

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

City of Campbell, 70 N. First St., Campbell, California



STUDY SESSION MEETING OF THE CAMPBELL CITY COUNCIL

Tuesday, September 1, 2020 – 5:30 p.m.
City Hall – 70 N. First St., Campbell, California

NOTE: This City Council Study Session meeting was conducted pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20.

No action may be taken on a matter under Study Session other than direction to staff to further review or prepare a report. Any proposed action regarding items on a Study Session must be agendized for a future Regular or Special City Council meeting.

This meeting was recorded and can be viewed in its entirety at <https://www.youtube.com/user/CityofCampbell>.

CALL TO ORDER

The City Council of the City of Campbell convened in the special meeting place, this September 1, 2020, via telecommunication.

Attendee Name	Title	Status
Susan M. Landry	Mayor	Remote
Elizabeth 'Liz' Gibbons	Vice Mayor	Remote
Rich Waterman	Councilmember	Remote
Anne Bybee	Councilmember	Remote
Paul Resnikoff	Councilmember	Remote

Staff Present:

Brian Loventhal, City Manager; Andrea Sanders, Deputy City Clerk; Bill Seligmann, City Attorney; Paul Kermoyan, Community Development Director; Cecil Lawson, Information Technology Manager.

General Plan Advisory Committee Members Present:

Sheldon AhSing, Mike Bangs, Chris Bracher, Vickki Essert, Jim Moffett, Navneet Rao, Barry Shilman, Gerry Uenaka.

1. **City Council Study Session to Consider the Administrative Draft General Plan**

Recommended Action: Conduct the study session.

Mayor Landry asked each member of the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) to offer their respective area of representation as they address the following list of questions provided by Council in advance of this meeting: 1. Does the Plan reflect the input of the GPAC? 2. Is it complete and ready for Council's consideration? If not, what issues remain to be discussed and resolved prior to Council's consideration? 3. Is there any additional information about the Plan you would like to share with the Council?

Mike Bangs, Member of GPAC, resident of the San Tomas Area stated that the work of the GPAC represents perseverance at its finest over several years. The draft General Plan does represent the intent of the GPAC. The consultants have created a coherent document reflecting the thoughts and conclusions of the GPAC discussions. This draft General Plan is now ready for the City Council to consider and reflects a consensus. He added that there are issues that could use further discussion and admitted that the GPAC struggled with where to provide additional housing. The GPAC understands the need for added housing and a lot of thought went into it. Member Bangs advised that the GPAC wanted to make sure that Campbell maintains its small-town environment. He stated that the Plan is intended to maintain having regional leaders do their part to make Campbell and the greater Bay Area better.

Mayor Landry asked Mike Bangs if he had any additional comments.

Mike Bangs added that at times the slow pace of the process was concerning. It could have been done better if it had gone faster and that attrition to the membership of the GPAC occurred and resulted in limiting comprehensive feedback from those who left.

Mayor Landry asked the Councilmembers if they have any questions for Mike Bangs.

Councilmembers Waterman and Bybee did not.

Councilmember Resnikoff had no additional questions and stated that it was good to hear it documented that the draft General Plan document does represent the input of the GPAC members.

Vice Mayor Gibbons thanked Mike Bangs for his commitment and time spent over several years as a member of the GPAC. She stated she was curious about the amount of time it took and pointed out that lots of things have changed during the time this draft was crafted including regulations, demographics and more. Vice Mayor Gibbons questioned whether this draft is work that results from information from three or four years ago rather than current conditions.

Mike Bangs replied no and in fact, it includes consideration of what has changed since COVID. He also stated that during the period of their deliberations, there was just a lack of continuity of meetings over some periods of time.

Vice Mayor Gibbons asked if there was specific concentration on housing.

Mike Bangs replied that there was consideration of identifying opportunity sites for housing in the right locations, adding that it was important for GPAC to honor the surrounding neighborhoods and not adversely impact existing residents. He pointed out that new housing will need to be placed within a built-out community and also advised that there were different expertise amongst the members of the GPAC.

Mayor Landry asked Mike Bangs if he believes that this draft General Plan document is now ready for Council consideration or does GPAC need more meetings.

