Attachment 3
General Plan Advisory Committee Feedback on Land Use Themes

The following information summarizes the Land Use Themes input and recommendations provided by the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) at their meeting on March 7, 2019. For additional details related to possible land use changes identified in this Memorandum, please refer to the Land Use Themes Report.

For three of the five focus areas (Lake Forest Drive, Civic Center, and Light Industrial/Rail Corridor), the General Plan Advisory Committee identified an additional land use pattern they requested be considered by the City Council, which is referred to as “Theme 5: GPAC Additional Consideration”. Specific comments regarding the Land Use Themes identified and considered in the Land Use Themes Report, along with Theme 5 (where applicable), are described in this summary memorandum.

Discussion Process

At their meeting on March 7, 2019, the General Plan Advisory Committee received a presentation summarizing the Land Use Themes Report (which they were provided in advance for review and consideration). Following the presentation, City Staff and the Consultant Team facilitated a roundtable discussion addressing each of the five Focus Area. The discussion began with a simple hands-up poll allowing GPAC members to indicate their initial Land Use Theme preference. The group then facilitated a discussion of the Themes and at the conclusion of the Focus Area discussion conducted a second hands-up poll asking GPAC members to indicate which Land Use Theme they would recommend to the City Council. The results of this “final hands-up poll” are those reflected in this Memorandum. Please note that not all GPAC members indicated their preference (i.e., they did not raise their hand) for one or more of the Focus Areas and as a result the number of responses is not consistent across all Focus Areas.

Focus Area 1: El Toro Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>1: Usual</th>
<th>2: Expanded Housing Options</th>
<th>3: Expanded Employment Choices</th>
<th>4: Mixed Growth</th>
<th>5: GPAC Additional Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final GPAC Hands-Up Poll Preference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

El Toro Road Corridor Discussion Points

- Envision this area like Los Olivos Village area in Irvine
- Need to coordinate with proposed Cal Trans improvement to existing on/off ramps
- Members like commercial revitalization along the corridor
- Desire to incorporate housing into this area
- General consensus that some housing works here because it’s close to the freeway so people can hop on and off efficiently
- General questions about the City’s role in redevelopment of shopping centers and what the City can or would do to implement a new vision for El Toro
- Comment that if higher density housing was going to go anywhere in the City, this is where it should go (that this is the most appropriate place in the city for that type of high-intensity housing).
Focus Area 2: Lake Forest Drive Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final GPAC Hands-Up Poll Preference</th>
<th>Theme Business Usual</th>
<th>1: as Theme Expanded Housing Options</th>
<th>2: Theme Expanded Employment Choices</th>
<th>3: Theme 4: Mixed Growth</th>
<th>4: Theme 5: GPAC Additional Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lake Forest Drive Corridor Discussion Points

- General agreement that this area is suitable for some sort of new residential development due to its proximity to I-5, Irvine Train Station, and regional destinations/activity centers.
- Interest in getting more information/establishing policy direction regarding allowable number of stories for new development.
- Could be a good location for urban industrial uses and reuse of existing buildings.
- General interest that mixed-use development along Lake Forest Drive would be desirable but concern about the densities and height of new buildings in this location for MU-60, as shown on Theme 2.
- GPAC Request (Theme 5): Add “Theme 5” which modifies Theme 2 by allowing for Mixed-Use development at densities up to 43 du/ac, versus up to 60 du/ac as illustrated in the original Theme 2.

Focus Area 3: Civic Center Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final GPAC Hands-Up Poll Preference</th>
<th>Theme Business Usual</th>
<th>1: as Theme Expanded Housing Options</th>
<th>2: Theme Expanded Employment Choices</th>
<th>3: Theme 4: Mixed Growth</th>
<th>4: Theme 5: GPAC Additional Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Civic Center Discussion Points

- Role of the trail as an asset but also potential buffer between uses.
- Desire to have a better looking “entrance” to the new Civic Center versus the light industrial buildings that are out there right now.
- Important to create a sense of place and destination to support the new Civic Center.
- Could be a good location for urban industrial uses but recognition that allowing for only additional nonresidential development intensity might not provide enough market incentive to get parcels to development into more desirable/attractive uses.
- Some GPAC members commented on how different density projects look from the street, especially the parking areas. Members made comments about how projects with bigger densities (like MU-60 or MU-43) allow for better-looking projects like “wrap” projects where parking is “hidden” within the building. If the intent is to make the “core” of the Civic Center look better, GPAC considered what mixed-use designation would look the best.
- Concern about making sure all future projects have adequate on-site parking.
- General consensus that mixed-use development could be appropriate at the core and along Lake Forest Drive but discussion over what density would be most appropriate.
- GPAC Request (Theme 5): Allow for mixed-use development at both the core and along Lake Forest Drive (Theme 2 plus Theme 4) but with a destination of MU-25 not MU-43 as shown in the previous themes.
Focus Area 4: Foothill Ranch Towne Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final GPAC Hands-Up Poll Preference</th>
<th>Theme Business Usual</th>
<th>1: as Theme Expanded Housing Options</th>
<th>2: Theme Expanded Employment Choices</th>
<th>3: Theme 4: Mixed Growth</th>
<th>Theme 5: GPAC Additional Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foothill Ranch Towne Centre Discussion Points

- Some preference for urban industrial uses at this location because it seems to be a spot where young people are going and will want to go in the future
- Confirmation that the Urban Industrial – Residential and MU-25 designations both allow for residential development at densities up to 25 du/ac (they do)
- General opinion that this is a desirable location for young people to live because it’s close to the 241 and jobs centers and already has some retail and entertainment options
- Some interest in Theme 2 with more variety in residential density and intensity to support a broader range of housing types, including some limited area for MU-60
- Recognition that the existing configuration of surface parking lots could be better utilized so long as existing uses continue to have access to adequate parking (in other words, there is no net reduction in the number of spaces even with new development)
- Idea that new development, if built where surface parking currently exists, could provide parking on-site to serve existing commercial users
- If our population is aging and we want young people to be able to live in our community, this is a location that might be a good fit for them
- GPAC Request: Keep Theme 4 as-is, but with the understanding that any future description of the Theme 4 vision includes references to urban industrial uses as desirable in this location (no separate Theme 5 option as prepared)

Focus Area 5: Light Industrial/Rail Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final GPAC Hands-Up Poll Preference</th>
<th>Theme Business Usual</th>
<th>1: as Theme Expanded Housing Options</th>
<th>2: Theme Expanded Employment Choices</th>
<th>3: Theme 4: Mixed Growth</th>
<th>Theme 5: GPAC Additional Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Light Industrial/Rail Corridor Discussion Points

- Initial opinion mixed on whether or not this is a good location for new residential development
- General recognition that this area is not attractive and does not represent the vision of Lake Forest moving forward
- Discussion about what type of land use designation would provide sufficient incentive to get these properties to redevelop into something that looks better and supports the community’s vision
- General consensus among the group that only increasing the allowable floor area ratio, without allowing for residential development, would not be sufficient to redevelop this area
- General agreement that some sort of residential development is the best way to see significant change in this focus area
• Concern about access and roadways but agreement that maybe the right land use designation, with a high enough allowable density, could allow future developments to make necessary improvements
• Concern about the number of individual parcels in this area and that as a limiting factor to redevelopment
• Concern about existing parking problems and request to make sure that any new development at this location be parked sufficiently in accordance with all City requirements
• GPAC Request (Theme 5): In order to incentive redevelopment, designate the entire Focus Area (except for the public facility) as MU-43