



CAG MEETING #1 MINUTES

Date: February 23, 2021	
To: Denice Thomas, AICP (Community Development Director)	Organization: Agoura Hills
From: Rachel Raynor	Title: Associate Planner
Project Name: Agoura Village Specific Plan Update	Project Number: 1800-01-UR19
Topic: CAG Meeting 1 Minutes	

Citizen's Advisory Group Members:

1. Mayor Pro Tem Deborah Klein Lopez
2. Councilmember Chris Anstead
3. Planning Commission Vice Chair Jeremy Wolf
4. Member Ed Corridori
5. Member Marianne Escaron
6. Member Deanna Glassberg
7. Member Irma Haldane
8. Member Gordon Larimer
9. Member Cyrena Nouzille
10. Member April Powers – **absent**
11. Member Gregory Sprague
12. Member Benjamin Suber
13. Member Rik Zelman

Five members of the public

Staff

1. Denice Thomas, AICP (Community Development Director)
2. Nathan Hamburger (City Manager)
3. Ramiro Adeva (Assistant City Manager)

Consultants

1. Erik Justesen, RRM Design Group
2. Lance Wierschem, RRM Design Group
3. Rachel Raynor, RRM Design Group

Minutes:

1. Welcome by Mayor Pro Tem Lopez
 - **Welcoming comments and background information on the project and reasoning for AVSP update**
 - **Recognizing range and variety of CAG members and representation across the city; professional experience – real estate agents/environmentalists/designers**
 - **General thank you**
2. Introductions and Background – (Community Development Director Thomas)
 - **Overview of CAG Orientation Package**
 - **Community Development Director Thomas provided overview of purpose of meeting and CAG, roundtable discussion ultimately to provide a recommendation to Council/PC and virtual meeting etiquette**
3. CAG Member Introductions and Issues
 - **Member Rik Zelman – on a similar committee in 1997/98; looking forward to direction and being able to help out**
 - **Member Ed Corridori – involved in original vision of the Agoura Village; make sure City keeps the spirit of that concept/vision alive; thought the plan in 2008 was distant from the vision that was originally formed; ensure we capture that**
 - **Member Jeremy Wolf – Vice Chair for Planning Commission; District Director for Senator Stern’s office**
 - **Member Marianne Escaron – lives in Liberty Canyon since 1988; wants to see that we do this right; excited to work together as a team in this endeavor**
 - **Member Ben Suber – resident of Agoura Hills since May 10, 2019; polymath – land use planning consultant and GIS specialist; involved in Census 2020 outreach; walking distance of Agoura Village amenities; excited to be included**
 - **Member Irma Haldane – long time resident, but also interested in real estate; how we can accommodate needed housing; time does change and we just have to do it right**
 - **Member Cyrena Nouzille – representing old Agoura; was on planning commission; outdoor/environmental issues; familiar to zoning/land use issues**
 - **Member Gordon Larimer – 20+ years in community, kids grew up; currently living in Malibou Lake; have to drive through the Village to get to the grocery store**
 - **Member Deanna Glassberg – 28-year resident; involved in schools; excited to see the Village come to fruition**
 - **Member – Greg Sprague; 20+ year resident, excited to be on the team, anxious and happy to see that the AVSP will be built (eventually) here; mini urban village**
4. Confirmation of Rules of Engagement and Planning Principles
 - **Welcome and introductions by RRM / Erik**
 - **Overview of planning / project principles – laid out by Council; like that it’s an urban village, pedestrian amenities – the other reason for change is the economy; renewed market study – changing commercial / office environment –**

wildfire – emergency access; technical analysis, how height is measured; density bonus

