

**MINUTES OF THE CITY OF DIAMOND BAR
GENERAL PLAN UPDATE
MEETING OF THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CITY HALL WINDMILL COMMUNITY ROOM
21810 COPLEY DRIVE, DIAMOND BAR, CA 91765
NOVEMBER 29, 2018**

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairperson St. Amant called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL:

Larry M. Black, David Busse, Teruni Evans, Mahendra Garg, Amy Harbin, Lee Mao, Michael Ramirez, Victor Ramirez, Gilbert Rivera, Paul Sherwood, Vice Chairperson Brian Worthington, and Chairperson Mark St. Amant.

GPAC Members not present: Ching Liu, Cindy Liu, and Tony Torng were excused.

Also present: Greg Gubman, Community Development Director; Grace Lee, Senior Planner; May Nakajima, Associate Planner; Natalie T. Espinoza, Assistant Planner; and, Stella Marquez, Administrative Coordinator.

Others present: Katharine Pan, AICP/Associate, Dyett & Bhatia Urban Regional Planners.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Approved as presented.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

3.1 GPAC Meeting Minutes September 13, 2018

Upon request by Chair/St. Amant and show of hands, the minutes of the GPAC Meeting of September 13, 2018, were approved as corrected, with members Busse, Evans and Harbin abstaining and Ching Liu, Cindy Liu, and Tony Torng absent.

Chair/St. Amant announced that the GPAC would continue the discussion of Draft Policies for the Community Character & Placemaking Elements followed by Public Comments on that matter. The GPAC would then move to review and discussion of Updated Draft Policies for the following Elements: Resource Conservation; Public Facilities & Services; Community Health & Sustainability; and Safety followed by Public Comments on those Elements.

4. **CONTINUED GPAC DISCUSSION OF DRAFT POLICIES FOR THE CIRCULATION AND COMMUNITY CHARACTER & PLACEMAKING ELEMENTS:**

- a) CDD/Gubman introduced Katharine Pan, Senior Associate, Dyett & Bhatia, who provided a brief review of the Community Character and Placemaking Draft Policies:

Katharine Pan explained that the General Plan contains an Introduction and seven elements, each of which the GPAC has seen, with the exception of Community Character & Placemaking: Land Use and Resource Conservation reviewed in June; Circulation reviewed in September; and, Public Facilities and Services, Safety and Community Health and Sustainability reviewed in August. Once this discussion is finished and staff has direction on policies including revisions that have been requested, they will be included in the full Draft General Plan with background narrative to give context to the policies. The Existing Conditions report will be updated along with the revised policies that will come back to the GPAC for further discussion and approval.

Community Character & Placemaking:

Katharine Pan explained the Overall Character and Design Draft Guiding Policies, which are the community objectives that arose from community engagement earlier in the process, which are as follows: Protect and preserve existing neighborhoods and city character; expand options for local dining and retail; protect and enhance environmental quality and resources; provide more spaces for public recreation and community gathering; and improve mobility.

Tonight, staff is seeking input from the GPAC members for the draft policies. Do the policies respond to Diamond Bar's community vision and objectives? Is there anything missing? Are there any concerns regarding the implementation of these policies? And, can you think of any additional issues that need to be addressed?

Staff looked at all of the guiding policies and text and determined that the Overall Character and Design Policies address character and design on a citywide level and include creation of: A distinctive City identity, high-quality, human-scaled design and development; sensitive transitions between densities & uses, expanded pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure network; and, sensitive hillside development. There are a series of policies for each of the focus areas: For the Neighborhood Mixed Use Focus Areas, they include creation of a well-designed walkable neighborhood making it a visual gateway into the City at the northern end and create unique open spaces and open space connections. For the Town Center Mixed Use Focus Area (Diamond Bar

Boulevard/Golden Springs Drive) the policies including creation of a Pedestrian-oriented “Main Street” with an inviting and comfortable public realm as a place for people to gather and enjoy a commercial/retail environment. The Transit Oriented Mixed Use Focus Area (to the of the Metrolink Station) the policies include encouraging a multi-modal transportation environment encouraging development that responds to a variety of housing needs, creation of spaces for recreation, community gathering and other such amenities to serve the neighborhood, and to make sure that new development is sensitive to the scale of adjacent uses, much of which currently exists. In the Community Core Focus Area (overlay on the southern portion of the golf course) the focus is on a master-planned destination with vibrant, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented uses for the community and region.

GPAC Clarifying Question:

Chair/St. Amant emphasized that the Community Core Overlay was included as a “place holder” and not as a plan, in the event the golf course ceases operation. Katharine Pan said she meant to say that if the area were to be developed and if the golf course closed, it would not end up being a piecemeal development and that development would occur under some kind of masterplan that considered the space as a whole.

M/Sherwood asked for clarification on whether the 36 acres mentioned pertained to the south portion only, and Katharine Pan responded “yes. M/Sherwood said he did not see that this process had addressed the status of the north portion of the golf course. Katharine Pan referred M/Sherwood to the Land Use Policies and the stated northern portion of the golf course is reserved for a “park.” M/Sherwood asked why the northern portion was not included in the Community Core Overlay. Katharine Pan said that these are areas for development which focused on the southern portion only. M/Sherwood asked if it would make sense to earmark the northern portion in the Park section in an Open Space section of this Element. Katharine Pan referred M/Sherwood to the recreation portion of the Public Facilities Element where it is discussed.

Public Comments:

Vinod Kashyap complimented CDD/Gubman and his team for their hard work and professionalism for the manner in which they have handled citizen concerns to preserve their quality of life and remaining open spaces. He appreciated and supported the modified General Plan language as now proposed by the City with the clear understanding that the General Plan and the municipal codes must work together. He complimented the efforts and contributions from a small group of Diamond Bar citizens who formed “Responsible Land Use”, a non-profit organization which seeks to preserve the

quality of life in the remaining natural spaces of the City by educating the community while offering alternative policies to meet Diamond Bar's needs as evidenced by the quality and number of changes as proposed that the City has incorporated in the Plan. He again thanked CDD/Gubman for his hard work and cooperation throughout the process. Residents of the City of Diamond Bar owe CDD/Gubman a special debt of gratitude for his conscientious work and rich legacy. He asked that the Hillside Management Code last revised circa 1999, be made airtight to reflect the intent and language of the General Plan. He thanked naturalist Cynthia "Robin" Smith of the Sierra Club for her endless research and editing of the General Plan language and plans. Without her, this would not have been possible. He complimented Lee Paulson, President of Responsible Land Use for his leadership and Chair/St. Amant for his hands-on approach and love for open spaces and his cooperation as a true son of Diamond Bar in helping to steer this ship out of the doldrums. He welcomed new City Council Member Andrew Chou and said he looked forward to his support.

Ira Thomas said that two issues that have been on his mind for some time are the SR57/60 Interchange and appreciate the change on the off-ramp to Grand Avenue and SR57 south and whatever is being done on the SR60 east. However, there is still the major bottleneck of the SR57/60 convergence on the south and north ends. There is a very nice bridge northbound 57 to westbound 60 which is a perfect transition. From the 57 north to the 60 east is a bottleneck because everybody on the 60 wants to go to the 57 and everybody on the 57 wants to go to the 60. On the north end, one has to get off the freeway. He keeps hearing people talk about taking care of the traffic problem and he thinks that the bridge at the 57/60 at the north end would relieve a lot of traffic so that one does not have to get off the freeway to make the transition. Same thing on the southbound, one would not have to go through that bottleneck. I'm sure this is a Caltrans issue and not a Diamond Bar issue but he would like to see somebody do something in regard to correcting that issue. The other issue is the restaurants and he would like to spend his dollars having dinner in Diamond Bar but he cannot. He has to go out of the area if he wants to have a nice meal. There are some fast food places, but he wants a real dinner restaurant. He would appreciate any input anybody has on these issues.

Fiona Tindall provided a handout for GPAC Members entitled *Good General Plans rely on accurate existing conditions reports*. The following highlights contradictions in said report. 1) Educational Oak Woodland signs proudly displayed at the Summitridge Center; 2) Habitat's map omitting Oak Woodlands in Diamond Bar; 3) Los Angeles County map showing Diamond Bar's high density of Oak Woodland areas. Responsible Land Use strongly recommends that the GPAC pass a motion instructing the City to correct their Existing Conditions Reports to include Diamond Bar's Oak Woodlands Habitat.

Lee Paulson wants the GPAC to know that when his group offered them the large book of proposed changes, the members did so with the attitude that they want the best for the City and they are very pleased that City staff carefully considered their proposed language changes with the same attitude. Most were accepted outright and policies were rewritten which included the spirit of others and he wanted CDD/Gubman to know how much the group appreciates him and his staff's effort to work with the group in a good way. Responsible Land Use (RLU), along with some of their experts, have carefully analyzed the City's revised and updated policies and recommend that the GPAC adopt the updated policies "as written" with one minor exception which has to do with the definition of "Open Space" which the group would like to have separated so that the policies for "Public Open Space" and "Private Open Space" are made clear. His group also appreciates the definition and solution to the issue regarding Open Space around Summitridge trails being zoned for housing which the group believes is a fair solution. The primary issue seems to be the saving of Open Space and preserving Tres Hermanos. He asked audience members to stand in support of preserving all of the City's open spaces. Because it seems to him that everyone wants to save open space, the issue for his group is how that can be done and what specifically can be done tonight to make that happen. As such, his group has two recommendations: 1) that the City be directed to request the Diamond Bar portion of Tres Hermanos that is currently classified as a Planning Area be changed to an Open Space designation by motion of the GPAC; 2) pass a motion which directs the City to place a deed restriction on all city-owned natural open spaces which protect them in perpetuity. Responsible Land Use sent an email explaining the reasons for taking these actions. If anyone wishes him to speak to these matters in more detail he is happy to do so. He thanked the GPAC Members for their efforts and for hanging in with everything Responsible Land Use has presented and for consideration of their efforts and recommendations.

