and say “promote the implementation of the Town Center Specific Plan to ensure...” (Rakochoy) What are staff’s recommendations? (Watts) Should this policy be generalized to be applicable city-wide? (Barquist) Eliminate first half of the policy and reference the Town Center Specific Plan (Hansen) Does the Town Center Specific Plan need to be mentioned if it is already adopted? (Baker) Allow areas plans to develop in other areas in the future (Lyons) Keep bullet points (Gorman) Should expand to be city-wide (Adams, Bent) Should be kept specific to the Town Center to protect the community core (Carbone) Brief statement about Town Center is ok, but need area plans in other parts of the City as well (Baker) Policy should recognize use of area plans in other areas in the future (Watts) Incorporate list of areas such as Town Center, Savi Ranch, etc. for area plans (Hansen) List of areas could change over time (Watts) Do not need to have a list of specific areas, keep general (Carbone, Adams, Bent)</p>
<p>Policy 4.7 Provide pedestrian and visual linkages between commercial, residential and public uses in the Community Core area, with particular emphasis in the Downtown Historic District.</p>	<p>Staff recommended revision: <i>Policy 4.7: Encourage the establishment of physical and functional connections between a variety of land uses.</i></p> <p>Agree with revision. Use “maintain” instead of “provide” (Bent) Agree with revision (Carbone, Baker, Rakochoy) Remove “variety” (Lyons) Keep “commercial, residential and public uses” instead of “variety of land uses” (Hansen) Make the policy more general (Gorman)</p>

LAND USE ELEMENT
(GPAC DISCUSSION
ITEMS)

	Notes/Comments
	<p>Change beginning of policy to “Establish physical and functional connections...” (Watts) Agree with revisions (Adams, Bent, Rakochy)</p>
<p>Policy 4.8 Update the City's building and development codes and regulations on a regular basis, as needed, to ensure that they incorporate state-of-the-art standards.</p>	<p>Staff recommended revision: <i>Policy 4.8: When reviewing existing City policies and regulations, consider standards and provisions that further enhance overall community design.</i></p> <p>Should “state of the art” be kept? Or add “new” before standards and provisions (Hansen) Adding “new” or “state of the art” would not change the intent of the policy (Barquist) The policy should include direction on how buildings function, not just on how they look. Does the revised policy encompass green design, safety, etc.? (Adams) The revised policy encompasses function. “State of the art” can mean “cutting edge”. Do not think the City should be using unproven technologies. (Bent) Focus on “community” is the important part of the policy (Watts) “Design” is comprehensive enough, includes fire safety, traffic safety, etc. (Lyons) Environmental considerations will also occur in the Conservation Element (Barquist)</p>
<p>Goal 5 New and existing development supported by adequate public infrastructure.</p>	<p>Staff recommended revision: <i>Goal 5: Existing and future development coordinated with future infrastructure capacity.</i></p> <p>Revised language is vague, not strong enough (Baker) Vague, should simplify language to be less planner-speak (Rakochy) Suggest “Existing and future development coordinated with adequate infrastructure” (Bent) Change back to original. Should not rely on future infrastructure to be built (Lyons) Coordinated is too weak (Rakochy) Keep original “adequate public infrastructure” and add “capacity” (Adams) Keep with original. Need a strong statement (Carbone) Change to “existing” or immediately built infrastructure (Watts)</p>
<p>Policy 5.1 Implement public infrastructure improvements necessary to serve land uses included in the Land Use Plan (as defined by the Circulation Element).</p>	<p>Staff recommended revision: <i>Policy 5.1: Coordinate future infrastructure improvements through the City's Capital Improvement Program to ensure facilities meet the needs of existing and future land uses.</i></p> <p>Should be broader than “facilities”. Does this include roads? (Rakochy) Facilities could include any infrastructure (Barquist) Use a more general term than facilities (Bent)</p>
<p>Policy 5.2 Require that development</p>	<p>Delete this policy (Baker, Rakochy, Lyons)</p>

LAND USE ELEMENT (GPAC DISCUSSION ITEMS)

	Notes/Comments
<p>approvals, General Plan Amendments, Zone Changes, Specific Plan adoptions, and other land use decisions be contingent upon the ability of public infrastructure and public services, including schools, to provide sufficient capacity to accommodate potential demand.</p>	<p>Keep policy as it provides specific implementation, but remove schools (Hansen) Ok with keeping policy (Gorman, Adams) Keep policy and keep schools. Will ensure decision process looks at schools when approving new development (Bent) Could delete policy if stated strongly elsewhere the infrastructure/services need to be adequate (Watts) Remove policy 5.1 and keep policy 5.2 (Hansen) Merge 5.1 and 5.2 or reword goal to be strong (Watts)</p>
<p>Policy 5.3 Coordinate the timing of the implementation and siting of public infrastructure and public facilities with other related public facilities and development.</p>	<p>Committee agreed this policy should be deleted.</p>
<p>Policy 5.4 Support the school district in its efforts to obtain financing and new sources of funding for the rehabilitation & improvement of existing facilities to meet increased need.</p>	<p>Committee agreed this policy should be deleted.</p>
<p>Policy 5.5 Promote the development of affordable residential uses which convey a quality design and are compatible with adjacent uses in the community.</p>	<p>Staff recommended revision: <i>Policy 5.5 Ensure residential development is designed and developed so that they are complimentary to the overall urban design of the city.</i> Delete, redundant to have a policy specifically about design of affordable housing (Bent) Committee agreed to keep as revised. Change to “urban design” to “community design”</p>
<p>Policy 5.6 Encourage the use of public sewer systems in new and infill development rather than septic systems.</p>	<p>Committee agreed this policy should be deleted.</p>
<p><i>Goal 6 Achieve a unified and contiguous City area through voluntary annexation by residents of developed County Islands located in the City's Sphere of Influence.</i></p>	<p>Staff recommended revision: <i>Goal 6: Establish a unified and contiguous city boundary through the incorporation of county islands and lands within the City's Sphere of Influence.</i> Removed “voluntary”. Ok with recommended revision (Adams)</p>
<p>Policy 6.1 Work closely with residents and property owners of County islands when conditions are appropriate for consideration of possible annexation to the City in order to clarify the nature and extent of public facility and service improvements required at property owner expense before annexation can occur.</p>	<p>Staff recommended revision: Revise policy to focus on the LAFCO process, focusing on identifying/addressing the needs/concerns of residents within annexation sites. Should steer away from staff getting involved with annexation (Watts) Only encourage annexation when it makes sense for the City economically (Baker) Clarify cost and service issues associated with annexation (Adams) Not enough information on costs and benefits to make a decision to support annexations (Watts) Areas cannot be annexed unless property owners agree to be annexed (Gorman) Does annexation need to be addressed in the General Plan?</p>

LAND USE ELEMENT
(GPAC DISCUSSION
ITEMS)

