



City of Palmdale General Plan Update General Plan Advisory Committee

Meeting #5 Part 2: February 19, 2020 | 6:30 pm – 8:30 pm
Chimbole Cultural Center “Manzanita Ballroom”

Agenda

Meeting Objectives


- Develop understanding of land use designations and place types
- Prepare land use alternatives
- Discuss location, type, and character of potential development

Meeting Agenda

- 6:30 pm** **Call to Order**
- Pledge of Allegiance
 - Approval of GPAC #5 meeting minutes
- 6:35 pm** **City Update re. GPAC Procedures**
- City Staff-led discussion
- 6: 50 pm** **Overview Presentation**
- Land Use Designations and Place Types Overview
- 7:05 pm** **Group Activity**
- *What areas should be prioritized for development in the next 25 years?*
 - *What area should not be prioritized for new development in the next 25 years?*
 - *What types of residential, employment, and commercial uses should go where?*
 - *What types of transportation priorities should accompany future growth?*
- 8:00 pm** **Group Activity Report Out/Discussion**
- 8:20 pm** **Public Comment (maximum of 2 minutes per person)**
- 8:30 pm** **Wrap-up + Adjourn**

Attachments:

Draft meeting minutes from GPAC #5 Meeting, January 15, 2020
Reference Maps



City of Palmdale General Plan Update

General Plan Advisory Committee

Meeting #5: January 15, 2019 | 6:30 pm – 8:30 pm
Chimbole Cultural Center “Manzanita Ballroom”

Draft Meeting Minutes

Meeting Objectives

- Refine areas of stability and growth
- Present overview of development constraints and capacity
- Prepare land use alternatives
- Discuss potential development location, type, and character

Attendees

GPAC Members

Present: Tony Avila, Juan Blanco, Colby Estes (Alternate), Laura Gordon, Theresa Hambro, Matthew Harris, Pat Hunt, Joe Parisio, Deborah Rutkowski-Hines, Jason Zink, Lourdes T. Everett, Aurora Hernandez, Sheri Kaneshiro

Absent: Teresa Lamping

City Staff

Department of Economic and Community Development staff: Mike Behen, Acting Director; Rob Bruce, Planning Manager; Carlene Saxton, Senior Planner; Nardy Lopez, Management Analyst

Consultant Team

Matt Raimi, Simran Malhotra, and Melissa Stark, Raimi + Associates

Public

Thirteen members of the public signed-in at the meeting, see attached sign-in sheet.

Meeting Summary

1. Call to Order

The Meeting began with reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

Next, Pat Hunt called a motion to not approve meeting #4 minutes because he felt that the summary lacked detail from the meeting’s discussion. Joe Parisio seconded.

This motion ensued a lengthy discussion regarding the detail of past GPAC meeting minutes. Members of the GPAC spoke openly about their feelings and concerns. Several members stated that in order to remember why a decision was made, they need to have a more detailed record of

the discussion. Some members of the GPAC requested detailed transcripts, video and audio recording, and for individual names to be noted next to specific remarks. One GPAC member cited City Council meeting minutes as the desired level of detail for GPAC meeting minutes. Other members of the GPAC spoke out against having their names denoted in the minutes and requested that meeting minutes be a detailed summary of the discussion and group decisions, noting that they represent the larger Palmdale community. A member of the GPAC suggested tabling approval of the minutes until direction from the City Council could be considered.

The consultant team and city staff responded with options for moving forward:

- One option is to have transcribed notes with a record of each individual comment. This would entail that each GPAC member state one's name prior to making any remarks. This level of detail would be additional work, not previously budgeted by the City under its existing contract with Raimi and Associates, as such, this would require sign-off and budget considerations from the City.
- Another option is to document discussions from the GPAC in greater detail but continue to summarize GPAC responses without noting individuals by name, and not with an official transcription.

Then, City staff asked for individuals to provide feedback on their preference for more detailed meeting minutes. A majority of the GPAC members expressed their preference for “more detail, but no names,” while going around the room. To get a clear idea of GPAC preferences, Matt Raimi called for a show of hands to determine which GPAC members would like more detailed meeting minutes that didn't denote individual names. Many members of the GPAC voted for more detailed minutes without individual names.

As a follow up, Matt Raimi asked GPAC members if they want more detailed minutes with transcript style record including names. Three GPAC members voted for transcript style recording denoting individual names.

Next, the GPAC voted on Pat Hunt's motion to reject the GPAC #4 meeting minutes. The motion fails with three votes in favor, all others opposed.

