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Calabasas preparing for cityhood

5 elected to council say finding place to meet, hiring manager are priorities

By Mike Crenna

CALABASAS — After a land¬
slide vote the incorporation, five
candidates elected to the first Cal¬
abasas City Council began serving
Monday and said they expect to
work out an office place within 60
days.
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Designated Sites: Retirement of Development Rights
Calabasas, California, “Canyon Oaks” Zoning Referendum, Measure F (November 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6,990</td>
<td>64.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,795</td>
<td>35.19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Development Forum Guidelines for larger development projects reflects the input of Calabasas residents, stakeholders, and public officials, and aids implementation of the Calabasas 2030 General Plan. In accordance with City Council Resolution No. 2017-1586, two Community Development Forums must be conducted for any commercial development project, or new residential subdivision or apartment project, which involves one or more of the following:

- a) General Plan Amendment;
- b) Development Plan Amendment;
- c) Development Agreement;
- d) Zone Change;
- e) Variance;
- f) Toricline Tract Map;
- g) Proposed new construction on undeveloped land, proposed new construction to fully replace an existing structure(s), or any proposed addition of 10,000 square feet or more to an existing building in a Commercial, Recreational, Multi-family or Planned Development zone.

The first public forum must be conducted prior to application submittal, and the second forum must be conducted prior to a determination by staff that the project application and plans are complete. Details about the purpose and process for the community development forums are found within the “Guidelines for Public Engagement – Community Development Forums”. 
Calabasas Entitlement Process

Application Submitted
- Development Review Committee (DRC)
- Architecture Review Panel (ARP)
- Traffic/Transportation Commission (TCC)
- Community Development Forum
- Application Deemed Complete
- CEQA
- Story Poles
- Public Noticing
- Planning Commission Hearing
- Calabasas City Council Hearing

Project Decision

Community Development Forums
Required for Projects over 10,000SF
Two Forums: 1) Pre-application 2) Prior to CEQA
Community Development Forums
Noticed to City Zone in which the project is located
Second Forum Televised

City of Calabasas Zone Map

Community Development Forums
Requires a Website be Established with
Contact Information and Periodic Updates

CITY COUNCIL HEARING ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 14TH
PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL RECEIVED JANUARY 4, 2018
Rozicki Realty Group has requested a rezoning of a 1.02 acre site from Commercial Office (CO) to Commercial Residential (Class C) to provide for mixed-use development consisting of 56 residential units and 2600 square feet of retail space in a three-story project located at 23800 Parkhurst Street, north of the 101 freeway and west of Port Chicago. The City of Calabasas Planning Commission approved the project in January, allowing it to proceed to the City Council on Wednesday, February 14, 2018.

CLICK ON THE “DOWNLOAD” BUTTON BELOW FOR MORE PROJECT INFORMATION

HOW CAN YOU HELP?
SHOW YOUR SUPPORT BY SPEAKING AT THE CITY COUNCIL HEARING ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 14TH AT 7:00 PM IN THE CALABASAS CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS AT CITY HALL.

CITY COUNCIL HEARING AGENDA - FEBRUARY 14, 2018

CAN’T ATTEND THE HEARING?
If you can’t attend the hearing, please contact Michael Klein, Senior Planner at the City of Calabasas, at (818) 325-8622 or email him at mklein@calabasas.com. Please let him know your position on the Rozicki Mixed Use Senior Housing Project and if you support the project.

Incorporate, simple USA, Michael Klein, Senior Planner at the City of Calabasas, Email: michael@calabasas.com, Phone: (818) 325-8622, Website www.cityofcalabasas.com
“Calabasas was about development, is about development, and will always be about development…”

Maureen Tamuri, March 25, 2018