

# MINUTES

## **GPAC Minutes**

*November 15, 2010*

### **1.0 CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Jay Corbin at 6:02 p.m.

### **2.0 ROLL CALL**

#### **In attendance**

Jay Corbin, Pat Flanagan, Paul Smith, Jeff Ohlfs, Terrienne Palmer, Lisa Pitts, Steve Whitten

### **3.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Minutes will be presented for approval at our next meeting.

### **4.0 PUBLIC COMMENTS**

A member of the audience inquired about copies of the General Plan and Draft EIR. Staff reported that copies are available in the Library and the Community Development office. Also you may purchase a printed copy or request CDs each for a fee.

### **5.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### **5.1 General Plan Goals and Implementation Policies:**

Pat Flanagan – Provided the GPAC and audience copies of the state standards for General Plans. Looking at the General Plan, Pat stated "...we have confusing implementation policies. The plan does not seem to follow the standards from the state." Steve Whitten inquired about why the standards are not followed. Pat informed the GPAC that there is much leeway in how General Plans are written.

#### **5.2 Draft General Plan**

##### **a. Land use Element**

Jay Corbin – Suggested that we as the GPAC create one document and forward our recommendations to the council as "Recommendations, Comments and Concerns". Jay distributed the concerns he had prepared for the GPAC's review. He is not looking for a stamp of approval.

Wastewater treatment plant –

Jay Corbin stated that the General Plan and Environmental Impact Report are inconsistent in their language and handling of the wastewater treatment topic. The General Plan makes statements that make it sound as if the city needs a Wastewater treatment solution. This may or may not be the case. Pat Flanagan feels that the GPAC should have Hogle-Ireland look at the facts. Jay says "it is our job to report inconsistencies."

Steve Whitten shared portions of the Downtown Specific Plan that is pointing to a problem. Jay Corbin clarified that they are pointing to a problem that may or may not exist. Steve feels it is important that if in the future a plant is needed that we should address it now. There is no easy answer to a wastewater treatment system. The GPAC decided that the implementation policy for this portion of the EIR (2.0.4) be to do the study of the needs. Karen Walton from the audience inquired if the Water District could help.

Lisa Pitts stated that she feels that newer higher impact uses be moved out of historic downtown into an area nearer the base. Steve Whitten stated that the lack of sewers is a constraint on businesses and their expansion and that there exists factual data for the need of a treatment plant. Carol from audience liked the comment Lisa made and the idea of expanding into newer areas as mentioned and the area near Stater Brothers.

After all this discussion, Jay Corbin agreed to rewrite the document on treatment facility and bring back for review of GPAC at next meeting. Ultimately the GPAC had 2 large findings on this topic. 1. The data outlined on page 1 indicates a conflict and needs resolution. 2. GPAC feels the document should state that "The Lack of a wastewater treatment facility is a constraint to development. The GPAC feels that we need to investigate the needs for Wastewater treatment prior to dedicating 11 million dollars."

#### Land Use Constraints—

Jay Corbin read the top portion of the land use constraints concerning industrial zoned land. GPAC recommend that we forward the comments with one minor correction to the document: 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph "...much of the industrially-zoned land is buildable and how much of it has topographical seismic, or flooding issues that prevent any possible development." Suggestion is to change last part to "...seismic, or flooding hazards."

Second part of Land Use Constraints – Steve Whitten stated "there is a need to revise documents so they are consistent." Staff informed the GPAC and others that the same codes used by the county in 1980 are still in use today. No intensification has occurred since the city incorporated with the exception of landscaping. The GPAC agreed that the documents should be consistent.

General Plan Inconsistencies—Steve Whitten stated, bottom line is to follow the directions in the technical report. There was no disagreement or issues raised from the GPAC. Pat Flanagan brought up that Implementation Policy 2.4 discourages extremes near residences, "New development will be sensitive to neighborhood character."

#### Design and Landscape Standards—

Jay Corbin feels there has been no direction from council on Design and Landscape standards, which is unfortunate. He feels the GPAC should recommend that a direction be created in both of these areas. Jane Smith from the audience asked if this could or should include green standards? Pat Flanagan says that it should include a sustainability plan similar to Apple Valley and Palm Springs. This should include background and information on greenhouse gas laws, facing, native plants, sighting and the like. She feels that we need to state that sustainability is a requirement and that the aspects of the term should be clear, listed and enumerated. Jay says without direction from council this is difficult because it is lacking from the current plan and we are not sure how much it would cost to add a Sustainability element. We decided to come back to this later.

#### Development near Joshua Tree National Park—

Discussion was had about the consistency issue with development near the Park. Pat suggested that standards for development within Land Use sections 2 and 2.4 be created and that there should be a policy about neighborhood zoning in the areas around the Park. Lisa Pitts spoke in favor of the tourist-oriented development being changed from adjacent to throughout the City of Twentynine Palms (Land Use section 10.3). Originally Jay and Pat felt that this section could be rewritten by Lisa to reflect changes and brought back to GPAC. Then Lisa found in the "Revised Implementation Policies per GPAC Recommendations, September 13, 2010" that the recommended changes to both Land Use questions mentioned in this section had been recorded by Hogle Ireland. Lisa read from the document the changes already recorded by Hogle-Ireland (see above mentioned document page XXV and XXXVI).

#### Residential Clustering—

Staff says that the current council has looked at clustering and decided to not move forward with it, but that the future councils could revisit it. Larry Briggs from the audience asked staff why did the current council reject the residential clustering idea? Staff reported that the council did not feel confident that the Open Space transfer would be 100% permanent and that in the future another council could not change the open space and develop the area, that there is no mechanism in place to protect the open space permanently. The GPAC decided that we wish to restate the clustering concept and present to the new council for their approval. Larry says he would like to see the document promote clustering and its benefits. The GPAC commented on additions to the language on the benefits, including maintaining community view sheds, reduced infrastructure costs and maintenance, walkable city, reduced emissions, and the like. Jay Corbin recorded the exact language for this section and will bring back in the recommendation document the GPAC is creating for this element.

#### Hillside Development—

As per the document prepared by Jay, the GPAC suggested that Implementation Policy for LU 7.4 should be rewritten.

Due to the late hour approaching it was determined that we should potentially meet again next Monday November 22, 2010. George Mulopulos had expressed his desire to discuss Solar at a meeting in the future. We also need to finish Land Use and start Circulation, then the revisit of the Conservation Element. Steve Whitten feels we should make an effort to meet next week if at all possible as we have a lot more to discuss. Lisa Pitts suggested we discuss having longer meetings to accommodate the information as we

were on a roll and doing a good job getting through the information. In the future we may need to ask for another extension. Steve Whitten stated that typically it takes 3 years to adopt a General Plan. Staff added that there are milestones that need to be hit or additional costs will ensue. Jay Corbin said he would call and see if a quorum could be had and decide if we are having another meeting next week. Consensus from the GPAC was to not have Hogle-Ireland at next meeting.

**5.3 Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)**

Not discussed due to time constraints

**5.4 Questions and Comments**

Next meeting: November 29, 2010, 6 p.m. City Hall Twentynine Palms CA.

**6.0 ADJOURN**

Motion to adjourn was made at 8:03 p.m., passed by consent.