



INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND

Originally platted as a township in 1887 and incorporated in 1906, Glendale has grown to population of more than 185,000¹ and an area of more than 30 square miles. The city encompasses diverse physical features, development patterns and population characteristics. Such variety provides both constraints and opportunities for the management of open space and for the conservation of natural resources.

Glendale's patterns of growth are shaped and defined by its geographic character. Variations in terrain have resulted in intense development in some areas and an absence of development in others. The most significant physical landmarks within the community are the Verdugo Mountains and the San Rafael Hills. These two geologic masses flank the central portion of the city. They are divided by a narrow valley, Verdugo Canyon, which connects Glendale's two major flatland areas. A segment of the Crescenta Valley, together with a section of the San Gabriel Mountains beyond, forms the northern boundary of this connection and of the city itself. At its opposite end, Verdugo Canyon opens into a broad alluvial valley that extends to the city's eastern and western boundaries and to the Repetto Hills on the south.

Development patterns have largely respected these geographic features. The two valleys have been the focus of Glendale's growth. The large southerly area was the site of the original city. It forms the urban core of the community, incorporating high density residential, industrial and local and regionally-oriented commercial uses. Development in the Crescenta Valley is suburban with low and medium-density housing and supportive commercial uses. Some residential development extends into the hillsides and the lower elevations of the canyon areas in the Verdugo Mountains and the San Rafael Hills. However, the majority of the ridgelines and rugged upper reaches of these land masses have remained open and undeveloped.

The 1990 Census counted Glendale's population at 180,038 persons. Projections for the future indicate that the city's population will increase to more than 189,000 by the year 2000. This trend is consistent with the goal of the Land Use Element of the General Plan to "effectuate a moderate growth policy for the City of Glendale consistent with community needs, available services, and the environment."²

TABLE 2-1 POPULATION CHANGES BY CENSUS TRACT IN GLENDALE 1940 - 1990

| CENSUS TRACT | 1940 | 1950 | 1960 | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 |
|--------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 3003 | ----- | ----- | 5,958 | 7,255 | 6,467 | 6,009 |
| 3004 | ----- | ----- | 6,344 | 5,926 | 4,936 | 5,211 |
| 3005 | ----- | ----- | ----- | 21 | 1,335 | 1,629 |
| 3006 | * | * | 5,509 | 6,082 | 5,337 | 6,080 |
| 3007 | 7,645 | 11,200 | 6,878 | 8,624 | 10,039 | 11,068 |
| 3008 | * | * | 4,037 | 5,631 | 5,499 | 6,668 |
| 3009 | 5,007 | 7,651 | 4,273 | 6,059 | 6,399 | 6,800 |
| 3010 | + | + | 5,210 | 5,049 | 4,419 | 4,845 |
| 3011 | 4,568 | 4,581 | 4,951 | 4,931 | 5,364 | 5,844 |
| 3012 | 7,615 | 8,501 | 9,019 | 10,071 | 10,866 | 14,659 |
| 3013 | ----- | ----- | 2,269 | 2,379 | 2,202 | 1,974 |
| 3014 | 3,230 | 4,030 | 3,882 | 3,854 | 3,729 | 3,606 |
| 3015 | 3,865 | 4,315 | 4,274 | 4,788 | 4,921 | 8,133 |
| 3016 | 4,659 | 6,803 | 6,464 | 7,466 | 7,800 | 10,667 |
| 3017 | 5,104 | 6,003 | 5,936 | 5,924 | 5,826 | 7,891 |
| 3018 | 4,620 | 4,651 | 4,527 | 4,267 | 4,507 | 6,969 |
| 3019 | 3,782 | 3,906 | 4,079 | 3,773 | 4,483 | 6,123 |
| 3020 | 4,499 | 4,797 | 5,040 | 5,913 | 6,438 | 10,389 |
| 3021 | 6,300 | 7,105 | 8,060 | 9,351 | 11,326 | 15,862 |
| 3022 | 4,893 | 4,631 | 4,469 | 4,371 | 5,195 | 8,791 |
| 3023 | 5,630 | 5,938 | 5,715 | 6,661 | 6,422 | 9,256 |
| 3024 | 4,518 | 4,489 | 4,331 | 4,578 | 4,635 | 5,477 |
| 3025 | 6,647 | 7,101 | 8,217 | 9,690 | 10,913 | 16,087 |
| TOTAL | 82,582 | 95,702 | 119,442 | 132,664 | 139,060 | 180,038 |

* Included in Tract 3007

+ Included in Tract 3009

Source: U.S. Census of Population and Housing 1940 through 1990.

