



ORANGE GENERAL PLAN GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

WORKSHOP #4

May 19, 2005

Summary

The third meeting of the Orange General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) was called to order at 6:40 p.m. in Conference Room “C” of Orange City Hall. After the flag salute, John Bridges of P&D Consultants provided an overview of the following meeting objectives:

1. Present the preliminary land use classification system for the General Plan update.
2. Identify land use focus areas to be addressed within the General Plan update.
3. Document GPAC comments and suggestions regarding the land use classification system and focus areas.
4. Begin discussion of land use alternatives for each focus area.
5. Receive community input.

LAND USE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM AND FOCUS AREAS

John Bridges provided an overview of the proposed land use classification system for the General Plan update. The presentation included definitions of terms such as density and intensity, as well as Floor Area Ratios (FARs). Several examples of current densities and FARs drawn from throughout Orange were presented and discussed with the GPAC. Mr. Bridges then compared the land use classification system from the current General Plan to that being considered as part of the update.

GPAC members asked several questions of clarification and engaged in a brief discussion:

- Why are there no FARs in residential categories?
- Re: Low Density Residential – Range is 2-6 dwelling units (du) per acre... at max. 6 units per acre, lots would be 7,200 s.f. in size. Description states... 4,500 to 12,000 s.f. 4,500 s.f. lots seem too small. We probably shouldn't be encouraging development of 4,500 s.f. lots if 6 du/acre is our maximum. We should send a firm message that development on 4,500 s.f. lots isn't practical
- I live on a 4,500 s.f. lot – smaller lots keep housing affordable. And my quality of life isn't diminished by having 4,500 s.f. lots. We talked about providing housing for all lifestyles, we need to stay with that. Hold developers to high quality of development.
- Is there a % definition for mixed use? What's residential, what's commercial?
- This almost always says retail shall be located on ground floor. We need to balance the residential and non-residential uses in mixed use.
- There's no discussion about number of occupants in housing.
- Need to provide GPAC information regarding the number of people in each focus area.
- We're still out of balance on parks – adding the density and people means we need to add the parks.



- People would like lower density homes – and seniors would like to stay in the community. We need to maintain driveways that can be backed out of, etc.
- Is there such a thing as “High” density in Orange? If “Medium” is the highest – let’s call it “High” and tell it like it is.
- What if developer comes in looking for a density bonus in the *Neighborhood Mixed Use* designation? Can he get up to 30-35 units per acre? Some developers will try to do this.
- Are there State laws that we need to be aware of regarding provision of Workforce Housing? Could that information be provided to the GPAC?
- Affirm comment about minimum guidelines for how much commercial should be in a mixed use area.
- Developers are building to the maximum today. We need to consider that. These categories are very important.

GPAC Recommendation: The GPAC did not recommend any modification of the proposed land use classification system. However, the GPAC did recommend that the General Plan specify clearly the requirement for public open spaces associated with each residential and mixed use category.

Mr. Bridges then introduced the GPAC to 12 land use focus areas located throughout the City. Understanding that land uses within most areas within the City are well-established, and that many are viable for the long term, land use designations for most locations within the City will not change as a result of the General Plan update. However, several sites present opportunities for change that are consistent with the Community Vision.

AREA 1: TUSTIN STREET – MALL VICINITY

Jeff Henderson from P&D Consultants presented the planning context, public input to date, existing land uses, the existing General Plan, Alternative 1, Alternative 2, and Alternative 3 for the Tustin Street-Mall Vicinity focus area. The differences between the various plans and the rationale behind the alternatives were discussed. Each alternative was displayed on the screen for GPAC members and public participants to view.

Comments offered by the GPAC on this focus area included the following:

- Desire to know what the population increase is for each given alternative.
- How can we make this attractive enough to developers to achieve the type of change we want?
- Mixed use provides the best option for transforming this area from a purely commercial corridor.
- We need pedestrian connections through the area if mixed use is allowed.

GPAC Recommendation: The GPAC recommended that *Alternative 2* would be appropriate for this focus area. *Alternative 2* introduces a *Neighborhood Mixed Use* designation for the currently commercial areas along Tustin Street, as well as the bowling alley and mobile home park sites located north of Meats Avenue east of Tustin. This style of mixed use encourages that the first floor of any multiple-story structure consist of a commercial retail use. Subsequent stories could consist of housing, offices, or other commercial uses. Other residential uses shown in the Existing General Plan would remain unchanged. The GPAC also recommended that within this focus area, the density range for the *Neighborhood Mixed*



Use designation be reduced from 15-24 du/acre to 6-15 du/acre to better correspond to surrounding residential neighborhoods, and to anticipate the use of density bonuses within the corridor that may encourage affordable housing.

AREA 2: EAST CHAPMAN AVENUE – EL MODENA

Mr. Henderson presented the planning context, public input to date, existing land uses, the existing General Plan, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 for the East Chapman Avenue – El Modena focus area. The differences between the various plans and the rationale behind the alternatives were discussed. Each alternative was displayed on the screen for GPAC members and public participants to view.

Comments offered by the GPAC on this focus area included the following:

- Mixed use is appropriate along Chapman – maybe even expand further along the corridor.
- This area needs to have public improvements that create a more pedestrian-oriented atmosphere.

Further comment regarding this focus area was deferred until the next GPAC meeting to afford time for public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Several members of the public offered comments at the conclusion of the GPAC meeting regarding the following:

El Modena

- Spanish theme on corridor.
- Percentage of lot coverage needs to be addressed through General Plan policy.
- Create a theme for the area that recognizes its sense of place.

Housing

- Need a variety of housing types, not just 7,200 square foot lots.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 PM. The next GPAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 2, 2005 at 6:30 PM. An additional GPAC meeting was scheduled for Thursday, June 9, 2005 at 6:30 PM.

