

DRAFT

**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
APRIL 19, 2018**

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairperson St. Amant called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m.

1. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** Approved by Chair St. Amant
2. **ROLL CALL:**

Larry M. Black, David Busse, Teruni Evans, Mahendra Garg, Amy Harbin, Victor Ramirez, Gilbert Rivera, Paul Sherwood, Dr. Tony Torng, Vice Chairperson Brian Worthington, Chairperson Mark St. Amant

GPAC Members not present: Ching Liu, Cindy Liu, Lee Mao, Joyce Young

Also present: Greg Gubman, Community Development Director;; Grace Lee, Senior Planner; Mayuko (May) Nakajima, Associate Planner; Natalie T. Espinoza, Assistant Planner; Marsha Roa, Public Information Manager; and Stella Marquez, Administrative Coordinator.

Others present: Katharine Pan, AICP, Dyett & Bhatia Urban Regional Planners; Julia Malmo-Laycock, Dyett & Bhatia Urban Regional Planners

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

3.1 GPAC Meeting Minutes for November 30, 2017:

Upon Motion by M/Black, seconded by M/Harbin, the minutes of the GPAC Meeting of November 30, 2017, were approved as presented with M/Torng abstaining.

4. **DISCUSSION OF DRAFT PREFERRED LAND USE PLAN AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR NEW LAND USE DESIGNATIONS –** Presentation by Katherine Pan, AICP, Associate, Dyett & Bhatia Urban and Regional Planners.

Ms. Pan reported on the January 30, 2018 Joint Meeting of the Planning Commission and City Council. At that meeting, the joint bodies selected Land Use Alternative 1 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative locates the future Town Center along Diamond Bar Boulevard, between Golden Springs and the SR 60 freeway. In addition, the Council and Commission discussed the need to be proactive in determining what would take place on the golf course should L.A. County decide to discontinue the golf course or reduce its size. The solution was an overlay that would support the

ongoing operation of the golf course but allow the southern portion to develop into a community-oriented, regional-serving commercial area that would coexist with the Town Center, and for the northern portion to be preserved as a community amenity such as a public park or community use.

The objective of tonight's meeting is to share the Draft Preferred Land Use Map with the GPAC and provide guiding principles and policies for the four main change areas to determine the overall community vision for those areas. From this point forward, policies will be drafted and presented over the next few meetings.

The new General Plan document will consist of seven chapters. In addition to the State-mandated elements (Land Use, Circulation, Open Space, Conservation, Noise and Public Safety), the document will include the following optional elements: Community Character and Placemaking, and Community Health and Sustainability.

Each chapter of the General Plan has various sections including background information analysis which is a narrative of existing conditions and trends that help to form a basis and rationale for the types of policies that will be introduced. Policies are divided into three tiers which include the goal (an overarching statement of intent), followed by policies and statements to guide decision-making to help reach those goals. Implementation strategies will then be crafted for each policy.

The draft Preferred Plan map consists of the land use designations carried over from the 1995 General Plan to reflect existing conditions where no changes are proposed, together with the four new designations: Neighborhood Mixed-Use on northern Diamond Bar Boulevard; Town Center Mixed-Use at Diamond Bar Boulevard and Golden Springs Drive; Transit-Oriented Mixed-Use near the Metrolink Station; and the Community Core Overlay on the portion of the golf course south of Grand Avenue.

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss and provide feedback to the Draft Policies. The goal is to understand the community's vision for the character of these areas so that when this process focuses on writing policies it reflects the community's vision which will provide a foundation for a lot of the policies in the Land Use Element.

The guiding policies include the following:

Neighborhood Mixed Use:

- 1) Promote the development of a vibrant corridor with a mix of uses including residential uses and neighborhood serving services and amenities that fulfill a diversity of local needs within walking and biking distance of neighborhood residents;
- 2) Create a well-designed walkable mixed-use neighborhood that encourages community interaction and healthy lifestyles while reducing reliance on automobiles;

- 3) Ensure that new development is sensitive to the scale of adjacent residential uses while allowing for higher intensity development along Diamond Bar Boulevard to foster the corridor's revitalization; and
- 4) Encourage a diversity of housing types and products.

Transit-Oriented Mixed Use:

- 1) Leverage the proximity of the City of Industry Metrolink Station to create an engaging compact mixed-use neighborhood that encourages multi-modal transportation and responds to a diversity of housing needs;
- 2) Ensure the adequate provision of spaces for recreation, community gathering, amenities and services that fulfill the daily needs of residents; and
- 3) Ensure that new development is sensitive to the scale of adjacent residential uses and potential sources of noise and air pollution.

Town Center Mixed Use:

- 1) Promote and support the commercial area on both sides of Diamond Bar Boulevard from Golden Springs Drive to State Route 60 as a vibrant pedestrian-oriented town center that serves as Diamond Bar's primary specialty retail and dining destination and is accessible to all Diamond Bar residents;
- 2) Ensure an inviting and comfortable public realm to encourage pedestrian activity in the town center area; and
- 3) Allow residential and office uses as secondary to commercial retail, dining and entertainment uses.

Community Core Overlay:

- 1) To support the continued operation of the Diamond Bar Golf Course by Los Angeles County as a public amenity; and
- 2) Should Los Angeles County choose to cease operations of the Diamond Bar Golf Course or reduce the area of the golf course, promote development of the portion of the golf course north of Grand Avenue as a public park or consolidated golf course and the southern portion of Grand Avenue as a walkable mixed-use community and regional destination offering retail, dining, entertainment and hotel uses, plazas and community gathering spaces, supporting residential uses, and civic and other supporting uses.

5. GPAC DISCUSSION:Transit-Oriented Mixed Use Area:

M/Black asked if each section could be considered separately. Chair/St. Amant agreed.

M/Black asked for clarity on whether the mixed-use high density with transit-oriented allows for retail businesses that facilitate that structured community. Ms. Pan responded that there would be some retail that would support some of the office uses including restaurants and other commercial uses to support people living in that area.

M/Black said that in his mind's eye, something that might mirror this would be the area in Claremont where there is residential above commercial. Ms. Pan responded that there are a couple of ways to approach mixed-use. There is the vertical version and the horizontal version and while there may be an option for either of those types of uses it would depend on the preference which is something the GPAC is being asked to articulate here – how the General Plan will define guidance for development in that area.

M/Black said that if high density is being considered, vertical would seem logical to him. There is only so much land and if the City is seeking higher density, logically, vertical is what this process would be looking at to achieve that goal for the most occupants in a transit-oriented area. From what he has garnered from the consultants, the goal behind that is that residents would obviously be using the transit system which results in fewer cars on the road and fewer vehicle miles traveled. As long as that is in the goal, he is very supportive of this concept.

M/Busse said he has looked at a lot of TODs in this state and elsewhere including Chicago when he was there over the weekend. He does not think this concept will work for Diamond Bar because Metrolink operates as a tenant on the Union Pacific railroad tracks and is contractually limited to five trains in each direction per day. And TODs work where there are all sorts of services throughout the day as they have in Claremont which is a totally different situation. He is skeptical as to whether this would work because with TODs, the whole idea is that people move into high density and they don't need two cars. They have only one car. And he does not know that this would be the kind of place where that concept would work.

CDD/Gubman explained that SCAG has identified this area within the radius of the transit center as a sustainable community strategy priority area; however, that would necessitate a heavier usage of commuter travel on that rail line which currently does not exist. So, the headway would have to be substantially increased and that being a long-term planning document, the policy language could be crafted to state that this is still designated as a long-term vision to be a transit-oriented development and there would have to be some significant change in the use of the existing infrastructure where that could truly function as a TOD area before the area could be transformed. It is fair to say that looking ahead for this to really be viable, the City would either need to encourage

or allow some organic evolution of that area to provide that transit infrastructure to then be followed by this implementation.

M/Ramirez asked for a description of Floor Area Ratio (FAR). What does it mean and what does it look like when looking at 1, 1.5, and 2. He has a sense this will have a profound effect on what it will look like. Ms. Pan explained that floor area ratio is how the intensity of non-residential development is described. It is a ratio of the square footage of the construction to the area of the site. So for example, a FAR of 1 could be one story covering the entire parcel. A FAR of 1.5 would be one story covering one-half of a parcel and it could also be two stories covering half a parcel or 1.5 could be three stories covering half of the parcel. It is a way of visualizing how something will be massed onto a parcel. In addition to floor area ratio, the zoning code will also have things like setbacks and other things that will dictate how much of the parcel can be covered by construction.

M/Ramirez said this site has a 1.5 max and is that adequate to create enough commercial and residential usage to be profitable for a developer or does that density need to be increased to perhaps create a higher residual land value. CDD/Gubman said that staff would be glad to look into that and provide some information such as to what different FARs might yield or generally, the feasibility of such.

M/Ramirez said that more particularly, he would like to know why this ratio was selected for this site and what does that mean to the commercial viability of the development into a transit-oriented mixed use. This site will have a challenge. It has enough commuter service on Metrolink to support traditional commuting into downtown. It is more than adequate. But, if it transitions into transit use throughout the day where Union Pacific would give up some of its rights then the ratio or density of that project has to be able to finally support that project and the number of people and businesses and he just does not understand what 1.5 FAR means to that entire scenario. CDD/Gubman said this process has established as a recommended density and FAR may dictate how large the residential units can be, but the residential density that is being proposed is a minimum of 30-units per acre/maximum 40-units per acre. The FAR could be looked into and when talking about residential, that may have the manifestation in size of units. Smaller units allow for more density within the same footprint (fixed FAR).