- i. **Whether to keep the AVSP Density Bonus allowance in the plan, or remove it and solely revert to State Density Bonus Law?**
 - **How does COVID play a part in the changing economy/public space and need for increased flexibility?**
5. Confirm schedule of CAG Meetings (3rd Tuesday)
- **CAG Meetings will be held on the third Tuesday of every other month**
 - i. March 16, 6pm – Housing Element and HCD
 - ii. April 20, 6pm
 - iii. June 15, 6pm
 - iv. August 17, 6pm
 - v. October 19, 6pm
 - **Special meeting in March for housing with HCD rep and Housing Element consultant**
 - **Community Development Director Thomas explained RHNA numbers and housing cycle process; explained City appeal was not approved**
6. CAG Questions
- **Member Nouzille: Question of when and what categories/topics will be reviewed at the CAG meetings – tackle issue areas identified in project planning principles**
 - **Erik Justesen (RRM) identified land use and its orientation and circulation first; then details – design standards, signage, start to flush out instructions and pull together a legislative, tracked change document (update, not re-write); a good way to track what is changing and what is remaining;**
 - **Climate action plan – how this effort relates to City’s Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP)**
 - i. **Assistant City Manager Adeva – ensure updated AVSP is in line with City’s standards; ensure elements integrated into plan; intersection of Kanan Rd. and Agoura Road in terms of evacuation**
 - ii. **Mayor Lopez – shared that the discussion will be continued at Council meeting on Wednesday, February 24th.**
 - **Consensus – move forward going through project principles; Community Development Director Thomas read through all principles and included discussion on specific principles below:**
 - i. **Councilmember Chris Anstead – general comment: planning principles overlap; original vision was more emphasis on the commercial; change vision to include other elements**
 - ii. **Planning Principle # 3**
 - I. **Member Corridori – saw the village as an experience driven, commercial area, not residential. Even at the time we did the original vision, residential demand was greater. Wanted a place where people on both sides of the freeway could gather**

2. **Member Sprague** – where do people gather? Besides the community center above City Hall, lack of demand for this
 3. **Member Nouzille** – provide services, the less trips generated or vehicle miles traveled; balance /cross-roads of it also becoming a draw for others outside the city coming in
- iii. **Planning Principle # 4**
1. **Member Corridori** – originally, we had said no residential north of Agoura Rd, this may have been shortsighted; AVSP boundary stops with Whizins Mall; Cornerstone
 2. **Erik Justesen (RRM)** – idea here to reconsider / shift things around
 3. **Vice Chair Wolf** – where are the boundary limits of the AVSP, is there potential to expand the AVSP boundary?
 4. **Member Zelman** – City Council originally wanted no residential south of the freeway between Agoura Rd.
 5. **Mayor Pro Tem Lopez** – no conversation or idea is off the table
 6. **Member Haldane** – what types of uses should we be encouraging that would generate less traffic?
 7. **Member Nouzille** – commercial development in Agoura is driven by amount of traffic generating uses; not nightlife generating uses
 8. **Member Corridori** – it is important to provide services that are active 24 hours for an active neighborhood with appropriate uses.
 9. **Member Haldane** – agrees that a mixed-use village provides nice activity throughout the day; case study in Thousand Oaks (former Lupe’s location) is really nice.
 10. **Mayor Pro Tem Lopez** – need to consider balance/ratio of the residential to non-residential uses
 11. **Member Zelman** – how does Measure H affect this?
 12. **Member Corridori** – Measure H limits commercial to 60,000 sf. for a single retail use
 13. **City Manager Hamburger** – single use, intended to prevent Home Depot, Target, etc.
 14. **Erik Justesen (RRM)** – intent to promote commercial environment; shopping; retail; gathering area
 15. **Member Wolf** – we are not Calabasas, other surrounding cities; special vision for Agoura Hills
- iv. **Planning Principle # 5**
1. **No comments**
- v. **Planning Principle # 6**
1. **Vice Chair Wolf** – beneficial to engage Malibu, especially after Woolsey Fire since that is one of their evacuation routes; especially excited to enhance our emergency preparedness
 2. **Member Suber** – it is important to also engage with LA County officials – unincorporated areas of the – Canyon Dune Rd.