Laura Gordon, then made a motion to approve the GPAC #4 minutes as-is and provide more detailed meeting minutes for future meetings. The motion also included a request for the City to confer with City Council and make a recommendation for GPAC meeting minutes. The motion is seconded by Theresa Hambro and passes.

Following the discussion, City staff offer to follow up via email with further direction and supplemental information. This resulted in adding an additional GPAC meeting—GPAC #5 Part 2 scheduled for February 19, 2020—which will provide direction and overview of GPAC roles and responsibilities from City Manager, J.J. Murphy, and Assistant City Attorney, Noel Doran.

Other Notes

One GPAC member noted that it's hard to tell what changes were made and why to the vision and guiding principles on the track changes version without additional notes.

The City and Consultant team will revisit the vision and guiding principles document and add clarification for who suggested changes and why.

2. Overview Presentation and Discussion of Development Patterns, Capacity, Constraints, and Development Character Types

The consultant team provided an overview presentation of a “Complete City” and a “Complete Neighborhood,” examples of complete cities that are similar in size and locational attributes to Palmdale (Fort Collins, CO; McKinney, TX; and Boise, ID), and how Palmdale measures up as a complete city.

Following this part of the presentation, the group discussed and provided the following feedback:

- The presence of an airport and cost of living should be included in the complete city comparison matrix
- Palmdale needs a four-year college/University
- Palmdale is missing out on having a diversified employer base, a true downtown, and other characteristics of a complete city
- Palmdale only matches up on one of the complete city metrics, we need to get the other 75% of what complete cities have

GPAC members also noted that the following elements are also needed in Palmdale:

- University and higher education
- Passenger Airport
- Diversity of employers
- Publicly accessible trail system
- City center that is like an old town with variety of restaurants and gathering places
- Better dispersed goods and services on the east side, including grocery stores and hotels
- Hospital and medical facilities on the east side
- Transportation investments will be a big factor in the future of Palmdale

Next, the consultant team presented build-out capacity on all vacant land in the City as well as market demand and development capacity through the General Plan horizon of 2045. One of the GPAC members pointed out a totaling error on one of the tables, which was corrected (see attached revised table).

Natural and humanmade constraints to future development were presented. Natural constraints included flood areas, wildfire zones, seismic zones and fault lines, liquefaction risk areas as well as habitat areas (*note: the flood areas map has been updated since this meeting*). Humanmade constraints include Plant 42 and Airport safety zones, the California Aqueduct and SR-14 as well as the lack of utility infrastructure. Implications for development were also discussed. Based on GPAC input and analysis of areas of stability and change (at GPAC#4), as well as these constraints, a smaller Core Area was defined and the development capacity for the vacant lands within was presented.

The last part of the presentation included information about General Plan Land Use designations and Place Types with illustrative examples for each place type. The difference between land use designations and place types was also presented.

Following the presentation, the group had several questions and comments that are summarized below:

- Palmdale’s mismatch between housing and jobs based on the housing demand and jobs demand, is that typical?

- No skyscrapers across the 14-freeway are likely due to the Airport safety zones
- Man-made constraints should include the railroad
- Four Points should be shown as a future retail center or activity commercial center on the activity centers map
- Is the future growth/demand estimated by the market or necessity by regional agencies?
- Interest in modernizing Palmdale, but thinking about design and character
- Want a cohesive look and to be intentional about what goes where in the future
- Hospital owns land near the country club, but users didn't like the suggested location for a future hospital, so it never happened

Input from the Public

One member of the public provided feedback during the discussion, which is summarized below.

- Rose Medina: Kaiser has purchased a lot of land in Palmdale, they are always looking for input. Think it's a good idea to talk to landowners and help influence what goes where. Buildings in Palmdale look like these were design for the climate, with a focus on insulation from the heat and cold instead of design aesthetic.

3. Group Activity

After this discussion and the remainder of the presentation, the group paused. Noting the time and the agenda, the consultant team asked if any GPAC members would consider staying past 8:30 p.m. to complete the group mapping activity per the meeting's agenda. The majority of GPAC members wanted to leave as close to 8:30 p.m. as possible. GPAC members wanted to dedicate adequate time to give the process and activity justice, thus the group activity did not take place. The consensus was to have an additional meeting to allow time for the land use alternatives group mapping exercise.

One GPAC member offered a Saturday as a possible part-two meeting. Majority of GPAC members did not want to have a Saturday meeting. The consultant team and City staff said they would follow up via email with a weeknight date for the part-two meeting to complete the land use alternatives mapping exercise. GPAC members also requested to have a focused part-two meeting with materials sent in advance (*note: Materials for this meeting were sent to GPAC members via email two days in advance*).