M/Ramirez said he was referring to commercial density. CDD/Gubman said the focus in the draft policies was geared more toward the residential density in trying to get an idea of the density that the GPAC would be comfortable with. At this time, there is nothing in the City that has a density of more than 20-units per acre and this proposes to essentially double that number. So for a transit-oriented development, 50-units per acre is still relatively moderate, but staff is attempting to discern where the comfort level is and that has been the primary focus. Policy language about commercial to support the neighborhood has been included, but to give better insight as to FAR as a metric to give the GPAC a ratio of commercial floor area to the population served that would be accommodated by that density can be studied and brought back to the GPAC. This

process starts the conversation and this type of feedback is what staff appreciates in order to hear members' insights and be responsive by coming back with analysis of those specific issues and expand this analysis to talk about the commercial component that would complete this district, along with the public spaces.

Chair/St. Amant said that to be clear, the FAR does not include surface parking or landscaping. The FAR is just the footprint/square footage of the building. Would a parking structure be considered part of the FAR? CDD/Gubman said that staff would look at a parking structure toward that FAR calculation because part of what FAR is trying to do is to also control building bulk. Obviously, a two-level parking structure, for example, would create bulk. Another thing that should be considered in regard to parking structures is perhaps requiring parking structures to be designed for future adaptive reuse to residential space if reliance on the automobile, particularly in a district like this, diminishes overtime. In his view, it would be prudent to be clear that a parking structure is part of that FAR calculation.

M/Torng said that when he served on the Planning Commission it was concerned about the high density requirements from the state. Diamond Bar has a high density requirement for the property next to the Diamond Ranch High School. Is the new TOD designated as high density to satisfy this requirement? CDD/Gubman responded that if M/Torng is concerned about meeting the RHNA default density obligation here, can the property south of Diamond Ranch High School be rezoned he believes that is something that could be factored in. If the City is able to meet its RHNA numbers and get a higher density elsewhere it can look at its next Housing Element cycle to reevaluate the zoning for the site next to Diamond Ranch High School.

M/Torng said that at that time the Planning Commission discussed this type of high density residential area and everyone was concerned that it would become low-income housing. CDD/Gubman said it would not necessarily be low-income housing. For this region, the state would consider 30-units per acre a default density that correlates with affordable units.

M/Torng suggested that it would be very helpful if staff provided the GPAC with information regarding the different types of buildings related to this topic to help members visualize. Chair/St. Amant said he believed that type of information was included in the booklet (Field Guide) that was handed out at the last meeting when M/Torng was absent. Ms. Pan said this information was also available online.

M/Sherwood pointed out that in the 1995 General Plan Land Use Element it was stated that it is the desire of the citizens of Diamond Bar to maintain a rural and country living environment and he is concerned about the reference to "high density" because the vast majority of Diamond Bar is rural to low to medium density residential and he believes this is going in a direction that does not meet the desire of the citizenry. From the workshops and surveys, people are still saying they want to maintain a rural open feeling to Diamond Bar and it is the primary character of the town that is currently residential

and he is concerned that this is shifting in a direction to make the town “urban” and Diamond Bar is not an urban town. It is not a Pasadena, a Claremont or a Brea that has a topography that is conducive to urban development. Diamond Bar is suburban at best. He doesn’t believe residents want to go in the direction of mixing the uses. He believes people want their homes to be separated from the businesses and to now contemplate stacking homes on top of businesses is not what he believes is in the character of Diamond Bar as its residents envision it.

M/Black said that with respect to SCAG, this is a long-range program and we are looking at this at a high-level. When we look at the transit-orientation and the congestion that is building here, it is like a pressure cooker that keeps going and we need to remove some of that pressure out of here. As much as we may want to keep Diamond Bar as country as possible and as there are more and more occupants that move into the area, more and more responsibilities are placed on this City by the state and other regulations and the City is forced to go into a higher density, especially around the transit locations. SCAG is working hard to get the Metrolink area more robust and he believes a 20-year vision has to consider that this is where the world is going. He believes that it can be governed by saying the City is going to limit the density to perhaps a threshold of 30. But he believes the rail system at some point in the future if SCAG and other entities that are pushing for more Metrolink activity is successful, this will work very well and this is a plan and a vision and hopefully it all comes together.

Chair/St. Amant said he agreed with M/Black that this is the direction the world is going. Further, as more and more of the population ages, we need places for seniors to downsize. For example, they have a sprawling two-story house that is no longer viable and they may want to stay in Diamond Bar but there are not affordable smaller units available with access to businesses. In addition, the state requires us to plan for future housing. CDD/Gubman stated that cities are obligated to provide their fair-share as determined by SCAG of the regional housing needs so yes, there is a certain number of units that are allocated to jurisdictions within the region that they are obligated to at least zone for to meet their fair-share of the anticipated housing needs. Not only is there a target number, there needs to be zoning to provide for different economic segments of the region which is why there is the requirement for the high-density development.

M/Ramirez said the way he sees it is that the City is looking at these five areas that were approved by the City Council and Planning Commission as Alternative 1 which is the direction the City’s leadership is going in. The way he sees these five areas, while some do not have the same character that existed in 1995, this is the 2018 plan and he sees it as if these five areas can be executed, it will allow the rest of Diamond Bar to maintain the atmosphere and kind of City living residents have enjoyed while at the same time, moving into the 21st Century. He believes that if everyone works in that direction of looking at how these five areas can be smartly designed, it will benefit Diamond Bar rather than looking back to the last Century.

VC/Worthington echoed what M/Ramirez just said, what M/Sherwood said and what M/Black said. When he moved to the City in 1996 the idea of Diamond Bar was a suburban more rural, more open space community and he believes everyone still loves that idea. But it is hard for him to downplay the amazing Sprouts Supermarket and walking through such a vibrant area. It is unbelievable and it is a tremendous source of pride for him as a 22-year resident. He believes the idea is to keep Diamond Bar rural, open, suburban, and at the same time, these areas that the City wants to develop, everything that can be done should be done to make it a place where people can shop. Diamond Bar's revenue is much less than other cities. He believes Diamond Bar can still be suburban and open space and at the same time, spend money in the City of Diamond Bar.

M/Torng agreed with VC/Worthington. While the City has to do something he does not want this to be up to 40 units per acre and would like to have it reduced to 30 units which he believes would be the maximum fit for Diamond Bar so it is not so crowded. Ms. Pan said that 40 was what the consultant was directed to study by the Planning Commission and City Council. CDD/Gubman said that through the kickoff meetings in 2016, there was openness for a higher density to be considered, particularly in this TOD area. We know that raising density does begin to create some anxiety which is one of the reasons staff put together the Field Guide which provides the GPAC with examples that members can visit that have those different densities to see how they look and feel and interact with the surrounding established neighborhoods. Ultimately, the density is going to be adopted based on whatever the City Council, at the adoption process, adopts and that process will take into account this entire effort the GPAC is charged with studying and challenging staff and consultants to provide the information so that the GPAC can make informed recommendations. If there is a specific density that the GPAC feels is a threshold that should not be crossed, that would be part of the GPAC's recommendations going forward.

M/Sherwood asked about the current density and CDD/Gubman responded that the current General Plan and Zoning Code, with the exception of that 30-unit per-acre designation south of Diamond Ranch High School is a 20-unit maximum density elsewhere. M/Sherwood said that statistically, in going from 20 to 30 or 40, what is the statistical impact on violent and non-violent crime? CDD/Gubman said he did not know of such a statistic. M/Sherwood felt it was an important consideration for considering an increase in density if there is the potential for increase of crime. CDD/Gubman said that in the EIR, when the Land Use Plan is established, that document will include analysis of calls for service and impacts on public safety and would be based on the best information available. Ms. Pan said that typically, the question in the EIR related to Public Safety Services is whether the increase in population in general would require an increase in Public Safety Services to the point that new facilities would need to be constructed to maintain that which could, therefore, cause environmental impacts. It would not necessarily be looking at calls for service and she is not sure that would be a statistic that would be available based on density to crime statistics. In this case, they would be looking to have a conversation with the Sheriff's Department to find out what

their service standards are and whether, with the buildout numbers that are being projected based on the land use changes, they feel they would need to increase their staff and/or presence in certain areas. With that information, the EIR would go on to say whether they would need a new facility or whether that facility being constructed, would cause an environmental impact.

M/Ramirez said he did not have concerns about crime with high density but he agrees with M/Torng that the City wants to maintain the culture and nature of Diamond Bar, and getting to densities that are very high begins to change the community.

M/Ramirez offered a motion that the GPAC encourage that densities not be increased to over 30 unless it is necessary for the viable development of a TOD. VC/Worthington seconded the motion.

CDD/Gubman inquired if the motion was intended to ask if since in mixed-use areas the City generally looks at those areas as residential rent or sales of units somewhat subsidizing the infrastructure for that area making the commercial component feasible, the process does have to take into account how much residential density is needed to subsidize the commercial use which does not generally provide the developer with that same land value. Would it be an accurate reflection of the motion to say that this process will need to study where that balance is of density to make the commercial component viable?

M/Ramirez said that CDD/Gubman was correct and that he would look to M/Harbin who has helped create TODs and one that is very successful to help the GPAC to understand that connection between the people and the commercial development and how developers look at that ratio. M/Torng's point that we don't want to go to a density that changes the character of Diamond Bar is an excellent point and if we can stay within a comfortable density and still have a successful TOD we should look to do that. How that is done, he does not know.