Mike Bangs replied no, he does not think additional GPAC meetings are required prior to handing off the draft to Council.

Mayor Landry called upon GPAC Member Chris Bracher.

Chris Bracher, GPAC member advised that he is both a commercial and residential property owner in Campbell. His family has properties in all five Campbell voting districts. He stated that the draft does represent the members of the GPAC wholeheartedly. He reported that the consultants helped the GPAC to hash through major issues and into a lot of future environmental and ecological issues as well. He declared that the draft represents all of the members' input and added that although the GPAC group is now smaller than it started with when originally organized, there has been input from the diverse group that was started out with. In regards to whether this document is now ready for Council consideration, he stated he hopes so. Member Bracher admitted that he is curious as to what Council will think of it and pointed out that it seems like some of their ideas have already been adopted. He spoke about the positive impacts to the City. He stated there has been good representation and hopes the Council is impressed and finds the draft to be all-encompassing. It includes new sections and criteria. He also agrees with Mike Bangs regarding the issues of housing and land use and that the next phase is just as critical and important as the preparation of this draft. After the General Plan is adopted, the City will need to look at its Ordinances and update them as needed and suggested consideration by Council for the creation of a follow-up GPAC to assist with that process. He also added that he hopes that task goes well and allows Planning and Building services to be more freed up from standards thereby offering more flexibility to do their jobs and thus allowing Council and staff to do their jobs better.

Mayor Landry asked the Councilmembers if they have any questions for Chris Bracher.

Councilmembers Waterman, Bybee and Resnikoff did not.

Vice Mayor Gibbons stated her agreement with the proposed next steps including land use and changes and asked Chris Bracher if he thought the Land Use Map initiated enough of a discussion on jobs, housing, commercial, office and mixed-use development. She also asked if the balance and mix were discussed in enough detail?

Chris Bracher replied yes there was ample discussion. He cautioned that these issues are moving targets today. What is best today may not be best in 20 years. He opined that the smartest things the GPAC did as a group was to recommend the adoption of area plans and added that Director Paul Kermoyan liked the idea and GPAC voted to recommend that action. He stated that steps like that are necessary as to keep doing/coming up with best uses that would cover as many periods of time as possible.

Councilmember Waterman pointed out that Chris Bracher has a great background and asked him how much discussion was held on the issues such as the expense of providing underground parking and whether there should be allowances for drive-thru restaurants. He suggested that allowing drive-thru restaurant service is currently and likely to be practical into the next five to ten years and was there any discussion on this?

Christ Bracher replied yes and added that GPAC had lofty future discussions including subjects such as parking of autonomous cars, solar walls and more. He also commented that GPAC wants Campbell to be a livable City; the need for Ordinance updates is high and assured that every conversation included a discussion of the practicalities of what we were considering. He advised that GPAC talked a lot about traffic, added that all members understand that traffic will increase and there must be practical concerns on how best to handle that increase, perhaps by installing better timing equipment at busy intersections. His recommendation is to stock the City's "toolbox" with as many tools as possible. There will be a little trial and error.

Mayor Landry asked Chris Bracher if there are any additional things that he wanted GPAC to cover in retrospect. If so, should it/they be added. Such as drive-thru restaurants and changing ways that housing units per acre could be counted stating that it seems that the number of units per acre would go higher if the units themselves are constructed smaller.

Chris Bracher stated that Campbell has got to find new places for housing while maintaining our small-town feel; added that the recommended zoning changes are not all for housing. Housing makes the most sense in areas near transit, Bracher stated. He assured the Council that all these topics were discussed and there is no easy answer.

Mayor Landry asked if there are other potential sites to be rezoned for housing. If so, where?

Mike Bangs replied no, it was more about making sure that new housing be put into the right places, adding that the subject of drive-thru for restaurants was suggested as a case-by-case basis.

Mayor Landry asked whether the idea of increasing units per acre by requiring smaller units was a consensus.

Mike Bangs said he does not specifically recall where they came down on that.

Chris Bracher said that the GPAC was okay increasing density but only in places where it makes sense and that the GPAC was very careful with the Land Use Map to consider just where it made sense to increase density.