Douglas Barcon said the latest news on Tres Hermanos Ranch is that the City of Commerce has shown interest in purchasing the property from the City of Industry and perhaps other cities have also shown interest in the property. The General Plan Update may not be able to incorporate specifics about Tres Hermanos Ranch because it may take several years for ownership and development concerns to wind their way through the legal systems. Any development of Tres Hermanos Ranch will impact Diamond Bar. Commercial or residential development of Tres Hermanos Ranch will increase traffic on City roadways and specifically on Grand Avenue and will impact quality of life and safety in Diamond Bar. Large-scale development in Tres Hermanos Ranch could turn Grand Avenue into a parking lot. Diamond Bar should have the ability and right to protect itself, its residents and businesses, from the negative effects of traffic generated by the development Tres Hermanos Ranch.

Diamond Bar can try to mitigate traffic from the development of Tres Hermanos Ranch through traffic signals and other traffic calming measures, but these changes will only make travel worse on Grand Avenue for residents and emergency vehicles that rely on Grand Avenue. Rather than spend countless thousands or millions of dollars trying to mitigate traffic on Grand Avenue with ineffective systems, the draconian and simple solution is to close Grand Avenue at the San Bernardino County line, build other roads and let the traffic re-route through those other roads to spread it out to minimize the impact on single routes. This concept should be investigated by the City and a solution should be developed with the help of the California Legislature. With this said, he suggested going in another direction to both preserve the open space of Tres Hermanos Ranch and maintain Grand Avenue as a viable route to Chino Hills. Developers will want to recoup their costs and turn a profit which could mean thousands of homes in Tres Hermanos Ranch. He has read reports suggesting as high as 30,000 homes, especially if a developer purchases Tres Hermanos Ranch for \$100 million. Diamond Bar should turn its resources toward converting Tres Hermanos Ranch into a State Park by giving naming rights and tax incentives to a corporate or private donor willing to purchase Tres Hermanos Ranch and donate it to the state, specifically for a state park, which would enable Grand Avenue to remain open without inundating Diamond Bar with thousands of extra daily vehicle trips and would preserve Tres Hermanos Ranch as open space in perpetuity. With respect to the Neighborhood Mixed Use Focus Area CC-I-41 and the cost to renew mixed-use development on the two northernmost parcels of the focus area, he wondered if the der Weinerschnitzel would be a part of that and if it should be considered for historical landmark status. Regarding the hill with houses on top near the SR60, it has been a notoriously unstable hill and believed it could be sold but wondered if it could be built on and should it be considered a no-go for mixed use? Under CC-I-42 with respect to monument signs he is concerned about the area at Sunset Crossing and Diamond Bar Boulevard because he can see a Diamond Bar monument being placed in the middle of Sunset Crossing Road just west of the SR57 which would segregate the homes west of the SR57 from being part of Diamond Bar. Responsible Land Use wants to prioritize in-fill development and re-use of existing vacant commercial property to grow the City's base of residence and he believes that rather than replacing vacant commercial space with long-term residential development and limited tax revenue encourages current property owners to make current properties conducive to business by rebuilding, remodeling, and implementing affordable rent structures, and adding solar power as renewable energy to any such developments as well as, using drought-tolerant landscaping.

David Warren, Vice Chair of the Diamond Bar/Pomona Valley Sierra Club stated that people are learning about the grave consequences of neglecting the environment, both globally and locally. The recent catastrophic fires in the state

are completely beyond what was previously known and experienced. While everyone is oversaturated with data and concerns about how people can live a healthy and safe life in relationship to their environmental responsibilities, please allow a simple principal to guide the committee – prioritize local natural resources. It is tricky because the techno-culture divides humans from the natural world through media, instead of encouraging a firsthand experience of nature. The best solution to mitigating pollution, city heat and second-born disease, and decline of green spaces is to do whatever one can in one's own place to learn about nature and protect it and plan to defend natural resources before the worst decision is made. One mature oak tree cleans more than 55,000 pounds of carbon in the air each and every year. Diamond Bar has many old oak trees and they should be prioritized – especially now, since their carbon-cleaning values are not replaceable with small mitigation trees. Make sure a specific chapter in the City's General Plan is a Conservation Element that prioritizes old oak trees. The local Sierra Club specializes in teaching environmental literacy to all and promotes the idea of natural green infrastructure so that the burdens of the built infrastructure are reduced. This is what sustainability really means, working with nature, not against her. The Sierra Club Angeles Chapter truly appreciates the GPAC's consideration of the earth as every explores, enjoys and protects it.

Jim Hays spoke about Community Character & Placemaking. He believes more effort needs to be made to solve Diamond Bar's Placemaking identity issue. Generally, he supports infill rather than new development, as much as possible. However, infill is not a universally positive development strategy and special care must be taken to maximize its benefits. Infill is faced with challenges from complex parking and regional environmental regulations from the City of Industry's ongoing development and limited or outdated analyses of traffic patterns. Planners and advocates should seek to champion infill strategies that promote community health and well-being now and into the future. It is crucial that policy solutions to these challenges be directly tied to improving public health outcomes while planning meticulously to minimize unintended consequences. For example, City of Industry built several buildings around his condo complex by the Metrolink and one of the unintended consequences of Baker Parkway to Grand Avenue has become a perfect racetrack. Almost every evening and night people are racing up and down the street and it is super noisy. This document needs to plan for those types of unintended consequences. He has been working with RLU which has been studying the idea of Placemaking in Diamond Bar. The RLU believes the consultants may have confused "branding" with "Placemaking" so while the monument signs are beautiful, the RLU is less interested in that than the other types of Placemaking (branding or placemaking). Members walked around the area to the Village in Walnut which is a simple setting that he and his group would like to see in Diamond Bar. The area contains a water element, tables

and umbrellas surrounded by trees where people can sit down and get comfortable. The City does not need to rip out a golf course to have that kind of place. He continued showing photos. The Target Shopping Center is a great place with potential where the City could rip out some of the asphalt, put in trees and a water element and maybe more walkways which is an example of what his group would like to see as infill turned into a place that people could gather. Another photo depicted the other side of Walnut at the Target Center where there is a Starbuck's and Jimmy John's, which is a type of placemaking with umbrella chairs. The last photo shows Sprouts Center, but that is a big wide open sea of asphalt where there were few places to sit. These are examples of what he means by infill and very careful infill and more placemaking through what currently exists.

Chair/St. Amant recommended that Mr. Hays call the City of Industry Sheriff's Station to register complaints about racing on Baker Parkway rather than the Diamond Bar/Walnut Sheriff's Station.

Grace Lim-Hays referred to the Healthy Infill Development handout she presented to the GPAC. She thanked City staff for their work in incorporating the comments and ideas brought forth by residents into the revised General Plan Policies. It is her sincere hope that ongoing communication with the GPAC and the City will bring Diamond Bar closer to the plan that really meets the present and future needs of the City. RLU has submitted additional Land Use Policies for healthy infill development to support neighborhood character which include linking residents to jobs, locating sensitive receptors away from noise and poor air quality, making efficient use of existing infrastructure, preventing strain on resources, engaging key stakeholders responding to data about local health and safety issues, and preventing displacement by preserving existing affordable housing. RLU believes that these land use policies will support the updated Resource Conservation and Safety Policies and also strongly suggest that the GPAC rethink its proposal for a TOD along these lines. As it is, the TOD proposal would go against its own policy which states, "New development should be compatible with potential noise and air pollution sources such as SR60 and the United Pacific Railroad right-of-way while also respecting surrounding residential neighborhoods." Lacking input from stakeholders in the area about their ideas and needs, the TOD tends to undermine the community's character, safety and health. Building the new homes so close to the freeways and railways would probably be harmful to every day residents with the stress of noise and pollution from railways and freeways which are linked to higher mortality rates, heart and lung disease, poor sleep and poor school performance. As a result, the California Air Resource Board recommends that new residences be at least 500 feet from a freeway and 1,000 feet from a rail yard. Having personally walked through these areas evading trucks where sidewalks do not exist and where loud trains

rattle the ground, she can attest that these parcels the GPAC is considering are not suitable for new housing. Moreover, compounding the traffic congesting in the area will definitely expose existing residents to more pollutants. Responsible Land Use also provided the GPAC a report on October 29th that underscores the economic benefits of the light industrial businesses in that area which would be sacrificed for high-density housing and the RLU has learned that these business owners are not aware of the changes being considered for their area and they could not believe that the City would entertain such a notion because of the businesses currently located in that area have operated in Diamond Bar for 20 to 30 years and have been recognized with multiple city and state awards and have greatly expanded their operations and continue to advertise for a variety of what they believe are very good paying jobs. They believe keeping their businesses in Diamond Bar makes a lot of economic sense and the City's 2017 Economic Development Action Plan states "successful economic development calls for creating an environment that supports and strengthens existing business areas, attracts businesses and creates employment opportunities" and consulting businesses would likely be an important step to address the gaps in services and preserving this neighborhoods positive attributes which include a mix of affordable housing, proximity to good jobs as mentioned, as well as good schools and services. In addition, the train is not likely to be a central means of travel in that area and it is more likely it should be considered an employment center to support the existing businesses that are thriving in the area while allowing for flexible uses to fill in some vacancies to meet the needs that are lacking in the area such as healthy food, light retail, health services, after school programs and senior citizen services.