	Notes/Comments
	<p>(Bent) Eliminate annexation discussion (Carbone) Only in favor of annexation if it is to the City's advantage (Baker) Important to have annexation policy in the General Plan. Simplify the statement (Rakochoy) Agree with staff recommendations on revisions. Strategic to have a policy (Lyons) Make the policy more general (Hansen) The City does not have control over the process. Delete the policy (Gorman) Keep it in to have strategic control (Adams) Keep the policy in (Bent) Does annexation need to have specific policies? Or just keep it as a goal (Watts) Without policies it would not be enforceable (Adams) Have one policy to support LAFCO and other processes (Watts)</p>
<p>Policy 6.2 Consider annexations of County islands which are a part of Yorba Linda's contiguous developed area, which receive services from the City, which will benefit from provision of services from the City, and are located in the Sphere of Influence, based on voluntary requests by residents of the County islands.</p>	<p>Committee agreed this policy should be deleted.</p>
<p>Policy 6.3 Establish as the first priority for annexation the Yorba Linda Country Club unincorporated lands which are wholly surrounded by the City, and which will contribute the valuable golf course amenity to the City's private recreation facilities resources.</p>	<p>Committee agreed this policy should be deleted.</p>
<p>Policy 6.4 Require that, prior to any annexation activities involving the Fairlynn County island, improvements which bring the area into conformance with the City's infrastructure standards and other relevant factors are addressed to the satisfaction of the City.</p>	<p>Committee agreed this policy should be deleted.</p>
<p>Policy 6.5 Work with adjacent cities and the County to establish uniform and continuous boundaries, avoiding irregular intrusions and projections.</p>	<p>Committee agreed this policy should be deleted.</p>
<p><i>Goal 7 New development opportunities offered by large undeveloped properties located in the sphere of influence.</i></p>	<p>Staff recommended revision: consider revising goal to address the management of future larger scale developments.</p> <p>What is meant by "opportunities"? (Baker) Should name specific areas and seek annexation as a goal</p>

LAND USE ELEMENT
(GPAC DISCUSSION ITEMS)

Notes/Comments
<p>(Rakochoy) Goal is redundant with Goal 6 (Watts) Change to be citywide, not just for annexations. Apply to all large developments (Lyons) Change Goal 7 to citywide (Watts) Change to “large developments of undeveloped properties in the sphere of influence and the City” (Adams)</p>
<p>Staff recommended revision: revise policy to address all sphere areas. Focus policy on assurance for health, safety and welfare of current and future residents.</p> <p>Delete the policy. Covered under Goal 6 (Hansen) Policy is specific to areas identified (Rehmer) Expand policy to all areas in the City and the sphere of influence. Delete reference to annexation (Watts)</p>

Policy 7.1 Seek the annexation of Shell, Murdock and other undeveloped properties within the northern sphere of influence based upon development plans that ensure access, infrastructure and land use concepts which are acceptable to the City.

Goal 4 High quality urban design that unites the City into a comprehensive entity, provides community gathering areas, and contributes to City pride and identity

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- Avoid the use of qualifying terms such as “high quality”
- Revise goal to a generalized higher-order policy statement

Committee Considerations

- Recommend revising goal to a stated end to read:

“Goal 4: Community urban design that contributes to the preservation and enhancement of character and identity in Yorba Linda. “

Policy 4.1 Require that all structures be constructed in accordance with the City's building and other pertinent codes and regulations; including new, adaptive reuse, and renovated buildings

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- Avoid the use of policy statements that say, “adhere to city codes”, etc.
- The adaptive reuse and renovation of buildings is covered as part of the Historic Resources Element
- Recommend striking this policy

Committee Considerations:

- Strike this policy and address in the historic resources element discussion

Policy 4.2 Ensure high quality community design image through the City design review process.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- Avoid the use of qualifying policy statements that say, “high quality”,

- *Policy should focus on the process to achieve the goal of*
- *Recommend striking this policy*

Committee Considerations:

- Revise policy to state:
“Policy 4.2: Utilize the city’s design review process to address community design considerations”

Policy 4.4 Stimulate improved citywide landscaping through public acceptance of limited area landscape maintenance districts in western areas of the City where landscape improvements and maintenance currently are provided for through the General Fund.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Should this policy focus on the higher-order issue of promoting landscaping city wide?*
- *Can this policy be generalized to specifically address landscaping as a means for improved Urban Design?*
- *Is this policy to funding specific?*

Committee Considerations:

- Revise policy to a generalized statement related to landscaping’s relationship to urban design

Policy 4.5 Emphasize attractive and functional urban design in new development.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *This policy may be duplicative*
- *This policy should address all development, inclusive of existing, public realm, etc.*

Committee Considerations:

- Consider striking this policy as it is present in other policy statements

Policy 4.6 Allow for the consideration, through the Area Plan designation, of changes in the permitted use and increases in the development density and residential intensity to accommodate the development of spaces and places for people to gather as a community in the Community Core area, provided that the uses are:

- **Compatible with adjacent uses;**
- **Contribute economic and social benefits to the City;**
- **Exhibit a distinctive level of architectural design and site planning merit;**
- **Incorporate streetscape and other public urban design amenities which contribute a high quality image and benefit the community.**

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *This is a code implementation issue*
- *This policy is reflected in the Town Center Specific Plan*
- *Recommend striking this policy*

Committee Considerations:

- Consider strike this policy, or
- Amend policy to apply citywide.

Policy 4.7 Provide pedestrian and visual linkages between commercial, residential and public uses in the Community Core area, with particular emphasis in the Downtown Historic District.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- Avoid use of term “provide”
- Policy should focus on the process to achieve the goal of
- Recommend striking this policy
- Policy can apply to any location in the City, not just the Downtown area

Committee Considerations:

- Revise policy to state:
“Policy 4.7: Encourage the establishment of physical and functional connections between a variety of land uses.”

Policy 4.8 Update the City's building and development codes and regulations on a regular basis, as needed, to ensure that they incorporate state-of-the-art standards.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- Policy focus is on updating the Code, whereas the core policy is to reflect design considerations
- Avoid qualifying language such as “state-of-the-art”
- Recommend revising policy

Committee Considerations:

- Revise policy to state:
“Policy 4.8: When reviewing existing City policies and regulations, consider standards and provisions that further enhance overall community design.”

Goal 5 New and existing development supported by adequate public infrastructure

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- This Goal is related to infrastructures ability to meet future buildout conditions
- Revise goal to a generalized higher-order policy statement

Committee Considerations

- Recommend revising goal to a stated end to read:

“Goal 5: Existing and future development coordinated with future infrastructure capacity. “

Policy 5.1 Implement public infrastructure improvements necessary to serve land uses included in the Land Use Plan (as defined by the Circulation Element).

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- Is this implementation vs. coordination?
- Issue relates to capital improvement programming.