Mike Bangs added that discussion got very nuanced.

Mayor Landry called upon GPAC Member Barry Shilman.

Barry Shilman, Member of GPAC said that he is a representative and long-time resident of the Downtown Area. He stated his concurrence with the previous comments by Mike Bangs and Chris Bracher. Also admitting that some of the discussions are hard to recall from way back. He stated that the draft represents the tone that the GPAC had agreed on. During the process of meeting, the GPAC moved along, nodded in agreement when an issue was good enough and/or as good as it was going to get, and then moved on to the next topic/issue. He agreed that it was a tediously slow pace made more difficult as the State was at the same time operating at warp speed making changes that impacted local jurisdictions and added that there is always a threat over our heads regarding our assigned new housing stock supply. The number keeps on getting larger. That is frustrating to him. He reported his frustration when a developer joined the last meeting held on Zoom. He was suddenly placed on the agenda and put forth ideas in a different direction than where GPAC had been going. He opined that the developer's presentation was more of a sales pitch than advising us on what is good for Campbell and admitted that he resented that last-minute sales pitch with no associated GPAC or public input. He stated he still feels the same way today.

Mayor Landry asked Barry Shilman to respond to the written questions including whether he thinks the draft adequately reflects the work of the GPAC; whether more GPAC meetings are needed; and whether the draft is now ready for Council consideration.

Barry Shilman advised that yes, he is happy to bring the Plan to Council; added that no additional GPAC meetings are required; reported that GPAC has done the best it could in these changing times and stated that it is now in the City Council's lap to accept, change or reject this draft General Plan.

Mayor Landry asked Barry Shilman if he supports the concept of a follow-up GPAC group to convene when the Ordinance updates begin. Is he interested in participating?

Barry Shilman replied he was not sure he if he was interested in serving at this time. He said the Council might want to consider appointing a whole new group of members for that next stage.

Mayor Landry asked the Councilmembers if they have any questions for Barry Shilman.

Councilmember Resnikoff asked Barry Shilman if he had done all he could do today. Is he concerned?

Barry Shilman replied that they did what they could with existing information knowing that changes might come. This draft General Plan is based on what we know and not what we fear.

Vice Mayor Gibbons agreed that dealing with the Land Use Map is more of a challenge because of the times we are currently in and reminded all that the next Housing Element Update is due in 2022 and goes into effect in 2023. She advised that catching up on the provision of housing could become much worse and stated the need to consider how best to use existing land. Vice Mayor Gibbons asked Barry Shilman if there was any discussion on how new housing could be created using available land and added that there were not too many Land Use Map changes.

Barry Shilman stated he has no recollection of there being much discussion regarding number of needed housing units and where those units should be built and added that they did specifically discuss placing more dense housing along transit corridors.

Vice Mayor Gibbons reminded all that when the GP format changed to actions, those actions became requirements for the City and listed the steps as policies, actions and goals.

Barry Shilman replied that the GPAC was deferring to the consultant and Director Kermoyan about those. They had set ideas on wording and formatting.

Chris Bracher reported that there was some discussion on the new format. He agreed that the GPAC largely relied on the consultant and staff on format. He said that he/they saw actions as directing day-to-day activities and impacting existing Ordinances. He assured there is nothing in the draft that does not fall in line with their intentions and the discussion as to format was not too in-depth.

Mayor Landry called upon GPAC Member Gerry Uenaka.

Gerry Uenaka, Member of GPAC introduced himself as a property owner and Campbell resident living in the Downtown Residential Neighborhood, of which he is also a representative and added that he is also a life-long Santa Clara Valley resident. He assured that the draft plan does reflect the input of the GPAC membership over these many years. He advised that the GPAC members did their homework long and hard and gave a lot of input throughout the process. He stated that as to whether the draft is now ready for Council, he believes so. It is ready for them to review and dissect and that he expects the draft to be molded by Council. That is a part of the process. Mr. Uenaka advised that this draft is the best we could create over an extremely long period of time. There were starts and stalls to the process. Some members were lost due to that and we are left with about a quarter of the original GPAC still standing at the end. He stated that he is pleased with the outcome. There was a lot of discussion on housing units and size. Those topics were discussed long and hard. Also stating that the GPAC found R-1 (Single Family Residential) Zoning to be the nature of Campbell and that is to be protected. It is part of the small-town feel. He supported more density along the transit corridors stating that it is important that when high density is developed, consideration