M/Harbin said this is a bit difficult. The most recent project she worked on is behind Baldwin Park City Hall. It is actually a fully affordable project from extremely low income to very low income. There are 71 units in that project, it is no more than three stories and it is generally within the one to two stories that are consistent across the City of Baldwin Park. As everyone knows, land is expensive – and a developer is not going to come in and do a project where he is unable to make money or where he is not, in the sense of an affordable project, be able to get subsidies to help him get some ROI (return on investment) on what he is trying to do. She understands about the density, but she believes how the City and the consultant have worked this is that they have put it in certain areas. For example, down by the rail station. She understands M/Busse and the train and the headways, but remember, this is a long term document that extends out over 20 years. And really, unless one goes out and looks at projects one cannot tell by looking at them how many units are in them or how dense they are. There are some projects in Pasadena that are over 40 dwelling units per acre and it's like wow, that's so

awesome! It really depends on what they look like and how they are developed. And she believes that how this discussion is progressing with putting the higher density in certain areas – one of the things that must be remembered is, if the density is reduced in the area up by Diamond Ranch High School that the Housing Element is counting on, that density has to go somewhere else because the state will not approve the Housing Element otherwise. It is a balance.

M/Busse asked M/Harbin if in her experience the Baldwin Park units are transit users and M/Harbin said that a lot of them are. As part of the development, each unit has one parking space which is in the parking structure directly behind the project. As mentioned, that entire project is affordable. Typically, the families cannot afford two cars. There is a train directly behind the project and there is a major bus route down Ramona Boulevard into El Monte Station so there are alternatives for transit. M/Harbin agreed with M/Busse that it is a different train line. It is the San Bernardino line.

M/Torng said he continued to support the lower density for one major reason. He is not trying to sell the school district but Walnut Unified School District feels the developer should be happy with a lower density and he agrees. Remember Site D – it was so successful and amazingly expensive. And he did not believe higher density was necessary for this location – he wants lower density and a real single family home for the younger generation to come into Diamond Bar for a good education and community. He believes that the GPAC should recommend the 30-unit limit to the City Council and let them consider it because again, it would offer a good opportunity for the younger generation to come to Diamond Bar to buy property.

Chair/St. Amant reread M/Ramirez's motion with a second by VC/Worthington: that the GPAC encourage that densities not be increased to over 30 unless it is necessary for the viable development of a TOD.

M/Black said that if the City determines it needs a higher density for commercial, what is the threshold then and M/Ramirez said it is listed at 40 currently so it cannot be any higher. M/Black said it had to be stated in the motion and M/Ramirez said he would accept that friendly amendment. M/Black said he so moved.

Chair/St. Amant called for a vote on the motion by Ramirez, seconded by VC/Worthington and amended by M/Black which increases the threshold limit to 40 based on the commercial development need with VC/Worthington seconding the amendment. Motion carried 9-2 by the following Roll Call vote:

Black	yes
Busse	yes
Evans	yes
Garg	yes
Harbin	no
Ramirez	yes

Rivera	yes
Sherwood	no
Tornng	yes
VC/Worthington	yes
Chair/St. Amant	yes

Ms. Pan said that if there was a concern about character it should be discussed in more detail because density and intensity are not the only things that determine character in an area. So if there is something in particular that members like about the community or a specific area that they think should be preserving in a different way, whether through design or other elements, those need to be expressed so that staff can speak specifically to those items.

M/Ramirez asked about the parkland requirements for this TOD project and asked Ms. Pan to describe it because he believes if there is going to be a successful TOD there should be a place where this high-density population can relax and enjoy their evenings after a public commute.

Ms. Pan explained that currently, the draft implementing policies contains the following language: "Require sites larger than 4-acres to include public parkland, require other developments to provide dedicated parkland, in-lieu fees, or a combination in accordance with Diamond Bar's park acreage standards to meet the recreational needs of new residents." This is something specifically for this TOD area as well because it is not currently very well served by recreational facilities.

M/Ramirez asked if there was enough space for four acres and Chair/St. Amant said there would be if it were built vertically.

Chair/St. Amant asked if a requirement could be added that perhaps through the back near the track a bike/pedestrian parkway (north side) could be placed so that people who are over on Lemon Avenue have a shorter commute and don't have to fight with vehicular traffic on Lycoming.

M/Harbin reminded members that parkland space did not have to be on the ground. That type of space can also be on roofs of buildings.

M/Black asked if by "character" Ms. Pan meant "theme" and Ms. Pan said that character is a bit of a vague term that people use to talk about the "thing" that they like about a place and themes in terms of designs or some sort of unifying feature that people like. M/Black asked if there is a "theme" at the Sprouts center, for example, did Diamond Bar impose some kind of character to that center. CDD/Gubman said that staff worked closely with the project architects to get the architecture of the building remodels to have a unifying theme and to incorporate some outdoor seating areas in each of those components. Also, there is a pedestrian path that goes from Chipotle to the Ross/Sprouts building that has trees alternating back and forth to provide a pedestrian

connectivity looking forward to visitors arriving by bus or parking toward the street that has pedestrian shaded walkways. It was essentially doing the best that could be done with the existing lay of the land, to add some architectural and pedestrian feeling to the site that did not previously exist, as well as more parking lot trees than there were previously when the Kmart was still there.

M/Black said he felt that everyone could agree that was a “home run” for Diamond Bar. Can that type of characteristic be applied in this instance and can that be articulated? CDD/Gubman said that staff would be introducing a “community character and placemaking (urban design element) to the General Plan to establish some well-defined criteria for placemaking to make the settings inviting and desirable to visit. There can be some specific policy language for the TOD area for example, and it would also cross-reference to that Placemaking Element to try to articulate what we like about certain places and how we can then establish criteria to create that sense of comfort and whatever it is that is often difficult to articulate when one visits Pasadena or Seattle or in the Village at Claremont. What are those things? Are they the little pocket parks, niche plazas or the fountain with seating surrounded by a theater, restaurants and so forth, and is it even the paving design – do we want to require interlocking pavers rather than just concrete or stamped concrete because there is that added texture and dimension to that overall setting. There can be many guiding placemaking features that can be put into words in the document.

M/Black asked staff to bring back some language that can encapsulate that into something has been done that could be incorporated into the GPAC’s recommendation so that it has something to consider voting on.

M/Sherwood said that M/Ramirez brought up the concern about parkland. Is parkland recreational space going to be a separate topic for discussion in a broader sense or is it something that has to be discussed in each interchange of the process. CDD/Gubman said that staff is looking to come back over the next series of meetings (tonight, June, July and August) to go over all of the elements which will involve the Resource Conservation Element which encompasses the park needs. Staff is establishing criteria in this policy language about the parkland requirements for a development. For example, if you have a four-acre development you have to incorporate parkland into that in some form. This has more of the quantitative acreage requirements and then through the Resource Conservation and Placemaking Elements we can get into more of what kind of amenities/features will be in the parkland.

M/Sherwood said his concern is that on the TOD map, spots are designated for parkland but a developer has an option to pay in-lieu of parkland into the City’s Park Improvement Fund which means that instead of putting a park in he could pay the City money instead? CDD/Gubman said that what staff is proposing at this time is that if the size of the development is four acres or larger, that they have to provide parkland and not in-lieu fees/contributions.

M/Sherwood asked how much money was in the Park Improvement Fund and said that could be discussed at a later time.

Chair/St. Amant commented on M/Torng's statement about high-density being not as nice, on Page 52 of the Field Guide is a photo of the Granada Court in Pasadena that has a density of 48-units and it is a really nice looking unit.

M/Sherwood asked the number of stories currently permitted in Diamond Bar and CDD/Gubman said that for three stories, 35-40 feet is for the most part the requirement.

Neighborhood Mixed Use Area:

M/Busse said this part of Diamond Bar has always been fascinating to him because it is near a university campus and probably what is going to be a new southern entrance to the campus and of all of the college towns he has visited, everybody surrounding a university campus seems to have a thriving commercial district – not just one, but literally, one on every road that leads to the campus. And this to him is a real critical issue if Diamond Bar wants to encourage a thriving commercial district in the City and reap the tax benefits of such. He is fascinated by this plan which he believes is a long time coming and believes it is something that has to be studied and maximize what is there now and think about 20 years from now when Cal Poly figures out what they are going to do with the Lanterman property. There is already so much infrastructure on the site that at the top of property it may be the entrance to the university for people coming from the south. So this is a big deal. And he believes there is more potential in this area for doing big things than there is in the town center concept. In his opinion, the location is critical to what Diamond Bar needs to do.

VC/Worthington said he remembers when Acapulco was here. They had karaoke and it was a gathering point for those of us who live in north Diamond Bar. Once that left, that entire center went down. He believes this is such a critical investment point for the City, it is a blighted area and he hopes the City can put as many resources into this area as possible.

M/Ramirez also believed this was a hidden gem for the City. It is an area that can become a real bright spot and an area of pride to the community. He fully agrees with both the guiding policies and the draft implementation policies but he thinks there is an area that is missing in those guiding principles. He knows that the GPAC will cover circulation in another part of the General Plan, but looking in what has been laid out in terms of the character of this site including walkability, interaction of people, bringing people out of their homes and having some commercial development, people on bikes, and people using different modes of transportation, all of those things do not mix with high speeds and when one looks at the speed of traffic from Temple to Sunset Crossing Road, it's like a southbound speedway that probably averages speed of about 55 mph. This is incongruent with the picture that has been laid out which he believes is excellent. He said he had language he would like to introduce as a motion. One of the things he

believes needs to be included as part of the guiding principles is figure out a balance by calming the traffic from Temple to Sunset Crossing so that everyone can enjoy the walkability, biking neighborhood that has been described for this area.