Committee Considerations

- Recommend revising goal to a stated end to read:

“Policy 5.1: Coordinate future infrastructure improvements through the City’s Capital Improvement Program to ensure facilities meet the needs of existing and future land uses . “

Policy 5.2 Require that development approvals, General Plan Amendments, Zone Changes, Specific Plan adoptions,

and other land use decisions be contingent upon the ability of public infrastructure and public services, including schools, to provide sufficient capacity to accommodate potential demand.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *This is an implementation issue*
- *This policy may be covered in Policy 5.1*

Committee Considerations

- *Recommend deleting this policy*

Policy 5.3 Coordinate the timing of the implementation and siting of public infrastructure and public facilities with other related public facilities and development.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Repetative of Policies 5.1 and 5.2*
- *A capital improvement program issue*

Committee Considerations

- *Recommend deleting this policy as it is captured in above goal and policies*

Policy 5.4 Support the school district in its efforts to obtain financing and new sources of funding for the rehabilitation & improvement of existing facilities to meet increased need.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *This Policy is covered under Policy 10.3*
- *Is this policy is better suited for Goal 10*

Committee Considerations

- *Recommend deleting policy and capturing is Goal 10 policies*

Policy 5.5 Promote the development of affordable residential uses which convey a quality design and are compatible with adjacent uses in the community.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *This policy is a design issue, not infrastructure issue*
- *May be more appropriate under design discussion*
- *Is the goal to “convey” or actually possess?*
- *Does this apply to all residential development types*

Committee Considerations

- *Consider relocating this policy under Goal 4*
- *Consider rewording the policy to state: “Ensure residential development is designed and developed so that they are complimentary to the overall urban design of the city.”*

Policy 5.6 Encourage the use of public sewer systems in new and infill development rather than septic systems.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Is this goal even appropriate or relevant?*

-

Committee Considerations

- *Recommend striking this policy*

Goal 6 Achieve a unified and contiguous City area through voluntary annexation by residents of developed County Islands located in the City's Sphere of Influence.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Is voluntary an appropriate term?*

Committee Considerations

- *Recommend revising goal to a stated end to read:*

“Goal 6: Establish a unified and contiguous city boundary through the incorporation of county islands and lands within the City’s Sphere of Influence”

Policy 6.1 Work closely with residents and property owners of County islands when conditions are appropriate for consideration of possible annexation to the City in order to clarify the nature and extent of public facility and service improvements required at property owner expense before annexation can occur.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *This is conducted through annexation agreements*
- *This is a LAFCO process*

Committee Considerations

- *Revised policy to focus on the LAFCO process, focusing on identifying/addressing the needs/concerns of residents within annexation sites.*

Policy 6.2 Consider annexations of County islands which are a part of Yorba Linda's contiguous developed area, which receive services from the City, which will benefit from provision of services from the City, and are located in the Sphere of Influence, based on voluntary requests by residents of the County islands.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Is voluntary request the basis?*
- *Is this an appropriate Policy in consideration of 6.1*

Committee Considerations

- *Recommend removing this policy*

Policy 6.3 Establish as the first priority for annexation the Yorba Linda Country Club unincorporated lands which are wholly surrounded by the City, and which will contribute the valuable golf course amenity to the City's private recreation facilities resources.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *The direct language of this policy may not be appropriate*
- *Consideration of all three County Islands (Hamer, CC and Fairlynn)?*

Committee Considerations

- *Refocus policy to address all three county islands*

Policy 6.4 Require that, prior to any annexation activities involving the Fairlynn County island, improvements which bring the area into conformance with the City's infrastructure standards and other relevant factors are addressed to the satisfaction of the City.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *LAFCO annexation agreement will apply here*
- *Revise goal to a generalized higher-order policy statement*

Committee Considerations

Goal 7 New development opportunities offered by large undeveloped properties located in the sphere of influence.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *This Goal is related to infrastructures ability to meet future buildout conditions*
- *Revise goal to a generalized higher-order policy statement*

Committee Considerations

- *Consider revising goal to address the management of future larger scale developments*

Policy 7.1 Seek the annexation of Shell, Murdock and other undeveloped properties within the northern sphere of influence based upon development plans that ensure access, infrastructure and land use concepts which are acceptable to the City.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Avoid identification of specific names*
- *Policy focus on broad application of sphere properties*

Committee Considerations

- *Recommend revising policy to address all sphere areas. Focus policy on assurance for health, safety and welfare of current and future residents.*

Policy 7.2 Require developers of undeveloped properties to complete improvements for required infrastructure and/or provide funds for required infrastructure (both on-site and related improvements) in accord with City determined service levels.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Policy is related to mitigating development impacts*
- *Can also apply to redevelopment (such as town center)*

Committee Considerations

- *Recommend revising goal focus on future develop approval based upon ability to provide services. Method can be determined as part of implementation*

Policy 7.3 Designate the Shell and Murdock properties for an Area Plan designation and require that a Specific Plan, Community (PC) or Planned Residential Development (PRD) development plan process, or other similar regulatory mechanisms acceptable to the City be prepared to implement the intent of the Area Plans as primarily low density residential communities.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Is this policy relevant in light of Cielo Vista and Esperanza?*
- *Revise goal to a generalized higher-order policy statement*

Committee Considerations

- *Consider reflecting this policy in Policy 7.1 above.*

Policy 7.4 Permit development at an average density of 1.0 dwelling units per base acre for the Murdock property; permit development at an average density not to exceed the City's target density of 2.8 dwelling units per base acre for the Shell property.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *This Goal is appropriate in response to Cielo Vista and Esperanza proposals?*
-

Committee Considerations

- *Recommend revising goal to address sphere areas generally*

Goal 8 Low density residential development in the hillside areas which protects the unique natural and topographic character.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Discussion of intensity vs. density of development*
- *Revise goal to a generalized higher-order policy statement reflective of desire for more suburban level densities in hillside areas*

Committee Considerations

- *Consider revising policy to address design and character preservation, then policies can address density and other development issues. Consider new language such as*
- *"Hillside development that preserves and protects the unique natural and topographic features of the community."*

Policy 8.1 Target lower densities to hillside areas with yield based on slope severity and stability, topographic conditions, and natural resource protection and other environmental conditions.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Policy can be combined with 8.1- 8.3?*
- *Revise goal to a generalized higher-order policy statement on hillside development*

Committee Considerations

- *Recommend revising goal to a comprehensive hillside development strategy*

Policy 8.2 Reduce the total yield of development if grading, habitat preservation, slope stabilization, drainage, etc. standards cannot be met.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Is total yield appropriate language?*
- *What about other issues (circulation, fire access, traffic, etc.)*

Committee Considerations

- *Recommend revising goal to a comprehensive hillside development strategy*

Policy 8.3 Uphold current development standards for determination of yield and regulation of quality within hillside areas.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Policy to uphold is simply to continue current policy. Is this appropriate?*
- *Revise goal to a generalized higher-order policy statement*

Committee Considerations

- *Recommend revising goal to a comprehensive hillside development strategy*

Goal 9 Preservation and enhancement of the natural setting of the City.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Definition of “setting”?*
- *Revise goal to a generalized higher-order policy statement*

Committee Considerations

- *Recommend revising goal to address the preservation and enhancement of the natural landscape and topography*

Policy 9.1 Preserve sensitive open space areas within the City.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Definition of “sensitive”*
- *Revise goal to a generalized higher-order policy statement*

Committee Considerations

- *Recommend revising goal address open space features that provide scenic, cultural or biological significance. Can be combined with policy 9.2 and 9.3.*

Policy 9.2 Protect the scenic and visual qualities of hillside areas and ridgelines.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *See Policy 9.1 comments*

Committee Considerations

- *See Policy 9.1 comments*

Policy 9.3 Ensure that land uses within designated and proposed scenic corridors are compatible with scenic enhancement and preservation.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *See Policy 9.1 comments*

Committee Considerations

- See Policy 9.1 comments

Goal 10 Provision of adequate school facilities according to the standards of the School District.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- Is this appropriate goal?
- Revise goal to a generalized higher-order policy statement

Committee Considerations

- Consider revising goal to continued monitoring and maintenance of facilities to meet needs of students.