must be taken with how it fits in terms of traffic. These transit corridors are where Campbell's housing growth ought to be placed. There were a lot of discussions over the last five meetings. Including Bascom, Hamilton and Highway 17. Mr. Uenaka agreed with Barry Shilman's concern over having a developer at the last meeting. It did come across as a sales pitch and the speaker brought forth ideas which had not been discussed including the costs of underground parking, the value of parcels and more. He admitted that would have been interesting information earlier in the process rather than at the very end and at the last minute. Perhaps even a year sooner stating that the GPAC process was valuable and he hopes the Council finds their draft to be a viable product.

Mayor Landry asked the Councilmembers if they have any questions for Gerry Uenaka.

Councilmember Waterman said that was an interesting comment. He suggested that three-dimensional developer input is helpful including what may or may not be practical in terms of underground parking. He stated that there seems to be a fear of having high-density housing forced upon us versus consideration of existing land not yet developed. He said that it is nice to get financial analysis, and he speaks as an accountant himself. He also clarified that the issue is between what we would like to see versus what is practical.

Gerry Uenaka stated that the GPAC did come to consensus about high density and the numbers were relevant. He reminded the group that high density is centered around the transit corridors. He felt that is where they ought to be placed and concluded that those are the parcels, we (GPAC) discussed.

Councilmember Waterman asked if there was any discussion with developers about high density housing.

Gerry Uenaka replied no and said that the discussion with the developer was between retail and residential; street parking versus going underground. He reiterated that those topics were first discussed at our last meeting and admitted he would have liked more of that but earlier in the process.

Mayor Landry asked if there were questions from the Councilmembers.

Councilmembers Bybee, Resnikoff and Vice Mayor Gibbons had none.

Mayor Landry asked Gerry Uenaka if he feels additional GPAC meetings are needed.

Gerry Uenaka replied no and reiterated that all of us are very pleased with the draft that we forwarded. He said that it is possible there could have been better discussions but the GPAC would likely have come up with a similar document. While the last discussion with the developer was valuable, it was too late into the process to be helpful. He said he would defer to Council to take this draft to the next level.

Mayor Landry introduced GPAC Member Jim Moffett.

Jim Moffett said he represents the Downtown Neighborhood Association and currently is in a lease-option to buy situation for his residence located on Alice Avenue, which is part of the Downtown. He stated that yes, this draft reflects the work of the GPAC. They have worked hard over several years including a large lapse in time when the format changed. He reported that this GPAC group was great to work with. He assured that the draft presented by GPAC is ready for Council and is as good as it's going to get. He stated his agreement with Gerry Uenaka and Barry Shilman regarding the sales pitch provided by a developer at the last GPAC meeting held and wished they could have heard that information earlier when discussing the Bascom Corridor.

Mayor Landry asked the Councilmembers if they have any questions for Jim Moffett.

Councilmembers Waterman, Bybee, Resnikoff and Vice Mayor Gibbons had none.

Mayor Landry asked Jim Moffett if he thinks there is still need for additional discussion of housing and parking by the GPAC.

Jim Moffett replied no and stated that the City Council should now take it forward. He admitted that the last meeting was very confusing due to that last-minute addition of a developer speaking. He also agreed with the suggestion that another Committee be formed to deal with Ordinance Updates that will become necessary with the adoption of a new General Plan.

Mayor Landry introduced GPAC Member, Sheldon AhSing.

Sheldon AhSing said that he is a property owner residing in the Pruneyard/Dry Creek Area. He pointed out that this GPAC started out with a lot more members and added that break-out discussions by neighborhoods were held with more participants. He stated that the draft General Plan is ready for Council at this time. He reminded the group that a lot of time has been spent by the GPAC and reaching this draft. It is at a good point where it is packaged nicely and reiterated that the consultants and staff guided us but did not lead the group to its decisions. He also recounted that he has enjoyed the process.

