



THOUSAND OAKS GENERAL PLAN 2045

JOINT GPAC MEETING + WORKSHOP #3 SUMMARY

April 21, 2021 | 6:00 pm – 8:30 pm | Virtual Zoom Meeting

Attendees

GPAC Members

Present: Andy Fox, Chaise Rasheed, Darren Bovard, Dustin Woomer, Fred Fukunaga, Jacqueline Emanuel, Jennifer Lobenhofer, Dr. Karen Gorback, Laura Behjan, Mic Farris, Nicholas Reale, Rorie Skei, Dr. Victor Hayek

Absent: Alicia Rincon, Amy Commans, Dr. Chris Kimball, Dena Jenson, Emily Dale, Ken Lamont, Michael Nigh, Patrick DuRoss, Paul Shrater, Tara Carruth, Wyatt McCrea

Public

This was a virtual meeting; hence no public sign-in is available.

Overview

On Wednesday, April 21, 2021, the City of Thousand Oaks hosted a joint General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) and public workshop to present the preferred land use map for the Thousand Oaks General Plan 2045 update project. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the workshop took place virtually as a Zoom Meeting from 6:00 to 8:30 pm. Approximately 75 attendees (including 13 GPAC members) joined the Zoom meeting, not counting the consultant team, elected officials, and city staff, with an additional 100 YouTube views. Members of the public could register in advance to join the live meeting along with GPAC members. Both GPAC and members of the public had access to video and audio throughout the presentation and discussion. This joint meeting was the third workshop in a series of four that will take place over the course of the General Plan update.

The joint event provided a brief overview of the land use alternatives survey results and supplemental analysis, an overview of key components of the preferred land use map, and breakout group discussions among GPAC and community members. The General Plan Team also announced the preferred land use map survey which was open between April 20 and May 12, 2021 and available in English and Spanish.

The following summary includes an overview of the presentation, community small group discussions, GPAC direction, and public comment.

Presentation and Discussion

The evening kicked off with a presentation by Matt Raimi, project consultant with Raimi + Associates, which was divided into several sections including background and process overview, land use alternatives survey results, overview of preferred land use map, and next steps.

Below are highlights of the presentation by section and group discussions.

PRESENTATION

Background + Process

Matt introduced the meeting objectives, how community members can provide feedback on the draft land use map, an overall update on the General Plan Update process.

The land use alternatives process overview included a recap of the flow of work, areas of change and stability map, high-level comparison of the three land use alternatives, and overview of the survey. In this section, Matt shared some of the community engagement activities conducted for the three land use alternatives, survey statistics, demographics of survey respondents, and results of detailed sensitivity analysis.

Land Use Alternatives Survey Results + Preferred Land Use Map

This section outlined the preferred land use process, proposed designations, and details of the land use alternatives survey results and how they relate to the new preferred map. The preferred land use map incorporated components of the three land use alternatives based primarily on survey results. The preferred map provides less total development capacity and maximum density compared to the previous three alternatives.

Matt highlighted the overall characteristics of the preferred land use map, then reviewed each of the five geographic areas relating survey feedback to the preferred map changes. Matt noted that the vast majority (83%) of the citywide preferred land use map is made up of single-family residential and parks, golf courses, or open space.

Preferred Land Use Alternative Next Steps

At the end of the presentation, Matt shared key dates and next steps in the preferred land use map process including the survey open through May 12, 2021, presentations to Planning Commission on April 26, 2021 and City Council on May 18th and 25th.

DISCUSSION

Breakout groups

After the presentation, members of the public and GPAC dispersed into small groups to discuss the preferred land use map. The GPAC remained in the main Zoom room, while members of the public were invited to join breakout groups with a facilitator. Members of the public could opt out of a breakout group and instead observe the GPAC discussion.

Joint GPAC Meeting + Workshop #3

Discussions took place for roughly one hour and were guided by two questions. For each area, both GPAC and members of the public were asked, “What did you like about the preferred land use alternative map?” and “What changes do you think should be made to the map?”

