



**CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH**  
**Inter Office Communication**  
Planning Department

**TO:** Planning Commission  
**FROM:** Scott Hess, AICP, Director of Planning   
**DATE:** June 5, 2009  
**SUBJECT: BEACH EDINGER CORRIDOR SPECIFIC PLAN STUDY SESSION – ATTACHMENT NO. 4 TO STUDY SESSION REPORT**

---

At the June 9<sup>th</sup> Study Session, staff will begin the review of public comments on the draft Specific Plan as received during the comment period held last Fall. Attached please find a Draft Comment Matrix, with the majority of the comments received included and responded to for your review. Staff has not had the opportunity to include or respond to all of the comments but will complete this in the coming months. For the June 9<sup>th</sup> meeting, staff hopes to review the Book I comments.

SH:MBB:rm

c: Rosemary Medel, Associate Planner



# DRAFT OF THE BEACH AND EDINGER DRAFT S

## BOOK I

	Comment No.	Comment	Specific Plan Section/Reference
<b>General Topics</b>			
1	HBAD-1 HBCC-1 HBCC-12	The document does not create interdependence between the two corridors. Separate the two corridors to create two plans to allow the proposed and potential development along Edinger Ave to proceed pending greater discussion of Beach Blvd. It might make sense to continue the Edinger Corridor across Beach and perhaps a block south to Warner; the remainder of Beach is different.	
2	HBAD-2	If two areas were created the City could revisit the use of Redevelopment as a potentially major management tool. It appears that there are already islands of Project Areas through out the community and the continuation of that approach deserves some serious consideration	
3	HBT-5	Reviewers and decision makers need independent reports describing the pros and cons, successes and failures of jurisdictions using form based code. Depending on untested concepts and words to guide city development without a qualification process is unfathomable. Independent and objective reports assessing the use of form based code should be obtained and evaluated from jurisdictions that have implemented form based code	
4	BSC-1	As the property owner of the Home Expo Center, we are excited about the future of the area with the updated Specific Plan. We believe the plan will allow for the enhancement of many properties throughout the City.	
5	WC - 4	Some areas in this exhibit have no “term” designation (short, medium, long). Please describe how these undesignated parcels relate to revitalization.	Page 3, Figure 1.2
6	WC-3	Specific Plan Area: How many acres in Specific Plan area? How many acres and ownership parcels on Edinger Ave and Environs areas?	Page viii
<b>Beach Boulevard</b>			
7	HBCC-2 HBCC-18	Pedestrian oriented design approach may be justified for the Edinger Corridor with Bella Terra, The Transit Center and Goldenwest College, as major components. The Beach Blvd Corridor should remain focused on a better auto and public transit improvements, with design and development standards that focus on future public improvements. The same or similar themes for the two corridors do not recognize how the corridors need to function	
8	HBCC-4 HBAD-5 HBCC-10	Although a number of specific focused concerns were identified for Beach Boulevard a greater clarification of the objectives along with implementation incentives need to be addressed for preservation and enhancement of the Auto Dealerships, Huntington Hospital, The Pacifica Community Plan and the Oakview Neighborhood. While the concept to allow mixed use/residential in some pockets on Beach might work, we hope that considerable more time would be spent to insure the continuation of major businesses currently in place.	Page 3, Sect. 1.3 Revitalization Strategy

# BOOK I

	Comment No.	Comment	Specific Plan Section/Reference
9	HBAD-4	Let's move forward. Because we believe in the progressive attitudes in place today in our community to improve Beach Blvd., we would like to help do it in a way that protects your interest as well as ours.	
10	TOC-1	As property owner of a parcel along Beach Blvd that is ½ acre in size we find the proposed plan over-reaching. The proposed development criteria seem to enhance value for large property owners but significantly restrict development and diminish value for existing smaller parcels. There does not seem to be any mechanism for rehabilitation of existing uses that are in the proposed plan suddenly deemed undesirable despite being needed by the public and having been in place for years. The public needs competition among gas stations and the lower prices that result from such competition. We believed the plan is significantly flawed in this regard.	
11	WC 1 WC 15	<p><b>Edinger Avenue</b></p> <p>Concerned that Freeway Industrial Park properties will be the default location for many of the amenities, facilities, and improvements currently being considered. Murdy Commons is shown to be the primary axis of major pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular corridors and appears to be the major location for public open space. These general issues could affect the cohesiveness of this development. If 1.4 or 2.1 are taken literally, our parcel could be split into four or more disconnected development parcels rather than once cohesive development.</p> <p>The Murdy Commons concept calls for a generous ¾ acre +/- common open space, with podium courtyards. Concern with accommodating a ½ acre public park on our development and the ownership of Specific Public Open Space. The concept of this public open space needs to be clarified. Please provide a detailed definition and description of what the City envisions for this area. The term "public" needs to be precisely defined, or use the term common open space</p>	Pages 4 and 30
12	WC-2 WC-6 WC-9 WC-10 HF-1 HBCC-7	<p>Revise the concept drawing to reflect the recently approved Bella Terra and Ripcurl. Add narrative that describes how these projects will be compatible with the Specific Plan concepts noting that the approved Bella Terra does not show a strong connectivity to Murdy Commons. Concerned that a cohesive concept for Murdy Commons could be impacted. We generally agree with the connectivity concept, but are concerned about the impact to the Murdy Commons project.</p> <p>The Plan does not adequately address the relationship of various concepts proposed in the Specific Plan to areas outside the planning area or explore the potential of the north-south railroad right-of-way being developed as a major north/south corridor. It should be a form of internal City transit, which could include combinations of neighborhood electric vehicles (NEV's), bikes, pedestrians and autos.</p>	Page 4, Figure 1.4 Page 8 Page 9, Illustrative