Mayor Landry asked Sheldon AhSing if he thinks additional housing and parking information is required. Is another GPAC needed?

Sheldon AhSing replied that another GPAC meeting is not required. The document presented is spot on.

Mayor Landry asked the Councilmembers if they have any questions for Sheldon AhSing.

Councilmembers Waterman, Bybee, Resnikoff and Vice Mayor Gibbons had none.

Mayor Landry called upon GPAC Member Navneet Rao.

Navneet Rao, Member of GPAC stated his residence is within the San Tomas West Neighborhood, between Campbell and Hamilton Avenue, west of San Tomas. He is a single-family home property owner and that his home in Campbell is the smallest home within the smallest community amongst his extended family. He said his relatives from other larger communities, when they hear of Campbell's maximum-density as being 27 units per gross acre, they ask him, "What country or city are you living in?"

Mr. Rao reported that the GPAC encompassed honorable intentions, ceding to small town charm and preserving it. He stated that he is really happy with the output the GPAC has produced and assured that this draft General Plan does reflect the work of the GPAC. He advised that the consultant, Ben Ritchie, and staff, Director Paul Kermoyan, did a really good job in keeping the GPAC engaged. He acceded to the Silicon Valley projected growth He also stated that they achieved a lot of things and this draft is now ready for Council. He pointed out that over the five years of work on this GPAC, there have been four mayors in office. He said that there have been enough deliberations on each and every topic and added that lots of homework preparation was done by GPAC members to come forth to meetings prepared to discuss issues together. Mr. Rao reiterated the draft General Plan is ready for Council. Topics/info he would like to share include the suggestion of greatly increasing EVC (Electric Vehicle Charging) stations throughout Campbell. He pointed out that almost every city is known for something. That it is harder to determine with a land-locked city like Campbell and suggested that perhaps Campbell could become the Electric Vehicle Charging (EVC) Station City of Silicon Valley and thought it was feasible. He also pointed out that although Campbell calls itself "The Orchard City," there remain no orchards within Campbell as seen when he bikes with his son throughout Campbell and wished we could change or restart that Orchard City designation. He stated that he would have loved to have had the evening's meeting in person but understand the existing circumstances that prevented it.

Mayor Landry offered to present some certificates to commemorate the GPAC.

Mayor Landry asked the Councilmembers if they have any questions for Navneet Rao.

Councilmembers Waterman, Bybee and Resnikoff had none.

Vice Mayor Gibbons stated that she has great news on the issue of EVC stations and asked Navneet Rao to give her a call to discuss this later.

Mayor Landry gave an overview of Navneet Rao's comments. She said that the suggestion for more EVC stations is a good point and reminded that Charge Point is located in Campbell on Dell Avenue. Mayor Landry added that she likes the observation raised by Navneet Rao that there are no namesake remaining orchards in Campbell. She stated that the draft GP is enhancing policies and asked Navneet Rao if he thinks that more GPAC meetings are needed especially on topics such as transit and e-vehicles.

Navneet Ra replied that no additional meetings were needed and added that there have been enough GPAC meetings held. He admitted that he would be interested in participating with any working group convened to work on needed policies and ordinances following adoption of a new General Plan.

Mayor Landry introduced GPAC Member, Vikki Essert:

Vikki Essert, GPAC Member said that she currently resides in the Pruneyard/Dry Creek Neighborhood and has since 1999. Just prior to that she lived in a condo in the Downtown. She stated that the draft General Plan does represent the input given by the members of the GPAC. Some important goals included the preservation of our historic buildings; maintenance of our Orchard City identity; and preservation of our small-town feel. She advised that the draft is now ready for Council and added that Council needs to take a close look at housing and densities. Ms. Essert suggested that there are different ways of calculating units per gross acre. The old way is to determine density using FAR, setbacks, etc. She pointed out that small housing units are less expensive for buyers to purchase. She reminded that there is a lack of affordable housing in Campbell. Right now, new homebuyers in Campbell tend to be dual-income tech workers. Professionals such as teachers and others can not afford to buy in Campbell today and stated that the need for housing is the most urgent issue for Council to act upon. She referenced the Fry's/Shell/Kohl's/Elephant Bar Area and suggested that before other properties are developed in that area, it would be important to have infrastructure ready. One such need is pedestrian access to the Light Rail from this area. It is currently not practical to walk that direction toward transit and stressed that need is extremely urgent.

