

**April 29, 2014 STUDY SESSION VIDEO SUMMARY - LAND USE ALTERNATIVES (01:00:53)**

Gary Armstrong, Director of Dev. Services, presented the Staff Report. (01:01:04)

Councilmember Leece asked about the traffic study and timing of when that will become available. (01:03:08)

Ernesto Munoz explained that it will be prepared with a preferred land use because it is expensive, we didn't do studies on multiple alternatives because some of them may not be used.

Laura Stetson, of MIG Hogle-Ireland, provided a presentation that included eight areas of Land Use Alternatives that included: Area A – Business Park Overlay, Area B – Segerstrom Home Ranch, Area C – Sakioka Lot 2, Area D – Residential Overlay, Area E – Corridor Mixed Use, Area F – Westside Overlay, Area G – Newport Boulevard Mixed Use, and Area H – SoBECA. (01:05:14)

General comments from Mayor Jim Righeimer and Councilmember Leece relative to an example of 300 units were related to focusing on mixed use center and including a maximum number cap on residential units.

Discussion ensued on land use; reduction in trips in residential versus commercial; and the amortization of heavy industries. (01:19:14). Mayor Righeimer noted that there was a lot of discussion with business owners and the biggest issue was notifying the new residents that "you're next to a place the does business, they may cause noise"; he also referred to a sentence concerning the amortization of heavy industries and that this language need to be removed so that those businesses could stay and not be subject to any amortization.

Laura Stetson noted that the language will be deleted.

Gary Armstrong spoke on the proposed trips; and Industrial uses. (01:32:05)

Mayor Pro tem Mensinger noted that the single most discussed issue is that business owners don't want to be in the position where the business is threatened by the fact that we put this overlay there and they have uses contrary to their business purposes, this has to be stated as we right these adjustments to the General Plan"

Discussion ensued on removing or replacing mobile home parks; affordable housing in the City; and the existing overlay. (01:36:55)

Councilmember Leece questioned if the City is keeping track of RHNA numbers and our affordability figures and if the units were being replaced that are demolished with new development.

Gary Armstrong responded that the issue hasn't been studied specifically and there are no proposals to remove mobile home parks. If a proposal were to come in, the City will need to study all the impacts of relocation, environmental impacts, and how that affects affordable housing in the City and if a proposal is submitted, the RHNA numbers will have to adjust accordingly.

Councilmember Leece asked if the proposal was to re-designate the land use for other mobile home parks in the rest of the City.

Gary Armstrong responses that a few mobile home parks are currently in the existing overlay area of the Westside, we currently don't have any preservation in our code of mobile home parks; they are treated no differently than other land uses.

Gary Armstrong requested preliminary feedback from Council; and noted that the added elements are: Conservation, Safety, Noise, Open Space and Recreation Elements. (01:44:30)

There was discussion on future public outreach and avoiding holiday times to hold public meeting.

**Public Comments:**

John Holly, Costa Mesa, spoke on live/work units; new development, and family businesses. (01:51:16)

Beth Rafakes, Costa Mesa, spoke on the issues with density and live/work units; and the loss of Industrial businesses. (01:55:03)

Gary Smith, Costa Mesa, Business Owner of GS Manufacturing, spoke on the high density residential impacts to Industrial businesses. (01:57:13)

Bonnie Copeland, Costa Mesa, spoke in opposition to multi-family dwellings; new overlay districts, increased density, variances, and traffic and parking problems. (01:58:24)

Shelia Pfafflin, Costa Mesa, spoke against the Westside Plan and increased density. (01:59:58)

Cynthia McDonald, Costa Mesa, spoke on the Northside of Costa Mesa; and concerns with density. (02:01:21)

Julie Ronsworth, Costa Mesa, business owner discussed concerns with having to relocate her business (02:03:31)

Jay Humphrey, Costa Mesa, spoke on the General Plan; expressed concern with the outreach meetings not providing enough feedback; issues with traffic throughout the City; and discussed protecting the mobile home parks. (02:05:33)

Rick Putlovitz, Costa Mesa, spoke on the cost of relocating a business to another City; and spoke against high density (02:08:20)

Robin Leffler, Costa Mesa, spoke on the community outreach; and the Westside overlays. (02:09:30)

Kim Harding, Costa Mesa, spoke as a business owner; spoke about the City as an optimal place to have a small business. (02:11:56)

Roger MacGregor, Costa Mesa, spoke against high density. (02:13:37)

Speaker, Costa Mesa, spoke on noise created at his Industrial business; and spoke against changing the General Plan (02:17:09)

Mike Balsamo, BIA spoke on vehicular traffic; and demographic trends. (02:18:20)

Council Member Leece expressed disappointment with the outreach meetings; concerned with high density; and residents opposed to live/work units. (02:20:40). She noted that there was an overwhelming opposition to the density, the 3 and 4 story units, and just the concern of the traffic that would be generated and wondered why wasn't that included in what was presented.

Gary Armstrong responded that the public input is part of the public record, that is available and that they were taken into consideration. There are property owners that have property rights and are asking for certain things. And staff did not feel that this is that great of an increase over the existing General Plan and the preliminary trip estimate indicates that.

Discussion ensued on the estimated traffic study; traffic indexes; added elements; live/work units; and the Quimby Law. (02:22:08)

Councilmember Leece asked if the traffic study was done on an estimation or if a scientific evaluation was considered.