M/Ramirez moved to adopt as part of the guiding principle, calming traffic strategies to support and promote neighborhood interaction, pedestrian walkability and to promote commercial patronage along Diamond Bar Boulevard from Temple Avenue to Sunset Crossing Road. VC/Worthington seconded the motion.

M/Busse said that if you want to slow traffic, put them on the freeway. That is probably the worst piece of engineering in Southern California.

Chair/St. Amant said he agreed and hopefully, with the fix, maybe there will be more people using the freeway.

M/Busse said he didn't believe that the City was trying to pull as much traffic off the freeway as it is to take advantage of what he believes will be there already with an entrance to the university.

M/Evans said she believed that as the commercial increases in that area the traffic speeds will decrease. At this time, there is not a lot of business and nothing is happening which she believes is why the drivers are speeding through the area. As soon as Sprouts opened, traffic between McDonald's and Diamond Bar Boulevard increased. She believes that as this area grows it will not have the 55 mph speeds.

VC/Worthington said there is a nice headwind coming up the road at Temple Avenue where Mission Boulevard comes up from Pomona where folks reach speeds of 60 mph and even faster. When they cross over Temple onto Diamond Bar Boulevard it's a speed race. There used to be traffic enforcement on that street and that strategy has changed and he believes there would have to be calming mitigation at that location to address that issue for the future density of that area. Traffic calming seems to him to be a very high priority.

M/Rivera said he would be more concerned about what impact calming traffic in that section between Temple and Sunset Crossing would have on the Diamond Bar Boulevard/McDonald's to Golden Springs Drive because by expecting to calm traffic on the northern end and expect it won't have an impact further south is not a reasonable assumption.

M/Sherwood asked CDD/Gubman the status of the Oak Tree project and CDD/Gubman responded that there was an application submitted in early 2016 and the applicant has not moved forward on it. It is an application for 148 residential units and 10,000 square feet of commercial which in the plan they submitted, would be through the retention of the building in the Ranch Center that was previously occupied by D'Antonio's and Hot Dog Pops.

M/Garg said he noticed traveling the SR57 southbound traffic starts to build from Temple and Sunset on the way to the SR57/60 and he believes that when the Confluence project is completed more cars will remain on the freeway and not exit onto Temple or Sunset which will automatically calm the traffic in that area.

M/Ramirez said he wanted to make sure everyone understands what that improvement will and will not do. It is not going to add an interchange from the westbound SR60 to the northbound SR57 and it will not add an interchange from the southbound SR57 to the eastbound SR60 so people will still get off at Sunset Crossing and get back on the freeway. Even with this improvement that will continue to happen. They look at the quickest way to cut through and even with the improvement he fears that people will still cut through Diamond Bar on Diamond Bar Boulevard both north and south but mostly southbound because they are trying to get through that area as quickly as they can and they will be driving at top speeds to get through this mixed use area. So he believes there is a balance that has to be carefully considered because M/Rivera is absolutely right that we do not want to slow it down so that we lose the commercial viability, but we cannot lose sight of this being a cut-through area with very high speeds.

M/Torng said he concurs with every concern expressed. Because this is so close to the "town center" already, it will become a competition. If the focus is on the town center, this site will become a second choice and he wondered if there was a way to integrate both areas to enhance both sites.

M/Ramirez said he concurred with M/Torng. He was absolutely right that it would be ideal if this plan could leverage the combination of those two projects. However, he fears the problem is that the interchange is not being completed so cars, trucks, diesels will still have to get off of the freeway to get back on the freeway and that path cuts right through the two projects. If, as a City, Diamond Bar could change Caltrans' plan and make them build that interchange, cars would not get off of the freeway, but the City does not have the will to do it. The City's leadership failed in that effort. He asked everyone to talk to leadership because that was a big mistake the City made.

Chair/St. Amant said the problem with the interchange that goes south SR57 to east SR60 and west SR60 to north SR57 and the problem with that is due to today's traffic standards. In order to accomplish that, 150 homes would have to be taken out in order to accommodate the curvature. It was badly designed from the very beginning.

M/Ramirez said he recognized it was a hard choice, but these two projects can never really come together because of that issue. And, because of that, we have to deal with some calming devices which is why he is making this motion.

Chair/St. Amant called for the vote on M/Ramirez's motion to adopt as part of the guiding principle, calming traffic strategies to support and promote neighborhood interaction, pedestrian walkability and to promote commercial patronage along Diamond Bar Boulevard from Temple Avenue to Sunset Crossing Road. The motion was seconded

by VC/Worthington. Motion carried 9-1 with one abstention by the following Roll Call vote:

M/Black	yes	
M/Busse	yes	
M/Evans	yes	
M/Garg	yes	
M/Harbin	abstain	(Because she did not know the details of the upcoming Circulation Element)
M/Rivera	no	
M/Ramirez	yes	
M/Sherwood	yes	
M/Torng	yes	
VC/Worthington	yes	
Chair/St. Amant	yes	

M/Black said it appears that in this case the threshold for residential seems very similar to the TOD with very little difference between the two, and he is concerned. He asked staff to articulate the difference and what is the vision of the commercial because he is thinking this will go vertical as well. Ms. Pan explained that the focus on this area is primarily on the residential portion with the commercial serving that neighborhood to relieve the need for people in the area to travel outside their area for basic needs. It is a way to promote walkability while reducing the amount of traffic that might originate from new housing units. The discussion of this area included the vision that a horizontal approach to mixed use might work in this area allowing for cluster of commercial activity rather than mixed in with residential to promote more diversity of housing for this area.

Chair/St. Amant said this area has potential to have student housing. USC just completed new student housing with commercial below and housing above which is a nice looking facility.

M/Black said that in order to support that type of buildout and the GPAC recommended a lesser density in that area, would that infill with more commercial or less commercial or would that end up with more open space? Ms. Pan said that is up for discussion and if there was an interest in reducing density here, the question of what takes its place would be up for discussion. CDD/Gubman said he believed it was a good question in that the daytime population had served the two shopping centers at the corner of Highland Valley and Diamond Bar Boulevard south to the Ranch Center. When Lanterman was operational there was, we believe, a daytime population that helped support the viability of that commercial district and we believe that the closure of Lanterman has accelerated the decline of those two shopping centers. The future plans that Cal Poly will have when they decide what they are going to do with the Lanterman area could backfill that void that was left by the closure of Lanterman. Staff does not really know where Cal Poly is headed so the challenge the property owner for those two properties is that they are not able to fill those vacant spaces. The idea of adding

residential to repopulate that area so that it could support continued or new commercial development is kind of the principle behind this plan. So in this case, the density needs to be looked at from how many units or how much density is needed to complement and bring the commercial component to the return that would be needed to be achieved, which is likely to be a function of how many residential units are incorporated into that development.

M/Sherwood said that on the section just north of Sunset Crossing there are a good number of existing businesses and just north of those existing businesses are some office buildings. So, some of that area is already established and he doesn't know how you undo what is already there. CDD/Gubman said that in this plan we are not necessarily seeking to lose the commercial land inventory at all, but there currently does not seem to be enough demand for the amount of commercial square footage that is primarily concentrated at the northern end of this district. It certainly would be foreseeable that the existing commercial and office uses will continue. It is more problematic with the two northern shopping centers as far as making that commercial area come back to life. And in lieu of having a daytime population through the Lanterman area providing an onsite population to support the commercial is more what is driving this plan rather than encouraging the changeover of the more thriving commercial and office uses.

M/Sherwood said he agrees with CDD/Gubman's assessment but is confused by the designations on the map because the major commercial frontage is shown to the north end and the south end so he is assuming the mixed use area (pink) is where existing buildings are (offices, tire store, etc.) and it seems to him it should be reversed with the commercial dropped down to the southern part and the mixed use on the northern end next to an existing neighborhood so it would be neighborhood residential next to residential and commercial next to commercial.

Chair/St. Amant agreed but felt the reason for this was to create walkability in both directions. If he were to live there he would not want to necessarily live where the Mobile Station or Del Taco is because it is a lot busier and he would rather be up in the residential area.

Chair/St. Amant asked if staff could reconsider the layout.

M/Ramirez thought the drawings were conceptual as a guideline, and developers would then come in and propose their own concepts. So, it's not targeting the Kentucky Fried Chicken, Mobil station or any of those commercial buildings but there would be something there whether it is in the north, south or middle. The GPAC is merely expressing concepts and guiding principles. Ms. Pan responded that M/Ramirez was correct, although at this time there is a policy that placement of a majority of commercial is required along the majority of the corridor – frontage 1,000 feet from both ends of the corridor which might be something M/Sherwood is commenting on. But yes, the actual details of anything developing in this area would be up to the developer at the time. One

of the other things about the clusters is that this concept allows for there to be two clusters of commercial development distributed along the area to allow area for people in the different neighborhoods which is another question of balance if the GPAC wanted to have a cluster of commercial development in another place.