Once discussions concluded, the meeting reconvened for highlights shared by the small group facilitator. Below are summaries from public small groups’ report-outs.

Small Group Report Out (Public)

Group 1

- Discussion focused on big-picture citywide vision.
- Opinions split between those who wanted more housing, mixed-use, higher density, and taller building heights versus those who wanted lower density, lower building heights, and less mixed use.
- Majority support housing in village centers and share a desire for more public meeting space like plazas.
- Majority support flexible designations for large retail centers.
- Group had split opinions on the future of the Borchard site, some in favor of mixed-use, and others in favor of maintaining single-family residential designation.

Group 2

- Discussion focused on the Rancho Conejo subarea because many participants did not feel comfortable discussing subareas they were not familiar with.
- Felt the Borchard property has a lot of potential and should allow for higher density residential. Many participants asked questions regarding the proposed split designation and preferred a single mixed-use designation.
- Acknowledged the need for affordable housing and felt the village centers were a good way to provide additional housing.
- Majority were disappointed village centers don’t include any residential and are commercial in the proposed land use map.
- Many felt The Oaks Mall and Janss Marketplace could include higher density residential.

Group 3

- Majority agree with the approach of focusing change to subareas and maintaining majority of the city in current configuration.
- Discussion focused on Rancho Conejo and Thousand Oaks Boulevard.
- In the Rancho Conejo subarea, had the following recommendations:
 - Supportive of mixed-use north of the 101 freeway.
 - Not supportive of tall buildings south of 101 freeway.
 - Current vacant property in the northwest corner of the Rancho Conejo subarea (commonly referred to as the “goldfish” or “7th Day Adventist” property) should be residential, not industrial as proposed.
 - Consider access and circulation in the area.
- Felt overall the preferred land use map is in a good place, with a few caveats.
- Thousand Oaks Boulevard Specific Plan Area should treat all property owners the same, allowing for Mixed Use Medium across all parcels. Similarly, the Oaks Mall and Janss Marketplace should allow greater flexibility.
- Supportive of the Westlake and East End proposed land uses.

- Parking should be addressed within village centers if mixed-use is added.

GPAC Direction

After listening to public small group report-outs, members of the GPAC took turns sharing their final thoughts and overall review of the preferred land use map. Note that all members of the GPAC in attendance shared their opinion at this time (one GPAC member left the meeting early and therefore did not provide their opinions). Below is a summary of the direction received from the GPAC as well as individual comments from GPAC members.

Summary:

10 members of the GPAC supported the direction of the preferred land use map, but offered specific tweaks to the map:

- Introduce mixed-use at some of the village centers.
- Propose mixed-use across the Borchard property.
- Provide flexibility and focus mixed-use throughout the Thousand Oaks Boulevard corridor.
- Add increased residential density at the Oaks Mall and Janss Marketplace.
- Remove mixed-use designations from sites we know are not likely to change in the next 20-30 years.

These GPAC members shared support for specific elements of the preferred land use map:

- Mixed-use at the Oaks Mall and Janss Marketplace.
- Emphasis on walkability and livability.
- Maintained community character by preserving parks, open space, and single-family neighborhoods.
- Expansion of jobs and focus on local economy.

2 members of the GPAC felt cautious about the preferred land use map, noting the scope of changes and potential impacts to schools, views and a potential to transform the overall character of the community as concerns.