Robin Smith referred to a handout she provided to the GPAC and explained that the sample she attached to her speech was labeled "hydrology and waterways" and actually, it is a brief description of drainage courses in Diamond Bar. In addition, the table of contents is a sample only. She said she was very grateful to be a part of the General Plan Update and it is encouraging to see that the Responsible Land Use recommendations are being considered in the current agenda. She thanked City staff for their consideration and hard work in sorting out all of the information and incorporating the data which she understands to be a massive undertaking. However, even with the improvements gained by this data, the City of Diamond Bar's General Plan still needs a standalone Open Space Conservation Element which means a separate chapter and not a paragraph which involves redoing the Resource Element. The Open Space Conservation Element is something that all other cities are doing and in reading them, they are remarkably clear, logical and to the point, and they cross reference other elements of the General Plan easily and clearly which makes the OSCE quite useful. The Conservation Element is intended to be a library of information which serves all of the General Plan

decisions and it is consistent with the new California Government Code (attached to the handout). The form that exists at this time in the process is disjointed and frankly, boilerplate information language taken from an outdated General Plan which is lacking precision and updated scientific assessments and local context which is below “meeting best practices” recommended by the State of California. A proper format model portrays a dedicated Open Space Conservation Element chapter of at least 200 pages that clearly describes natural resources and detailed plans of conservation in defensible language. In order to conserve any natural resource, particular overlay districts must be created and/or deed restrictions and conservation easements be applied. How does a Conservation Element work? When a city wants to save a 100 acre parcel of open space, for example, the Conservation Element explains how and why that is done – and that is where the detail (in the current General Plan) is missing. Along with the open space are questions of biological resource values that are applicable locally as well as, broadly. Serious environmental challenges exist today including climate change and the fact that all natural habitats are Mediterranean ecosystems, which is present in Diamond Bar and is in grave danger of direct loss or significant degradation as a result of anthropogenic changes. The 1995 General Plan did not effectively conserve some of the City’s most sensitive natural resources, nor did it provide reliable mitigation support. These immeasurable losses degrade the local quality of life and also reduce the City’s positive contributions to climate stabilization which have cumulative impacts. Consequently, she informed the GPAC that a citizen-based non-profit called the Diamond Bar Preservation Alliance has funded the professional crafting of an Open Space Conservation Element document proposal (currently being crafted), a sample of which has been provided to the GPAC. When completed, this document will be submitted to the General Plan Update process. She appealed to the honorable GPAC Members to please move to request a dedicated chapter Open Space Conservation Element be provided to serve the special and particular needs of the City of Diamond Bar General Plan. Although she is not a member of the non-profit organization, she is speaking on behalf of the organization and is available to answer questions from the GPAC.

Diego Tamayo said that attached to the letter he presented the GPAC there are photos and records of flora and fauna in Diamond Bar. He is a member of the Sierra Club and has been studying the natural resources in Diamond Bar for over two years through the Diamond Bar Natural History project which he began as a survey and is providing it to the GPAC and asking that its data be incorporated into the General Plan. He has been hiking the City’s trails, parks and wildlands logging all of the flora and fauna he observes and has been researching the international data base inaturalist.org which marks the location, description and relevancy of these observations. Through this site, he has been able to find and mark sensitive, rare and endangered species within the

City that have been improperly logged in former CEQA documents and EIRs. He was confused and surprised that the City appears to be the only city without a specific chapter in its General Plan entitled "Conservation Element" and even though there is a lot of language about natural resources, the language is not sufficiently specific. In a time where nature is threatened by human activities, the City needs that specific chapter spelling out in detail what needs to be done to provide greener stable development. His latest project is the audit as an apprentice with Rob Hamilton of Hamilton Biological, Inc. Last weekend he observed a gnatcatcher in Pantera Park and one near Summitridge Park a year ago. The gnatcatcher is a federally protected endangered species and attached to his letter are other species he has mapped including the normal flora and fauna to the more rare species of flora and fauna. He intends to continue pursuing a career in the study and policy of nature. He knows that the young people of Diamond Bar compare findings about the natural resources and take this pursuit very seriously. He asked the GPAC to improve the care for natural resources in the City and motion or request the inclusion of the Conservation Element into the General Plan.

Jim Gallagher, Chino Hills, said he is present to speak about Chino Hills' excellent General Plan and that Chapter 4 contains a Conservation Element. The Conservation Element is quite specific and is a full chapter which contains conservation elements that are tied into all of the other elements of that General Plan. There are specific goals that meet the mission and values of the plan as well as, action items. For example, "preserve Chino Hills rural character" which is a strong feature with eight actions that follow this statement which includes: 1) preserving and protecting Chino Hills rural and natural scenic qualities; 2) protect identified extremely prominent ridgelines and knolls; 3) preserve the character of natural open space by integrating existing natural features and new development. This action item flows to the city's development code so that every contractor that comes to Chino Hills to develop has to follow these guidelines and actions; and 4) Preserving and protecting Chino Hills biological resources (Policy CN1.2). There are six action items that flow from this action item which shows how specific it is written such as one item that states "preserving natural open space that act as wildlife corridors" and "discouraging new development in areas that contain sensitive, rare or endangered species" is another area. And so on. "Requiring biological resources surveys that are prior to proposed developments" is another action item. Another goal "protecting Chino Hills cultural resources" is one that he is very fond of. Another action item "requiring appropriate archeological surveys as part of the environmental review process wherever archeological resources may be present." Diamond Bar and Chino Hills exist in very sensitive archeological areas. Chino Hills has had major problems in the past with the Gabrielino Indians because mass graves were unfortunately uncovered with development. "Requiring online inspections by a qualified archeologist during grading" is

another action item. Again, these are specific. Another policy is “protecting Chino Hills paleontological resources” for which there are three specific action items: 1) “require identified paleontological materials to be preserved, restored, catalogued and retransmitted to the appropriate repository.” Another policy is “protecting Chino Hills potential historical resources” which he likes a lot because Chino Hills has three historical areas – the Boys Republic, their portion of the Tres Hermanos property which they considered to be very historical and the Los Serranos Golf Course which has a 1925 clubhouse the city seeks to preserve. And there are specific actions that identify that. He knows that Diamond Bar has specific historic areas as well. And then there is one on greenhouse gas emissions with specific actions and another on developing and implementing a climate action plan and specific to that, the city wants city vehicles to be emission friendly. Water conservation is another one. Water resource protection and protecting water quality, each of which has action items. What he has heard proposed this evening might be a good input for the GPAC to consider. Develop a very sound Conservation Element in the General Plan and make sure it connects and flows to the other elements and in so doing, he believes Diamond Bar would meet all of the State required laws. And please, let’s save Tres Hermanos.

GPAC DISCUSSION:

M/Rivera asked why is it that when so many other cities have an Open Space Conservation Element, it was not included in the Diamond Bar General Plan?

Katharine Pan responded that a few months ago the GPAC went over the Resource Conservation Element, and many of the policies the last speaker provided examples of are contained in the Resource Conservation Element policies. What the consultant and staff have presented to date for all of the elements are the policies for the GPAC to comment on, along with context of background information contained in the Existing Conditions Report and the Alternatives Reports, etc. When the full Draft General Plan is produced it will not be 200 pages long, but it will likely include 40-50 pages of background information and context for the policies such as the Water Resource Conservation, Open Space, Hillside Conservation, Biological Resources and steps for developers to follow in terms of onsite assessments being done prior to development, all of which are required by the State of California and as part of the CEQA evaluation.

M/Rivera asked if what Katharine Pan is saying is that it is delineated in the General Plan and what he has heard from individual speakers is that it is not in one specific dedicated chapter.

Katharine Pan reiterated that it is delineated in the Resource Conservation Element and the Open Space Element and Conservation Element tend to touch on a lot of similar topics which is why, in this case, it is combined to avoid too much cross referencing.

M/Black said that once this is detailed in the Draft General Plan, much of what was mentioned as action items during Public Comment is the criteria that will be followed in assembling the analysis.

Katharine Pan responded that the way the Elements are structured currently does not follow the goal action item structure which is the structure used in General Plans. Another structure that has been followed in the Draft General Plan is the Guiding Policies versus Implementing Policies because the Guiding Policies offer the goal level overarching view. For example, Guiding Policy 1 under Resource Conservation states “create and maintain a balanced Open Space system that will preserve scenic beauty and community identity, protect important biological resources, provide open space for outdoor recreation and the enjoyment of nature, conserve natural resources and ensure Public Health and Safety” and the Implementing Policy 1 states “obtain and designate Open Space land through feasible acquisition techniques such as requiring the incorporation of open space and recreational areas into the design of new development projects and allowing clustering or transferring of all or part of the development potential of the site to a portion of the site” which is the more specific language that explains how the City will accomplish Guiding Policy 1. It is possible to structure these in that same way, but the issue that has come to the foreground over time is that some Implementing Policies are actions that implement more than one goal which is why the goals have been clustered at the top of each topic area which allows the Implementing Policies to support one or more of each of the Guiding Policies.

M/Black said that explanation made sense to him and that in layman’s terms, this is the overview and the process is drilling down into these concepts and that staff and the consultant will provide the background for each.

Katharine Pan further explained that a lot of the background information comes from research that was previously done for the Existing Conditions Report and when this is put into the General Plan language it becomes more of a narrative and anything that needs to be updated from what was done two years ago will be updated and focus on items that are driving the Policies and not just a general overview. For example, when the discussion is about Open Spaces, an inventory of the Open Space and Map would be included, etc.

M/Garg asked if in developing the Diamond Bar General Plan staff looks at other cities’ General Plans.

Katharine Pan explained that to the extent that the GPAC wants to model Diamond Bar's plan after other city's plans, it is direction the consultant can take from the GPAC. Some cities for which her firm consults have said there is a city nearby and they like how that city approached a certain issue. As a result, Dyett & Bhatia will look at how that city addressed that issue. On the other hand, Dyett & Bhatia has its own experience, and when entering into a contract with a city such as Diamond Bar, they look at what Diamond Bar currently has and compares it to the background of the firm. And to the extent that there is interest in following the example of another city, the consultant takes that direction. However, Dyett & Bhatia wants to closely look at things that are "best practices" and "current" in planning, which comes to Dyett & Bhatia through research and application.

Chair/St. Amant asked about deed restrictions on open space. The way the Summitridge Trail was sold to the City was that it would be deed restricted and his understanding is that it can be changed by a vote of the people and he is not comfortable with that. Is there a way that deed restrictions can be done to protect the land in perpetuity?

CDD/Gubman responded that the GPAC can make a recommendation that the City Council record deed restrictions on the publicly owned open space if it wishes to do so. As an advisor and guide to the GPAC as this project moves forward, he would suggest that that might be overkill in terms of the level of commitment that has been articulated in the City's revised and more robust policies and in the fact that the City puts the General Plan designation of Open Space on that land with the added burden that not only must the City Council approve a General Plan Amendment to change that designation, it must go to a vote of the people as well. With respect to the lands that comprise the Summitridge Trail area and another area that was also dedicated to the City near Pantera Park, if one goes back to the Tentative Map and the Resolutions Certifying the EIR and approving the Tentative Tract Map, throughout those findings provided in the document, even though ultimately the land was dedicated to the City without a deed restriction explicitly stated on the Map, the City Council Resolution certifying the EIR repeatedly says that this land is dedicated to the City for perpetual open space. And, there are a number of commitments that have been documented which shows it is the City's intent to do so. If it is the desire to make that recommendation to also put a deed restriction, the GPAC can certainly do so, but he would say at this point with all of the levels of obligation to protect those areas as natural open space, there are already belt and suspenders on these things. A deed restriction would likely add a safety pin to that. It couldn't hurt, but it may not be getting the GPAC much more than the protections that exist and we're proposing as much as possibly can be done.