In Glendale, the population changes that have occurred are both distributional and quantitative. Staff research and the 1970 and 1980 Census figures indicate that during the 1960s and 1970s the population changes were mostly distributional as shown in Table 2-1. During those years the number of children under 14 declined both in real numbers and as a percentage of total population, the number of elderly persons stabilized at a consistent share of the total population (approximately 28 percent), the number of young adults (age 15 to 24) increased substantially, the number of married persons and average household size declined, and the relative percentage of males and females was stable.

However, the 1990 Census and staff research indicates that in the 1980s Glendale experienced both distributional and quantitative population changes as shown in Table 2-2. The Census figures show that during those

years, the number of children under 14 increased both in real numbers and as a total percentage of the population, the number of elderly persons increased by 1.3 percent, the number of young adults (age 15 to 24) decreased by 2.4 percent, the number of married persons stabilized at a consistent share of the total population (approximately 51 percent), the average household size increased and the relative percentage of males and females changed by 1.1 percent with the number of males increasing and the number of females decreasing.

In addition to changes in the distribution of population in Glendale by age and gender, the city has experienced dramatic changes in its ethnic distribution as shown in Table 2-3. According to Census figures between 1980 and 1990, the White population decreased more than 11 percent, the Asian or Pacific Islander population increased more than seven percent and the Hispanic popu-

**TABLE 2-2 POPULATION CHANGES BY AGE GROUP 1940 - 1990**

| Age Group | 1940 | 1950 | 1960 | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 |
|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Under 5 | 4,175 5.1% | 6,464 6.8% | 9,120 7.6% | 8,852 6.7% | 7,255 5.2% | 11,910 6.6% |
| 5-14 | 9,778 11.8% | 10,626 11.1% | 16,015 13.4% | 18,097 13.6% | 15,795 11.4% | 20,967 11.6% |
| 15-24 | 14,375 17.4% | 11,231 11.7% | 14,543 12.2% | 19,023 14.3% | 22,179 15.9% | 24,266 13.5% |
| 25-34 | 13,363 16.2% | 14,280 14.9% | 13,247 11.1% | 17,641 13.3% | 22,832 16.4% | 35,302 19.6% |
| 35-44 | 13,926 16.9% | 15,184 15.9% | 16,205 13.6% | 14,341 10.8% | 17,035 12.3% | 28,778 16.0% |
| 45-54 | 11,890 14.4% | 14,955 15.6 | 17,454 14.6% | 17,654 13.3% | 15,268 11.0% | 19,400 10.8% |
| 55-64 | 7,712 9.3% | 11,696 12.2% | 15,198 12.7% | 16,400 12.4% | 16,009 11.5% | 15,438 8.6% |
| 65-74 | 4,907 5.9% | 7,485 7.8% | 11,205 9.4% | 12,051 9.1% | 12,381 8.9% | 12,688 7.0% |
| 75 and over | 2,456 3.0% | 3,781 4.0% | 6,455 5.4% | 8,693 6.5% | 10,306 7.4% | 11,281 6.3% |
| TOTAL | 82,582 | 95,702 | 119,442 | 132,752* | 139,060 | 180,038 |

* U.S. Census 1970, subsequently revised to 132,664. Since age categories were not similarly revised, the earlier data were used.

Source: U.S. Census of Population and Housing 1940 through 1990, City of Glendale Planning Division

lation increased three percent. Within the Caucasian population, an ethnic shift occurred with a decrease in residents of Northern European ancestry and an increase of 26 percent in residents of Middle Eastern origin. With these ethnic and racial changes, the city also has seen an increase in average household size and an increase in the number of persons living in extended family arrangements.

These population trends indicate that in the 1960s and 1970s the need for additional open space areas, parkland and recreational sites, over and above the deficiencies already identified in the 1972 Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element and the 1986 revisions to the Land Use Element, was relatively constant. How-

ever, in the 1980s and 1990s, the need for such land uses greatly increased as a result of a growing population, changing demographics and increased urbanization of remaining open space areas. This increased demand places additional burdens on existing open space, parkland and recreational areas in the city.