M/Black moved to accept the concept as amended by M/Ramirez's motion. M/Ramirez seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously by the following Roll Call vote:

M/Black	yes
M/Busse	yes
M/Evans	yes
M/Garg	yes
M/Harbin	yes
M/Ramirez	yes
M/Rivera	yes
M/Sherwood	yes
M/Torng	yes
VC/Worthington	yes
Chair/St. Amant	yes

M/Black asked that staff come back to the GPAC with a theme for this concept. Ms. Pan said that when the process gets to the design element there can be more of a structured discussion about elements of character. CDD/Gubman said that to that end, GPAC members might be thinking about what they like about that area with respect to building types and architectural themes that are good at defining a desired character. Ms. Pan said the consideration for characteristics, consider other developments that members like and things about that development such as setbacks, landscapes, streetscapes and whether it has a "neighborly" feel according to the amount of interaction the area provides.

M/Black suggested a "country living" theme be considered in all areas of the City if that is the desire of the community.

M/Torng left the meeting at 8:35 p.m. due to another commitment.

RECESS: Chair/St. Amant recessed the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

RECONVENE: Chair/St. Amant reconvened the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Chair/St. Amant announced that all motions to this point in the meeting would be held in abeyance until completion of public comments. Following public comments, the GPAC would then deliberate on the remaining two areas and affirm, amend or withdraw their motions on the first two items.

Town Center Area:

M/Rivera asked to comment on the Community Core Overlay which he believes important to express prior to the Public Comment section.

M/Rivera said that the Community Core Overlay includes the southern section of the golf course. He does not recall that being this group's recommendation to the Planning Commission (jointly with the City Council) as part of Alternative 1. Did the Planning Commission (and City Council) make that recommendation and if so, do they have information that would lead them to believe that the golf course has any plans to scuttle the course or diminish its use such that they were so inclined to input that they wanted that southern section of the golf course to be designated as a Community Core Overlay. Are we doing that to protect the community's interest or are we doing that with the possibility of now having developers knocking at City Hall's door if that designation is affirmed.

Chair/St. Amant said he believed the provision was that they supported the golf course and that if LA County decided to no longer run it as a golf course, that this was a backup plan.

CDD/Gubman said that the Planning Commission and City Council looked at the three alternatives that were discussed by the GPAC in November and they also received the GPAC's recommendation by a 9-1 vote to select Alternative 1 as the Preferred Alternative and through their discussion, Alternatives 2 and 3 were still matters for them to deliberate on in light of the recommendation of the committee for Alternative 1 and what came out of that discussion was this hybrid decision where Alternative 1 was the Preferred Alternative and to support the preservation of the golf course area north of Grand Avenue for either a future golf course or some repurposed recreational area. However, if there was that future decision by LA County to modify or close the golf course, that the portion south of Grand Avenue would be in play for commercial development. CDD/Gubman said he was unaware of any interest or movement by the County to close or repurpose or do anything to the golf course so it appeared to him that it was to at least have some proactive policies in place in the event that the golf course, in the future, was going to be up for discussion at the County level what its future would be. One of the guiding principles in this instance is that the continued use of that facility by the County as a golf course would be supported.

VC/Worthington said he understood it was a backup plan if the County pulled out of the property which would allow the City to have control over the use of the property in case of that happening.

VC/Sherwood said that one point that was made by C/Herrera that was not passed on to the GPAC was the potential for the County to convert the golf course to homeless shelters which seemed to him a scare tactic, so this was a backup plan to put a

placeholder on the golf course which gives the City first right-of-refusal if the County were to come along and say they were getting rid of it.

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Douglas Barcon spoke about the mixed use proposal for north Diamond Bar and the issue of traffic calming. He is quite familiar with that issue being off of Prospectors Road with the trees in the middle (of the roadway) that people have to drive around, the large traffic humps, etc. and he can't think of what could be done on Diamond Bar Boulevard other than something to that effect or stop signs and traffic lights everywhere to slow it down. The street could be posted at 35 mph and that might help a little bit, but nothing is really going to slow people down unless there is a physical barrier. With respect to the Transit-Oriented zone, his mother's house was along the train tracks in Covina west of Azusa which is a Metrolink line. There are two tracks there and it was once a bypass. The railroad traffic comes by continually and late at night there are big freights coming through on schedule. Train horns go off all day long and half the night and he cannot imagine living by the Metrolink with that being a mainline, being up in the air where the sound will go and having train horns blaring all day and all night. So that might require a quiet zone which would cost several million dollars to construct. Recently, SB 827 got killed and that's the bill that would have forced transit-oriented development of five stories. Regarding the property at Highland Valley, the overcrossing there (to the former Lanterman property), if Amazon was to go in there with 50,000 employees, imagine the traffic crossing over that bridge. It may be worthwhile to close that bridge versus keeping it open even though it is an entry into Cal Poly's property. If students moved into housing in that area multiple students would live in each residence so it would be unlike a single owner and maybe a spouse with one or two vehicles. There will be multiple residents living in that type of housing so the traffic will be worse.

Allen Wilson said the audience has been sitting here for more than two hours and the public speaking time was cut from five minutes to three minutes. The agenda said five minutes. He has a lot of concerns. He has been at every event since this process started with a town hall for the community on Wednesday, November 9, 2016. It appears that when the public gives their information to the GPAC and the GPAC gives it to the Council and Planning Commission, they decide not to give any consideration to what the public has been saying they want in this community. We don't want high density. We want to keep the golf course. Apparently, someone is not getting the message. And now you're saying that you want an overlay which was not part of Alternative 1. He wants to take away the hammer from the Council and the Planning Commission and let us (the public) decide on the process. He has lost his patience and he is now beginning to lose confidence in this process. Now we hear about one acre near the Metrolink Station. One acre is less than a football field. It equals an average of 18 homes of 2,400 square feet each. If you do 30 units, that's 1,450 units and you need to put a cap on this and make sure we don't have high density, no more than two stories. This is a suburban community. We are not an urban community like Santa Ana, Los Angeles, San Diego and San Francisco. He is sick and tired of Sacramento telling

us what you can do and what you cannot do. The people of this state are pushing back on SB 54 and we need to push back and take back our community. He is not comfortable with the Council because he is trying to have a conversation with some of the Council and they do not want to listen to us and he just hopes that something can be changed in this process. With respect to the parking structure you want to do on Golden Springs and so forth, how high do you want to go? Four stories? Five stories? You don't want a view? There is so much that we can say and to the very idea of SCAG, SCAG is a very interesting entity where Diamond Bar pays \$25,000 to be a member. That's a bunch of cities making decisions over our own community. And he is totally lost of this concept but his concern is the Community Core Overlay – we did not agree to the second half across from Calvary Chapel. You really need to think twice about this. We as the voters should decide this.

Grace Lim-Hays said her community has asked her to represent them in the TOD. There are several questions and she would like time to express their concerns. She is grateful to be able to participate in this process and make sure the City arrives at a General Plan that represents the values and history and protects residents' quality of life. However, she is truly concerned that this preferred plan in its existing form, is far from arriving at this goal. At the January 30, 2018, meeting several individuals submitted written public comments to get information that is critical and vital to the concerns of the City such as air quality, induced travel, and financial feasibility. Residents have yet to receive responses to their written requests. She is hoping this process will become more transparent and more responsive to the concerns and needs and voices of our community. First, the planned overlay over the golf course amounts to pretty much adopting Alternative 2 which residents overwhelmingly reject which she believes everyone knows. So it is clearly a betrayal of what we had intended. It is like a little ticking time bomb ready to blow up all the promises made by Alternative 1 and it takes away all of the protections we had intended and the curbing of development we had hoped for. It really is like putting a hole in the ship for us. And to better make sense, why does the General Plan not include an ongoing and in depth study of conservation and open space first and throughout the process, both of which are critical elements required by the state? Why is it immediately focused on development opportunities without first understanding what these development projects will affect and destroy? Where is the study of our air quality, our water, our carbon emissions, our sensitive habitats? So much has yet to be studied but so much has already been decided. Sadly, the most pressing thing is the Transit-Oriented Mixed Use area by the Metrolink Station in her neighborhood which to her seems to be a mixed bag of motives and some strange excuses to benefit more of the developers than the residents who live there now. It is already a fact that you have discussed the train schedule is very limited and she does not really understand this decision. It (the train) is not the primary mode of travel by residents in that area. In the 25 years she has lived there she has known of only two individuals who used the train for travel. Most of the residents do not work in LA. So the schedule is very limited and the destination is very limited so it doesn't make any sense to make that a justification for ramping up development for high density with commercial which is definitely out-of-scale with the existing neighborhoods of low and

medium density homes. Plus the promise of park development that is four acres is very vague at this point. There is no clear requirement of acreage for the park, we don't know what size those parks are going to be and we don't know how many units are going to be planned in those parcels. With 30-40 expected units (per acre) it seems enormous and far out of scale with the existing neighborhood. Even more perplexing is the conceptual illustration that includes building on existing mobile home parks. What is going to happen to our neighbors? Is the City planning to displace those who could be most vulnerable? What happened to protecting and respecting existing neighborhoods which was stated in the plan? Lives are going to be uprooted. This is not placemaking, this is just place taking and grabbing. The idea behind TOD to make an area that is pedestrian friendly to local destinations is baffling to those who live there because the existing businesses are already primarily light industrial. It is not a fine dining destination or shopping spot unless I want to stock up on restaurant supplies, cabinets, sod or tiles. That's what you find in our neighborhood. We are right next to City of Industry, not the Brea Mall or historic downtown. She pointed out that several intersections are already impacted by development for this area and they are already at unacceptable levels of service, particularly Brea Canyon Road and Golden Springs Drive rated .94. This is just as bad as Diamond Bar Boulevard and Grand Avenue and Brea Canyon Road and Lycoming is approaching such levels. With the addition of the freeway onramp at Lemon, what would be the impact on the area's level of service – it is already presently overly congested during peak hours. They are boxed in by trucks and are also concerned whether promoting street connectivity includes opening up Washington Street to make a parkway which would introduce more truck traffic into their neighborhood. In all of the alternatives her area never had a chance but to be transit-oriented mixed use. Is it not possible to consider scaling back on the level of development?