3. **City Manager Hamburger** – the City is currently working with surrounding jurisdictions on emergency plan
 4. **Mayor Pro Tem** – Member Larimer lost structures in Woolsey fire
 5. **Member Larimer** – most of our neighbors are still rebuilding their homes after they were destroyed in the fires
 6. **Member Corridori** – any participation from people proposing projects in the AVSP with the evacuation plan? Are they required to participate in the planning for fire evacuation?
 7. **City Manager Hamburger** – at this point, it is FEMA, Sheriff Departments, and Public Safety professionals looking at lessons learned; but will be shared publicly with residents and property owners
 8. **Member Corridori** – believes that Fire Dept. has not said anything negative about proposed developments with regards to fire evacuation
 9. **City Manager Hamburger** – going through LA County, it is quite restrictive, add more restrictions to the buildings, than being less so; different division than City Planning Division; more intensive in their review in the most recent years
- vi. **Planning Principle # 7**
1. **Member Corridori** – height has always been an issue; remain a low-profile; that issue should be addressed in grading requirements
 2. **Assistant City Manager Adeva** – intent was to match existing grades so you are not over-grading the land; difficult on the development side; can try to make grades gradual, but it is often a case-by-case basis
 3. **Member Sprague** – shouldn't this be a building issue, why is this something we are even considering? Should not even be addressing Principles 6/7
 4. **Councilmember Anstead** – the point is more so taking into account the analysis provided for the evacuation plan and whether/how it impacts the AVSP
 5. **Community Development Director Thomas** – AVSP is zoning and building height is dictated by zoning and reviewed by City Planning Division; AVSP is our zoning document which dictates the development potential
 6. **Councilmember Anstead** – does height change public viewshed and is it compatible with the height of the surrounding buildings?
 7. **Mayor Pro Tem** – this document (Planning Principles doc) was created by the Council and chosen to share with the CAG
 8. **Member Haldane** – we should not be providing recommendation on grading
- vii. **Planning Principle # 8**
1. See discussion for planning principle # 7

- viii. **Planning Principle # 9**
 - 1. **Assistant City Manager Adeva - Density Bonus** allowed through **AVSP** and **Density Bonus** allowed through **State** (related to affordable housing development) developers need to choose one; decide if both options are to remain and what threshold or whether the current **Density Bonus** in **AVSP** is still desired
 - 2. **Member Corridori** – what is a public amenity and who does it serve?
 - 3. **City Manager Hamburger** – if **AVSP Density Bonus** is to remain, further define what public amenities are required and how that is quantified
- ix. **Planning Principle # 10**
 - 1. **Member Suber** – Can density be distributed by parcel area instead of by zone?
 - 2. **Community Development Director Thomas** – come up with objective standard; perhaps not all parcels would be suitable for residential
- x. **Planning Principle # 11**
 - 1. **Member Sprague** – Can you provide update on the plans for the traffic circle / roundabout at **Kanan and Agoura Rd**, if you could eliminate the people crossing, the path for fire escape you could speed up traffic lights; pedestrian bridges?
 - 2. **Assistant City Manager Adeva** – Roundabout off the table; City can provide discussion and materials leading up to meeting discussion about transportation
 - 3. **Member Suber** – Can you provide update on feasibility of underpass of **Medea Creek** under the **101**?
 - 4. **Vice Chair Wolfe and Members Haldane / Suber** – good idea; good for businesses in the immediate area; good opportunity to look at for better option for crossing **101**
- xi. **Planning Principle # 12**
 - 1. **No comment/discussion**
- xii. **Planning Principle # 13**
 - 1. **No comment/discussion**
- xiii. **Planning Principle # 14**
 - 1. **No comment/discussion**
- xiv. **Planning Principle # 15**
 - 1. **Vice Chair Wolfe** – this project is going to be within the **2.5 / 3** miles of the world’s largest wildlife crossing at **Liberty Canyon**
 - 2. **Member Sprague** – are there some projects in the pipeline that will adhere to old **AVSP** or with the new updated one?
 - 3. **City Manager Hamburger** – **City Council** would like to see it apply as much as possible/feasible

7. Closing remarks and meeting adjourned