The changing population patterns within Glendale are reflected and reinforced through adjustments in land use as well. Although the demarcation between developed and undeveloped land remains essentially intact, some urban and suburban sectors of the community are experiencing profound shifts in density and intensity of uses. An example of this is found in south Glendale. The South Glendale Task Force Report (1983) noted that a substan-

TABLE 2-3 POPULATION BY RACE OR DESCENT 1970-1990

| Race or Descent | 1970 | | 1980 | | 1990 | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| | Number of Persons | Percent of Population | Number of Persons | Percent of Population | Number of Persons | Percent of Population |
| White | 116,763 | 87.9% | 104,989 | 75.5% | 114,765 | 63.74% |
| Hispanic** | 13,697 | 10.3% | 24,717 | 17.8% | 37,731 | 20.96% |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,300 | 1.0% | 8,359 | 6.0% | 24,673 | 13.7% |
| American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut | 360 | 0.3% | 269 | 0.2% | 473 | .26% |
| Black | 84 | 0.1% | 431 | 0.3% | 2,065 | 1.2% |
| Other | 548 | 0.4% | 295 | 0.2% | 331 | .18% |
| TOTAL | 132,752* | 100.0% | 139,060 | 100.0% | 180,038 | 100.0% |

* U.S. Census 1970, subsequently revised to 132,664, since racial categories were not similarly revised, the earlier data were used.

** There is no direct comparison of 1970 Hispanics and 1980 and 1990 Hispanics, as in the 1980 and 1990 Census persons reported as White, Black, American Indian, Eskimo or Aleut, Asian or Pacific Islander or Other Race of Hispanic Origin.

tial percentage (72 percent) of the owner-occupied housing in this area was built before 1950. The report also found indications of deferred maintenance and absentee ownership.

This information coincides with data in the 1989 Housing Element and the South Brand Boulevard Specific Plan (1992) which identify areas of underutilization according to current zoning densities. The combination of housing age, condition and low density has led to an increase in the number of multiple family units constructed in the area. Among the many impacts that are associated with such building activity, increased density can place growing demands on city services and facilities, including recreational resources and open space areas. The south Glendale area is just one area of the city experiencing growth, and just one area in which the need for additional recreational resources has been identified.

The trend toward intensification of uses in a city that is virtually built out increases pressure for development in undeveloped hillside areas. At the same time, the intensification of uses leaves little available land in urbanized areas for conservation or for undeveloped open space uses, but increases the need for such spaces.

The challenge then, is to identify strategies, objectives

and implementation programs that will allow appropriate levels of growth while providing for the conservation of natural resources and open space land.

B. PURPOSE AND FUNCTION

The Open Space and Conservation Element is concerned with the preservation of open space and natural resources and the amenities that are important to the residents of the City of Glendale. In the highly urbanized area that comprises most of Glendale, natural resources are generally public parks and areas landscaped by private property owners. However, Glendale is fortunate to have a major natural resource in its hillside areas. Comprised of the Verdugo Mountains, the San Rafael Hills, a small portion of the San Gabriel Mountains and the undeveloped ridgelines and canyons of these mountain ranges, this resource is a scenic, biological and potential passive and active recreational asset for the city. The Open Space and Conservation Element addresses General Plan issues concerning open space and conservation of natural resources as required by the California Government Code sections 65302, 65560 and Public Resources Code sections 2762 and 5076.



C. AUTHORITY AND SCOPE

The State of California Government Code requires every General Plan to have an Open Space Element [Section 65302 (e)] and a Conservation Element in [Section 65302 (d)], or to combine these two elements into a single element. The required components include an inventory of both public and private open space land, biotic, mineral and aesthetic resources, and the policies and goals which serve to identify, protect and maintain these natural resources and to prevent their wasteful exploitation and ultimate destruction.

The Open Space and Conservation element addresses the preservation of those resources and amenities that are important to the residents of Glendale and satisfies the requirements of California Government Code Section 65302 (d) and (e). According to Section 65560 of the California Government Code, open space land is any parcel or area of land or water that is essentially unimproved and devoted to an open space use, as defined in Section 65560 of the Code and which is designated on a local, regional or state open space plan as any of the following:

- 1) Open space for the preservation of natural resources,
- 2) Open space used for the managed production of resources,
- 3) Open space for outdoor recreation, and
- 4) Open space for public health and safety.