GPAC member comments:

- Overall, the preferred land use map is reasonable and does not change most of the land in the city.
- The City has done a great job of reaching out to community members through outreach.
- The Borchard property owner is a lifelong resident and does not want to negatively affect the neighbors with future development. The proposed development there would be mutually beneficial for neighbors, businesses, and the city as a whole.
- Cautious and hesitant to accept the preferred land use map as it stands now. There are impacts that will need to be addressed like school enrollment.
- Supportive of providing flexibility through higher densities at only The Oaks Mall and Janss Marketplace.
- Prefer to spread out density across the city.
- The preferred land use map is going in right direction, small tweaks are needed to increase flexibility.
- The Oaks Mall and Janss Marketplace both have too much parking, those areas could support future housing.
- The preferred land use map is going in the right direction.
- Consider allowing more uses (like hotels) and providing greater flexibility on height and density for retail centers.
- Agree with other GPAC members that some of the large retail centers in the Westlake and East End (i.e., The Promenade) are not going to change, so the mixed-use designation should be moved elsewhere.
- The preferred land use map is moving in the right direction.
- The General Plan is not about buildings; it is about people, enhanced livability, and making the City a better place to live, work, raise a family, and grow old. In the future we need to make those connections clear with the proposed changes to the General Plan.

Joint GPAC Meeting + Workshop #3

- Village Centers would be a great place to live in the future.
- Thankful to the Team for preparing this information and providing outreach to the community.
- Generally supportive of the preferred land use map. Some tweaks are needed to address the concerns and comments raised tonight including:
 - Some village centers should allow mixed-use.
 - Not comfortable increasing heights or densities beyond what is proposed.
 - Overall want to maximum flexibility.
- Overall, the map is a balanced approach that preserves what this community has built over the course of its history.
- The team has done a great job synthesizing input and preparing the preferred land use map. Thank you for the effort and progress.
- By-in-large the preferred land use map is going in the correct direction, but a few tweaks are needed including adding mixed use to the Village Centers and allowing increased flexibility for The Oaks Mall and Janss Marketplace. Additional housing units should go in these locations.
- Cautious of the scope and size of proposed changes, seems out of historic character for Thousand Oaks. The proposed map includes some great resources for us to consider.
- There are changes we need to make, State requirements, and inevitable economic changes are coming.
- Recommend or support changes at The Oaks Mall and Janss Marketplace since shopping malls are changing. The City should think proactively and not reactively. Support a global biotech hub in Thousand Oaks and want to continue to support Rancho Conejo north of the 101 freeway.
- “Residents” historically have wanted buildings to be low profile to maintain mountain views.
- Overall, the Plan is going in the right direction.
- Supportive of the mall areas and Village Center proposals.
- Vision for the future is to have walkable, bikeable, destinations that are accessible by transit. Desire to not have a landscape dominated by cars in the future.
- At a high level, the proposed map is good, but does need a few tweaks.
- We should remove mixed-use designations from sites we do not anticipate changing in the next 20 to 30 years. Those units should be reallocated to underutilized sites instead.
- The plan does preserve long-standing principles like maintaining single-family neighborhoods, protecting open space, parks, and viewsheds. As well as focusing on job centers and the economy.
- The plan should provide as much flexibility as possible along the 101 Corridor and throughout Thousand Oaks Boulevard.
- Mixed-use should be applied to the Oaks Mall, Janss Marketplace, along Thousand Oaks Boulevard in certain places, and the Borchard property.
- Consider a different designation for parcels that are 20 or 30 acres in size and greater. This could give flexibility to property owners while lowering the overall housing numbers that people are concerned with.
- Focus on opportunity sites identified by City Council.
- Great job to the General Plan Team.
- Generally, support preferred land use map with a few tweaks.
- Need for flexibility specifically the two large shopping centers.
- Would like to see mixed-use Village Centers.
- Overall, the plan is well done.
- Echo several comments from other GPAC members.
- Feel that walkable Village Centers are important, especially for youth.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Following the small group discussions, report-outs, and GPAC direction, members of the public were invited to provide brief public comments. Nine members of the public participated. A summary of these comments is provided below.

- Thank you for a great meeting, I will provide additional comments via email.

