



CAG MEETING #10 MINUTES

Date: December 15, 2021	
To: Denice Thomas, AICP (Community Development Director)	Organization: City of Agoura Hills
From: Rachel Raynor, AICP	Title: Associate Planner
Project Name: Agoura Village Specific Plan Update	Project Number: 1800-01-UR19
Topic: CAG Meeting 10 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 – absent
6. Member Deanna Glassberg
7. Member Irma Haldane
8. Member Gordon Larimer
9. Member Cyrena Nouzille
10. Member April Powers
11. Member Gregory Sprague
12. Member Benjamin Suber
13. Member Rik Zelman

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

Minutes:

Presentation by RRM Design Group – Land Use Allocation (Zones G & K, E, J, and Agoura Rd. south)

RRM Design Group presented the Draft Land Use Allocation Summary and site plan / feasibility analysis for Zones G & K, E, J, mini storage, and Agoura Rd. south.

Questions and Comments on RRM Design Group presentation

1. Mayor Pro Tem Lopez: Question and thoughts. There seems to be a lot of building for some small amount of open space on Site K. Could we take out the 3 story mixed use in the center and create more public feeling European plaza? Things like in Ojai, Solvang, not sure how it messes with the numbers.
 - Erik Justesen Response: Thank you. To Deborah's point, that outdoor gathering space is about 70'x130'. It's not small but similar to the same size as the site in Malibu.
2. Mayor Pro Tem Lopez: The center building looks like it chops up the space. Make it a public square.
 - Member Suber: I'd like to see 3d renderings and renderings for this area.
 - Member Sprague: Are we approving floor plans or are we approving the rezoning.
 - Erik Justesen Response: We are looking to get input and confirm that the density and massing is the direction we want to go to move forward with the develop standards and guidelines.
 - Member Sprague: I'd say the existing uses could be centered on the courtyard. On the Theater site, I'm worried too many restaurants will be over here. Lastly, if there is a hotel on the regency site, are we limiting the hotel properties to 2 hotels to the entire AVSP area?
 - City Manager Hamburger and Erik Justesen Response: confirmed based on economic demand study. These would be either the AVE site or West Village. The only one proposed now has been on the AVE.
 - Erik Justesen Response: The plan will allow a non-residential use on the ground floor, not just restaurants. Our job is to create standards that will allow various commercial uses in those spaces.
 - Member Zelman: The original thought process for the village was meandering open space. These renderings look like there's too much building. I wouldn't mind if we left that whole parking lot open for open space, as well as smaller open space on the other lots.
 - Member Zelman: Do we even have enough parking?
 - Erik Justesen Response: the analysis and concepts show that we can meet the regulation requirements, and in both concepts provide more than what are currently provided. Location of parking is also important. We should think about Cornell to incorporate diagonal parking to make the businesses there viable.
 - Member Haldane: Does the mini storage bring in a lot of money for the City, would that offset with what concept that is being shown? Would the owners be interested in seeing this?
 - Erik Justesen Response: not sure they are bringing the City a ton of money. No sales tax, not much property tax. The owner has every right to redevelop this. Residential property and retail revenue would be more than what the City gets now.