Policy 10.1 Facilitate coordination between the School District and the developer to ensure that school facilities are adequately sized, located and funded to serve the present and projected needs of the area according to the standards of the School District.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- May be too detailed policy
- Revise goal to a generalized higher-order policy statement

Committee Considerations

- Revise goal to ensure future development is coordinated with School district needs for existing and future facilities and programming needs.

Policy 10.2 Require that any new development contribute its fair share toward the costs of expanding, upgrading or providing school facilities to serve the population generated by the development, or provide the required facilities as a condition of approval.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- Is this repetitive to Policy 10.1?
- Revise goal to a generalized higher-order policy statement

Committee Considerations

Policy 10.3 Work closely with the School District in identifying and pursuing new sources of adequate funding for the rehabilitation, improvement, expansion and construction of existing and future school facilities that will benefit students of the City.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- Is this a planning issue?

Committee Considerations

- Consider revising policy to be supportive/collaborative with School district interests/needs versus finding funding sources.

Policy 10.4 Require General Plan amendments and the specific plan or development plan process to identify and establish the impact upon school facilities.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Is this policy redundant to 10.2?*

Committee Considerations

- *Recommend combining this with policy 10.2*

Policy 10.5 Coordinate the planning and siting of schools with the Parks and Recreation Department and other public facility providers in the City at an early stage in the planning and approval process.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Is policy on coordination for what end?*
- *Should focus policy to consider what benefits the City*

Committee Considerations

- *Recommend addressing the need to take advantage of the joint use and coordinated use of facilities*

Policy 10.6 Recognizing the independent fiscal and operational authority of school districts regarding service boundaries, resource allocations and related considerations, seek the reconciliation of district boundaries so that, to the maximum extent possible, students within the City are served by a single school district.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Is this policy appropriate for the General Plan?*
-

Committee Considerations

- *Recommend revising goal to address policy in context of land use*

Policy 10.7 Promote the concept of the existence of a high school within the corporate boundaries of the City of Yorba Linda.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *This is complete*

Committee Considerations

- *Recommend delete policy*

NEW GOAL AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS – The following new goals and policies were provided by committee members for consideration.

Goal X Develop risk assessment processes to be applied to all proposed construction, reconstruction, or remodeling of structures located or proposed within the most current adopted Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Coordinate this policy with the Safety Element*

Committee Considerations

Policy X.1 Projects which would increase the number of persons living or working within a VHFHSZ shall be assessed to determine the three most expeditious evacuation routes from the site to reach a paved public

roadway outside the VHFHSZ and which is at least 60 feet in width.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Coordinate this policy with the Safety Element*

Committee Considerations

Policy X.2 Projects which would increase the number of persons living or working within a VHFHSZ shall be prohibited if the additional persons using any two of the three evacuation routes identified in Policy 1.1 would increase the total number of persons using that evacuation route by 10% or more, unless the project includes increasing the capacity of all three routes by an amount not less than the additional persons proposed to use each route. Projects which have less than three evacuation routes shall treat each missing evacuation route as increasing usage by more than 10%.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Coordinate this policy with the Safety Element*

Committee Considerations

Goal 2X: Develop infrastructure to facilitate future use of non-potable water for irrigation and other approved uses.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Coordinate this policy with the Safety Element*

Committee Considerations

Policy 2X.1 Require all new construction, reconstruction, or remodeling of structures to include dual pipe water distribution systems within the project. Initially, both pipes are connected to the same source of potable water at the water meter or property boundary.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Coordinate this policy with the Safety Element*

Committee Considerations

**July 23, 2013
6:30 – 8:30 PM
YORBA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER**

III. GPAC REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF GENERAL PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT POLICY PROGRAM

The Committee continued its discussion of the General Plan Land Use Element policy program. Refer to Attachment “A” (Yorba Linda General Plan Policy Review

Matrix – July 23, 2013) for Committee discussion on the individual goals and polices.

<p>LAND USE ELEMENT <i>(GPAC DISCUSSION ITEMS)</i></p>	<p>Notes/Comments</p>
<p><i>Goal 7 New development opportunities offered by large undeveloped properties located in the sphere of influence.</i></p>	
<p>Policy 7.1 Seek the annexation of Shell, Murdock and other undeveloped properties within the northern sphere of influence based upon development plans that ensure access, infrastructure and land use concepts which are acceptable to the City.</p>	<p>Adams- address all sphere of influence areas; remove specific names of properties Carbone- throughout the sphere of influence, not just the northern sphere; don't include specific names Lyons and Gorman- agree with above Rakochy- all of Goal 7 focuses undeveloped properties Adams- still include "undeveloped" properties Hansen- Seek the annexation of undeveloped properties to ensure access, infrastructure and land use concepts which are acceptable to the City. Gorman- look at next 2 policies, possibly combine Watson- disagree, keep separate policies Adams- do we need to include health safety and welfare? Pickel- already included with "acceptable to the City" Committee agreed on language in bold</p>
<p>Policy 7.2 Require developers of undeveloped properties to complete improvements for required infrastructure and/or provide funds for required infrastructure (both on-site and related improvements) in accord with City determined service levels.</p>	<p>Gorman- allow for case by case basis flexibility for Council to determine what developer should be required to do Adams- General Plan should provide guidance for future City Councils Watson- Agree w with Committee Member Gorman. With loss of RDA, don't want to tie hands of the City that prevents contribution to a good project. Change to "require collaboration between City and developers" or "recommend" Carbone- need developers to contribute, should be a requirement that developers bear the cost Rakochy- policy already in place as part of CUP process, etc. Pickel- still negotiable even if policy in place Behura- City has the ability to negotiate still, leave it as is Huang- keep as is. Important to tie to level of service Committee agreed to keep policy as stated</p>
<p>Policy 7.3 Designate the Shell and Murdock properties for an Area Plan designation and require that a Specific Plan, Community (PC) or Planned Residential Development (PRD) development plan process, or other similar regulatory mechanisms acceptable to the City be prepared to implement the intent of the Area Plans as primarily low density residential communities.</p>	<p>Lyons- is this policy redundant w/ 7.1? Gorman- delete this policy Rakochy- doesn't include designating areas for SP or PRD development. Does it need to be included in 7.1? Adams- include some of the wording about designation in 7.1 to have some control over properties Carbone- would like to see some designated as preserve instead of planned residential Adams- do not need to develop all of the area Watson- is there an acreage threshold for a specific plan?</p>

**LAND USE ELEMENT
(GPAC DISCUSSION
ITEMS)**

Notes/Comments

Rehmer- no threshold
 Watson- include in language 'undeveloped area in excess of X size'
 Rehmer- can be small areas; provide a comprehensive plan for entire development instead of designating PD or PRD; include list of uses
 Pickle- should be a separate policy, should be reworded to be big picture for entire area
 Lyons- would rather be vague in language- say "comprehensive plan for entire area"- not to include specifics
 Behura- make sure wording doesn't exclude something
 Rakochy- intent of area plans is primarily low density communities- keep this
 Carbone- Measure B ensures the low density intent is kept
 Hansen- keep policies 7.1 and 7.3 separate
 Adams- agree with Hansen
 Rakochy- 7.4 is very specific, move from general to specific, keep "low density"
 Pickel- propose language - **"designate properties for an Area Plan designation and require a comprehensive plan process or other regulatory mechanisms be prepared to implement the intent of the Area Plans as primarily low density residential communities, etc."**
 Adams- include "as primarily low density residential communities or preserves"
 Pickel- leave as comprehensive plan process, don't specify low density residential
 Huang- include in language comprehensive plan; property rights need to be balanced
 Pickel- would comprehensive plan process eliminate need for other language?
 Rehmer- include "to include such things as..."; beneficial for staff to have specifics
 Watson- Goal 7 is only for large properties undeveloped in sphere
 Gorman- include in list of uses "open space"; do not limit development to the point that no property taxes are generated
 Pickel- staff/consultant to list some items to include
 Barquist- need to define "comprehensive plan" as well
 Adams- include preserves along with open space
 Committee agreed on language in bold. Staff/consultant to propose a list of uses to include

Policy 7.4 Permit development at an average density of 1.0 dwelling units per base acre for the Murdock property; permit development at an average density not to exceed the City's target density of 2.8 dwelling units per base acre for the Shell property.