Ernesto Munoz and Gary Armstrong responded the traffic study is very expensive and detailed and that the traffic study will be comprehensive using latest numbers. Traffic indexes are available for each type of use and across the United States they have developed fairly good estimates of numbers for specific uses, specific densities and these types of uses. They are projections, they are estimates, but they're pretty good estimates.

Councilmember Leece stated that now that that City has realized to incorporate other elements, conservation element, safety element, noise element, open space and recreation element if additional outreach will be planned and if a whole holistic approach will be used so that all elements are reviewed by the community. In other words, if the community wants more park space and incorporation of open space, is that going to be added to this layout?

Gary Armstrong responds that it's up to the council to decide what's in our plan and certainly public outcry is taken into decision making in what council finally approves. And staff is just trying to provide alternatives for the city council to make those decisions.

Councilmember Leece asked about the ownership of live/work units and how the park fees will be applied.

Gary Armstrong responded that most are proposed to be for sale and we would assume that typically an owner would occupy, but that's up to the individual owner, whether he chooses to live there or not. If the project is subdivided, with subdivision map act that falls under the Quimby law, and currently there's a fee for either parkland dedication or park fees. And the multifamily fee is \$13,892, single family is \$13,572. Currently there is no fee for non-subdivided projects like apartments, staff just sent out a proposal on Monday to request the nexus study to provide a fee for the non-subdivided properties based on council direction that will be presented to council for review and approval.

Ernesto Munoz, spoke on the update of the Open Space Master Plan. (02:26:20)

Councilmember Leece stated that it would be interesting to know with what's proposed here with the density, how much that's going to generate in park fees. She stated that we are going in the wrong direction, that it's too dense and it's encompassing too much, it's hard break it apart right now and if there was a way to do an economic study, as far as the jobs that would be lost if industrial and commercial property is transferred to residential; what is existing tax base compared to the proposed and if is there any way to estimate how that's going to be affected.

Laura Stetson stated yes, it's only done as part of a General Plan Program if it's directed that it'd be done.

Mayor Righeimer spoke on the outreach meetings; Westside trips numbers; setback from residential to reduce heights and noise; and SoBeca. (02:29:28)

Mayor Righeimer stated that he has read the document and has been to many of the outreach meetings, and there is no outcry. There are 10, 12, 20, 30 people who show up, most are the same, and there's no outcry in the community because the proposed change is almost nothing. Minimum change to the westside overlay plan is proposed to go from 20 units/acre to 20 units/acre, to go from 4 stories to 4 stories, the exact same buffer area as it has which has already been discussed. Good project have been built, such as the Vivante project which is doing extremely well and that there needs to be sensitivity to the existing businesses. New residents need to be notified and sign documents that they are living within an area with existing industries. The current and future councils are not going to be against that, as long as it's made very clear up front that people know what those issues are. With respect to the westside, the trips are being dropped. He noted that the added trips are north of the freeway and job creation is focused on the north side of the freeway. Industrial jobs are needed by state regulations are pushing the jobs from Orange County. On area E, the idea is to assemble lots and not include the car dealerships and large assembled lots. Consider the area from Hamilton to Bay on the eastside of Harbor and exclude from Bernard Street to Ford Street because they are large, already assembled parcels.

Mayor Righeimer stated that he is concerned about the Newport mixed-use and the need to reduce the number of trips. He directed to consider problem properties and pick two or three areas with a block or two that have a high potential for redevelopment; the areas should not include 10-15 year old condo projects or townhouse projects. And also to make sure that the development standards (height, noise, etc.) take into account the adjacent residential properties. The area should be reduced to approximately 30 percent. There is already a specific plan that allows 17 du/acre for this general area; the increase to 20 du/acre will not incentivize development. The density needs to move up to the 20-40 range, in order to make anything happen there; nothing has happened since 1996.

With SoBECA, mayor recommended the since no development has occurred with the current standard of 20 du/acre, a high density up to 40 du/acre should be considered for site specific and with an overall unit cap for the area.

Mayor Pro Tem Mensinger spoke on balancing residential and manufacturing; and requested setting up guidelines and criteria to protecting existing uses and provided the following comments. (02:43:21)

- How do we protect the existing uses that want to stay here and how do we encourage, to the extent a city can, those businesses continue to operate here without being interfered in.
- How do we balance the issues brought up by the property owners, in terms of their concern about uses around them and how do we address that knowing that we have what we have

and this patchwork of different uses all around here. And I'm interested in the perspective of our staff.

- We have to figure out how to protect the property owner's rights that are in those locations, as it relates to the Westside overlay.
- Newport Blvd: would like to reduce the densities in those areas and would like to see some meaningful changes made so we can encourage something to happen on those areas

Discussion ensued on community outreach meetings; protecting businesses; and refining and adapting an overlay. (02:54:41). Councilmember Leece asked if staff could work with Mr. Holly and some of the industrial/commercial owners to carve out an industrial overlay.

Mayor Righeimer read into the record Councilmember Genis's comments pertaining to the General Plan; General Plan updated growing exponentially; concerned with loss of economic base locations; high density uses; review economic implications; and cost revenue study and economic modeling of the City. (03:03:39)

Council Member Leece requested an economic report; and more outreach to the community. (03:04:53)