Chair/St. Amant said that it would be a failsafe because who knows what the future holds, but we could end up with somebody actually wanting to sell it without a failsafe.

CDD/Gubman reiterated that if the City proposed to dispose of land that it owned, it would have to go to the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission would have to make a finding for General Plan consistency based on the purpose for which the land is being disposed. So, if the purpose is for a non-open space use, the disposal of that land would not be consistent with the General Plan. When the Industry Successor Agency wanted to dispose of its land to the City of Industry, the City of Diamond Bar Planning Commission as well as the Chino Hills Planning Commission, made findings that the disposal of that land was not going to be consistent with the respective General Plans because Diamond Bar knew that the intent was to develop a solar farm which is egregiously in opposition to what Diamond Bar envisioned for that site.

M/MRamirez motioned that Diamond Bar's portion of Tres Hermanos be classified/defined as a biologically significant area and classify its zoning as Open Space. The motion was seconded by M/Busse.

M/Sherwood said that as he understands it, the Diamond Bar portion of Tres Hermanos is zoned for 1-unit per five acres which is a low-density zoning for that area. Because Diamond Bar does not know what the future of that area will be and if you do what M/Ramirez wants to do, could a State Park or golf course or any type of development be built?

CDD/Gubman said that if it was designated open space, the policy proposed in the General Plan is that to change from Open Space to another designation would require a vote of the people. Before the question is called, he asked to provide more context with respect to the Tres Hermanos area. First, the General Plan Land Use designation as it stands at this time is Planning Area and the definition of Planning Area in the current General Plan and as proposed to be rolled forward into the General Plan Update is that that area is dedicated to conserve Open Space resources and is to be applied to properties where creative approaches are needed to integrate future development with existing natural resources. All proposed development within these designated areas shall require the formation of a Specific Plan pursuant to the provisions of the California Government Code, pursuant to State Law. And as M/Sherwood stated, the property is currently zoned 1-unit per five acres and with about 700 acres that yields about 124 dwelling units before applying the Hillside Density Reductions. It is already severely restricted and given that the property is the subject of litigation and settlement negotiations at this time, it may be premature

for the GPAC to weigh in on that but it may be something to consider at the appropriate time.

Chair/St. Amant said that for clarification the City could control that one house per five acres and require clustering.

CDD/Gubman responded that the Planning Area designation encourages clustering so that open space can be consolidated and preserved and the clustering would seek to concentrate development into as small a footprint as possible so that the remaining acreage could then be truly preserved as an Open Space resource.

Chair/St. Amant said a developer could not come in and say that he wanted to use each five acres for each house.

CDD/Gubman said that since there would be a Specific Plan requirement and as the City's Community Development Director reviewing the project, he would not support a Specific Plan that basically divides Tres Hermanos into five acre parcels with one house apiece. If something was proposed to include a residential component it would absolutely need to cluster and follow the intent of the Planning Area language to maximize the preservation of the open space and natural resources.

M/Sherwood asked if a golf course or State Park would be considered "open space" or given the motion, could a park exist?

CDD/Gubman explained that an active park could not be considered "open space" because it requires grading, earth movement and removal of resources which would be inconsistent with the intent of the Open Space designation and the way the policies have been drafted.

M/Harbin asked if M/VRamirez's motion were approved, would it eliminate the need for a Specific Plan should a developer come in with a proposal.

CDD/Gubman responded that it would still be a "recommendation", but if it was designated "Open Space" the Planning Area designation that currently exists in the Draft Land Use Plan would be replaced by the Open Space designation. So no, a developer would not be able to use it.

M/Harbin asked if the motion would eliminate the extra layer of requiring the Specific Plan. If the GPAC makes the recommendation to rezone it "Open Space" in that case, if a developer wanted to come in and build 100 units, he would not have to submit a Specific Plan.

CDD/Gubman responded that the way State Law is written, if a developer purchased the land they would have the right to build one dwelling unit per parcel. Tres Hermanos within the City of Diamond Bar is maybe divided up into six or seven parcels.

M/Black said he was not sure that he understood the answer. He asked if a developer would have to file a Specific Plan if it was designated Open Space.

CDD/Gubman said the answer is “no” and there would not really be anything to develop.

M/Black asked what significance is it with the biological aspect of that because he believed the motion had two components – Open Space and Biologically Significant Area.

CDD/Gubman explained that a Specific Plan for that area would, without question, require an EIR and the EIR is going to require specific biological surveys, soil surveys, archeological and paleontological surveys, so there would be much more detailed environmental analysis than the relatively high-level EIR review that the General Plan would require. It would be a “project-specific” EIR which would be extremely complex and detailed.

VC/Worthington asked Lee Paulson to address the Committee to provide his thoughts on the designation of Open Space in Tres Hermanos Ranch in terms of everything that has been discussed. It sounds to him like the GPAC has a consistent message on that, that Open Space would add another layer to it.

Lee Paulson said that we (the RLU) agree. It is basically another layer of protection and by designating it as a Biologically Significant Area there is a specific goal in the language that has been proposed that says it needs to be protected. The idea is two-fold in that once it has been dedicated as Open Space to protect it as “natural open space” that is a layer of protection that will hopefully reduce the value of the property to allow someone to purchase the property for a park or to help raise money to make it a park. If the City’s goal is to save the land, RLU’s position is that it is better from the GPAC’s perspective to support the City’s desire for that – to put as many road bumps in the way of development as possible.

Chair/St. Amant said he questioned whether the GPAC would be putting a road bump in front of itself because as M/Sherwood said, we could not then have a park if it was designated Open Space.

Lee Paulson said that M/Sherwood was correct and it was something for the GPAC to consider because part of the issue that has been brought up in the

past is the idea of specific definition and we have separated in our General Plan the idea of “parks” which are basically things with lawn where grading has taken place and natural space which is natural open space. So, if the GPAC wants to say okay, we want to save this land but we might want to put some grading and other things into it, he would suggest that the GPAC decide how much land and make a specific proposal to do that.

Chair/St. Amant asked if Lee Paulson’s recommendation was to cut it into parcels and designating a portion as Open Space and leaving the rest as the RL designation.

Lee Paulson said that the RLU’s position is to make the whole thing “natural open space” which is what citizens of the community have said as well. But, we will respect the GPAC’s decision.

M/Sherwood said he was not sure this was an issue the GPAC should deal with this evening because he believes that this is a land use issue which is not on the agenda tonight and the GPAC may be off track.

Chair/St. Amant said yes, unless we consider it under Resource Conservation which we have not gotten to yet this evening.

M/Sherwood said since the GPAC has not yet completed its first task this evening it could be considered later in the process.

Lee Paulson said it is a little of both which is why the RLU suggested it this evening because it is Resource Conservation.

M/Sherwood reiterated the GPAC is not there yet and it needs to attack the Community Character first.

M/MRamirez felt it was important to move forward to protect the land and he would like for the GPAC to vote on his motion that Diamond Bar’s portion of Tres Hermanos be classified/defined as a biologically significant area and classify its zoning as Open Space.

M/Rivera asked if the motion could be modified to allow for “active” parks.

M/MRamirez responded that would have to be defined as to how much you would want set aside for “active” parkland. What is at hand is protecting the land because it is two-fold. If the land gets sold, the City has to protect it now so it would provide no value to the buyer. If it gets broken down into parcels it would take time to figure out how much would be designated were there ever to be built an active park on the land, but he believes at this point, what he does

not want to happen is for someone to buy it from the City of Industry and the point is to protect it as Open Space at this time which is obviously GPAC's decision.

M/Sherwood – point of order. Agenda Item #4 is Continued GPAC discussion on Draft Policies for Community Character & Placemaking Element and he believes the GPAC is straying away from that item.

M/MRamirez said he would hold his motion for the next Agenda item.

M/Harbin felt the GPAC was treading on Land Use issues and she adamantly believed the members needed to consider that when one dances on somebody's property, a lot of times they have a right to come after you and sue for loss of value. This is only a recommendation to the City Council and they still have to make the change to Open Space and that could be months in the making during which a purchase of the property could go through the court.

M/MRamirez said that because of the current litigation he believed it could be tied up in court for years.

Lee Paulson said it could take a couple of years and there is no question now that the City of Industry owns it, which allows them to disregard anything that Diamond Bar puts in its General Plan because the City of Industry is a municipality and what they are trying to do is come up with something that suits municipal purposes and allows them to get out from under Diamond Bar's General Plan. And because it is a municipality and if they want to sell the property, the purpose of making it into Open Space is that once it turns into private property – once City of Industry sells it to a private individual, at that point the General Plan designation kicks in. So, if it is already designated as "Open Space" and somebody wants to buy it, if he were a developer and it was already designated as "Open Space" he would think twice about buying it in the first place. So, the idea isn't to take somebody's value away, it is to have someone take a hard look at it and say no, let's just sell it to someone that wants to preserve it. There are a lot of moving parts to this, but that's what RLU is trying to do.

M/Garg said if this area is designated as Open Space and the City of Commerce purchased it and Diamond Bar sells their portion, could they still build a solar farm. What he is hearing from Mr. Paulson is that if it is designated "Open Space" the buyer cannot do anything but leave it the way it is. Is that correct?

RECESS: Chair/St. Amant recessed the GPAC meeting at 7:40 p.m.

RECONVENE: Chair/St. Amant reconvened the GPAC meeting at 7:53 p.m.

Following discussion, M/MRamirez withdrew his motion that Diamond Bar's portion of Tres Hermanos be classified/defined as a biologically significant area and classify its zoning as Open Space.

4. GPAC DISCUSSION OF DRAFT POLICIES FOR THE COMMUNITY CHARACTER & PLACEMAKING ELEMENT CONTINUED:

M/Sherwood said that with respect to Item 18, Site Planning and Parking Implementation (Page 4) he would like for the consultant to expand and elaborate on or explain "encouraging the aggregation of individual small lots into larger developmental parcels within mixed-use areas that would support appropriately scaled cohesive and economically viable development."