Hansen- does the City have control over this topic?
 Barquist- Yes, the City has the ability to designate areas in sphere
 Behura- doesn't the property have to be in the City to have control?
 Barquist- the City is an additional agency in EIR with some level of review

LAND USE ELEMENT
(GPAC DISCUSSION
ITEMS)

Notes/Comments

Behura- Will the County give the City authority to review development?
 Watson- the City does not have control, but can comment on environmental; keep language general instead of calling out densities
 Pickel- moot point unless annexed before developed
 Hansen- density listed is unrealistic
 Rakochy- density achieved through clustering; General Plan should have some sort of structure for these areas; Measure B requires vote of people anyway
 Adams- does City have the option to litigate based on land being in the sphere of influence? Would it hurt to put numbers in?
 Pickel- anything could be litigated
 Watson- specifying a density could be a deterrent to bringing people to the table
 Behura- why do the properties want to be annexed? If properties are going to be annexed they should follow standards
 Huang- the City will want to annex these properties eventually because they will use Yorba Linda's roads
 Pickel- is there a limit of development based on LOS of roadways?
 Gorman- the City does not have control. Focus policy on how to deal with the County. Can't developer decide to piecemeal sell off area?
 Rakochy- need framework to give staff leverage
 Watson- instead of calling out specific density include "properties within sphere of influence should be developed consistent with adjacent properties within the City of Yorba Linda"
 Adams- include "not to exceed current adjacent residential densities"
 Lyons- "match zoning of contiguous"
 Rehmer- current proposal for these areas could meet 1 du/ac standards
 Behura- meeting it through clustering
 Gorman- include "work with the County to ensure..."
 Gorman- include something about infrastructure
 Lyons- do not include infrastructure because current plans say infrastructure could handle proposed development; don't want degradation of quality of life
 Pickel- Reword to "**Permit development in the sphere of influence should be no greater than the contiguous city properties.**"
 Committee agreed to language in bold

Goal 8 Low density residential development in the hillside areas which protects the unique natural and topographic character.

Policy 8.1 Target lower densities to hillside

Pickle- fold policies 8.2 and 8.3 into 8.1

LAND USE ELEMENT
(GPAC DISCUSSION
ITEMS)

	Notes/Comments
<p>areas with yield based on slope severity and stability, topographic conditions, and natural resource protection and other environmental conditions.</p>	<p>Adams- don't make 8.1 too long Rakochy- 8.1 and 8.3 could be in one policy. 8.2 could be a separate policy Committee agreed that 8.1 and 8.3 should be combined and 8.2 should be kept in a separate policy</p>
<p>Policy 8.2 Reduce the total yield of development if grading, habitat preservation, slope stabilization, drainage, etc. standards cannot be met.</p>	
<p>Policy 8.3 Uphold current development standards for determination of yield and regulation of quality within hillside areas.</p>	
<p><i>Goal 9 Preservation and enhancement of the natural setting of the City.</i></p>	<p>Committee agreed to change "setting" to "landscape and topography" Lyons- landscaping in Yorba Linda is natural and don't want to revert to natural Rakochy- use "semi-rural" instead Adams- focus maintaining topography Pickel- focus on preserving ridgelines Behura- what is the definition of open space? What is sensitive? Rehmer- Yorba Linda designates 2 types of open space- public open space and private open space. Public allows for parks, private allows some development. Neither mentions preserves Gorman- haven't managed to preserve open space to date; lakebed is controlled by County</p>
<p>Policy 9.1 Preserve sensitive open space areas within the City.</p>	<p>Behura- clarify "sensitive" and "open space", talk about terrain Adams- change "open space" to "preserve" Watson- nothing is designated preserve now. Have a policy to create preserves Hansen- don't want to get too specific Lyons- policy to encourage or incentivize creation of preserves to protect open space Adams- open space isn't the right term Rehmer- change to "preserve natural landscaping" or "natural settings" or define open space Gorman- make policy 9.2 the goal Pickel- policy 9.2 would be too specific as the goal Rakochy- also going to be addressed in recreation and resources element; what do we want future open space to look like? Adams- preserve sensitive areas within the City that provide biological significance Behura- is sensitive clear? Pickel- sensitive is defined by CEQA; keep as "natural setting" Adams- preserve spaces that need to be left untouched- scenic, biological- flora and fauna Rakochy- agree with amendment recommended by staff- scenic, cultural and biological significance</p>

LAND USE ELEMENT (GPAC DISCUSSION ITEMS)	Notes/Comments
	<p>Watson- does cultural need to be included if talking about open space</p> <p>Rakochoy- cultural in open space is not structures, example- cemetery</p> <p>Pickel- Preserve areas within the City that provide scenic, cultural, natural or biological significance.</p> <p>Gorman- doesn't control private property</p> <p>Behura- yes, City can control private property through EIR process</p> <p>Huang- city can use nuisance ordinance can come after property owners that violate</p> <p>Committee agreed on language in bold</p>
Policy 9.2 Protect the scenic and visual qualities of hillside areas and ridgelines.	Committee agreed to keep policy as stated
Policy 9.3 Ensure that land uses within designated and proposed scenic corridors are compatible with scenic enhancement and preservation.	<p>Rehmer- 91 Fwy through Coal Canyon is a designated scenic corridor</p> <p>Carbone- is the wildlife corridor a scenic corridor?</p> <p>Rehmer- no</p> <p>Watson- is there a policy on scenic enhancement and preservation?</p> <p>Huang- is purpose of policy to keep character along existing developed corridors?</p> <p>Barquist- showed diagram of scenic corridor from based on State definition</p> <p>Behura- could have local definition of scenic corridor</p> <p>Gorman- portions of trails could be scenic corridors</p> <p>Adams- not hurtful to leave it in</p> <p>Watson- define what scenic corridor is</p> <p>Behura- time and effort to needed create definition of local scenic corridor</p> <p>Committee decided to keep the policy as is</p>
Goal 10 Provision of adequate school facilities according to the standards of the School District.	<p>Adams –include “coordination” to ensure adequate facilities for city residents</p> <p>Pickel- The City is a conduit, but can't keep any funds collected for schools</p> <p>Huang- up to the school district to meet state standards</p>
Policy 10.1 Facilitate coordination between the School District and the developer to ensure that school facilities are adequately sized, located and funded to serve the present and projected needs of the area according to the standards of the School District.	<p>Lyons- state law prevails</p> <p>Huang- developer deals with schools, not with City on school issues</p> <p>Rakochoy- can control development, include coordinate w/ the district</p> <p>Behura- City could complain to the district</p> <p>Rehmer- the City doesn't have a mechanism or inspection authority to look at maintenance issues at schools</p> <p>Rehmer- City collects the fees for schools and passes them on</p> <p>Pickel- joint use agreements are covered in Parks and Rec Master Plan, don't need to address here</p>