She responded to the Mayor that no additional GPAC meetings are required and offered to serve on the Ordinance Update Committee when it is formed.

Mayor Landry asked the Councilmembers if they have any questions for Vikki Essert.

Councilmembers Waterman, Bybee, and Vice Mayor Gibbons had none.

Mayor Landry provided an overview of Vikki Essert's comments stating using "units per acre" is encouraging the construction of larger and expensive luxury units and use of FAR and setbacks equates to a higher number of units albeit smaller, which are affordable to more buyers.

Vikki Essert replied yes, that is her personal belief.

Mayor Landry said it seems that all GPAC members believe the draft document reflects the GPAC; the draft is considered ready by GPAC to be handed off to the Council; and no further GPAC meetings are necessary. She asked if there were any further comments from GPAC?

Chris Bracher clarified that the contents of the draft reflect the intent of the GPAC. He stated that lots of things were discussed with details not incorporated, adding that the consultant (Ben Ritchie) cautioned not to get too detailed. Mr. Bracher agreed that there

are issues to consider about the size of new homes and the provision of new ideas to solve some of our housing issues. He said that the term of “small home” was not listed but also not declined. He suggested there be as much flexibility as possible to meet practicalities.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mayor Landry asked staff if there are members of the public waiting to speak.

Developer Dennis Randall thanked the Mayor and Council for the opportunity to speak. He admitted that he was the developer that gave the “sales pitch” to the GPAC in July and explained that his appearance before the GPAC was based upon their recently denied General Plan Amendment request by Council. At that time, Council suggested that he contact GPAC. He reported that he has read Campbell’s draft General Plan and thinks it’s a good document. He has no issue with it whatsoever. The objectives are laudable to include open public spaces, commercial space and use of below-grade parking. He stated that the area around The Pruneyard is both a density and pedestrian-oriented area for Campbell and opined that building much needed high-density housing developments is not economically feasible if Campbell’s highest allowed density is not increased from the existing 27 upward to about 45 units per acre. He closed with commending everyone’s effort in this update effort.

John Pringle, Business Partner to Dennis Randall commended the GPAC for their five years of work, adding that he previously served on two different cities’ GPACs. He admitted he is surprised that the housing density was not increased as part of this update. He expressed support for the comments provided by GPAC Member Vikki Essert about housing needs versus what is being built and encouraged the Council to further investigate the true cost of developing housing units. He assured that the City would be able to adopt higher density standard(s) without destroying the City.

Raja Pallela, Campbell resident thanked the GPAC for their work, he was surprised that the lost GPAC members were not replaced with new appointees. He claimed he had tried to attend a GPAC meeting and was denied and had asked Director Kermoyan why the meetings were not open to the public. He pointed out that the GPAC document indicates that their meetings were open to the public. He reported he had attended one GPAC meeting and found that the members were all of the “Baby Boomers” mindset and that they were using current standards while planning for the new General Plan. He pointed out that the City’s San Tomas Area Neighborhood Plan (STANP) impacts one-third of the City of Campbell and that there is only one Area Plan for such a large portion of the community. He said that Dell Avenue is intended for Research & Development and Industrial uses and that the areas around Hwy 17/San Tomas/Hwy 85 are great locations for mixed-use developments.

Mayor Landry reiterated that all members of the GPAC have indicated that they feel this draft is ready now for the Council, adding that none of them feel the need to have additional GPAC meetings at this juncture. She said that the next projected need will be to establish a new appointed Committee to work on the Ordinances that will need to be

updated following the adoption of a new General Plan. It could include some members from this GPAC as well as other new people. Mayor Landry said it seems the highlighted issue is housing. That issue is a moving target with constant new State imposed regulations and reminded that this new draft GP does not have an updated Housing Element. The next new Housing Element is due to be done in 2022 and become effective by 2023. She listed other considerations to be units per acre and updates to the Green Building Code and agreed as indicated by Navneet Rao that there no longer are orchards in Campbell. She stated that there is an urgent need for a Specific Area Plan for the Hamilton/ Salmar/Almarida area. She agreed that looking into allowable units per gross acres is something worthy of further investigation. She said it seems clear that most of the information provided by the developers at the last GPAC meeting would have been better received earlier than at the end of the project. She reiterated that one speaker, Raja Pallela, has claimed failings of process, as he pointed out, on Page 70 of the STANP, it indicates applying to one-third of the City.