Katharine Pan explained that for smaller parcels that might not be viable for mixed-use development to encourage those to be consolidated into larger sites that could accommodate the type of development the City encourages. The question that is often asked during GPAC meetings is whether or not certain sizes of developments could be economically viable and this is suggesting, that as part of site planning, rather than looking at individual parcels that might be too small, to encourage those to be consolidated.

M/Sherwood said that in the Guiding Policies of Overall Character and Design he wanted to put forth some additional guiding policies that he believes should be number 1 and 2. In the first community workshop, people were asked what words they thought defines Diamond Bar and the most common responses were "community" and "country living" and the 1995 General Plan Vision Statement "retention of rural country living, community character" and in the Vision Statement, "preservation of open space" and he would like to include to items 1 and 2 add Community Character Guiding Principles - #1 "Retention of Rural Country Living Community Character. There is a strong and long held goal among residents to maintain and protect distinctive physical attributes of Diamond Bar, which make it a desirable place in which to live with the careful balances of housing, business, services, public facilities, preservation and significant natural resources." As for new #2 he asked to add the following: "Significant private and publicly owned vacant areas exist within the boundaries of Diamond Bar and within its Sphere of Influence. The preservation of these resources contribute to the goals of retaining the City's distinctive character and offers educational, recreational and environmental opportunities." M/Sherwood moved that the GPAC adopt #1 and #2 as read.

M/Rivera asked if M/Sherwood was intending to replace CC-G-1 and CC-G2 with the wording he has provided. M/Sherwood said he wanted to make his statements

Items 1 and 2 with all of the others slide down into place as 3, 4, 5, etc. He explained that these are new items that he pulled from the 1995 General Plan Vision Statement and these items would go on the first page of Overall Character and Design Guiding Policies as Items 1 and 2.

M/Rivera seconded M/Sherwood's motion.

VC/Worthington asked M/Sherwood to reread his motion which he did.

Roll Call vote:

M/Sherwood	Aye	
M/Rivera	Aye	
M/Black	Aye	
M/Busse	Aye	
M/Evans	Aye	
M/Garg	Aye	
M/Harbin	No	because it is out of synch with the other language as written in the document.
M/Mao	Aye	
M/MRamirez	Aye	he asked M/Harbin to explain how the language is out of character or inconsistent

M/Harbin asked to see M/Sherwood's written language. She said she understood where M/Sherwood is coming from. However, when it talks about this is the first one that he is looking to add: "Retention of Rural Country Living and Community Character" he says there is a strong long-held goal among residents which she understands. That type of explanatory language, however, is not included in the other guiding policies, which is her reason for voting no. If they were written in accordance with the other policies, she would be more amenable to his motion.

M/MRamirez asked if they were in conflict or if it was just the character of the language and adjectives used to describe the character that concerned M/Harbin.

M/Harbin said it is not that they are in conflict, but rather are inconsistent with how the other parts of the document are written. She understands where he is going with his motion and believes they can be written similar to the language currently contained within the policies in the document.

CDD/Gubman explained that the language that M/Sherwood read is from the Vision Statement in the introduction of the 1995 General Plan so that language is not in the form of policies but rather more of the overall global vision that sets the tone for the General Plan. Staff can certainly craft policies that say in terms of community character, retain the rural country community character that has been

established in the City, for example, which would be a policy. Staff understands what the GPAC's desire is for the policies to say and staff will be coming back to the GPAC with all of the comments on community character and staff will draft language that embodies the intent of the motion.

CDD/Gubman responded to M/Sherwood that his motion could direct staff to draft policies that convey the intent of these two vision statement bullet points.

M/Sherwood amended his motion to direct staff to draft policy language that address the retention of rural country living, community character and the preservation of open space resources. M/Rivera seconded M/Sherwood's amended motion.

Motion approved 12-0 by the following Roll Call vote:

M/Sherwood	Aye
M/Rivera	Aye
M/Black	Aye
M/Busse	Aye
M/Evans	Aye
M/Garg	Aye
M/Harbin	Aye
M/Mao	Aye
M/MRamirez	Aye
M/VRamirez	Aye
VC/Worthington	Aye
Chair/St. Amant	Aye

M/Sherwood said that the current Community Character Guiding Policy presumes the City has a pedestrian-oriented mixed-use focused areas and frankly, it does not. He thinks the Guiding Principles do not reflect what Diamond Bar is. Residents listed low density as an attribute they preferred for the City and he feels that the City has a higher density and retail focused policy with this update, which he does not believe fits the character of Diamond Bar which is a family residential community. To that end, he would eliminate the current Guiding Principal #1 and move to strike CC-G1. In his opinion, what this is doing is forcing the community into something it isn't – we are not a pedestrian community. We are not Pasadena where you leave your apartment and walk down the street to the mini-mart. Diamond Bar is a car centric community that is primarily a bedroom community and he would like for the GPAC to stay focused on what we are and not shoehorn the City into a higher density urban palette.

M/Mao reflected back to the previous GPAC Meeting when CDD/Gubman said that parking space is not what it used to be and when the City builds new outlets there

is limited parking available. If the City does not build a pedestrian-oriented City there will not be enough parking available. In addition, isn't that the intent that was discussed for downtown Diamond Bar? He does not believe it is right to take this away from the Plan after going through all of the exercises trying to create a downtown or town center where people can gather and walk around.

M/Ramirez said he completely agreed with M/Mao. What the community has asked the GPAC to do is to envision what Diamond Bar will be. We know what Diamond Bar is today. And if we didn't want any changes at all, we would not have identified a mixed-neighborhood town center transit-oriented development and, we would not have done all that we have already accomplished and agreed on. He does not agree that the GPAC should change the City's guiding policy to reflect what Diamond Bar is today and that the GPAC should move to a guiding policy that takes the City where it wants to be.

Chair/St. Amant said that in getting rid of the mixed-use areas we are then in conflict with the desire to have open space and California requires that we have housing for growth. And if we don't do infill, that means we're going to do regular homes at one per half-acre or one per quarter-acre which defeats the purpose of saving open space.

M/Sherwood read CCG-7 – “ensure hillside development is sensitive to topography, views, native ecology and significant natural landforms”. He said he agreed with the RLU group that this statement belongs in the land use section.

CDD/Gubman said the reason staff would consider this appropriate for Community Character and Placemaking is that the most significant character defining feature of Diamond Bar is its topography and its landscape. So, the intent of placing the policy here is recognizing that it is a key aspect of the community's character and that any land uses or any development that occurs in the future needs to respect that.

M/Sherwood said he was satisfied with CDD/Gubman's explanation and reasoning.

M/Sherwood said that with respect to the site planning and parking implementation (Item 18, Page 4), he is concerned that this triggers higher density and could be aimed at the TOD and converting existing single-family neighborhoods to be redeveloped to a higher density. To that end, he is concerned that quite often cities will use Eminent Domain to pursue developmental preferences. He wants to know what assurances there are that Diamond Bar will not be using Eminent Domain for redevelopment as it has been done in other cities.

CDD/Gubman said he could not speak for decisions of future City Councils. To date there has been a very tangible intense aversion to Eminent Domain. There were deep reservations even of imposing the powers of Eminent Domain to take over the windmill when that shopping center was under the prior ownership and they did not appear to be inclined to preserve that historic object. One of the options the City Manager at the time suggested was to use Eminent Domain to seize ownership of the windmill and even that was a distasteful for the Council to think to consider. That has been the past practice and philosophy of past City Councils and whether future City Councils feel differently he cannot predict.

M/VRamirez said he was not concerned with Eminent Domain that would lead to commercial development. In fact, there was precedent set by the Supreme Court of the United States that prohibits that kind of use of Eminent Domain. Eminent Domain can be used for the community to buy land for community use, for transportation, schools – for public use. But the Supreme Court ruling prohibits the use of Eminent Domain for a commercial development.

M/Sherwood said that on building mass and design implementation 32 on Page 5 – ensure infill residential development is designed to be sensitive to the scale, character and identity of adjacent existing development. He wanted to know how that would work in the TOD since surrounding homes are, for the most part, single family dwellings.

CDD/Gubman explained that there is a practice that has been well established called form-based coding and this applies the spirit of form based codes where the City takes the existing built environment with the scale of what the adjacent surrounding development is and if new development is going in that might be of larger scale and/or masser bulk, that one considers the context and designs the new development to appropriately transition so that for example, one would not put a four-story structure next to a two-story structure. If a four-story structure is contemplated for this new development there needs to be a transition in the form so that there isn't that discordant effect of incompatible structures or elements.

Katharine Pan referred to Implementation Policy CC-I-29 that states where new development within a mixed-used district is adjacent to less intensive uses, ensure that the new development creates a sensitive transition that minimizes impacts on the adjacent existing use and, it lists a few measures that would be included such as requiring step backs for higher stories, enhancing landscapes and requiring similar setbacks.

Chair/St. Amant asked why crime prevention through environmental design isn't included as a requirement for new developments.

Katharine Pan said she believed that was addressed in a couple of other areas but if there is something specific Chair/St. Amant would like to see it can be included.

CDD/Gubman said he believed it was contained in the Safety Element and because any development has to be consistent with the entire General Plan, environmental design pursuant to CPTED principles of design would also be factored into the other criteria in project design including aesthetic factors and compatibility.

M/Rivera said it was Item #15 and Katharine Pan said it is under Parks and Open Spaces. The policy that the City has is directed more toward the public realm – public spaces to be physically and visually accessible from the street.

CDD/Gubman explained that when the policies that are drafted here are incorporated into the Draft General Plan, staff will attempt to organize the policies to avoid as much repetitive language as possible. Staff could certainly establish the order or organization of the policies for this Element with some more overriding goals, this being one that would certainly be applicable to any type of development. This is a good point that has been raised which has been discussed by staff as to how this can be made a more organized and better flowing document. This is something staff will look at as to how the document is formatted so that the same thing does not have to be repeated under subcategory.

M/Busse said that both CC-I-31 and CC-I-43 refer to installing sidewalk bulbout in key locations and pointed out that he learned what a bulbout was in the *Los Angeles Times* two days ago where he read that the installation of bulbout impeded the emergency egress in the town of Paradise and he would be real skeptical to suggest that Diamond Bar do anything for the sake of landscaping that impedes emergency access or egress, particularly in commercial areas.