LAND USE ELEMENT
(GPAC DISCUSSION
ITEMS)

	Notes/Comments
	Rakochoy- policy was driven by desire to have a high school in Yorba Linda, which is done; talk about coordination efforts only Watson- put in parks and rec master plan; not appropriate to put City in middle of land use discussions related to schools Pickel- a coordination process only Committee agreed to eliminate Goal 10 and all related policies; Include coordination of use of school facilities in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan/Element
Policy 10.2 Require that any new development contribute its fair share toward the costs of expanding, upgrading or providing school facilities to serve the population generated by the development, or provide the required facilities as a condition of approval.	
Policy 10.3 Work closely with the School District in identifying and pursuing new sources of adequate funding for the rehabilitation, improvement, expansion and construction of existing and future school facilities that will benefit students of the City.	
Policy 10.4 Require General Plan amendments and the specific plan or development plan process to identify and establish the impact upon school facilities.	
Policy 10.5 Coordinate the planning and siting of schools with the Parks and Recreation Department and other public facility providers in the City at an early stage in the planning and approval process.	
Policy 10.6 Recognizing the independent fiscal and operational authority of school districts regarding service boundaries, resource allocations and related considerations, seek the reconciliation of district boundaries so that, to the maximum extent possible, students within the City are served by a single school district.	
Policy 10.7 Promote the concept of the existence of a high school within the corporate boundaries of the City of Yorba Linda.	

September 10, 2013
6:30 – 8:30PM

YORBA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER

III. GPAC CONTINUED REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF GENERAL PLAN POLICY PROGRAM- LAND USE

Refer to Attachment "A".

	Committee Comments
NEW GOALS AND POLICIES RECOMMENDED	
<p><i>Goal X Develop risk assessment processes to be applied to all proposed construction, reconstruction, or remodeling of structures located or proposed within the most current adopted Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones.</i></p>	
<p>Policy X.1 Projects which would increase the number of persons living or working within a VHFHSZ shall be assessed to determine the three most expeditious evacuation routes from the site to reach a paved public roadway outside the VHFHSZ and which is at least 60 feet in width.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it appropriate to require 3 routes? (Watts) • Three is based on the number of stairways in a high-rise buildings. Any neighborhood is required to have 2 evacuation routes. In high fire hazard areas backed up to Chino Hills State Park, increasing the number of routes to 3 would be beneficial (Baker) • Would like to see scientific/technical documentation to support the recommendation for number of evacuation routes (Watts) • This policy refers to the Shell/Murdock property where there is only 1 route out (Hansen) • This policy would apply to other areas such as Hidden Hills too (Baker) • Concerned regarding the specification of 3 routes based on building safety issue. What is the planning standard? (Watson) • Is this legally enforceable? (Behura) • Is there any precedence? (Pickel) • Having a requirement would help with setting parameters for the unincorporated properties that would be annexed into the City. Requirements would also apply to other areas of the City (Carbone) • Agree that a requirement should be included in the General Plan, but would like to reflect a scientific standard (Watts) • Would routes already be addressed in the EIR? (Watson) • From a traffic engineering perspective there would be a way to calculate the number of routes needed based on standards (Behura) • The General Plan looks at implementing the community's vision. If this is part of the vision, there is no legal requirement to prove the vision or require a

Committee Comments
<p>scientific study to implement the vision (Baker)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Would it be useful to the Planning Department to have something to refer to in the General Plan? (Bent)• Yes (Rehmer)• Replace language with a requirement to conduct additional studies to determine the minimum number of routes by project (Watson)• Would like to include a specific number (Hansen)• Not every project is the same and would require the same number (Watson)• Add language to require the EIR to assess the specific number of evacuation routes (Lyons)• Would support having a study required or using a formula (Watts)• Having a specific number would be trying to fit all projects into the same requirement, the General Plan should be broad (Rehmer)• If 3 routes are not used, there should be some mitigation. Traffic engineers look at the smaller neighborhood level, but these studies would need to go all the way to the edge of the evacuation zone (Baker)• There are other issues such as flood, earthquake and other natural disasters that should be addressed as well (Gorman)• This policy refers to safety and land use issues, primarily fire but could be expanded (Baker)• Suggest including a minimum number of routes and then requiring the EIR to look at what should be added. Specifying a specific number would be challenged by developers. The General Plan should not have that fine grained detail (Pickel)• Would a developer right now consult with Cal Fire, etc. for the EIR? (Huang)• The lead agency focuses the scope of the EIR. The City could comment asking for evacuation routes to be looked at, but it is not automatic (Rehmer)• For high fire hazard areas, policy should require consultation with Cal Fire and other agencies (Huang)• Does the City have a current policy? (Rakochoy)• No (Rehmer)• Remove the numbers. Should be developing the policy and process to come up with the numbers later (Rakochoy)• Suggest saying “more than 2 routes” since 2 is already the required minimum. (Behura)• Policy should be focused on adequacy of routes based on the context of disasters that have occurred in the City. Are there mitigation measures available? (Watts)• Would like to have some flexibility to provide mitigation (Bent)• What type of development would this apply to? Concerned that small projects like a guest house would

- Would it be useful to the Planning Department to have something to refer to in the General Plan? (Bent)

- Yes (Rehmer)

- Replace language with a requirement to conduct additional studies to determine the minimum number of routes by project (Watson)

- Would like to include a specific number (Hansen)

- Not every project is the same and would require the same number (Watson)

- Add language to require the EIR to assess the specific number of evacuation routes (Lyons)

- Would support having a study required or using a formula (Watts)

- Having a specific number would be trying to fit all projects into the same requirement, the General Plan should be broad (Rehmer)

- If 3 routes are not used, there should be some mitigation. Traffic engineers look at the smaller neighborhood level, but these studies would need to go all the way to the edge of the evacuation zone (Baker)

- There are other issues such as flood, earthquake and other natural disasters that should be addressed as well (Gorman)

- This policy refers to safety and land use issues, primarily fire but could be expanded (Baker)

- Suggest including a minimum number of routes and then requiring the EIR to look at what should be added. Specifying a specific number would be challenged by developers. The General Plan should not have that fine grained detail (Pickel)

- Would a developer right now consult with Cal Fire, etc. for the EIR? (Huang)

- The lead agency focuses the scope of the EIR. The City could comment asking for evacuation routes to be looked at, but it is not automatic (Rehmer)

- For high fire hazard areas, policy should require consultation with Cal Fire and other agencies (Huang)

- Does the City have a current policy? (Rakochoy)

- No (Rehmer)

- Remove the numbers. Should be developing the policy and process to come up with the numbers later (Rakochoy)

- Suggest saying “more than 2 routes” since 2 is already the required minimum. (Behura)

- Policy should be focused on adequacy of routes based on the context of disasters that have occurred in the City. Are there mitigation measures available? (Watts)

- Would like to have some flexibility to provide mitigation (Bent)

- What type of development would this apply to?