Staff Recommendation/Comments	PC Recommendation	Notes
<p>No change recommended. This section reads New development closest to Bella Terra will likely feature at least one new anchor store. On Page 28, Building Use Regulations provide a list of uses that are sufficiently varied to respond to market trends and demand.</p>		
<p>The term leveraging as used in this instance means to focus potential public investment and expedited review in this area due to the greater likelihood of redevelopment in this area as a spin-off of the Bella Terra success.</p>		

Staff Recommendation/Comments	PC Recommendation	Notes
<p>is being done through study sessions with the Planning Commission and will be continued in staff reports for the proposed Specific Plan.</p>		
<p>Change Recommended. Site Plan review process by the Director is allowed unless a conditional use permit is required. The Specific Plan is very detailed to ensure high quality development. This is a similar process that is allowed in Boeing and Bella Terra. The Plan review process is appealable.</p>		
<p>as defined in the Specific Plan. No change recommended. The 15% proposed in Specific Plan is more permissive than existing code, but is set at level that will still ensure change over time. Subsection iii indicates that the only regulations of the Plan that apply to exterior renovations without a permit for area are the architectural regulations.</p>		<p>The current Zoning Code allows alterations to existing nonconforming structures up to 10%.</p>
<p>change recommended. The 20 percent deviation will allow the Planning Director to consider Special Circumstances when there is deviation from a standard. Therefore, no change is recommended. The Specific Plan is much more detailed than the Zoning and Ordinance to maximize compatibility and quality of design.</p>		
<p>change recommended because at this time the goal is to provide a wide variety of housing opportunities within the Specific Plan area.</p>		<p>The newly adopted City Housing Element indicates that inclusionary requirements would be met on-site or w/in the Specific Plan boundary.</p> <p>The Holly Seacliff SP requires that its required affordable housing units be provided within the SP area.</p>
<p>change recommended. The Specific Plan already allows for a Density Bonus consistent with State law and Section 230.14 of the Zoning Code</p>		
<p>The Specific Plan allows for continued use and change of tenants without triggering Plan performance. However, staff recommends a modification to allow for a nonconforming structure to move into an existing building for up to one year as a new tenant.</p>		

Staff Recommendation/Comments	PC Recommendation	Notes
<p>necessarily. As indicated in the table            ow the diagram, the only parking allowed            in the front setback area for an anchor            e with more than 30,000 sq. ft. is that in a            cture, wrapped on the ground level.            face parking is not allowed for these uses            he front setback. It would be permitted in            side setback area.</p>		
<p>rocessing flow chart will be developed,            ever, without timeframes as these vary            ending on project complexity.</p>		
<p>change recommended. The City has            umerous Specific Plans that effectively limit            amount of development (Holly Seacliff,            wntown, Seabridge, etc.). When the            AND limit is reached (10-20 years)            itional environmental analysis would be            uired.</p>		<p>The draft development limits (6,400            units, etc.) were developed after an            economic and land analysis of            development potential along the            corridors. It was not derived based            on environmental impacts. The EIR            will evaluate the proposed MAND to            see what the resulting impacts could            be.</p>

Staff Recommendation/Comments	PC Recommendation	Notes
change recommended. The specific plan allows flexibility to respond to market demand.		
Staff recommends allowing residential at the ground level along Ash and Cypress. Propose to modify Specific Plan to add (L8) to Section 1.6 a & b and to legend.		
Staff recommends modifying the Specific to allow restaurant uses on Warner Avenue. Add "(L8) Warner Ave." to Location Legend and "L8" to 2.2.2.a)		
change recommended. The Specific Plan allows all of these uses on Beach Blvd. and Main St. in this District. In addition, convenience uses are allowed anywhere in a corner store configuration.		
change recommended. An important component of the Specific Plan is to develop and strengthen the residential base and neighborhood atmosphere. In addition, the residential portion of the development will contribute towards the City's Housing Stock and therefore no change recommended.		
The work units do not have separate entrances. Access is from the interior of a mail space.		
The Specific Plan allows convenience uses in a Corner Store (CS) configuration for Gothard. Staff recommends a modification to allow Eating & Drinking establishments under awnings/seats anywhere along Gothard.		The Specific Plan is designed to locate/focus retail along Edinger in this part of the Specific Plan area.