Jim Hays lives in the high density mixed use area (Cottonwood Lane) and while this may sound like self-pity, why us? Most of the City is yellow but right in their neighborhood is the high density purple. Like the former speaker said, it is in a place where there are mobile homes and he is upset that the City has this grand plan for their neighborhood based on a transit mixed use when it is not really used that much in that way. The idea that people are going to walk from his complex is absurd because people who live where they live drive to the transit and there is still traffic even though it is in close proximity. He appreciates that the committee has concerns about density but he would like for this committee to act because he does not have confidence the City Council with the exception of perhaps one Councilmember that has anything in their mind but develop our City. He has heard glimmer of hope that some of the GPAC members have more sensitivity toward the residents who move here not to maximize their profit margin but because they are interested in minimal development within the guidelines of what is necessary. More development won't solve the traffic issues and it is already very bad at rush hour in many neighborhoods and high density development and all development will make that worse. He asked the GPAC to please concentrate more on open space and not development which is why everyone moved to Diamond Bar.

Yuwen Wang said that in this preferred land use plan the area near the Metrolink Station is designated for transit-oriented mixed use and this plan for high density housing requires the removal of mobile home parks that currently occupy that area along Washington Avenue which will displace the low to medium income families and individuals currently living there, many of whom are veterans retired and even some college students. This land use plan will create a large homeless population, most of which cannot afford to purchase a new home in Diamond Bar. How will the City of Diamond Bar mitigate the homeless problem this transit-oriented mixed use element creates? In addition, her questions and concerns addressed to the City during the January 30, 2018, joint meeting have not yet been answered. Why? A copy of her speech will be mailed to the GPAC and please respond to her questions by May 1st.

Robin Smith said she met with a financier who told her that many cities do transit-oriented development to backfill pension portfolios for staff members. It is quite common. So we the people really question why we are being shoved into TODs like many communities are. She understands the motivation. In April 2016, when she asked questions about conservation, the City Manager said well, we're almost built out now so we should be starting to think about conservation right about now. So her question is, the Conservation Element is a mandated element in all General Plans and why hasn't this City implemented a real Conservation Element to conserve the sensitive environment areas of the City. A lot of cities like Huntington Beach, Irvine, and Newport Beach have pushed back on SCAG's pressure for more affordable housing. When does any community that is already built out finally say, no more? What happens, do we get fined, do we get in trouble? There are communities that are trying to preserve the character and have pushed back on SCAG and she wants to know why Diamond Bar has to kowtow to SCAG. As for this comparison of high density being like Pasadena, Mr. St. Amant, I think you know, this is not Pasadena. When she goes to Pasadena she goes to the Playhouse and a restaurant and it is not the same vibe here. We are suburban and that's what we are. We had restaurants with china and tablecloths like Acapulco Restaurant, a beautiful Farmer's Market over by the bowling alley years ago, we had a movie theater down south and all of those things we're saying here tonight we want, yes, they are good things and why did they go away. And she wants to know what gives GPAC the confidence that just building more stuff is going to bring that back. She thinks something is being missed here. This City is overbuilt. We are not addressing that. We have numerous vacant business buildings, we have vacant hotels. And she also wants to know what the annual occupancy rate is of the City's hotel population before we start building more hotels. That's why the City has economic blight. The 1995 General Plan Housing Element says we are only going to build luxury gated homes here. That causes gentrification which is what we are in the middle of now. And if we take away things like the trailer park, that's gentrification. We're displacing our middle to lower income folks. That's hostile to a community. This community character without getting into the environmentally sensitive areas is this: It is openness and a sense of airiness in our neighborhoods. She has an acre in a suburban neighborhood that has coastal scrub and Oak woodland on it. Even if she didn't have that, she has the freshness of a viewshed, the relief and good feelings of space. She doesn't have to

look out her kitchen window and see her neighbor's bedroom window, and that's what we have here. That's country living, if you will. Other people live in rural areas that have more acreage, but we're trying to preserve the sense of relief, openness and comfort here. We are not a commercial area – that's what suburbia is. And everything we have seen in this General Plan process she thinks has gone against the voice of the people. And by the way, the City's census is down to 57,100. It was projected in the 1995 General Plan at 62,000. We have a decreasing census so check the numbers.

R. Lee Paulson echoed feelings and concerns of other speakers. When this process first started, his comment to the GPAC was that we have hills here and we have sensitive ecological areas here and we have habitat that other communities can only dream of. And when we talk about what is going to happen in the next 20-30 years, what he sees us trying to do is pave all of that over and turn it into West Covina. In the next 20 years, the most valuable thing that will be left in the LA Basin is going to be open space conserved natural areas, specifically, the area of Tres Hermanos. When we put our plan together for our spaces and our future, we should use those hills to our advantage. What he has been hearing over the last year and one-half is, let's pave it over. He urged the GPAC to rethink and to use the value what is available now and exploit that instead of trying to turn the City into something it is not. The other concern was that the City is already short on parks. The 1995 General Plan was adamant about having five-acres per 1,000 people – we now have 1.2 (acres per 1,000) and when he read that it said for any development over four acres there has to be parkland, he would like that to be specific and he would like the GPAC to address the fact that there be an absolute minimum amount of parkland established for any development and that, under no circumstances, can a developer pay off the City to put more housing in like they did in Site D. When the City Council talked about taking away the golf course, should the County decide to shut it down, it will make that open space and recreation area that much less and he didn't hear one word about what the City proposed to do to mitigate that loss. And he would like that addressed. One of his concerns is that if the SR57 project goes, that south area of the golf course will have to be rebuilt and he has a sneaking suspicion there is something going on under the table. He can't say for sure but it sure looks like that, that when all of that comes down, the south part of the golf course is going to become available when they put the interchange in and they will have to take out some of the holes on that side. When he watched the video of the City Council, he saw people salivating over the opportunity to pave that over and that is of great concern for residents.

Mario Salas thanked the members, public and M/Sherwood for representing what he believes is the vast majority of Diamond Bar residents. He understood some of the concerns and expressions by VC/Worthington when he pointed out that the City Council and leadership has designated these certain areas for density growth and that we have to look forward from 2018 beyond. The problem is that we are using 1996 transportation infrastructure which is a big problem. In relation to the neighborhood mixed use area, have any studies been done by the traffic committee or city engineers to see if it will interfere with the transition from the SR60 to the SR57. He heard someone say

150 homes may be affected by doing an interchange but now, if there is more building how many more homes will have to be addressed and potentially dealt with? Speaking of the character of Diamond Bar, he fears our mantra will transition from country living to in-your-car living and it has got to be addressed. He said he understood the difficulties, specifically by those who have been tasked with it, of implementing the Governor's OPR Guidelines. It's a pain trying to find a medium, but pouring thousands of cars through our streets from the SR57 and the SR60 is definitely not conducive to healthy living. Maybe leadership needs to push back and get some funding to fix that problem. The decisions made here today affect him and his future. We've got to get this right – that's 20 to 40 years from now. I don't know how many people will still be here doing what they are doing but he will be and he will have to clean up the mess that's made if it is not done right.

Vice Chair Worthington announced that the Speakers who were limited to three minutes of comments could return for an additional two minutes which provided a total of five minutes of comments:

Douglas Barcon asked what would happen to the bike lane on Diamond Bar Boulevard on the southbound side from Temple to Sunset Crossing if that street is widened to possibly six lanes or narrow it down for traffic calming. On the second to last page of the handout, the map shows Gentle Springs being part of the drawing that was shown last time. The map shows Palomino Drive and Gentle Springs with a new spur coming off of that going over to Prospectors. At the last meeting it was mentioned that that proposed road should not go through north of the Fall Creek condos. Keep in mind that the map is not properly aligned. The City is looking to add new buildings and business, etc., but the City of Industry is going to build out all of that property along Grand Avenue that is going to impact that area. Looking at the mixed-use property, if you've got two owners per parcel with the bottom layer being commercial and the residential above that, how is that going to work out for tax basis and what happens if the businesses down below fold up. All you're going to have at that point is blight on the bottom floor and condos above that. What about business placement along the corridor from Sunset Crossing to Temple. It's been addressed already, but what about the Mobil Station – all of the businesses there, the high rises of sorts, the auto repair places. Supposedly, the owner of the auto repair places does not intend to sell so that is going to remain. Once a decision is made about what will be done and move forward, if it is wrong we can't go back on it. It's a done deal, so keep that part in mind. We have to make sure we do this right the first time.

Allen Wilson emphasized that quality of life is very important to him and he has become of an age that open space is very important to him and people who live in this community. He moved here 20 years ago and has lived in the San Gabriel Valley all of his life and he knows what's going on here. He just wants to make sure that the golf course remains as it is. He doesn't want to hear anything about land swap with Tres Hermanos. We need open space to serve generations to come. He has seen this area change and he wants something to give future generations to appreciate the fact that we did something.