Concerned that small projects like a guest house would

	Committee Comments
	<p>trigger this requirement (Watson)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 percent threshold included in the policy (Behura) • Suggest that any development that meets the threshold and proposes 2 or less evacuation routes be required to have a study to justify the number of routes (Watts) • The requirement for 2 routes is based on need for redundancy. How would 3 routes be better? (Lyons) • Because of locations of high fire hazard areas against the park, there are limited directions to go. Parallel routes may not be effective (Baker) • Include language to eliminate reliance on parallel routes (Lyons) • If egress in 2 different directions isn't possible, what will the City require? Suggest language stating if a development is not able to provide egress in 2 different directions a 3rd route is required (Behura) • Would like to see more flexibility, not locked into a number (Bent)
<p>Policy X.2 Projects which would increase the number of persons living or working within a VHFHSZ shall be prohibited if the additional persons using any two of the three evacuation routes identified in Policy 1.1 would increase the total number of persons using that evacuation route by 10% or more, unless the project includes increasing the capacity of all three routes by an amount not less than the additional persons proposed to use each route. Projects which have less than three evacuation routes shall treat each missing evacuation route as increasing usage by more than 10%.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is 10% calculated? It is aggregate? • Suggest removing remodel and redevelop (Rehmer) • Suggest wording to say new development or zone change (Watson) • Committee agreed to requirements for construction and new development
<p><i>Goal 2X: Develop infrastructure to facilitate future use of non-potable water for irrigation and other approved uses.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SB 750 is a new bill that will require separate meters for multiunit structures, May affect this goal/policies (Pickel)
<p>Policy 2X.1 Require all new construction, reconstruction, or remodeling of structures to include dual pipe water distribution systems within the project. Initially, both pipes are connected to the same source of potable water at the water meter or property boundary.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requiring this in new or replacement construction is not an undue burden (Rakochy) • Agree (Pickel) • Can be a burden. It is outfitting the house for infrastructure that doesn't exist yet (Lyons) • Does the water district have plans to distribute reclaimed water for houses? (Watson) • There are areas already using reclaimed water in the City. It may be economical for large developments. There isn't a plan for providing non-potable water to houses because there aren't residents asking for it (Baker) • Would like to get input from Water District (Watson) • Would like to know if it is in the Water District's long range plans and what would be the trigger to providing

Committee Comments
<p>it (Pickel)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Committee agreed that the policy should be for new development or replacement of the system.• City is the largest water user, but is not replacing its pipes. Suggest that the City does as well (Rakochoy)• Add encouragement to the policy if the Water District is on board and suggest adding a timeline (Behura)• Add working with the water district to the policy (Rehmer)

IV. INTRODUCTION OF RE-DESIGNATE/RE-ZONE REQUEST OF PROPERTIES SUBMITTED BY PRIVATE PARTIES FOR GPAC CONSIDERATION

Mr. Rehmer provided the Committee with letters of request from property owners to consider re-designating/re-zoning of six parcels along with maps of each site. He asked that the Committee read the information prior to discussions about land use that will be put on a future meeting agenda.

Committee Member Lyons requested that the City Attorney be consulted regarding participation by him and Committee Member Watson in the GPAC discussions about these parcels.

Tuesday, September 30, 2014

6:30 – 8:30 PM

YORBA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER

I. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF LAND USE CHANGE REQUESTS

Public Comments:

Rosemary Sauer, Yorba Linda resident, stated that landowners should follow the rezone process and not try to get out of Measure B. She also stated that the requested rezones should not be combined with the General Plan land use changes.

Public Comments:

Dean Robinson, Yorba Linda resident, was at the City Council meeting. He stated that there are procedures in place and that the requestors should go through the Measure B vote and not try to circumvent the law.

Public Comments:

Nancy Stephens, Yorba Linda resident, stated that the requested rezones should go to a vote.

Public Comments:

John Hanson, Yorba Linda resident, stated that there are procedures in place for a Measure B vote.

Public Comments:

DeeDee Frederick, Yorba Linda resident, stated that the parcel zoned for equestrian uses should be reviewed for what will be developed there.

Committee Member Behura stated that the GPAC is here to look at the big picture and not look at individual parcels.

Committee Member Adams states that a Measure B vote may hang up the General Plan update process.

Committee Chair Watts stated that he drafted and sent an email about his views of the process. His view is that the policy should be that a Measure B vote should be borne by the developer and not the City.

Committee Member Hansen asked what the best course of action is to move along the process of the requested rezones.

Committee Member Lyons stated that “tabling” the topic implies that the GPAC will not discuss the requested rezones.

Committee Member Lyons presented a motion to table the topic of the requested rezones, and Committee Chair Watts seconded the motion.

Before the call for the vote, Committee Member Rakochy stated that the GPAC should state a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Committee Chair Watts withdrew his second to Committee Member Lyons motion.

Committee Member Rakochy presented a motion to recommend to the Planning and Commission and City Council that the requested rezoning should follow the process set forth in Municipal Code Section 1801.A (subject to a Measure B vote) and individually processed and not part of the General Plan update. Committee Member Carbone seconded the motion; motion passed.

Committee Member Bent stated that the rezones are not in the purview of the GPAC.

Public Comment:

Mr. Elliot, Landowner of Site 5 (18042 Blair Drive), stated that no one is trying to be “sneaky” in the process. He has lived in Yorba Linda for over 40 years and just wanted to state that he was trying to determine the highest and best use of his property per surrounding uses, which are developing at a higher density than his parcel.

II. REVIEW OF GENERAL PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT

Mr. Barquist stated the following points:

- The General Plan Land Use Designations ensures that future zoning is compatible with the land use policy. Existing General Plan land use designations and policy review (density/intensity).
- Distribution of commercial type of uses and whether it meets the needs of the community especially with the new developments occurring (Esperanza, Cielo Vista).
- Esperanza Hills and Cielo Vista are in the Sphere of Influence and the GPAC must look at the implications of development in these areas since they will eventually be incorporated into the City.

Committee Member Gorman asked why there is a 1.8 dwelling unit per acre standard. Senior Planner Rehmer responded that this is because landowners may have two acres and will only be allowed to build two units.

Committee Member Lyons asked if City staff and consultants can overlay the GP land use map over a topographic layer.

Committee Member Adams asked to designate Cielo Vista and Esperanza on the General Plan land use map.

Committee Member Carbone asked to indicate equestrian parcels on the General Plan land use map, and wants a “Preserve” land use designation.

Committee Member Hansen asked to indicate the trails on the General Plan land use map.

Committee Chair Watts asked how to start the process of developing the land use updates.

Mr. Barquist replied that criteria must be established in order to determine the changes in land use in the City; and a process of voting must be determined in order to reach consensus about the land use changes.

Committee Member Bent asked whether the changes to land use are determined by future desired uses and density by parcel. And asked for an example of how General Plan policies can address community needs.

Mr. Barquist replied that it does not really mean that land use changes need to be made in the General Plan.

Committee Member Baker requested that school sites should be shown along with water district sites on the General Plan land use map.

Committee Member Knarr stated that there is already a Zoning Map and a Trails map on the City's website.