- Member Larimer: Love the mini storage site design concept. This is a huge piece of this street frontage that is not providing value to the City at all. One of the things the City needs is storage facilities, like things for boats and RV's. Providing an alternate location for a facility like this has to be a critical piece to this. Is the City looking into this?
 - City Manager Hamburger Response: When redevelopment went away, the funding and ability went away. Now we don't really have that power.
 - Erik Justesen Response: The City could look for other properties and evaluate their zoning to help the owner find a separate site.
- Member Sprague: Isn't the YARD in the process on the west end of this site?
 - Community Development Director Thomas Response: The YARD is an entertainment/retail proposal. The files were too large to share but we can provide those.
 - Erik Justesen Response: The YARD doesn't have any residential component, but that doesn't mean a project has to have it, we just allow for it in the AVSP.
- Member Suber: The initial glance looking at view across the highway, I'm pleased the clock tower is still visible and the proposed buildings don't look too high. I'm worried about the view from the path between Trader Joes and where I live.
 - Erik Justesen Response: This helps show the proportions and heights.
- Member Sprague: I think the closer you get to Kanan and Agoura, the height should taper down to the corner.
- Member Glassberg: I agree with Greg, but I like the one story vs. the 2 story.
- Member Suber: I like the one story as well. Is the natural grade of Kanan to Malibu considered a view corridor in general?
- Member Haldane: I like the 1 story building. I'm looking at these long block red walls and I don't like it at all. Even if buildings were connected but you had openings and pedestrian walkways, that would help with viewsheds.
- Member Zelman: Irma touched on my question, but what direction are these buildings? Are they oriented to the interior or to the street?
 - Erik Justesen Response: We would ask that the orientation would be to Agoura Road.
- Member Zelman: If there was glass oriented to the street and also glass on the side of the buildings facing the openings and pedestrian paths, that would look much better.
 - Erik Justesen Response: It's difficult to interpret these massing studies and realize them as actual buildings, but yes, they will be articulated per our design guidelines.
- Member Sprague: I think 3 stories along Agoura Road on the north side might be too tall. It would feel too tall walking on the sidewalk. Scale it back on the north side to 2 stories.
- Member Zelman: Maybe more building setbacks on the ground floor on the north side, and more building setbacks on the second and third floor.
- Community Development Director Thomas: Are we looking to give feedback on the bulk as well as height?
 - Erik Justesen Response: Correct, maybe we want more setbacks on the upper floor setbacks.
- Member Glassberg: I would like to see a more substantial setback on Kanan at the corner. 10' isn't enough, but even 30' would be more inviting and open up the view corridor looking toward Malibu. If we can set some standards to make it more inviting, it would go over better than tall buildings on the corner.

- Member Larimer: I don't know if you are asking the right question, no one is going to look at this and say they want taller buildings. The only reason to build it taller is to get the density you want. To me the single story and the 3 story buildings further back makes sense.
 - Erik: The previous plan had taller buildings on the street. The density can be achieved with the residential on the interior lot.
- Member Haldane: I think north of Agoura should be one or two stories. I think the corner of Kanan and Agoura needs to have open space and a fountain, etc. 3 stories behind is fine with me.
- Member Suber: I'm a fan of one story on the south and preserving the view of Ladyface Mountain.
- Member Powers: Thank you for the visuals, it is everything. Like Deb, I'm about less is more, to lower height and add more open space. I'm looking at these concepts and I'd like to see more greenery and open space.
- Member Sprague: You want to take a V at the corner and open up the corners. Is that impossible to do?
 - Erik Justesen Response: That is not an issue, we can definitely update the AVSP to provide that type of development.
- Member Sprague: I don't get how one story on the south side of the street would not lower the value of the property. Could we increase height getting closer to the Cantina?
- Member Haldane: I agree, we don't need one story on the entire frontage.
 - Erik Justesen Response: I think what we are hearing is that we can allow mass in some areas and decrease in in others. Open up the corner of Kanan and Agoura, and work on upper floor step backs, so the street feels like one story walking along it but it has a second story.
- Member Corridori: I really appreciate these comments.
 - Community Development Director Thomas Response: We will post this to the website in addition to the meeting is public.

Presentation by Denice Thomas, Community Development Director

Community Development Director Thomas: next steps with this review will wrap up what we prepared for the CAG to do. I will send some dates and times in January to see what your availability is. The CAG deliverable will be direction on the Planning Principles. We will present all the principles and the feedback we heard and make sure the feedback we heard is complete and has everything we have heard. Then we will present this to Council and send to RRM to draft the revised AVSP. We will send you an advanced copy of the revised plan and you can provide feedback when the rest of the public provides feedback on the public review draft.

Public Comments

- No comments from the public

Next Meeting: January TBD, at 6:00 p.m.