Chair/St. Amant said he agrees. There are bulbouts in Diamond Bar on Sunset Crossing and Prospectors Road near Beaverhead and some of the other intersections. He believes that in the case of the article called out by M/Busse, Paradise actually reduced a large boulevard from four lanes to two lanes and included the bulbouts. He doesn't believe that the bulbout would impede emergency vehicles as much as reducing the lanes from four to two would impede emergency vehicles. In this instance, that was done to slow traffic and increase commercial sales by getting people to stop and visit the shops. Bulbouts are generally installed for the safety of pedestrians so that cars don't whip into a right turn. With the bulbout, the pedestrian is visible to the driver attempting to turn right whereas they are not visible without the bulbout.

CDD/Gubman said that CC-I-31, Page 5, contains some elaboration to help explain the intent of the policy which is why it is italicized. It is not part of the policy

but provides examples of how to encourage more pedestrian activity and tries to be more strategic in saying “installing the bulbout in key locations.” The appropriateness of a feature such as a bulbout should be scrutinized if it is going to be considered, but certainly, if it is preferred that the General Plan not get to that level of specificity in the types of enhancements and leave it more broad and vague that can be done with the same policy language.

Katharine Pan said that if any sort of improvements to the roadway are proposed, that sort of thing does undergo review through both the engineering department and the fire department for approval once they determine that their apparatus can make it through the roadway and make safe turns without increasing hazards. In addition, bulbouts are one of the standard tools that streetscape planners use to improve pedestrian safety and the tradeoff is between the width of the roadway and the day-to-day comfort and safety of pedestrians crossing the street which can be balanced in a number of ways. The bulbout is a suggestion and in any location, this policy could be implemented in a number of different ways.

M/Sherwood referred to the Neighborhood Mixed-Use Focus Area, Page 8, Implementation Policy #42, it calls for two gateways on Diamond Bar Boulevard, one at Highland Valley Road and one at Sunset Crossing Road. Why two and not just one at Highland Valley Road?

Katharine Pan responded that a “gateway” is a visual indication that lets a visitor know they are entering a location that is a focal point or special in some way. Usually, signage is associated with gateways but it can be limited to landscaping, streetscape and such. The intent of this policy was to catch both ends of that neighborhood as those intersections being significant in some way.

M/Sherwood asked if the work that was done at Grand Avenue and Diamond Bar Boulevard be considered “gateway” and CDD/Gubman said yes. The intersections have some features that help define that as a “place” that is distinctive.

M/Sherwood said he can see a gateway at Highland Valley Road because that is where Diamond Bar begins but he is having trouble with the idea of having a gateway at Sunset Crossing Road.

Chair/St. Amant said he believed it was because the off-ramp (at Sunset Crossing) is a major access. The way it could be resolved is to do what some other cities have done, and on the overpass place a “Welcome to Diamond Bar” (monument/sign) in stone.

M/VRamirez said it wouldn't have to be as significant as a monument, it could just be a design feature that lets people know they are entering into this mixed-use neighborhood. Also, he would not be too concerned by this language because the

developer will create the kind of visual aspects that will let everyone know “this is a mixed-use neighborhood” and he likes that idea.

M/Sherwood spoke about the TOD Mixed-Use focus area. Implementation Item #68, Page 12: “Develop specific building height and other developmental standards through implementation mechanisms such as the City’s Zoning Ordinance or Master Planning process. Until such time as specific standards are developed, building height should not exceed 45 feet.” He asked what the current building height is in Diamond Bar and is there a difference between commercial and residential.

CDD/Gubman responded that 35 feet is the predominant building height with the exception of the Gateway Corporate Center.

M/Sherwood asked what the rationale was for going to 45 feet at the TOD.

CDD/Gubman responded the proposed height is something that the GPAC can consider. It is a height limitation that staff established and it would have to work in concert with the other compatibility standards so if there was additional development in Shea Center that is in the interior of the site, that might be a more appropriate place for a 45 foot structure. If there are any reservations about that, perhaps different language could be inserted such as “maximum height of three stories” or whatever other thoughts the GPAC may have.

Chair/St. Amant said this subject was brought up three or four meetings ago.

M/VRamirez said he cannot remember the term that related the size of the project and the density of the building, the footprint.

CDD/Gubman responded that the term is FAR (Floor Area Ratio)

M/VRamirez said the GPAC agreed on a specific ratio and asked if the 45 foot standard fit within that ratio or is it wider or taller based on the FAR?

Chair/St. Amant said that 45 feet would be four stories and if he remembers the conversation correctly, the discussion was about having “space” rather than having the building fill the lot by building smaller but taller in order to provide open public space.

CDD/Gubman said that Chair/St. Amant was correct. But allowing more height in concert with FAR, there would be less of a building footprint because FAR is going to control the overall intensity of development.

M/VRamirez said it was his opinion that the City should allow the FAR to govern the size and footprint of the building. A maximum has already been established that he felt should be higher, but the will of the committee was to be smaller so that the buildings and density would be smaller.

M/Sherwood said his concern was that the City was changing the current standard of 35 feet and he would like for this to say "not to exceed 35 feet" because until such time as specific standards are developed he believes the General Plan should be consistent throughout the City with 35 feet.

M/MRamirez said that the GPAC has to take into consideration that this document is a plan that extends out for the next 25 years and things will change within that 25 year period and this is giving the City some leeway if and when things change in the future.

Chair/St. Amant said that in addition, it helps the City with infill to which M/MRamirez agreed.

M/Sherwood said that if the City establishes a 45 foot standard limit for the TOD it will go into other areas which would mean a vertical City, higher density and more traffic.

M/VRamirez said he does not see how that would be possible. If an FAR has been established that describes the density, it is not possible. M/Harbin agreed.

M/Black concurred with M/VRamirez. He thinks the established standard of 45 feet should apply. There needs to be some latitude, but to be fair, that discussion also included discussion of development costs and by setting the limit tentatively at 45 feet helped entice developers into that area.

M/Sherwood said that perhaps he is not understanding the FAR because the current limit is 35 feet on building height and to maintain a density that the people wish for is a low to medium density community and a higher height limit will increase density which he believes people do not want.

Chair/St. Amant said because the FAR is set so if it cannot increase density by what it does, it increases public and private space and it won't necessarily be residential - it could be office, for example.

5. REVIEW AND DISCUSS UPDATED DRAFT POLICIES FOR THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS: RESOURCE CONSERVATION; PUBLIC FACILITIES & SERVICES; COMMUNITY HEALTH & SUSTAINABILITY; AND, SAFETY.

CDD/Gubman explained that this is the first agenda item which is being returned to the GPAC with proposed revisions, updates, and refinements to policies that had previously been presented to the committee. With the conclusion of the Community Character & Placemaking discussion, staff has introduced all of the Draft General Plan Elements. The GPAC received a lot of written and verbal comments with respect to the Land Use/Economic Development Element, as well as the Resource Conservation Element. There has been feedback on the other Elements (Circulation, Safety, Community Health & Sustainability, Public Facilities & Services) and looking at the volume of comments received and the amount of work that has gone into studying those comments and providing recommendations it became clear that it would be too burdensome and virtually impossible to come back to the GPAC with all of the draft policies staff has looked at to date in one meeting. Since Land Use and Conservation were the two most feedback generating Elements, tonight's focus will be on the agenda items only that generated fewer comments so that staff can then use future meetings to cover the bigger ticket items that would require more time to discuss such as Land Use and Circulation. Staff spent a substantial amount of time genuinely determining how all of the public comments and concerns could be given proper consideration as evidenced by the included charts. To help the GPAC navigate through the policies that have been combined in the charts, the information has been organized into three columns. The left column is the policy as originally presented when the item was on the GPAC agenda; the middle column is a compilation of all of the comments that were received for each of those policies, and the far right column is staff's recommendation on how to proceed. In order to dispense with some of the less controversial or accepted Policies, the left column shows those in highlighted in yellow in the left column. If the original policy generated no comments and staff saw no need for further revision, those were highlighted in the left column. If there was a comment received from sources that staff believed did a better job in conveying the intent of that policy, that policy was highlighted in the middle column and staff is recommending substituting the alternative presented by the GPAC or by the public, for what was originally presented. If there is a policy that was originally drafted for which comments were received, staff highlighted the far right column where there was an attempt to craft a revised policy that synthesized the various comments into a better policy that takes into account all of the feedback.

This effort involved compiling about 256 policies, 64 of which generated comments. Staff is recommending that the GPAC accept more than 76 percent of the proposed revisions – either what is highlighted in the middle column in response to the public proposal or, the way in which staff has attempted to blend

the best suggestions into a new policy which would be found in the right column. In order to get through this more quickly, the GPAC may wish to dispense with everything that is highlighted in yellow in the left column with no comment and the highlighted comments in the middle column received through public comment and if the GPAC is happy with staff's recommendation focus on, the highlighted portions of the right column. And finally, concentrate on the right column or if the left column was highlighted and comments were received, but staff believes the original policy was written properly.

M/VRamirez thanked staff for the work they did for this meeting. This is the first GPAC meeting where the community, community groups and stakeholders have actually complimented staff for their work and instilling their comments. This is exactly what the GPAC needed, this is what the GPAC asked staff to do and he really appreciates the work that was done. Clearly this was a big effort on staff's part and from the general comments the GPAC received this evening during Public Comments it sounds like the community is happy too. He will not make a motion at this time but he is inclined to agree with staff's recommendations.

M/Mao echoed M/VRamirez. Upon receipt of the packet he wondered how he would be able to go through all of the policy changes and staff made it so easy. When making changes they included staff's statement about why they did so, which helps committee members and the public understand the reason behind their recommendations. This packet is incredible. It usually takes a long time for him to go through his packet prior to the meetings, but this time it was a lot easier.

M/Sherwood reiterated what has been said. He knows this was a lot of work and he can attest that CDD/Gubman worked very hard on this because he sent CDD/Gubman a message at 10:00 p.m. one evening and got a response about 10 minutes later which shocked him. He thanked CDD/Gubman for the hard work he put into this effort. It was very helpful to him and he knows that CDD/Gubman struggled mightily with it.

M/Sherwood asked for clarification on Implementation Item 7, Page 6 "require new development to preserve mature native trees including oak and walnut, and trees of significant culture, etc." He wanted to know how this is implemented and how is new development preserving these? If a tree is in the middle of where a builder wants to place a building, does that negate building a building or how does this all work?