Tuesday, October 28, 2014
6:30 – 8:30 PM
YORBA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER

I. WEST BASTANCHURY SITE STUDY – PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION BY URBAN LAND INSTITUTE (ULI)

Community Development Director Steve Harris provided an introduction of the Urban Land Institute (ULI). He explained that the City is attaining the services of ULI in order to prepare a study of the west Bastanchury site.

Phyllis Alzamora from ULI provided background information on the organization. ULI is a non-profit research and education organization, which provides an open exchange of ideas, information, and experience among industry leaders and policy makers. Ms. Alzamora emphasized that ULI is not an advocacy or lobbying organization. ULI has created a team (Technical Assistance Panel) of industry leaders to execute the study, which will be completed in six weeks. Todd Pennington, chair of the Technical Assistance Panel, explained that the team will be reviewing and studying the site with the goal of determining the most feasible use in the future.

II. LAND USE EXERCISE

City Consultant David Barquist introduced the GPAC to the land use exercise that will help start the discussion on the priorities of the committee members as they relate to land use and growth in the City. Committee members were divided into small groups and

provided with four questions to discuss. Each group provided feedback by presenting their ideas to the larger group. A summary of group comments and results from the land use exercise is provided in Attachment A.

Discussion Groups

Hearts: Committee Members Behura, Baker, and Knarr

Diamonds: Committee Chair Watts, Committee Member Adams and Huang

Clubs: Committee Members Carbone, Hansen, and Gorman

Spades: Committee Vice-Chair Bent, and Committee Member Lyons

**General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting #22
October 28, 2014
Exercise Responses Summary and Conclusions**

Question 1: Future growth and change in Yorba Linda – how should we grow in the future?

Responses demonstrated a strong desire to limit development and for the City to retain its current character. There were several responses that encouraged promoting additional development within commercial/business pockets while also maintaining open space.

Question 2: Where are the primary focus areas for change in the community? Identify this geographically and from a policy perspective?

Responses focused on having development that is compatible with surrounding land uses while also mitigating any traffic or services impact. There were also several responses that suggested developing the Town Center into a tourist and gathering center for the community.

Question 3: How should the General Plan address the Right-to-Vote Amendment (Measure B) in the General Plan?

Options on this issue varied greatly from group to group.

Question 4: What land use strategies will contribute to community economic development and support the local economy?

Several of the responses supported developing the Town Center in a manner that promotes tourism and community gathering. The responses had a general theme of preserving the “character” of Yorba Linda.

Question 1: Future Growth and Change in Yorba Linda - How should we grow in the Future?		
Group	Response	# of Responses
Diamond	Meet affordable housing element/ requirements	3
	Land use in consonance with surrounding communities	1
	Maintain and protect existing and future open space both large and small parcels	6

	Promote and maintain commercial and business pockets	0
	Slowly and methodically (public input)	0
Spade	Fiscally responsible	2
	Encourage local spending - more white collar jobs	3
	Adhere to new open space ratio standards	2
	Develop transit system to accommodate growth	4
	Hold line on average density	5
Heart	Try to retain current mix of land uses by percentages (e.g. residential: commercial: open space, etc.)	3
	Increase commercial (revenue producing/sales tax) uses within current commercial land use or areas that will lend to or compatible to commercial uses	3
	"Growth" should be limited to the extent possible to retain rural nature (population & traffic)	7
	Managing traffic congestion through City	2
	Limit high density homes to the extent required by Rena Nos	2
Club	Esperanza Hills & Cielo Vista: safety (traffic & fire) and traffic congestion; transportation solution	1
	Maintain present 33%; 1/3 - 1/2 acre single family homes with congruent hiking & riding trails; no McMansions or rental properties on same property; historical value & identity - distinction like Temecula; open space and parks	6
	Revenue - taxes; Savi Ranch industrial & manufacturing; empty strip malls convert to low/mod housing	0
	New library and new equestrian	6

Question 2: Where are the primary focus areas for change in the community? Identify this geographically and from a policy perspective.		
Group	Response	# of Responses
Club	GEO: Savi Ranch & La Palma POLICY: business incentives; develop commercial building use along La Palma - frontage road	5
	GEO: Town Center POLICY: revenue generating and a destination	3

	GEO: West Bastanchury POLICY: preserve open space; all purpose destination equestrian; and revenue generating	7
	GEO: Aging strip malls POLICY: provide incentives to develop; replace with mod. Housing	4
	GEO: 2 properties under our sphere of influence - Esperanza Hills & Cielo Vista POLICY: Congruent with City traffic, safety rules; sales revenue; condos & townhomes	3
Spade	Who owns the property? Land swaps?	2
	How do we pay for it?	
	Lease and lease back models? Tax forgiveness incentives?	
	How much City investment? Should we?	1
	Consider collateral infrastructure impact?	
Diamond	Undeveloped properties within City or SOI must reflect surrounding properties (density)	3
	All development must compensate/mitigate impact of additional traffic, safety and service on all of Yorba Linda	2
	"Redevelop" business pockets by encouraging productive and necessary community needs	1
	Town Center and adjacent new library as community gathering center	8
Heart	Stop changing commercial to HD residential	4
	Fix City land use/zoning maps for correct usage to attract developers	2
	Assist property owners with compatible businesses (based in City analysis)	2
	Revisit specific sites	1

Question 3: How should the General Plan address the Right-to-Vote Amendment (Measure B) in the General Plan?		
Group	Response	# of Responses
Heart	High density only for the purpose of meeting RHNA housing needs - overlay vs. outright zone change	9
	Some Specific Area Plans should be included in the updated General Plan	5

Spade	Until land passes Measure B vote no need to add to General Plan	2
	Measure B is law just add it in as a reference	5
	Work on housing element (update) every year (or more frequently compared to now) so we don't wait until final year to have a Measure B vote	2
	Has a Measure B ever been tested in court?	0
	Get what is voted for and have Measure B votes be more specific if passed as low income or high density make zone change conditional on developers sticking with what is approved	3
Diamond	Embracing "B" as step in land development and land use change	3
	No (unnecessary) General Plan changes should trigger "B"	0
	Embrace the policy that "B" vote is an applicant cost and not a city cost	3
Club	Support Measure B inclusion in General Plan	1
	Reviewed to be clearly understood	0

Question 4: What land use strategies will contribute to community economic development and support the local economy?		
Group	Response	# of Responses
Diamond	Look at current business pockets - determine how that can be more viable and better serve community; keep business in pockets	9
	Savi Ranch - focus commercial and business which generates greatest sales tax revenue	2
	Town Center/Library - retail activities which promotes community gathering and not just tax revenue; business/retail encourage community activities	6
Club	Promote tourism - Nixon Library, Town Center, new library	6
	Historical values - Buddhist temple; connections by trolley or horse trails; spray park	0
	Dog park; adventure playground; equestrian; food sales	0
	City more entrepreneurial; art work	3
	Don't increase density - preserve home values	0

Spade	Focus on fiscally responsible developments	4
	White collar jobs/ businesses with many employees	1
	Revenue developing	1
	Innovative ways to attract the businesses that have the character we want	3
	Be aggressive	1
Heart	Updating the General Plan with a single public expense Measure B vote for specific areas such as Savi Ranch offers an incentive to attract desired development	6
	Be thoughtful about open space	2
	Consider defining neighborhoods	0