

RECEIVED

2014 DEC 17 PM 4 12

Agenda Item: ID#14-653 (5:00 P.M.)

Date: 12/11/14

CITY CLERK, FRESNO CA

FRESNO CITY COUNCIL



Supplemental Information Packet

Agenda Related Items – ID#14-653 (5:00 P.M.)

Contents of Supplement: Letter from Fresno Metro Ministry

Item(s)

HEARING to consider approvals related to the Proposed General Plan Update
(Citywide)

1. Consideration of General Plan Update and certification of the related Environmental Impact Report (EIR) SCH No. 2012111015 filed by Jennifer K. Clark, Development and Resource Management Director, on behalf of the City of Fresno, citywide application

Supplemental Information:

Any agenda related public documents received and distributed to a majority of the City Council after the Agenda Packet is printed are included in Supplemental Packets. Supplemental Packets are produced as needed. The Supplemental Packet is available for public inspection in the City Clerk's Office, 2600 Fresno Street, during normal business hours (main location pursuant to the Brown Act, G.C. 54957.5(2)). In addition, Supplemental Packets are available for public review at the City Council meeting in the City Council Chambers, 2600 Fresno Street. Supplemental Packets are also available on-line on the City Clerk's website.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA):

The meeting room is accessible to the physically disabled, and the services of a translator can be made available. Requests for additional accommodations for the disabled, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or translators should be made one week prior to the meeting. Please call City Clerk's Office at 621-7650. Please keep the doorways, aisles and wheelchair seating areas open and accessible. If you need assistance with seating because of a disability, please see Security.

RECEIVED



2014 DEC 17 PM 4 09

4270 N. BLACKSTONE AVE, SUITE 212, FRESNO, CA 93726 PH. 559.485.1416 FAX 559.485.9109
INFO@FRESNOMETMIN.ORG WWW.FRESNOMETMIN.ORG

12/17/14

CITY COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES,

As you know, Fresno Metro Ministry has supported healthier land use decision making for the last decade, and has advocated on behalf of neighborhoods left behind by sprawl since our inception in 1970. We are deeply committed to ensuring that Fresno plans in a way that we believe will SAVE Fresno: Stops annexing new land that doesn't pay its fair share, Accepts responsibility for existing neighborhoods, Values all residents and Elevates strategies that work to make Fresno healthier and more prosperous place.

We were concerned by aspects of Councilman Caprioglio's motion that was made at the end of the General Plan hearing on the 11th at the Convention Center. In addition to being unclear as to "what Jeff said" when the Jeff in question had over 10 minutes of comments during the public hearing, we are deeply concerned by a few of the policy requests that Jeff Roberts of Granville Homes included in his packet to council. We believe it wasn't fair to ask for changes with insufficient detail to the remaining members of the public, which left many feeling confused and shortchanged by the process. No one wants these impacts. We are responding in writing today to the seven item list of requests from Jeff Roberts of Granville Homes that we accessed via the city council website.

Re: points 1, 2 and 3, as well as other councilmen's requests for land use changes in their own districts: We defer to the city staff planners' expert opinions as to which of Granville Homes' land use modification requests will affect the EIR or Housing Element compliance and we hope that you will as well. We would hope that any changes would reflect existing entitlements and not a free short cut of the rezone process on property that has been bought but not entitled since August of 2012.

Re: point 4: We firmly support the Farmland Mitigation policy, and hope that the staff recommendation from the beginning of the meeting on Thursday the 11th will remain in place. Farmland is an essential resource in our valley, and we as a city must work to protect the farmland within our sphere from premature conversion. Furthermore, as land becomes converted, we should work to protect farmland outside our sphere to preserve these assets, which is what mitigation does.

Re: point 5: We believe firmly that new developments should be fairly assessed for all costs to the city that they incur. We support the language as written and strongly urge you to deny this request.

Re: point 6: We believe that the commentary on the UF-12 and UF-13 are important to remind future planners and city council representatives of the goals and vision of this plan. It is imperative that we plan a different way and make steady progress towards our goals on filling-in and investing in existing neighborhoods. We believe that the language is appropriate as commentary, and not give explicit permission to continue to develop on the edge at the expense of existing neighborhoods that it could be interpreted to mean, should it be included as policy. The thousands of Frenans who have been involved in this planning process so far have made it very clear that they want Fresno to shift how it invests, how it plans, and how it grows, in order to reinvest in the neighborhoods and commercial areas that have already been built. Balanced growth is important, and history tells us that this means we need to focus on the interior and manage the exterior to make that balance happen.

Re: point 7. It is very unclear what the seconded motion included in terms of "Any and possibly all of the issues that have been submitted to the City in writing or presented orally at scheduled public workshops or public hearings where the General Plan Update/ Development Code Draft Environmental Impact Report has been the scheduled topic of discussion."

We would hope that no further changes will be made to this plan, in order to protect the integrity of the plan and the process so far. We urge you to vote yes on this plan without policy modifications and with the fewest land use designation changes possible, in order to support balanced growth for Fresno's future. We believe that the plan in its current form does support existing neighborhoods and creates policies that will be substantial improvements in existing neighborhoods at all income levels. We stand ready to partner to implement to make Fresno a more vibrant, healthy and prosperous place for all its residents.

Sincerely,



KR Bergthold

Keith Bergthold
Executive Director

Attachments:

Text from Jeff Robert's December 8th email included in the Supplemental Information Packet ID#14-653

These items will be discussed by Granville Homes at the scheduled hearing of the Planning Commission on December 12th, 2014 @ 5:00 pm:

1. The proposed "Modifications" to the General Plan land Use map that were previously submitted by Granville Homes on several different occasions. Some of these Modification requests proposed a change in land use and others were submitted to maintain the existing land use and density previously approved for the property. Only those proposed modifications not supported by the staff in the report to the Planning Commission will be discussed in the public hearing, The discussion at the Commission Hearing will include the following:
 - a. Several modifications in the "Copper River Ranch" project area
 - b. Several modifications in the vicinity of N. Fowler and E. Clinton Avenues
 - c. Several Modifications of land within the "Mission Ranch" (formerly "Running Horse,,)
2. Request a modification to the Land Use map for 75.72 acres of land located at the southeast corner of W. Herndon Ave. and N. Riverside Dr. (APN 504-09t-I4,35, 37) be changed from "High Density', to „Urban Neighborhood".
3. The need for Zoning Districts that can "implement" the land use designations outlined in the General plan Document / Plan Map if they are approved by the City Council ahead of the creation/adoption of the proposed Development Code. This can be accomplished with a modified "Zoning Consistency Matrix" (Table 3-3 or Table 12-1) or a new Matrix that will identify applicable zoning categories available to implement the plan designations until a new "Development Code" is adopted by the Council at a later date. This Matrix needs to be adopted as a part of any Council action or selected properties in the City will not be able to develop as planned.
4. Elimination of Policy No. RC-9-b including the creation of a "Farmland Preservation policy"
5. Modification of Policy No. ED-S-b that requires new development annexing to the City to "fully fund ongoing public safety and public service cost".
6. Modification of Policy UF-12 and UF-13 (and associated "Commentary")to provide clarity regarding the intent for growth and development in all of the areas designated as "Residential" by the General plan Update(see attached wording changes)
7. Any and possibly all of the issues that have been submitted to the City in writing or presented orally at scheduled public workshops or public hearings where the General Plan Update/ Development Code Draft Environmental Impact Report has been the scheduled topic of discussion.