



# CAG MEETING #6 MINUTES

<b>Date:</b> July 6, 2021	
<b>To:</b> Denice Thomas, AICP (Community Development Director)	<b>Organization:</b> Agoura Hills
<b>From:</b> Lance Wierschem	<b>Title:</b> Senior Landscape Architect
<b>Project Name:</b> Agoura Village Specific Plan Update	<b>Project Number:</b> 1800-01-UR19
<b>Topic:</b> CAG Meeting 6 Minutes	

## Citizen’s Advisory Group Members:

1. Mayor Pro Tem Deborah Klein Lopez
2. Planning Commission Vice Chair Jeremy Wolf
3. Member Deanna Glassberg
4. Member Irma Haldane
5. Member Cyrena Nouzille
6. Member Gregory Sprague
7. Member Benjamin Suber
8. Member Gordon Larimer
9. Member Ed Corridori

## Nine members of the public present

### Staff

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

### Consultants

1. Lance Wierschem, RRM Design Group

### Minutes:

1. Minutes – June 15, 2021 (Community Development Director Thomas)
  - Community Development Director Thomas shared minutes and how to access Zoom recording of previous March CAG meeting and purpose for minutes
2. Objective Standards Presentation (Community Development Director Thomas)  
Discuss and vote on interim standards for the AVSP to be subsequently forwarded to the Planning Commission and the City Council. Discuss and vote on draft ODS, or

wordsmith them, then these will be presented to Planning Commission and City Council for review and consideration. Packet was provided to each CAG member to review the 18 ODS. These will be available on the City's website. Two polls will be taken during meeting to review and vote on each of the 18 standards. Polls will record who has voted on what standard. We can vote on the proposed language or provide optional language.

**Mayor Pro Tem Deborah Klein Lopez - suggested that she and Planning Commission Vice Chair Jeremy Wolf do not vote.**

#### Draft Interim Objective Standards

1. **Interior noise levels within residential dwelling units shall be constructed to not exceed 45 Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). Prior to approval of development within the AVSP, the applicant shall submit a noise study which, with the use of noise attenuation best management practices if necessary, demonstrates this objective standard is met.**
2. **Exterior noise levels within residential and mixed use developments shall be developed not to exceed 55 CNEL. Prior to approval of development within the AVSP, the applicant shall submit a noise study which, with the use of noise attenuation best management practices if necessary, demonstrates this objective standard has been met.**
  - **Member Gregory Sprague – were these standards also used when constructing the care facility?**
  - **Community Development Director Thomas – yes, these would have been met**
  - **Member Ed Corridori - Exterior noise levels, how is that study done? Is it during normal freeway traffic periods? The freeway noise goes up and down. How is the exterior noise levels studied?**
  - **Community Development Director Thomas – they take a 24 hour period and take the median noise level for interior and exterior.**
  - **Member Cyrena Nouzille – what if a restaurant with live music is allowed a CUP, how is that measured?**
  - **Community Development Director Thomas – The applicant would determine the acceptable use and present to PC and CC to review and make decision.**
  - **Member Ed Corridori – The properties we are looking at have close proximity to the freeway. Are the standards in our ordinance similar to other communities?**
  - **Community Development Director Thomas – We would need to do a survey on other communities to know what their ordinances allow. City Council and Planning Commission could support a project that does not comply with the noise levels. The GP was codified in 2010, projects since then have been reviewed per this standard.**

- **Member Irma Haldane** – I live not too far from Plaza Rey Adobe. They have bands/weddings which are louder than a vacuum cleaner, and I don't find it objectionable.
  - **Member Gregory Sprague** – if we pass this, it won't add extra costs to the contractor, right?
  - **Community Development Director Thomas** – yes.
3. **New residential and/or mixed use development projects shall provide a minimum of 15% of the net site area for public spaces.**
- **Member Gregory Sprague** – is this the same number as other development in Agoura Hills?
  - **Community Development Director Thomas** – this is specific to the AVSP.
  - **Member Gregory Sprague** – Do you know what number has been used in the past? This number seems high to me.
  - **Member Ed Corridori** – What accounts for open space within the AVSP? Public Space is not only the open space buffers at the edge of development, it is the public space within the development?
  - **Member Cyrena Nouzille** – I would like to provide a definition of what public open space is.
  - **Community Development Director Thomas** – We will provide a definition with the standard, but as a general 15% within the AVSP is what we are voting on, is it appropriate or not?
  - **Member Ben Suber** – I'm afraid this will hinder development North of Agoura Road.
  - **Member Cyrena Nouzille** – Would a greenbelt walkway along the creek count toward the 15%?
  - **Member Irma Haldane** – If someone wanted to do more than this, would they be able to?
  - **Community Development Director Thomas** – explained the by right process for housing projects
  - **Member Gregory Sprague** – Is it only the residential and mixed use projects? Outside the AVSP for residential, is it 15% as well? It's not likely more than 15%?
  - **Member Ed Corridori** – Assuming they can meet all the standards, do they have to abandon the whole process, could they ask for a variance?
  - **Community Development Director Thomas** – explained process. We will get through these.
4. **Residential and/or mixed use development projects abutting Medea, Lindero, Canyon, and Chesebro Creeks shall dedicate and construct the segment of the recreational greenbelt and trail that traverses their property and shall provide connections for adjacent property owners to construct their segments.**
- **Member Cyrena Nouzille** – where are these trails and creeks in the plan?
  - **Member Ed Corridori and Ben Suber** – address the creek name in the eastern portion of the plan area. It is not called out.