Joint GPAC Meeting + Workshop #3

- I am in support of future mixed-use development at the Borchard property with a buffer from the existing neighborhood.
- As the property owner, the goal for the Borchard site is to create a place that serves the Newbury Park community. There is a lack of gathering spaces in this neighborhood. We have a plan that includes open space, a buffer, and amenities, and want to work with existing residents to make this successful.
- As a homeowner on Michael Drive, I support future development at the Borchard property. People are looking for areas to go and things to do, we would like to have something nearby that we can walk to.
- The Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce appreciates the discussion on the preferred land use map. Would like to see flexibility for more property owners in the form of more medium and high density in the appropriate areas. Also support the GPAC's comment regarding concentrating new land uses on feasible sites that are likely to change in the next 20-30 years.
- Casa Conejo neighbors are largely opposed to major development on the Borchard property due to flood control issues and waterfowl. We are in favor of something softer on this site. There are other shopping centers nearby that are more appropriate for entertainment uses.
- As a residential and businessowner in Thousand Oaks, I am supportive of future development at the Borchard property. I would like to integrate a future tap room into the area as an extension of my business. I feel that the property owner wants to work with residents and make something that enhances the Newbury Park neighborhood and supports existing businesses like Amgen.
- I am supportive of future development at the Borchard property and am encouraged by the design the property owner showed that includes a large greenbelt buffering single family homes. I think the concerns about flooding and habitat would be addressed through the planning process by turning that area into a greenbelt, instead of the split zoning that is proposed now. The property should have one mixed-use designation going forward. The Janss Marketplace and The Oaks Malls should be considered for mixed-use medium which would provide those property owners maximum flexibility for the future.
- Of the previous three land use alternatives, the Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce supported Map 1 because it offered mixed-use medium and mixed-use high. The survey results showed highest support for Map 1, and that was the basis for the new map (preferred land use map), but it removed the things we liked about map 1. We encourage the committee and City to add those things back into the preferred land use map. We want to promote affordable housing, but the only way to get affordable units is to allow higher densities.

NEXT STEPS

The meeting concluded with an overview of next steps, including how members of the public could provide feedback through the briefing book, online survey, and virtual office hours.

The meeting adjourned at 8:42 pm.

Attachments: Facilitator notes from GPAC and public small group discussions.

FACILITATOR WORKSHEET

Joint Workshop #3 and GPAC #15

Preferred Land Use Alternative | April 21, 2021

GPAC DISCUSSION QUESTIONS AND NOTES

Responses by the General Plan Team are italicized.

GPAC Member 1. How will the impacts of new residential units on schools be addressed? If too many new units are developed, the district may have to redraw boundaries and that could influence neighborhood schools.

- *While this is a valid concern, we do not know the makeup of residential units will be, so we cannot yet anticipate the impact to local schools.*

GPAC Member 2. Regarding village centers, if we are not changing land uses, how do we ensure that kind of walkable aesthetic and environment is created?

- *We can use policies to influence the format of a commercial shopping center to look and feel more like a main street. If we move forward with commercial only village centers, the General Plan could be amended later to allow residential or mixed-use in these areas.*

GPAC Member 3. I think we need to reiterate that future development will incorporate sustainable principles and nature through parks, open space, and landscaping. This community is very sensitive to the environment, we cannot lose sight of that when talking about the future.

GPAC Member 4. I think it would be a missed opportunity to not include mixed-use or residential units in village centers. They could provide housing opportunities for young families, young workers, and seniors, and help spread out the residential units so we do not overwhelm one area of town. It could create a designation that is walkable from existing neighborhoods, like a European High Street Model.

GPAC Member 5. In talking with the property owner, I think the proposed development at the Borchard site would be a good project that would take into consideration the concerns of adjacent neighbors.

GPAC Member 6. Why were certain areas identified as mixed-use medium and others were identified as mixed-use low?

- *Certain areas have already been envisioned for higher density, like the Civic Arts Plaza and Downtown Core areas, while west*

Thousand Oaks Boulevard near Tarantula Hill has new development that could provide synergy. The Rancho Conejo area was selected due to the proximity to adjacent uses, so it could be viewed as another node.