The importance of open space preservation to the people of California is discussed in Section 65561 of the Government Code in which the legislature finds and declares:

- a) That the preservation of open space land, as defined in this article, is necessary not only for the maintenance of the economy of the state, but also for the assurance of the continued availability of land for the production of food and fiber, for the enjoyment of scenic beauty, for recreation and for the use of natural resources.
- b) That discouraging premature and unnecessary conversion of open space land to urban uses is a matter of public interest and will be of benefit to urban dwellers because it will discourage non-contiguous development patterns which unnecessarily increase the costs of community services to community residents.

- c) That the anticipated increase in the population of the state demands that cities, counties and the state, at the earliest possible date, make definite plans for the preservation of valuable open space land and take positive action to carry out such plans by the adoption and strict administration of laws, ordinances, rules and regulations authorized by this chapter or by other appropriate methods.
- d) That in order to assure that the interests of all its people are met in the orderly growth and development of the state and the preservation and conservation of its resources, it is necessary to provide for the development by the state, regional agencies, counties and cities, including charter cities, of state-wide coordinated plans for the conservation and preservation of open space lands.
- e) That for these reasons this article is necessary for the promotion of the general welfare and for the protection of the public interest in open space land.

The intent of the legislature in enacting this article (Section 65562) is:

- a) To assure that cities and counties recognize that open space land is a limited and valuable resource which must be conserved wherever possible, and
- b) To assure that every city and county will prepare and carry out open space plans, which, along with state and regional open space plans, will accomplish the objectives of a comprehensive open space program.

D. APPLICATION

The goals, objectives, policies, findings, recommendations and implementation program contained in the Open Space and Conservation Element are part of the City of Glendale's General Plan. As such they form the blueprint for development and management of renewable and non-renewable resources located within the boundaries of the incorporated City of Glendale.

E. ORGANIZATION OF THE ELEMENT

Because the topics of open space and resource conservation are so closely related, this revised element combines these two state mandated elements—Open Space and Conservation—into a single element, as permitted by the

Governor's Office of Planning and Research. The 1972 version of the City of Glendale's Open Space and Conservation Element included discussion of park and recreation needs and was titled the Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element. In the 20 years since the previous Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element was prepared, demographics and development pressures have changed, and the decision was made to combine open space and conservation issues into one element and to prepare a separate Recreation Element in order to treat each topic in a more comprehensive manner in a document of a manageable size.

The Open Space and Conservation Element meets the requirements of local, regional and state law, presents an inventory of private and public open space land and natural resources and establishes policies, goals, objectives and implementation measures for the management of those resources within a local and regional context. These issues are organized into five chapters, which are:

- 1) Executive Summary, which briefly details the contents of the element,
- 2) Introduction, which discusses the required content of an element and its relationship to other planning legislation,
- 3) Overview, which presents information on the community and regional context and identifies the goals, objectives and policies of the element,
- 4) Open Space/Conservation Plan, which presents the inventory and evaluation of resources, and
- 5) Implementation, which details the program for the management of the identified resources.

To avoid redundancy and duplication where data on specific resources are fully addressed in another element of the General Plan, such citation is given and by such is incorporated by reference in this element, and the reader is referred to that document. Technical appendices and reference and resource materials are available in the Planning Division office.

F. THE PLANNING PROCESS: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Public participation early in the development of a planning document is an important component in the identification of issues, goals, objectives and methods of implementing proposed changes to existing development and resource management policies. After conducting pre-

liminary research on the issues of open space availability and needs, natural resources and existing development patterns and conditions in the city, city planning staff developed a preliminary set of issues and objectives, a mission statement, policies and goals. A working paper focused on the portion of resource management policy that appeared to be the most controversial—hillside development. This material was then presented to City Council in a study session format on March 17, 1992. Upon receiving Council's input, additional research and analysis was conducted on hillside development standards in preparation for a series of public workshops and study sessions. These sessions were held on April 22, May 13, May 27, June 10, July 1, and July 22, 1992. Property owners, representatives of homeowner organizations, residents, members of the development community and planning advocates attended these workshops and voiced their concerns, observations and suggestions. Simultaneously, planning staff organized a technical task force to review and evaluate suggested approaches to hillside development in order to better address community concerns in this area, and the City Manager's office organized a Community Task Force for the purpose of consensus building. A technical task force was comprised of representatives of city engineering, fire, planning and public works departments. This group met 13 times between April and July 1992. The Community Task Force was comprised of general public, citizens groups, homeowners associations, developers, property owners and design professionals. This group met several times in 1992. In addition, City Council and the Planning Commission also conducted a series of eight study sessions between September and November 1992 to discuss important hillside issues. As a result of all of the commentary and input received from the public meetings, workshops, task force sessions and staff research, a set of draft guidelines for subdivision and other code changes as well as strategies for ridgeline preservation were developed. Upon completion of the guidelines, public workshops and study sessions were again held and revisions made to the guidelines.