And we need to keep an eye on the Golden Springs Shopping Center, we need to fix those existing shopping centers and do something about them. You've heard the phrase if you build it they will come and that's his concern about the community core overlay. He hopes we can come to a conclusion about this land swap business. M/Sherwood mentioned about what C/Herrera said at the joint meeting and she used a scare tactic to scare the people of this community. He mentioned it at the last Council meeting and he resents what she did. She had no right to do what she did. She's been on the Council for too long. She needs to go.

Jim Hays said the next topic is community core overlay. It seems very suspicious and he asked that the GPAC keep an eye on that because it sounds like there is already a plan in the works to redevelop the golf course, and that is just really a setup like people have mentioned, to have Alternative 2 because that's going to be developed. It wasn't said like that, it was an overlay for the future. But he thinks that is very deceptive. He hopes that some understand that is maybe in the works rather than just something for the future.

Robin Smith said the January 30, 2018, meeting was videotaped and is posted on YouTube. It's a three hour meeting that people can view. Just look under Save Tres Hermanos and there it is.

GPAC DISCUSSION CONTINUES:

Community Core Overlay:

M/Sherwood said that with respect to the golf course, it is his understanding that the golf course is intended to stay. Now there is suspicion that something is in the works. Well, we don't know. The idea of the overlay is that the City wants to have some say into what happens with that property if the County wants to get rid of the golf course. While it sounded like a scare tactic, it is not unreasonable to say well, maybe they are going to put a homeless shelter there. So he thinks the City just wants to have a plan in place in the eventuality that it comes to pass that the County wants to get rid of the golf course. The way he views the map is, since the southern portion is across from the Target Center, etc. it would be conceptualized for retail and he kind of understands that. The northern (larger) portion which runs up against residential is intended to be open space, recreational space, park space, or whatever, and he does not believe there is an intent to develop that commercially. So he thinks everyone is safe there. That's the intent he understood. Right now there is no plan and hopefully they are being honest with us and we can only hope for the best that the golf course is going to stay because that's what people want and he agrees. But, the City also needs to have a backup plan, so to speak, if the County were to say, you know what, we're going to get rid of the golf course so he thinks that's really the intent. And hopefully that is the truth.

M/Ramirez shares everyone's concern with the Community Core overlay. It was, he thought, haphazardly added to a set of alternatives that was approved. Before anyone can do anything to the golf course it has to go through an environmental study and he wants everyone to know, if they do not already know, that the SR57/60 project, Phase III will take parts of hole #6, 7, 2, 1, 13 and 14, to introduce bypass lanes for the SR57. That's been environmentally approved and once there is funding for Phase III that will happen so he encourages everyone to watch for notices for environmental updates to that project to make sure that's all they take and anything else.

M/Sherwood asked what happens when they take holes away. M/Ramirez responded that they are not taking holes away, they are either going to be shortened or narrowed so the holes will still be there, they are basically just going to slice the portion along the freeway so they can add a bypass lane. CDD/Gubman confirmed that M/Ramirez was correct.

Chair/St. Amant said that his understanding is that the south part is 55 acres that will be reduced to 37 acres after Phase III has taken the slice. CDD/Gubman explained that the south portion will be reduced to about 35-37 acres. What will constitute the largest take is the realignment of the eastbound off ramp onto Grand Avenue which will slice into the golf course somewhat midway between the current off ramp and Golden Springs Drive.

VC/Worthington wanted to address the comments that the City Council was trying to pull a fast one with regard to the overlay. He asked the Council Members about that because he was not at the meeting and the answer to him seemed to be pretty straightforward that it was a backup plan and he has no reason not to believe that. He has known the Council Members for many years and tends to believe that is the truth.

M/Harbin added that the County is going to every city looking for any slice of land – anything where they could put homeless shelters, etc. She believes that by having these guiding policies and implementing policies in the General Plan it will slow the County down and make them think twice about looking at us as, for lack of a better term, a dumping ground. Chair/St. Amant agreed with M/Harbin.

M/Sherwood said that this subject was never presented to the GPAC. This came out of left field at the joint meeting and he was a little disappointed that this information was never passed on as a scenario that the GPAC could have discussed and considered in its discussions. It was lobbed in after the GPAC had done all of its work.

M/Busse said that while it seemed that this may have come out of left field, he can understand why. There could be discussions going on downtown at the Board of Supervisors behind closed doors with, for lack of better terms, the "Kremlinesque" neighbors we have in City of Industry and their string pullers at Majestic Realty. And the bottom line here is that we could wake up some morning and open the L.A. Times and find out that the County is going to sell that property to whomever. And unless Diamond

Bar has some plan in place, we have no say in what happens. He is not a golfer, he grew up next to two golf courses, he thinks this is a crummy place for a golf course – he wouldn't want to be playing golf next to a freeway, but that said, it is a nice view when you drive down Golden Springs and with that in mind, the City Council had to do this to make sure the City is prepared for when stuff happens downtown LA and Diamond Bar all of a sudden gets it thrown in our laps. And he would say that is a very real possibility – maybe a homeless camp, maybe a hospital, maybe whatever they want to do with it. This protects Diamond Bar.

Town Center Area:

M/Harbin said she would like to see as a follow up in the Zoning Code is that before the City puts two hotels here that feasibility studies are done that show that there is an actual need for those hotels. Otherwise, they sometimes become “no-tell motels” and that's not what Diamond Bar wants.

M/Sherwood said that one thing he sees that is a push and a pull, residents view Diamond Bar as a rural, low density to medium density bedroom community and the City Council and cities in general view development as dollars in the coffers of the City. Brea rakes in the money with the mall and all of their retail through sales tax and so they have a lot of money coming in. Diamond Bar does not have a great deal of retail and so, he can see the temptation on the part of City Council where you have limited retail, pushing retail because that's dollars to the City. It is a push and a pull – it is a struggle which he understands. But, at the same time, there is a lot of retail at a lot of other places so how much does Diamond Bar actually need and can support. Second, hotels generate a lot of taxes for cities so that's why there is this push for the hotels. The occupancy taxes are the largest amounts City's take. Yes, it would be interesting to know of the hotels we have, and they have just finished redoing the Doubletree over on Temple which is Pomona but is in Diamond Bar's sphere of influence, so to speak, and affects the City, if Diamond Bar doesn't have the occupancy it doesn't make sense to add hotels. So it gets down to dollars and cents. Residents want residential, cities want commercial and that's the fight we have.

VC/Worthington asked that the image/illustration of the Town Center Area be expanded and cleaned up for better viewing.

M/Evans asked if this plan was proposing hotels on Golden Springs and Diamond Bar Boulevard and Ms. Pan explained that this was put together just as an illustration when discussing the alternatives. When they were comparing the different town center sites this was a way to show how potential commercial development could be configured on the three different sites. This is not a specific development plan. There is not a proposal for a hotel or two hotels, it was produced by the team's urban designer who was attempting to show potential development. M/Evans said when she looks at this illustration she gets scared because when she sees hotels on the corner of a major intersection, she says “no.” M/Evans asked if the GPAC could get a more accurate

depiction and Ms. Pan explained that it would not necessarily be accurate because it depends on what actual development would be proposed by a developer in the future. A similar drawing could be done to align with what was done for the other two areas that show how the policies would perhaps play out. It would be much more diagrammatic. Ms. Pan agreed that they should probably move away from this diagram for future meetings.

Chair/St. Amant affirmed that this is just a concept so where it says “new street” that is just a concept. There are no concrete plans for what is going in.

M/Ramirez said he had not focused on that sketch but he did focus on the implementing policies and guiding policies which he believes are well-defined. The biggest problem to this site and the biggest challenge it will have is that the way it has been identified in terms of the residual land value, this project doesn't pencil out for any developer. And that's the biggest problem we have. So whatever the development is, as long as we require a hulking parking lot as part of this project, we will never be able to get a developer to consolidate and get a return on their investment. So he focused on the last bullet of the Draft Implementing Policies that says: Avoid expanses of surface parking (which he thinks is great) and encourage the consolidation location of parking to the rear or side of the buildings (which he believes is ideal). The problem is, is that in order to develop this property, they have to follow the existing zoning requirements for the ratio of parking to the site. We are using a 20th Century zoning rule for the 21st Century and we know how people will demand parking and transportation will change and is already changing. Consequently, he has another motion which is about getting the City and Planning Department or whoever is responsible for zoning, to relook at the commercial parking requirements. As long as this big parking lot is required in the middle of this project, we're doomed. He offered the following motion:

M/Ramirez moved to add to the end of bullet: “Avoid expanses of surface parking and encourage the consolidated location of parking to the rear or side of the buildings.” To wit: Re-evaluate current parking ratio requirements to maximize the project's residual land value. M/Black seconded the motion.

Discussion on the motion:

M/Sherwood asked if maximizing meant more parking or less parking and M/Ramirez responded “less parking.” We need less parking and that will drive up the residual land value and make it a viable project. Without it, this project will never happen.

M/Black said he believed staff could get the gist of what we're trying to accomplish here and can formulate that into something that would work.

M/Harbin asked if at the conclusion of the General Plan Update staff would be taking a comprehensive look at the Zoning Code where this would be one issue that would be considered and CDD/Gubman explained that the first implementation of the General

Plan staff will take on is the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update, because once the updated General Plan is adopted, there will be new policies, new land use designations, etc. that will be incongruent with the current Zoning Ordinance, and which will necessitate adoption of a new Zoning Ordinance to align with the new General Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies. To that end, there is nothing wrong with adding the guiding principle to the list.