- GPAC Member 7.** I think village centers need to include housing in the form of mixed-use because retail is changing, and we need room to evolve. The area around Borchard should include something other than single family homes, we need additional flexibility.
- GPAC Member 8.** Concerned with the scope of changes proposed in the plan. Do the changes have to be as big as they are presented? Can we meet RHNA without such sweeping changes? Can we take steps forward in a phased approach? Density alone will not solve housing affordability; we need policies to ensure future housing is affordable.
- *Agree with your assessment that strong housing policies are needed to ensure future development is affordable. In previous conversations, members of the public brought up the need for an (updated) Inclusionary Housing Ordinance.*
- GPAC Member 9.** I think we need to revisit the allowed uses across Mixed-Use Low, Medium, and High. Restaurants, retail, and hotels should be allowed across all three designations. Regarding The Oaks Mall and Janss Marketplace, I feel that Mixed-Use Low is insufficient to accommodate the future evolution of these shopping centers. Both centers should be up to Mixed-use Medium, and perhaps consider a residential unit cap to prohibit the site from turning to all residential and going beyond the Measure E capacity.
- GPAC Member 10.** I would suggest maintaining the Thousand Oaks Boulevard Specific Plan as much as possible. Incorporate the opportunity sites identified by City Council, including the YMCA property for housing or mixed-use. Remove the mixed-use designation on sites we know are not likely to change in the next 20-30 years, including the Promenade site. Provide more flexibility at the Oaks Mall and Janss Marketplace. Regarding the Borchard site, the residents prefer a buffer and the only way to achieve that is through a higher density designation like Mixed-Use Medium or Mixed-Use Low.
- GPAC Member 11.** I support village centers and wonder if we can include mixed-use anywhere within the industrial core of the Rancho Conejo area (north of the 101 Freeway).
- GPAC Member 12.** We should consider policies to maintain retail (like grocery stores) within mixed-use village centers. We want to balance new residential with amenities that support existing neighborhoods.
- GPAC Member 13.** Young adults would like to see walkable village centers and revitalization of the Janss Marketplace.

FACILITATOR WORKSHEET

Joint Workshop #3 and GPAC #15
 Preferred Land Use Alternative | April 21, 2021

PUBLIC GROUP #1 DISCUSSION QUESTIONS AND NOTES

1. What is your reaction to the overall citywide preferred land use alternative map?

Notes

- Need more housing
 - Disappointed with the lack of high-density housing
 - Village centers – no mixed-use, more human scale, more walkability
 - Reuse existing vacant retail
 - Transit hubs
 - Distribute housing, etc.
 - Taller buildings should be located at the Oaks Mall and Janss Marketplace
 - Plazas and meeting spaces are needed
- Need affordable housing for young families, like starter homes, etc.
- Do not concentrated multifamily housing
 - Village centers should have housing
 - Low density housing is preferred
 - Move housing out by CLU and Moorpark Rd instead of Newbury Park
- What about environmental considerations? Concern over infrastructure for water and transportation
- Consider ADU's for additional housing units
- Concern over concentration of housing on TOB – traffic congestion, emergency evacuation
- Concern with building height increase but desire for affordability

2. What is your reaction to the preferred land use alternative for the Rancho Conejo area?

Likes

- Downtown/village center for Newbury Park – activities for young families/children

Changes

- Park or water feature at Alice/Borchard property
- More housing by industrial north of 101
- Village center needed in Dos Vientos



- Less need for office and retail after COVID.