Staff Recommendation/Comments	PC Recommendation	Notes
<p>Book III will be completed to more fully address the existing conditions and opportunities for recreational open space in conjunction with the EIR process. The SP does contain public and private open space requirements for new development that occurs in the area within the Development Standards Charts, pp. 28-43.</p>		
<p>No change recommended. The Specific Plan already allows for this type of open space.</p>		
<p>No change recommended because of the flexibility provided in the Specific Plan to meet open space requirements. Also this requirement only applies to a project over 20,000 sq ft</p>		
<p>No change is recommended. Section 2.6.3 addresses the various opportunities for provide open space.</p>		
<p>No change recommended. Section 2.6 provides the various design options. The Specific Plan document criteria provides for the flexibility referred to in the comment. The Specific Plan also distinguishes between Private Open Space and Public Open Space. Master planned sites typically have a combination and allowed for shared use of public/common open space..</p>		
<p>No change recommended. Open Space requirements are based on population growth, so the exact amount of open space that will be required is unknown. However, the EIR will address the overall need. In terms of the particular location shown, that was chosen because of expected population in the area and to provide a public gathering space. It is not necessarily the case that this could fully satisfy all park need for Specific Plan development.</p>		
<p>The open space provisions are minimums and are varied. In addition, these two corridors would become more urban over time, without conventional subdivision developments. Nonetheless, the EIR will address overall recreational needs, and as projects are proposed, open space facilities to serve specific project needs will be developed.</p>		

Staff Recommendation/Comments	PC Recommendation	Notes
No change recommended. Requests for Deviation from the Specific Plan are allowed for (pg. 24) providing a relief mechanism for design constraints.		
The Specific Plan allows rooftop gardens to count as private open space. It is also possible that a project could propose a demonstration garden as part of the public open space. The Plan could be modified to specify these as an allowable use on page 74.		
The Specific Plan states that Mixed Use projects will be evaluated on a case by case basis and are eligible to be considered for reductions. See page 82, Section 2.7.1.1).		
The Specific Plan states that Mixed Use projects will be evaluated on a case by case basis and are eligible to be considered for reductions. See page 82, Section 2.7.1.1).		
No change recommended. The Specific Plan states that net new on-street parking spaces provided along new streets or service lanes may be counted toward the minimum parking requirement for commercial development on that property. As the frontage area parking will be new, it could be counted toward the parking requirement.		
No change recommended. The intent is to move buildings closer to the street. It should be noted that side parking lots are permitted in this area.		
No change recommended. The provisions of the Specific Plan address standards and design options to accommodate various development scenarios. In addition, the Specific Plan limits block size, which results in new streets. The opportunity for corner buildings, with an access on each street, is therefore more likely.		

Staff Recommendation/Comments	PC Recommendation	Notes
<p>The Town Center Blvd. Requires parking within 200 feet for live/work only; for other uses the requirement is 500 feet. The Specific Plan does not alter existing uses unless they are added onto or replaced per Section 2.0.1.</p>		
<p>The Specific Plan states that Mixed Use projects will be evaluated on a case by case basis and are eligible to be considered for reductions. See page 82, Section 2.7.1.1).</p> <p>Maximum applies to the maximum amount of surface parking that can be on-site.</p>		
<p>The Specific Plan states that Mixed Use projects will be evaluated on a case by case basis and are eligible to be considered for reductions. See page 82, Section 2.7.1.1).</p>		
<p>The Specific Plan states that Mixed Use projects will be evaluated on a case by case basis and are eligible to be considered for reductions. See page 82, Section 2.7.1.1).</p>		
<p>Staff recommends modifying Specific Plan to allow up to 10 stories within 1,000 ft. of the 405 freeway.</p>		
<p>No change recommended. This proposal would not meet the current California Building Code.</p>		
<p>No change recommended. The Specific Plan currently proposes 5 stories on this property.</p>		

Staff Recommendation/Comments	PC Recommendation	Notes
Page 30 Town Center Neighborhood allows for six stories therefore there is no conflict.		
Staff agrees. This will be corrected on page 34 to show that it is applicable.		
Yes, deviation of up to 20% could allow up to 360 ft.		
Format of table is same for each section. There is frontage on Main, which is included in the Section.		
No change recommended. Staff does not believe that the proposed Specific Plan area is suitable for the level of development intensity suggested in the comment.		