After this conclusion, GPAC members requested additional materials and maps as reference for the group mapping activity. These are summarized below.

- Maps on boards or hung on walls, not comfortable to work on tables
- Take maps home to visualize before next meeting
- More information on urban growth boundary
- Map of any proposed transportation changes
- Map of entitled projects (if available)
- Map of current zoning
- Map of broadband infrastructure (if available)
- Information on train "quiet zones"
- Information on specific plans and horse property designations'

City staff and the consultant team will provide the requested information as available and relevant for the alternatives exercise.

4. Group Activity Report Out/Discussion

The group activity did not take place due to time constraints, so there was no report out or discussion.

5. Public Comment

Thirteen members of the public signed in, but not all stayed for the entire meeting. Three members of the public shared comments at the end of the meeting, which are summarized below.

- Don Gershal: President of Antelope Valley Audubon Society. Inquiry into any plans for solar fields within Palmdale with the desire to preserve and protect birds.
- Judy Timicow: Longtime resident of Palmdale. Unhappy with sale of “safe and sane” fireworks within the city as they are fire prone and very dangerous. Also happy with city’s response to calls of graffiti which have been cleaned up quickly.
- Brent Shoff: Pastor of Palmdale Church. Palmdale Church is given goods to distribute to those in need within the community. Wants to work with the City and those within the community to provide help.

6. Wrap Up and Adjourn

The consultant team and city staff confirmed they will email the GPAC to set up an additional meeting to conduct the group activity that did not take place at this meeting. The team will also confirm the date for the following meeting.

City staff presented an opportunity for five GPAC members to attend the Planning Commissioners Academy on March 4-6th in Sacramento. Staff confirmed they will also follow up via email with details about the opportunity.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 pm.


Attachment: Public sign in sheet

General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting #5 Sign In

January 15, 2020 | City of Palmdale

Please include your email address if you'd like to be kept up to date on the General Plan

Name	Email Address
city Carlene Saxton	COP
Tracey La Monica	[REDACTED]
Ez Montano	[REDACTED]
Hon. Geschl	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Jennifer Navarro	[REDACTED]
Joyce Bruce	[REDACTED]
Vicky Ventura	[REDACTED]
Judy Timko	[REDACTED]
GPAC Aurora Hernandez	[REDACTED]
Km Fhy	[REDACTED]
Glenn Winkelstein	[REDACTED]
Brent Shoff	[REDACTED]
Gary Royce	[REDACTED]
Gerald Dummett	[REDACTED]




Existing Land Use

- City Boundary
- Sphere of Influence
- California Aqueduct
- Major Highway/Arterial


Railroad

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Retail/Commercial | Extraction Uses | Office | Single Family Detached | Cemeteries |
| Commercial Recreation | Hospitals | Mixed Use | Parks and Recreation | Transportation |
| Accommodation | Public Education | Mobile Home | Flood Drainage/Golf Course | Utilities/Communications |
| Industrial | Private Institutions | Multifamily | Natural/Conservation | Vacant |
| Wholesale/Warehousing | Civic Facilities | Single Family Attached | Agriculture | Water |












Data Sources: City of Palmdale GIS data; World Terrain Base, 2015 ESRI, USGS, NOAA.

Produced by Raimi + Associates
March 2019




Vacant Parcels (Citywide)

-  City Boundary
-  Sphere of Influence
-  California Aqueduct
-  Major Highway/Arterial
-  Railroad
-  Water Body
-  Park
-  Vacant




Data Sources: City of Palmdale GIS data; World Terrain Base, 2015 ESRI, USGS, NOAA.






Produced by Raimi + Associates
March 2019






























Vacant Core Land



General Plan


-  City Boundary
-  Sphere of Influence
-  California Aqueduct
-  Major Highway/Arterial
-  Railroad

 Equestrian Residential (ER)	 Medium Residential (MR)	 Neighborhood Commercial (NC)	 Business Park (BP)	 Open Space (OS)
 Single Family Residential 1 (SFR-1)	 Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)	 Community Commercial (CC)	 Office Commercial (OC)	 Park/Public Facility (PF)
 Single Family Residential 2 (SFR-2)	 Multifamily Residential (MFR)	 Regional Commercial (RC)	 Mineral Resource Extraction (MRE)	 Public Facility-School (PF-S)
 Single Family Residential 3 (SFR-3)	 High Density Residential (HDR)	 Downtown Commercial (DC)	 Industrial (IND)	 Public Facility-Treatment Plant (PF-TP)
 Low Density Residential (LDR)	 Special Development (SD)	 Specific Plan Area	 Commercial Manufacturing (CM)	 California Aqueduct
			 Airport and Related Uses (AR)	



Data Sources: City of Palmdale GIS data; World Terrain Base, 2015 ESRI, USGS, NOAA.