- **Community Development Director Thomas – City will provide figure numbers.**
5. **At the time of application submission, the applicant shall submit a traffic impact analysis that demonstrates additional traffic generated by the proposed development does not cause a reduction in the level of service on the roadway or at intersections within the AVSP.**
- **Community Development Director Thomas – this standard requires the applicant to provide a traffic impact analysis that will identify the level of service. This standard it to address the impact of development but also evacuation. It is difficult to know how to evacuate for emergencies because there are many unknowns to determine exact numbers.**
  - **Member Ed Corridori – Comments on the wording – should we say “current” level of service. What about the term “within”**
  - **Community Development Director Thomas – will coordinate with Kimley Horn to make sure there are not impacts to adjacent areas just outside of the AVSP.**
  - **Member Gordon Larimer – what happens when each developer provides their own traffic study?**
  - **Community Development Director Thomas – it does not work in a vacuum.**
  - **Member Gordon Larimer – with high beach traffic volumes in the summer, you can’t even get through Agoura Village Road.**
  - **Member Imra Haldane – I really don’t understand how anything doesn’t impact any more when it is already really bad and isn’t working.**
  - **Community Development Director Thomas – what I’ve been told is there are many different evacuation routes than leading away from the fire, even taking all lanes of traffic out of an area, and to compare beach traffic is different than emergency.**
  - **Member Cyrena Nouzille – the way this is worded, emergency traffic and regular traffic are different. This is an impossible check box for any applicant.**
  - **Assistant City Manager Adeva – emergency traffic is impossible to count, but moving forward, ensuring a plan is in force so that the capacity of roadway can exceed the volume for what the proposed development intends.**
  - **Member Ben Suber – Could we add a definition for the level of service?**
  - **Mayor Pro Tem Deborah Klein Lopez – we want to study in peak**
  - **Assistant City Manager Adeva – needs to be tight coordination with emergency response to take both travel lanes to allow more flow out of the area rather than just the direction of travel lane.**
  - **Member Gregory Sprague – Does the fact that the AVSP properties are 600 yards from the 101 Freeway considered less impactful than those in Malibu Canyon with regards to evacuation?**
  - **Assistant City Manager Adeva – evacuation does not always happen if you plan it that way.**
  - **Jeremy Wolf – There is not a regional strategy yet for emergency evacuation, but this is such a unique corridor for the Santa Monica mountain region. The**

importance to figure out a regional strategy is important and what the community feels about adding any more traffic to this area.

- **Community Development Director Thomas** – we will massage the language to address the intersections and a second standard the deals with emergency evacuation and levels of service.

**6. Residential and/or mixed use development building coverage shall not exceed 60 percent.**

- **Community Development Director Thomas** – this deals with lot coverage. The definition is in the ordinance. This is not to be confused with Floor Area Ratio, this is the building footprint. It is not written as whether net or gross, this assumes that it is considered gross.
- **Member Cyrena Nouzille** – does that include parking lots and hardscaping? What about a trellis?
- **Community Development Director Thomas** – consider if solar shade structures or subsurface parking with nothing above ground?
- **Member Goran Larimer** – are we being too restrictive? It's hard to define what falls into each category.
- **Community Development Director Thomas** – we can't put restrictions so onerous that you don't get affordable housing. If the definition that exists say "structures" than we should include statement that says "structures, except ..."
- **Member Gregory Sprague** – is this 60% common? Inside and outside AVSP?
- **Member Cyrena Nouzille** – I would consider above ground structures compatible with CAP planning, anything that promotes the CAP would be excluded.
- **Member Ed Corridori** – This seems reasonable to me, but this seems to me that being more restrictive would lead to a larger footprint. How are we voting on the changes?
- **Community Development Director Thomas** – We will define what lot coverage includes and exclude items that promote CAP.

**7. Public Comments**

- **Steve Hess** – Offer words of encouragement – suggest set aside issues of how wide a path is, and focus on traffic. Hyperbolic double speed doesn't make any sense. Feels compassionate about traffic because it doesn't work.

**8. Next Meeting: July 20, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.**

- **Community Development Director Thomas** – next meeting will pick up on ODS #7.