

UNOFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY  
AUGUST 13, 2001**

The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Costa Mesa, California, met in a regular meeting on August 13, 2001, in the Police Department auditorium, 99 Fair Drive, Costa Mesa. The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Acting Chairperson Dixon, who led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

**ROLL**

Agency Members present:	Vice Chairperson Dixon Agency Member Robinson Agency Member Steel
Agency Members absent:	Chairperson Monahan Agency Member Cowan
Officials present:	City Manager Roeder Agency Attorney Wood Planning & Redevelopment Mgr. Robinson

In the absence of Chairperson Monahan, Vice Chairperson Dixon acted as Chairperson.

**POSTING** The Redevelopment Agency agenda was posted at the Council Chambers and Police Department on Wednesday, August 8, 2001.

**MINUTES** On a motion by Agency Member Robinson, seconded by Vice Chairperson Dixon, and carried 3-0 (Chairperson Monahan and Agency Member Cowan absent), the Minutes of July 9, 2001, were approved as written.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**Redevelopment  
Project Area  
Feasibility Study  
Workshop and  
Training**

Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson presented the recent history of the Agency's interest in redevelopment. He introduced Mr. John Huffman and Mr. Richard Tillberg of Urban Futures, the consultant firm the Redevelopment Agency contracted with to provide a study for redeveloping a number of areas in the City.

Mr. Huffman reviewed Costa Mesa redevelopment history with the help of Mr. Robinson. They went through the Redevelopment projects the Costa Mesa Redevelopment Agency has done.

Mr. Robinson explained a similar workshop was presented to the 3R Committee and there would be another one Thursday, August 16<sup>th</sup> from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. for the public at the Neighborhood Community Center. He then turned the meeting over to the consultants.

Mr. Huffman and Mr. Tillberg did a Powerpoint presentation concerning how redevelopment works in California and specifically in Costa Mesa. They clearly defined redevelopment tools and powers. The law governing adoption of a redevelopment plan was explained along with the conditions that need to be present to institute a redevelopment plan. The various approaches to redevelopment were discussed in the presentation also. The presentation highlighted the required use of funds, when and for how long tax increments are used as a funding tool, and how money is dispersed. The replacement rule was defined.

Existing Agency Goals and Objectives were also discussed. Implementation, non-housing goals and objectives covering land use incompatibilities, circulation, and structural obsolescence were discussed.

It was also explained that public/private partnership was an important goal.

Since the workshop was also intended to achieve an understanding of concerns in Costa Mesa, the consultants listed the issues they identified, and they enumerated them as quality of life, land use compatibility, highest and best use of land resources, traffic and circulation, and parking. He noted everyone wanted to see property values high.

The consultants also offered that a new redevelopment plan could be formed or an existing redevelopment plan could be amended as a means of controlling fiscal and time limitations. He further described what conditions must be present in the existing redevelopment plan to amend it.

They explained that it was the Redevelopment Agency's duty to preserve existing housing, affordability and provide adequate housing sites to ensure accessibility and to prevent discrimination. They enumerated a number of existing housing programs.

The consultants talked briefly about the feasibility process and noted there were 16 suggested new project areas designated in the City and they were identified on a map. He said it was more desirable to create new redevelopment areas than amending existing project areas, although he went through advantages to amending existing areas. He showed photos that represented blight in three of the planning areas they reviewed, and pointed out what constituted blight.

In response to Redevelopment Agency Member Robinson, the consultant explained the condition of structures and building material; garage conversions; obsolescence because of proximity to blighted property; land use incompatibility such as residential directly adjacent to industrial uses; lack of sidewalks and curbs; the presence of hazardous material and waste; and lack of parking all contribute to defining an area as blighted.

They again reviewed a number of reasons that may make it advantageous to add to the existing redevelopment area. An amendment to existing area may be helpful to modify existing fiscal and time limitations caps so they could have more time for redevelopment implementation or to amend tax increments limits that may be constraining the existing plan.

He also showed slides illustrating very good things in the existing redevelopment area, which are important if the Agency decides they wish to amend the existing redevelopment area.

Agency Member Robinson pointed out that a number of areas on the eastside of Costa Mesa were without sidewalks because of choice.

There was a brief comparison of the City's General Plan and a Redevelopment Plan, with it noted that the General Plan is a regulatory, long range and policy document, while a Redevelopment Plan is a financing tool that implements the General Plan over the term of the redevelopment plan.

An ensuing discussion period included Agency Member Robinson suggesting the feasibility presentation to the public be less technical than the presentation this evening and the 3R Committee presentation. She noted that she felt the photos were most compelling since they accentuated the blight.

Responding to a question asked by Agency Member Robinson concerning the 20% low-income housing increment, the consultant explained the difference between that and the inclusionary and replacement rule, which

he said deals only with units and bedrooms, not funding. The 20% rule deals with the demand that 20% of redevelopment money must be spent on a variety of housing programs that don't always necessarily pertain to the replacement rule.

Acting Chairperson Dixon asked that, at subsequent community meetings, redevelopment explanations be in layman terms because she wanted to be sure people understood redevelopment was not general bulldozing that would strand people. She also was in favor of presenting many pictures to illustrate the major points of the feasibility study.