Mayor Landry called for final Councilmember comments and direction to staff.

Councilmember Waterman said he would like to see staff present this draft General Plan to some of the larger developers to see if the plan is or is not practical in their estimation. He pointed out that there are seven or eight very large properties that will be redeveloped and change greatly from what is there now. He stressed the importance of getting developer views. He stated that he finds that not allowing drive-thru restaurants does not seem like a good stance and asked why that provision is included.

Mayor Landry said that prohibition of drive-thru restaurants is not included in the draft right now.

Councilmember Bybee said that she appreciates hearing from all members of the GPAC tonight. It had been good to listen and hear their comments and experience serving on the GPAC. She added that she is glad that GPAC says that their draft is now ready for Council and thanked them for their time and effort on this General Plan Update. She said those present from GPAC tonight are the last group standing. However, she also thanks all of the other original GPAC appointees for their service. Councilmember Bybee agreed that it is important to develop Area Plans and that it is often hard to make decisions without having the guidance that an Area Plan provides. She suggested that creation of needed Area Plans be done as soon as is possible and before too much development occurs without such an Area Plan. She concluded that as the draft is now ready to take on by Council, it should be so forwarded and cautioned that Council will need to structure the process.

Councilmember Resnikoff thanked all appointees to the GPAC and most especially the eight members left at the end here tonight. He said that Council did its best with the demographic makeup of the City. He added that the draft GP reflects the GPAC members and they agree that it is ready for Council to take on. He stated that several members have made it clear that while staff guided the GPAC, staff did not direct their decisions. Councilmember Resnikoff said he looks forward to parsing this draft publicly, also stating that developing Area Plan(s) versus one project at a time equates to a

better option to help determine what is best for Campbell. As an example, he discussed how the former Vallco Shopping Center in Cupertino was so badly mishandled. He supported moving this draft forward with guidelines. He thanked all involved and said the draft was well done.

Vice Mayor Gibbons thanked all involved as well. She said that during tonight's joint study session with Council and the GPAC, as well as over five years' worth of exceptional commitment to the City by the GPAC members, the City has been well served. She also expressed agreement with Councilmembers Bybee and Resnikoff. She stated that the next step is to forward the draft to the City Council. She opined that spot-zoning is not the best option for a City and agreed that it is a priority to identify those locations (areas) needing specific Area Plans. Vice Mayor Gibbons admitted that she is a pessimist about the risk of losing local control of housing for our small-town and added that density and height limits may be imposed by the State. She said she looks forward to Council's discussion on how best to move forward and suggested that perhaps it might be best to split the General Plan up. She also referenced the need for a Climate Action Plan and added that she is cautious that the General Plan document does not become a work plan for the City. She concluded that there is need for a lot of tweaking that is important to understand.

Mayor Landry summarized the final Councilmember comments. Councilmember Waterman suggested a roundtable with developers be held prior to coming back to the Council. Mayor Landry suggested that staff look into the suggestion for such a roundtable. She added that it seems there is much support for development of Specific Area Plans. She noted that if local jurisdictions continue to lose local control, those issues would have to be integrated with the next Housing Element and Climate Action Plan. She suggested that staff come back to Council with a plan on how to get this draft General Plan forward for final approval.

Mayor Landry commended the eight members of the GPAC present that evening. She applauded the members of the GPAC saying it was a good way to close out their hard work.

ADJOURN

Mayor Landry adjourned the Study Session meeting at 7:15 p.m.

APPROVED:

ATTEST:

Susan M. Landry, Mayor

Andrea Sanders, Deputy City Clerk