The final guidelines have been incorporated into the draft Open Space and Conservation Element in the goals, objectives and policies and the implementation portions of this document. Further public input was sought on the draft element in the form of City Council and Planning Commission study sessions and community workshops to ensure that this element includes a full range of community input on all issues that are part of this Element.

Upon completion of the community workshops on the draft element, further public input was solicited and received through the environmental review process and



the public hearing notification and meeting process. The final element was considered by the Planning Commission and City Council after all public input had been received and evaluated and appropriate revisions to the document made. The policies, goals and findings will be instrumental in providing the basis for future potential amendments to hillside development regulations.

G. RELATIONSHIP TO AND CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND OTHER PLANS, POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

The General Plan Guidelines discuss the need for inter-element consistency and intra-element consistency. State planning law divides the content of a general plan into seven required elements. These are often prepared separately, although they may be combined into a single general plan document. The division of each element, or subject area, whether in separate documents or in separate sections within a single general plan document, de-emphasizes the "...statutory and functional interrelationships among the elements and issues to be addressed in the general plan," (General Plan Guidelines) and may promote fragmentation through inconsistencies in policies and program goals. But by combining closely related elements in a single document, the relationship and effect of policies upon reciprocal issues is emphasized and the implementation of appropriate management strategies consistent with all elements of the General Plan can be facilitated. Examples of the interrelationship of issues among the various General Plan elements includes the following discussion from the General Plan Guidelines:

"... geologic hazards are mentioned specifically in the safety element and also appear under "open space for public health and safety" in the open space element. Open space in turn is mentioned as one of the categories to be addressed in the land use element. Similarly, natural resources are to be addressed in the open space and conservation elements as well as in the land use element. The issues to be addressed in the general plan also interrelate functionally. The consideration of fire hazards in wild land areas involves the analysis of vegetation, topography, weather, availability of water, density of development, adequacy of road systems and fire protection services."³

The Open Space and Conservation Element has been prepared with the full knowledge and comprehension of the Land Use, Seismic Safety, Safety, Housing, Circulation and Scenic Highways, Historic Preservation, Community Facilities elements and the Recreation portion of

the 1972 Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element of the Glendale General Plan. In addition, preparation of an updated Recreation Element will commence upon completion of the Open Space and Conservation Element. In this way, consistency among the elements will be achieved.

Supporting the General Plan are community plans, specific plans, ordinances and policies that serve as the implementation program for the General Plan. Consistency among these documents and the General Plan is mandatory. In the preparation of the Open Space and Conservation Element the recommendations of policy documents such as community plans, specific plans and ordinances have been consulted and the element prepared with knowledge and comprehension of such documents. Inter-document consistency is not confined however, to city-prepared plans and ordinances. County, regional, State and Federal planning documents and legislation also must be integrated into the General Plan process in order to achieve comprehensive consistency with all applicable mandates.

In preparing the Open Space and Conservation Element update of 1992, planning staff has reviewed and complied with mandated applicable regional, State and Federal legislation governing the management of water resources, integrated and hazardous wastes, air resources, geologic and mineral resources and archaeological and historic resources in a manner consistent with the policies established by the respective legislation.

H. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT COMPLIANCE

The Open Space and Conservation Element update was the subject of an initial study and subsequent environmental assessment as required by the California Environmental Quality Act. Rather than create the potential for new development at intensities and densities beyond those already identified in the adopted General Plan, the element update has the potential to reduce environmental impacts through more efficient site planning, conservation of resources and preservation of significant habitat areas. It will serve as a guide for the orderly acquisition and management of resources and thus reduce adverse environmental impacts.