Responding to Agency Member Steel's inquiry concerning what the redevelopment areas would look like after redevelopment, Mr. Huffman explained it was difficult to have a redevelopment plan do exactly what is envisioned by today's Council, because it is a thirty-year process that would be broken down into 5-year implementation plans. Each new Council may envision the goals differently. The policy direction as to what will occur is really a function of the implementation plan rather than the redevelopment plan, which is very general.

Acting Chairperson Dixon opened the public hearing.

Mr. Paul Bunney, felt the Westside had a lot of problems, one of which is a very old industrial area with no sidewalks. He expressed a problem understanding zoning in relation to redevelopment. Responding to his question, the consultant explained that zoning is dictated by the General Plan, which is controlled by the City Council - a separate entity from the Redevelopment Agency. Owners have property rights and there are grandfather clauses and other reasons that many uses would be retained even if zoning is changed. The redevelopment plan does not change zoning, but if zoning is changed, the redevelopment agency can assist in effecting the change through funding.

Acting Chairperson Dixon further elaborated that zoning was a separate function, completely removed for any action taken now by the Redevelopment Agency. Agency Member Robinson explained, as an example, that redevelopment areas identified as industrial must be redeveloped as industrial unless there is a zone change.

Mr. Huffman explained the General Plan is the entity dealing with policies and goals and a redevelopment plan provides the financial means to fund those goals and policies.

Responding to a question from Acting Chairperson Dixon, Mr. Huffman explained the best way to commence the redevelopment process is to declare a redevelopment area as quickly as possible. That action would give authority to collect funds to make redevelopment possible. Then with funding in place, City Council and the Planning Commission can determine the policies and goals they wish to pursue. The long-term issues, such as zoning, can then begin to be dealt with.

Mr. Bunney rephrased the explanation as zoning is the tool the City uses to define their vision of the City, if they are looking for change. Redevelopment is a different tool that will fund changes. The consultant agreed and added Ms. Dixon's comment that the agency is also constrained by the zoning ordinance.

Tom Egan, 1893 Parkview Circle, expressed his thoughts that the redevelopment area should be large, with the Agency able to redevelop those certain sections in the area that are considered blighted. He asked if that was correct. He believes that not all areas within a redevelopment

area are necessarily blighted. He wanted project areas within a redevelopment project area.

Mr. Huffman explained the difference between a redevelopment project area and a redevelopment project. He stated a redevelopment project has a finite period and when it is completed, they are through with it. He explained either a parcel is in a project area or it is not. One exception is housing, which can be built anywhere in the City as part of the 20% rule.

Mr. Egan gave an example of a large unblighted project within a possible redevelopment project area and asked if such a project could be excluded from the project area. Mr. Huffman stated the Agency may draw boundaries as they desire, but he said it was inefficient to exclude areas because every parcel is not blighted.

Acting Chair Dixon asked the consultants to inform the Agency Members what should be beneficial to include in the redevelopment project area. Mr. Huffman and Mr. Tillberg agreed that was their function and it is what they will do.

Allan Roeder, City Manager, offered a point of information regarding the coming community meeting on August 30<sup>th</sup>. He said notification issues were prevalent during the Westside Specific Plan discussions and he wanted to be sure groups were notified, along with a broad inclusion of people in the City.

Mr. Robinson explained they would use as many sources for distribution as possible. They were planning a press release, and flyers and since various committee members had already inquired, they would be using several committees as distribution sources. He said they had an extensive mailing list of about 400 names, including committees, groups, Homeowners Associations, and Chamber of Commerce members.

Agency Member Robinson inquired as to the roll of the 3R Committee in the process, stating that they had been very active in the past and would like to be involved, whether it be as the 3R Committee or as members of other committees. She also highlighted they had experience with the Downtown Redevelopment Area.

In the discussion, Acting Chairperson Dixon thought either a Project Area Committee would be formed or advisory committees could be created. She thought they had voted to create advisory committees within the community areas to facilitate input, after the feasibility study was completed.

Agency Member Steel shared his thoughts that the presentations should be kept simple because he believed most people want to know how redevelopment will affect them personally. He noted also that staff had presented the Agency with three options: 1) project area committee; 2) new advisory committees; and/or 3) the 3R Committee, and he felt the appropriate decision was still not final. He also expressed his feeling that the 3R Committee was too heavily involved with the Westside Specific Plan

Because there was a question among the Agency Members as to whether the 3R Committee was involved with the Westside Specific Plan, they asked Bill Turpit, who was in the audience. He said 3R Committee was not involved in the Westside Specific Plan discussions.

Acting Chairperson Dixon asked that the community meeting on August 30<sup>th</sup> be bi-lingual so the entire community may participate.

**NEW BUSINESS** None

**Executive Director** None.

**Agency Attorney** None.

**WARRANT RESOLUTION CMRA-290** On a motion by Agency Member Steel and seconded by Agency Member Robinson, and carried 3-0, (Chairperson Monahan and Agency Member Cowan were absent), Warrant Resolution CMRA-290 was approved.

**ORAL COMMUNICATION** None.

**AGENCY MEMBER COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS**

**Agency Member Robinson** Encouraged everyone interested to watch for redevelopment study presentations and to participate in them. She noted that everyone can get their questions answered at these presentations.

**Agency Member Steel** Agreed with Agency Member Robinson and urged people to watch the City Council meetings on television, read the papers and get involved.

**Acting Chairperson Dixon** None

**ADJOURN** There being no further items for discussion, Acting Chairperson Dixon adjourned at 7:55 p.m. to the City Council meeting of Monday, August 20, 2001.