3. What is your reaction to the preferred land use alternative for the Moorpark Rd and West Thousand Oaks Blvd area?

Likes

- Flexibility at Oaks Mall area

4. What is your reaction to the preferred land use alternative for the Downtown and Thousand Oaks Blvd area?

(N/A)

5. What is your reaction to the preferred land use alternative for the Westlake and East End area?

Changes

- Lower building heights on Westlake Blvd (industrial flex)

6. What is your reaction to the preferred land use alternative for the Village Centers?

(N/A)



FACILITATOR WORKSHEET

Joint Workshop #3 and GPAC #15
Preferred Land Use Alternative | April 21, 2021

PUBLIC GROUP #2 QUESTIONS, NOTES + REPORT OUT:

1. What is your reaction to the overall citywide preferred land use alternative map?

Notes

- Why did Village Center make it to the Preferred Land Use Map? There seems to be comparable support as to the Oaks Mall in survey.
- Small amount of space to work with in T.O. for new housing. Would like to see map re-evaluated to maximize change also like to see Village Centers re-evaluated.
- Has City considered a Specific Plan overlay for Borchard site? Allows developer flexibility to plan the overall site with consideration of constraints.

Report out

- Mixed comments regarding the Alice/ Borchard site.
- Comments regarding re-visiting the Village Centers.

2. What is your reaction to the preferred land use alternative for the Rancho Conejo area?

Changes

- Concern regarding amount of change in the Rancho Conejo area and that it is where the most change/ new development will occur.
- “Alice” parcel should be re-designated to mixed use in its entirety.
- Borchard/Alice site – concerns regarding parking if all mixed use.

3. What is your reaction to the preferred land use alternative for the Moorpark Rd and West Thousand Oaks Blvd area?

Likes

- 275 (?) East Moorpark- n/o Hillcrest – shows as Mixed Use Low -supports.

4. What is your reaction to the preferred land use alternative for the Downtown and Thousand Oaks Blvd area?



(N/A)

5. What is your reaction to the preferred land use alternative for the Westlake and East End area?

(N/A)

6. What is your reaction to the preferred land use alternative for the Village Centers?

Likes

- Add here Why did Village Center make it to the Preferred Land Use Map? There seems to be comparable support as to the Oaks Mall in survey.

FACILITATOR WORKSHEET

Joint Workshop #3 and GPAC #15
 Preferred Land Use Alternative | April 21, 2021

PUBLIC GROUP #3 QUESTIONS, NOTES + REPORT OUT:

1. What is your reaction to the overall citywide preferred land use alternative map?

Notes

- Paul is interested in the Rancho Conejo/Newbury Park area
- Mark is interested in TOB (mixed-use) and the SDA property as a residential site; all of TOB should allow for mixed-use

Report out

- Only focusing on the 10% of City that are “areas of change” was a good approach
- There was too much to absorb at once and during a pandemic (but this is a multi-year process and is still a work in progress)
- Initially worried about the survey due to the 3 alternatives but feel there is now a good compromise after seeing the results

2. What is your reaction to the preferred land use alternative for the Rancho Conejo area?

Likes

- Mixed-use North of the freeway near existing commercial areas and Amgen

Changes

- SDA site to a residential designation
- South of the freeway should not allow tall buildings (not necessarily mixed-use development)
- Better access for less traffic

3. What is your reaction to the preferred land use alternative for the Moorpark Rd and West Thousand Oaks Blvd area?

Changes

- All TOB should be at least mixed-use medium, not all the sites will be developed that way in the future; equal rights to develop for all TOB property owners

4. What is your reaction to the preferred land use alternative for the Downtown and Thousand Oaks Blvd area?

Likes

- The areas that do allow for mixed-use medium

Changes

- All TOB should be at least mixed-use medium, not all the sites will be developed that way in the future; equal rights to develop for all TOB property owners
- Better access to lower traffic

5. What is your reaction to the preferred land use alternative for the Westlake and East End area?

Likes

- Approved K-Mart pre-screen project is in a good location

Changes

- Add here

6. What is your reaction to the preferred land use alternative for the Village Centers?

Likes

- Village Centers are essential and key; people should be able to walk to the store nearby

Changes

- Having adequate parking if you're adding mixed-use