Staff Recommendation/Comments	PC Recommendation	Notes
<p>No change recommended. The Decron property is designated for Neighborhood Center, which allows for a minimum 5 ft./maximum 10 ft. setback.</p>		<p>Decron requests that their site be changed to Town Center Boulevard, which requires a minimum 12 ft. staff. See comment no. 2</p>
<p>No change recommended. The development standards apply to new construction or additions of more than 15% per page 23, Book II</p>		
<p>No change recommended. The answer to the question is generally Yes. The Specific Plan defines frontage requirements.</p>		

Staff Recommendation/Comments	PC Recommendation	Notes
<p>Individual intersections will be improved as needed as informed by the environmental analysis. However, the City may choose to development specific intersection designs as development progresses.</p>		
<p>The only agency coordination required is from Caltrans. The Plan will be revised to remove reference to the Coastal Commission and City of Westminster.</p>		
<p>In general, improvements occur at time of development and are dictated, in part, on the environmental analysis for a particular project.</p>		
<p>Staff agrees that a development plan will be required; however no change to the Specific Plan is recommended..</p>		
<p>No change recommended. The detailed traffic study is being prepared as part of the EIR. By allowing Mixed Use, the Specific Plan can improve traffic flow/conditions.</p>		
<p>Staff would evaluate the project specific impacts and make a determination at such time. It is largely dependent on the amount of change that is proposed in the context of the overall site. It is also dependent on the types of trips generated by the new uses and the resulting environmental analysis.</p>		
<p>This is correct</p>		
<p>No change recommended. EIR will address if widening is required along Edinger in general. At intersections additional ROW may be required.</p>		
<p>No change recommended. The proposed setback is not that dissimilar than existing regulations that require a minimum 25' front setback on Edinger, especially because parking will be allowed in the frontage area. In addition, the Specific Plan allows for greater density, no FARs and reduced building setbacks than are currently permitted. The City Council will evaluate funding issues. It is likely that this area will be deeded to the City.</p>		

Staff Recommendation/Comments	PC Recommendation	Notes
<p>The Classic Boulevard treatment is required on both sides of Edinger within the Specific Plan area. It is also required in the Bella Terra Specific Plan along the Montgomery Ward site. Improvements will be designed for adequate transition.</p>		
<p>Final design is prepared at time of development.</p>		
<p>No Change Recommended. Potential impacts of population growth will be addressed in the EIR, for which the schools have been consulted. Development will occur over 10-20 year period, during which there may be changes in demographic trends, school operations, State law with respect to impact fee collection and operations.</p>		
<p>No Change Recommended. Potential impacts of population growth and the associated impacts to school, utilities and other services will be addressed in the EIR. Trash pickup will continue to be carried out in the same manner as it is done currently in Huntington Beach.</p>		
<p>The Murdy Commons project will be evaluated in an environmental impact report, taking into consideration cumulative development (The Red Oak/Amstar project (former The Ripcurl) and The Village at Bella Terra). Both of those projects have certified EIRs which identified potential impacts and mitigation measures to address those impacts. The proposed projects are not adjacent to existing single family homes but are adjacent to a college, a transit center, an existing regional mall and an office/hotel development.</p>		

Staff Recommendation/Comments	PC Recommendation	Notes
<p>The Transit Center is not included in the Specific Plan boundary. This topic would be better considered as part of the citywide Circulation Element.</p>		
<p>Staff recommends adding a reference to the need for bus turnouts in certain situations or where appropriate as development occurs.</p>		
<p>A goal of the Specific Plan is to take advantage of the existing transit center. Implementation of the PRT system is better considered as part of the citywide Circulation Element; however, staff does not think it is feasible at this time.</p>		
<p>A goal of the Specific Plan is to allow for greater densities, which may ultimately establish a demand for better transit options. The EIR will evaluate the proposed Plan's development maximums on the existing street network. Implementation of the PRT system is better considered as part of the citywide Circulation Element; however, staff does not think it is feasible at this time.</p>		
<p>Staff concurs that continuing to promote tourism is very important. The proposed Specific Plan is designed to strengthen destination shopping areas, such as Five Points, which may be a stopping point for tourists traveling on Beach Blvd, as well as improve the aesthetics of Beach Boulevard. Implementation of the PRT system is better considered as part of the citywide Circulation Element; however, staff does not think it is feasible at this time.</p>		