CDD/Gubman explained that the challenge is that if there are significant or protected trees, the builder needs to find a way to develop around it. If a tree is a significant specimen and it is in the way, the builder may be compelled to relocate it. In a previous community he worked for called the city of trees and PhD's where there are oak trees within project sites, they have protected the natural grade of

that oak tree and avoided the drip line to that tree and found a way to develop around it. And there were also instances where they had to go through the very expensive process of relocating an oak tree. Depending on how much tree cover there is and since Diamond Bar is dealing primarily with infill, although there are a couple of undeveloped residential sites, it may not be possible to preserve all of the trees but the City needs to require that builders make a genuine effort to protect those significant trees and avoid impacts to them.

M/Sherwood said that if as an example, Willow Heights had a bunch of oak trees on that site, they could still build provided they move the trees somewhere else.

CDD/Gubman responded that could be one option or they would have to find a way to build around it and perhaps staff would have to provide some encouragement by relaxing some development standards because the importance of that tree may perhaps warrant granting of the variance of another development standard.

M/Black asked about the elimination of RC-1-3, Page 2, right hand column, except for the last paragraph.

CDD/Gubman responded that after reading the comments and reviewing the policy language that is carried over from the current General Plan, it became obvious that the first three sections is a lot of legalese and a lot of citations of state law which somewhat convolutes the core intent of the policy, which is simply that if land is designated as open space or if it has a deed restriction of open space, if somebody wants to change that General Plan designation they are not going to simply be able to go through the process of getting a City Council approval, they would also have to have a successful ballot measure passed to get that designation changed from Open Space to something else. Leaving the last section distills the language, avoids any difficulty in interpretation and makes the language as clear and concise as needed to get the point across.

M/Sherwood referred to water resources implementation Item RC-1-23 on Page 10 “where possible, require the use of mulch in landscape areas to improve the water holding capacity of the soil by reducing evaporation and soil compaction” and asked who this applied to, to the entire City or applicable only to the City’s landscaping requirements?

CDD/Gubman responded that this applies to public and private development and the intent is to conserve water to be more water efficient and the City’s Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance is already extremely stringent and requires measures such as this which is something the City is already doing.

M/Sherwood said that when it comes to water he understands that the City tends to lose a lot of water through leaks of the water company's own delivery systems. He wanted to know if there was anything the City does or could do to address that issue?

CDD/Gubman this might be more in the Public Facilities & Services area where it speaks to maintaining and upgrading and fixing the City's infrastructure.

Chair/St. Amant referred to the bottom of Page 4, PF-1-11 of Public Facilities & Services section which states: "Should Los Angeles County choose to cease operations of the Diamond Bar Golf Course or reduce the area of the Golf Course, prepare a master plan for the area to include a public park comprising a range of passive and active recreational uses to suit the needs of Diamond Bar residents." He asked if that could be interpreted to mean that they can do other things and include a small park because the language was limited earlier when the GPAC talked about the overlay for the golf course can only be a park, but by wording it this way it appears the City could take two acres of that and turn it into a park because it is not specific enough that it can only be a park.

CDD/Gubman responded that the Land Use Element will prescribe that and since this is Public Facilities & Services, what is being said here is that, the entire site would have to be master planned and since this is a focus on Public Facilities & Services it is not the Land Use Element that speaks to Grand Avenue and what happens north and south, it is saying that the City cannot just do some sort of piecemeal, out-of-context park plan, it has to look at the entire site and master plan it.

M/Rivera asked if the GPAC needed to vote on each of the policy matrixes only or if there could be one vote on the entirety.

CDD/Gubman said that before the GPAC takes action, this should be opened up for public comment after which the GPAC can take a single vote on all of the policies should it chose to do so. If there is one policy element that the GPAC wishes to change or eliminate it can separate the motions.

M/Sherwood referred to PF-G-4 on Page 7 (Schools and Community Facilities) which states: "Continue to provide residents of all ages and abilities with access to high quality local educational facilities and learning opportunities, etc." From a recreational standpoint, are school facilities open to the public when schools are not in session?

CDD/Gubman responded that in some cases they could be. It would depend on the Joint Use Agreement between the districts and the City in terms of the level of use for the general public.

M/VRamirez said that he and M/Evans can attest that all of the Diamond Bar Middle Schools are used for soccer and other sports and there is a dearth of public space for recreation and sports and these schools are good enough to allow these sports teams (softball, soccer, football, basketball) to use their facilities. The middle schools are the key to the kid's sports programs.

Katharine Pan added that there are some policies in the Recreation that promote that type of partnership which can be found under PF-I-18 on Page 6 which states: "To seek partnerships with schools and private entities to provide more recreational facilities and opportunities."

Public Comments:

Lee Paulson reiterated his respect for what the City has done and said he appreciates what they have done for his group and continue to recommend that the policies be adopted as written. On Page 4 under RC-1-7, the RLU asked that the City adopt something similar to what Brea adopted for their slope density with a specific number of units-per-acre depending on slope density and the City came back and said that their way of doing it with a slope density table is better. He agrees with that and the RLU agrees with using the table but wish to make a caveat that the General Plan and Municipal Codes have to work together and the existing table that describes the slope densities is "development oriented" and what the RLU recommends that the GPAC do is suggest that the City revise that table to make it more conservation-friendly. The tables say that up to 30% the amount of reduces very little whereas, most other cities, no development allowed much over a slope density of 30 percent. The RLU table says greater than 50 percent try not to do it. While the RLU agrees this is the way to go, in order to make it better reflect the views of what the City is trying to do, that Municipal Code will need to be changed and it will need to be done by the City Council.

Allen Wilson said that at the beginning of the meeting there were a lot of comments made about the open space and whether to turn it into a park. We know that area of Tres Hermanos is of significant value and he recommended that the GPAC consider adding a land use designation of Historical Land Preservation for the Tres Hermanos property under Public Facilities, Open Space and Hillside LU-147. This property has a lot of historical significance and in the next 20 years Diamond Bar will be 50 years old and historical preservation of the community should be on the table with Tres Hermanos being one area of consideration.

Robin Smith spoke about biology and science. Conservation is about science. It is about understanding how things live, what they need to live, how they survive and what those living things do to provide ecosystem services for humans and animals. She would like the GPAC to consider what sort of scientific input is there in this document. There is nothing wrong with land planners clustering, but her point is with respect to Tres Hermanos, for example, it just so happens today that where those condos are planned is right on a very sensitive watershed that has not been mapped in the DEIR that was done in 2012-2013. That is an omission that will impact that area and what she is attempting to convey is, it is not just clustering of houses in a sensitive environmental area that is the solution, it is the question of, where are we putting the development and will it degrade the ecosystem which is a working life system. And when that ecosystem, like the human body, is impaired in some way, however small it will lead to further degradation and that is why a Conservation Element is performed by biologists who go out and look at a plant community and know how it functions and what it does, like an oak woodland, which is not just a bunch of trees but rather, how they ecologically function. And understanding that and getting the best information is how Diamond Bar gets good development and good development would be achieving true sustainability which means the ecosystem is going to survive and flourish and the City will have a nice development also. That is very sensitive work which is called conservation planning. She is not aware of any biologists' input in this document and it seems to be missing. The mature oak trees M/Sherwood asked about have to be designated as "heritage trees" or the oak woodland has to be designated and recognized as a working landscape according to the State of California which recently redid all of its vegetation measurements. Rather than taking a decorative approach or a simple safety approach, getting to the deeper facts like the Puente soil that is moveable means that Tres Hermanos is not buildable because of the landslide risk and things which create constraint. The question is, how much is that constraint and what does it do and that's what a dedicated Conservation Element would provide rather than conjecture and opinion. Please consider getting science involved which is where the facts lie.

Vinod Kayshap spoke about density grading and as a civil engineer, he knows that the code cannot be written as-is because the City faced the same situation at South Point School when the canyon was filled and at Site D by building retaining walls where a trapezoidal channel was built. One can follow along the bottom of the wall and up where it is about 40 feet high. On top of that there is a three-story house. His home is in that development and friends of his live above the development. Whereas previously, they had a view and now they view these homes. It is not right to give public land to developers so that they can make money and our property values go down. There were traffic studies done which he bird-dogged and when one gets on Diamond Bar Boulevard or through the back streets to Brea Canyon from where he lives it takes him 10 minutes to get onto Brea Canyon Road at the traffic signal. Imagine what is being discussed here. We're talking about

grading 10%, 20%, 30% and 50% slopes and the simple answer is build a retaining wall, a reinforced retaining wall and then on top of that build homes which are next to zero side setbacks? What are we doing here? These are the kinds of things we need to guard against when the City comes up with the kind of standards we're looking at as engineering standards. There are engineering standards available. If you look at the County of Los Angeles, they have standard plans which tell you what you can and cannot do in certain situations. And most cities adopt the City or County of Los Angeles standard plans, they don't wing it. And that is the direction in which we need to go. They are tried and trusted methods, they are standard specifications for public works construction, there are plans for public works construction, but none of it is addressed over here. As Responsible Land Use he is approaching it the same way as when he was working for Metropolitan Water District. If you wanted to build a dam or a treatment plant we're taking the same approach. And I suggest to you (the GPAC) that is the approach that is taken – an engineering approach is not the same as a planner's approach.

Diego Tamayo spoke about Tres Hermanos and the Zoning of one unit per five-acres. He said he wanted to reinforce what Robin Smith said earlier. He personally took a course through the UC California Naturalist Program Course and he can say with great certainty that if there is any development on Tres Hermanos there will be fragmentation and the value of that open space will be extremely compromised because if you develop an area, the immediate area surrounding it will be disturbed.

Chair/St. Amant closed Public Comments:

GPAC Discussion:

M/Sherwood asked if language could be drawn up to address telecommunication service providers. Language that would state that telecommunications and telephone service providers provide service in the spirit of the following offered language: "Require telecommunications and telephone service providers using rights-of-ways and easements to provide service to all homes and businesses." Some telecommunications providers go into a neighborhood but do not provide service to the entire neighborhood. And being a utility that uses the City's rights-of-ways and easements as a quasi-utility similar to the gas and electric companies, they should be required to provide services to all homes and all businesses in the sector they are developing.