Produced by Raimi + Associates
March 2019



Zoning


- City Boundary
- Sphere of Influence
- California Aqueduct
- Major Highway/Arterial
- Railroad

R-1-1	R-1-7,000	C-1	C-5	M-1	Pre Zone
R-1-20,000	R-1-2.5	C-2	C-D MX	M-2	
R-1-15,000	R-2	C-2 MX	OR	M-3	
R-1-13,000	R-3	C-3	PF	M-4	
R-1-12,000	R-4 (30)	C-3 MX	Specific Plan	QR	
R-1-10,000	R-4 (50)	C-4	CA Aqueduct	A-1	




Data Sources: City of Palmdale GIS data; World Terrain Base, 2015 ESRI, USGS, NOAA.

Produced by Raimi + Associates
March 2019




Specific Plans

- City Boundary
- Sphere of Influence
- California Aqueduct
- Major Highway/Arterial
- Railroad
- Water Body
- Antelope Valley Auto Center
- Antelope Valley Business Park
- City Ranch
- Foothill Ranch
- Hillside Residential
- Joshua Hills
- Lockheed
- Palmdale Business Park Center
- Palmdale Trade and Commerce
- Palmdale Transit Village
- Rancho Vista
- Ritter Ranch



Data Sources: City of Palmdale GIS data; World Terrain Base, 2015 ESRI, USGS, NOAA.

Produced by Raimi + Associates
March 2019



Natural Constraints

City of Palmdale

Railroads

Slope Hazards

Flood Hazard Zones

Liquefaction Hazards

Fault Hazards

Sphere of Influence

Water Body

10 - 25%

Undetermined Risk Areas

Seismic Hazard Liquefaction Zones

Fault

Major Highway/Arterial

>25%

Moderate to Low Risk Areas (500 year flood zone)

Fire Hazards

Fault Zone

Roads


High Risk Areas (100 year flood zone)

Very High Fire Severity Zone

0 0.75 1.5 2.25 3 Miles

0 3,000 6,000 Feet





Natural Communities

- Major highway/Arterial
- City Limits
- City Boundary
- Sphere of Influence
- Railroad
- Arterials
- Water Body

Natural Community Name


- Alkali Desert Scrub (3,369.47 ac)
- Annual Grassland (9,690.83 ac)
- Barren (536.27 ac)
- Bitterbrush (50.52 ac)
- Chamise-Redshank Chaparral (44.77 ac)

- Coastal Oak Woodland (2.67 ac)
- Coastal Scrub (3.78 ac)
- Deciduous Orchard (10.01 ac)
- Desert Riparian (75.29 ac)
- Desert Scrub (7,154.18 ac)
- Desert Wash (442.46 ac)

- Dryland Grain Crops (3.34 ac)
- Fresh Emergent Wetland (18.01 ac)
- Irrigated Hayfield (32.91 ac)
- Irrigated Row and Field Crops (1,497.95 ac)
- Joshua Tree (4,351.44 ac)
- Juniper (3,410.07 ac)


- Lacustrine (323.20 ac)
- Mixed Chaparral (8,042.36 ac)
- Montane Chaparral (173.66 ac)
- Montane Hardwood (1,061.98 ac)
- Montane Riparian (43.93 ac)
- Pasture (76.95 ac)

- Sagebrush (5,891.40 ac)
- Saline Emergent Wetland (40.03 ac)
- Urban (21,644.37 ac)
- Valley Foothill Riparian (29.02 ac)



Data Sources: City of Palmdale GIS data; World Terrain Base, 2015 ESRI, USGS, NOAA.


Produced by Raimi + Associates
March 2019



Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community

Human-Made Constraints

- | | | | |
|------------------------|------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| City Boundary | Railroad | Air Installations Compatible Use Zones | Air Force Plant 42 |
| Sphere of Influence | Water Body | Clear Zone | City of Palmdale Sewer Mainline |
| California Aqueduct | Park | Accident Potential Zone (APZ) I | City of Palmdale Storm Drain Mainline |
| Major Highway/Arterial | | Accident Potential Zone (APZ) II | Limited or No Utilities |



Data Sources: City of Palmdale GIS data; World Terrain Base, 2015 ESRI, USGS, NOAA.

Produced by Raimi + Associates
March 2019