CDD/Gubman said this would be beyond the regulatory purview of the City. These entities are regulated by the Public Utilities Commission and the City cannot compel them to provide the fiber optics. They started to roll FIOS out in the City and then they stopped so that that the entire City is not served by fiber optics telecommunications infrastructure and the City cannot compel them to do so.

What is even worse is that the PUC grants the utilities so many preemptions over local regulations that they often do things the City would rather they not do, primarily for aesthetic reasons, but they continue to get more preemptions granted that exempt them from how the City might want to regulate them.

M/MRiviera motioned that the policies be adopted for the Public Facilities & Service Policy Matrix and the Resource Conservation Policy Matrix as prepared by staff. Chair/St. Amant seconded M/Riviera's motion.

M/Black asked that the motion be amended to include all four attachments. M/Riviera accepted the amendment and Chair/St. Amant seconded the amended motion.

M/Sherwood said that regarding the Community Health & Sustainability Elements, implementation policy #21, Page 6: "Develop destinations such as clusters of commercial use, uses planned along Diamond Bar Boulevard and the neighborhood mixed-use area and throughout the transit mixed-use area and new town center that draw residents from the entire community." He asked if that should be included under Land Use.

Katharine Pan said the section is under "social connection" and the idea was to develop places in the community where that could be a destination for everyone in the community.

Motion carried by the following Roll Call vote:

M/Riviera	Aye
Chair/St. Amant	Aye
M/Black	Aye
M/Busse	Aye
M/Evans	Aye
M/Garg	Aye
M/Harbin	Aye
M/Mao	Aye
M/MRamirez	Aye
M/VRamirez	Aye
M/Sherwood	Aye
VC/Worthington	Aye

Chair/St. Amant thanked staff, consultants, members and the public for their excellent work.

M/VRamirez said there has been a lot of discussion by the community throughout the process and he believes there is clear consensus that the community and that

the GPAC wants to protect is Tres Hermanos. He is pleased that the City is fighting the good fight, both the City of Diamond Bar and the City of Chino Hills. Both are challenging the beast that is the City of Industry and the City of Commerce and that should continue. He agrees with M/MRamirez sentiment that the GPAC needs to protect Tres Hermanos, but he does not believe the GPAC's role should be to protect Tres Hermanos tonight or in this process by using the GPAC's recommendations as a strategy to fight the litigation. He believes that Tres Hermanos is too important to this community and to everyone and he goes back to why he and he believes others, are here, and that is to try to instill in the General Plan a "vision" of what everyone wants Tres Hermanos to be. And he likes the idea of the focus being "we want the open spaces, but we also really need recreation and parkland that is useable." He has no idea how much can be used in Tres Hermanos and he would like to profit from the recommendations made by the community that we need a conservation study to identify what should be protected and what might be useable in terms of parkland and space we can use for our children for generations to come. While he agrees with the idea of having Tres Hermanos be an open space, he also thinks it should include useable parkland and park facilities that the community can use and he has no understanding of what that might entail nor would he suggest that the GPAC try to create a ratio because he believes it needs to be studied. It might end up that there can be no recreational use, that it is such a sensitive ecosystem that we can't really do anything. But he does not want to lose that opportunity and he does not believe that this process should try to create a strategy for the litigation – let's fight that and at the same time think about the General Plan and what we want this land to be in the future.

Chair/St. Amant agreed with M/VRamirez and felt the City might be hurting itself by limiting it to open space and also, as M/Harbin pointed out, that there would be no Specific Plan which opens the City up to something worse.

M/Harbin said it is not that she advocates for more government bureaucracy, but in this case, in order to protect Tres Hermanos, if it were to be zoned Open Space, a developer could come in and develop to whatever the OS (Open Space) standards are, whereas, if you leave it as a Planning Area which requires a Specific Plan, it adds that extra layer of governmental review that you would not otherwise have with the OS zoning designation. With the Specific Plan requirement, staff and the City Council has the ability to say "no" to a proposed project.

M/Black said that by leaving it in a Planning Area which he supports, what would a planning zone with it being designated as "biologically sensitive" work? His understanding is that it would add another layer of environmental research onto the site.

CDD/Gubman responded that a Specific Plan would require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and there are numerous required components of an EIR including biology, air quality, cultural resources, archeology, paleontology, historic resources, Native American Heritage value on the site, hydrology, soil, seismic, all of which would be subject to detailed technical analysis. So the opportunities and constraints and the potential impacts of doing any kind of land disturbance in specific areas are going to be measurable and defined through that process. At this point, he could not say that the entire 700 acres is too sensitive of a resource to do anything at all, but that would be brought to the forefront and disclosed to everyone involved in the decision-making process and the public, what those resources are and what the potential impacts would be, before a decision is made.

Katharine Pan said she was not sure what the conditions are for this particular Specific Plan area, but the Specific Plan designation in a lot of cases, has its own set of conditions that can be placed on development of the site.

Chair/St. Amant asked if staff could look into that and asked staff to come back with recommendations for the GPAC to add layers of protection. And, whether the area that is designated by Diamond Ranch High School, with the City's plans for TOD and Mixed-Use Town Centers, could be eliminated because it would be replaced with infill and thereby replace the state's requirement with infill.

CDD/Gubman said theoretically, yes, it could be replaced with infill. SCAG has started its RHNA subcommittee to start the process determining the allocations for the communities within its region and staff would find out how much the City will be hit with its "fair-share" of the Regional Housing Need. If the City can accommodate that through its planning efforts and absorb the obligation that is being fulfilled by rezoning for that area south of Diamond Ranch High School, it is potentially a result of this planning effort. Housing Elements are the only General Plan Elements that require Certification by a State Agency and the California Department of Housing and Community Development, and it will have to be acceptable to them if that is done. It can be a painful, disappointing and aggravating process that sometimes causes planners to get into shouting matches with HCD staff.

Chair/St. Amant asked if there was anything the GPAC could do to try to ensure that the area south of Diamond Ranch High School is replaced with infill of a town center, etc.

CDD/Gubman said he could not say that the GPAC could ensure that because the City is at the mercy of HCD. We can strive to get there by capitalizing on infill housing opportunities elsewhere. HCD is notoriously difficult in terms of them liking vacant land more than infill land. If there is development and we want to plan

for that to be redeveloped with mixed-use they might say “no” – maybe when you get that plan done then maybe we’ll certify your Housing Element. The reality is that HCD is a state agency that does not seem to be accountable to anybody and he cannot make any promises. What he can say is if we make an effort to try to provide housing opportunities to fulfill our RHNA allocation that may present a stronger case to make to HCD when the Housing Element has to be updated in 2021.

Chair/St. Amant asked if M/MRamirez and M/Black wished to ask staff to come back with recommendations for added layers of protection for Tres Hermanos.

M/Evans asked if there was a way that the ecological aspects could be studied to determine whether it was useable land and if so, why these studies are not done beforehand.

CDD/Gubman reiterated that if a Specific Plan comes forward it is going to be subject to an Environmental Impact Report and it is going to require scientists and specialists and various disciplines to identify those impacts which could ultimately determine that a development is going to have impacts that cannot be mitigated and the decision of the City would be to either deny the project or find that there are overriding benefits that warrant that impact that cannot be mitigated. But there needs a proposal for that to be kicked off.

Chair/St. Amant asked if the City could preemptively do an EIR on an area that would discourage developers from looking at it.

CDD/Gubman said that at the General Plan level, an EIR is too high-level to get to that project-specific detail. These types of studies are really project-level studies, not General Plan level studies.

M/Black said that what he is hearing is that the EIR is rather onerous and it will go through several layers. Designating the Tres Hermanos Ranch as a biologically sensitive area could be a needless layer because so much will be covered in the project-specific environmental impact study. This is not going to change anything that already is and that has already been accomplished having the Tres Hermanos Ranch under a Planning Zone which does not hamstring the City of Diamond Bar from being able to do something with the land, such as a park or recreational area or golf course that the City and its constituents deem appropriate. He is not hearing that by adding another layer of protection it would mean someone would have to jump through extra hoops to protect the environment. If that is the case and with the understanding of what the constituents want and what the public wants, and what is good for Diamond Bar, he is good with the current zoning.

M/Black reiterated Chair/St. Amant's question about designating the entire site as a Planning Zone as it is currently designated, and whether that altered the area next to Diamond Ranch High School. M/Black said he does not believe it changes that at all because Diamond Bar is at the mercy of state agencies. If that is the case, he sees reason not to move ahead and take a motion that the Tres Hermanos Ranch will be designated as a Planning Zone as it currently exists and he makes the motion to reaffirm that existing designation.

M/MRamirez asked if Diamond Bar knows how Chino Hills has their portion of Tres Hermanos zoned?

CDD/Gubman said that it is very similar to Diamond Bar. In speaking to the Chino Hills City Manager, his understanding is that the zoning is along the lines of one unit per five acres and that they zoned a portion of their piece of Tres Hermanos for high-density to placate HCD and to meet their RHNA numbers.

CDD/Gubman said that Diamond Bar's designation is Planning Area 1 and staff is proposing to not address any changes from what the current designation is, especially in light of the current challenges and the pending lawsuits.

M/Black withdrew his motion.

VC/Worthington asked if M/MRamirez was withdrawing his motion and he responded that he was.

6. REVIEW OF NEXT STEPS:

CDD/Gubman said there would be one or more GPAC meetings for review of a similar review of matrices as provided this evening for the Land Use Element, Community Character & Placemaking Element and the Circulation Element. Staff will work on scheduling those meetings and would anticipate coming back to the GPAC Members early next year and he will continue to coordinate dates that would ensure a quorum.

Chair/St. Amant reiterated his appreciation for the work staff and the consultant put into this reading. He cannot imagine having to go through and do what CDD/Gubman did and it was an excellent layout and presentation. He also thanked the public for their participation and input.

6. DATES FOR FUTURE MEETINGS:

To Be Determined.

ADJOURNMENT: With no further business before the General Plan Advisory Committee, Chair/St. Amant adjourned the meeting at 10:03 p.m.

The foregoing minutes are hereby approved this 21st day of March, 2019.

Attest:
Respectfully Submitted,

Greg Gubman
Community Development Director

Brian Worthington, Vice Chairperson