M/Black said that was what he was assuming and his statement is that the motion we are discussing now is one of the guiding principles that will be incorporated and reworked. The same with the comment from M/Harbin regarding the motel – it would be a guiding principle.

Chair/St. Amant wondered if future City Council would begin getting complaints about inadequate parking like what currently exists at Walmart. M/Black said there would be more land and what he assumed would end up happening is that they can do a parking structure which increases the cost of development and will that cause this property to be less utilized because no developer will buy it because they have a parking structure requirement. That's where this motion comes into play, in his opinion.

M/Ramirez said that obviously, there will be a need for parking and the question is, does it have to be three stories/1200 parking spots. He goes to Brea Mall to shop and be entertained and he is not dissuaded from going when he has to chase parking and it is not simple. But he is assuming and expecting that as technology takes over, how we move about in our cars and how we use our cars, the advent of Uber and other modes of transportation will solve this problem and change how we move about.

M/Sherwood asked CDD/Gubman who financed the Brea parking structures on Brea Boulevard and behind Tower Records building. CDD/Gubman said he did not know. Birch Street Downtown was a redevelopment project developed when the Brea redevelopment Agency existed. The parking structure on Brea Boulevard heading south and turning right on Birch Street would have been part of the Redevelopment project, but he does not know the details of the one behind Tower Records.

M/Sherwood said he is concerned that we are pushing development and what he hears the residents saying is "enough development." So, how do we strike a balance between the two and how do we articulate that in this General Plan.

M/Busse said his only hesitation is what he reads in the Wall Street Journal is upheaval in retail. He doesn't know what brick and mortar will look like 15-20 years down the road and he wonders if this process ends up banking on the future with retail model that is not going to exist or exist in a very different form that people are accustomed to.

M/Sherwood said that to that point, Toys "R" Us just went out of business and Bon-Ton stores back east just filed for bankruptcy and is being liquidated and all of those stores are going out of business and 30,000 people are being put out of work. To M/Busse's

point, retail is changing and we have to adjust our expectations and plans accordingly and it seems like we're thinking "old school" when it comes to retail. Bring in business, bring in business, and the people in our town say "enough already."

Chair/St. Amant said he believes everyone is realizing how business is changing with Amazon and others. He's not positive but he believes Toys "R" Us was a hedge fund takeover and liquidation. Retail is changing, but he believes the way the GPAC has been looking at this town center thing is more of a "gathering place" with things that will never go away like coffee shops, restaurants, small boutique shops, cafés, ice cream shops, sandwich shops and a sense of community.

M/Sherwood said that perhaps the plan needs to articulate it is "neighborhood retail" or small scale retail, something to draw a balance between density and development and the neighborhood feel this community wants. Chair/St. Amant agrees and asked staff if there was a way to focus more on pedestrian-friendly retail/gathering places.

CDD/Gubman stated that the Draft Implementing Policies include those terms and concepts – pedestrian friendly, gathering places, etc. All of those guiding principles are in the bullet points. The Town Center sketch is a very ambitious conceptual plan here but just because we draw a hotel at that corner does not mean the City can make somebody build it. The City cannot get rid of a gas station and have it repurposed on that site for residential. It will be market driven, but what we can do through these guiding policies is at least direct the size and bulk of the buildings, the kind of pedestrian amenities that need to be incorporated, etc. The most important feature on the illustration is that the new main street that goes parallel to the Sprouts building in that it starts to establish a small scale block system and areas for the pedestrian to walk from one end to the other and have points of interest, points to stop and shop or relax, have a midway plaza or amenity where people can spend some time. More important than looking at the map colors and legend is the concept of breaking up that parking lot into smaller modules and creating the opportunities for it to become a walkable area. Chair/St. Amant said similar to The Shoppes in Chino Hills. CDD/Gubman said that was mentioned previously as being a similar concept in that Grand Avenue is a busy arterial heading toward a busy freeway so one has to actually enter The Shoppes to become part of that lifestyle center and experience. If it helps the committee, staff can provide something that is more schematic and provides more of the framework and idea that we are trying to create a place or atmosphere. Ms. Pan said her designer can create specifications more to scale along with an idea of what the market opportunity is for developers later on that will help the committee see a more viable but smaller scale development.

M/Ramirez said we need to get rid of the sketch and he encouraged the consultant to read the language that is put into the actual draft that describes what everyone is saying here and that is, walkable, patios, plazas, entertainment, etc. which are the things this community is thirsty for.

M/Sherwood said he was concerned that in the list of implementing policies there have not been allowances for green space/landscaping/small park areas in commercial zones. He noticed at the new Coffee Bean and Tea Leaf one can sit outside but you're almost sitting on Diamond Bar Boulevard. It is noisy and it would have been nice if the plants were around the patio to create a buffer from the seating area to the traffic.

M/Ramirez restated his motion that was amended by M/Sherwood: To reevaluate current parking zonal ratio requirements to maximize the project's residual land value. The restated amended motion was seconded by M/Black. Motion approved unanimously by the following Roll Call vote:

M/Black	yes
M/Busse	yes
M/Evans	yes
M/Garg	yes
M/Harbin	yes
M/Ramirez	yes
M/Rivera	yes
M/Sherwood	yes
M/Torng	Absent
VC/Worthington	yes
Chair/St. Amant	yes

CDD/Gubman responded to M/Sherwood's concern regarding green space/landscaping/small park areas being included in Commercial Zones that staff will proceed with that as its direction for inclusion.

M/Harbin moved, M/Black seconded, that before any new hotel/motel is considered, that a market feasibility study be completed. Motion carried unanimously by the following Roll Call vote:

M/Black	yes
M/Busse	yes
M/Evans	yes
M/Garg	yes
M/Harbin	yes
M/Ramirez	yes
M/Rivera	yes
M/Sherwood	yes
M/Torng	Absent
VC/Worthington	yes
Chair/St. Amant	yes

M/Sherwood moved, VC/Worthington seconded that commercial projects incorporate green space/landscaping/small parklike areas including the town center. Motion carried unanimously by the following Roll Call vote:

M/Black	yes
M/Busse	yes
M/Evans	yes
M/Garg	yes
M/Harbin	yes
M/Ramirez	yes
M/Rivera	yes
M/Sherwood	yes
M/Torng	Absent
VC/Worthington	yes
Chair/St. Amant	yes

M/Black moved, M/Sherwood seconded, to accept the guiding policies and implementing policies under the Town Center Mixed Use outline as augmented by the previous motions. Motion carried unanimously by the following Roll Call vote:

M/Black	yes
M/Busse	yes
M/Evans	yes
M/Garg	yes
M/Harbin	yes
M/Ramirez	yes
M/Rivera	yes
M/Sherwood	yes
M/Torng	Absent
VC/Worthington	yes
Chair/St. Amant	yes

RECONSIDERATION OF PRIOR MOTIONS by area:

Transit Oriented Mixed Use Area:

Discussion of motion by Ramirez, seconded by VC/Worthington as amended by M/Black to study the balance of density to make commercial component viable and to increase the threshold limit to 40 dwelling units per acre based on the commercial development need.

M/Ramirez clarified his motion to establish a maximum density of 30 dwelling units per acre unless the viability of the project requires a high density. He recalled there was an amendment by M/Black that it could not increase the threshold limit above 40 dwelling units per acre.

M/Sherwood asked the purpose of increasing the density to 40 if currently Diamond Bar has a density of 20 dwelling units per acre. Chair/St. Amant said the purpose was to make the project commercially viable. M/Ramirez stated that staff's language placed the density at 40 and there was a concern stated by M/Torng that 40 seemed too high with which M/Ramirez agreed. And he felt that since the discussion was about a development that is mixed use, he assumed that that development would require a particular density and we don't want it to be higher than 30 unless it has to go higher than 30. M/Sherwood is suggesting 20 and M/Ramirez said he did know if that would render the project unviable but he believes it is better than staff's recommendation which is 40. M/Sherwood was concerned that if we say they can go to 40 then they will go to 40.

Chair/St. Amant said that as he looks through the booklet he notices that the examples of density units on almost all of them were somewhere around 12 to 16. The only exception was the Pasadena project which was at 48. The next highest was in the 20's.

CDD/Gubman said that 20 is on the low side for transit-oriented type developments. 30 units per acre is also rather low but may be appropriate for Diamond Bar. The Baldwin Park development is 70 or so units on one acre. If 40 or anything higher than 30 is hitting your threshold of pain that can be reflected in the policy language staff moves forward with. Referring back to the Field Guide, CDD/Gubman cited examples in El Monte (page 28) at 72-units per acre; Baldwin Park 70-units per acre and so forth.

M/Sherwood said that to M/Busse's point, the train service there is limited and one person who lives there mentioned she knows of only two individuals using the train. So, would it make sense to pack that area in with the assumption people are going to use the train when they are not going to use the train and they will use cars which means how many cars per unit? He thinks that's trying to pack too many sardines into the can.

M/Ramirez said the Metrolink site is not just Metrolink, it is a hub now for Foothill Transit. It has multi-level parking. He takes the train every day and has for the past 20 plus years and he can say that the bus traffic is approaching the train traffic.

M/Black said he believed the concept that he and M/Ramirez were talking about the fact that we are giving the City the latitude if this is viable to bring a development because this is all about the developers and the value of the land. It is possible that with the value of the land and the units that would be sold and the retail that would be there, perhaps it would require 30 units per acre or 29 units per acre. Again, if the City has a developer that says 35 will work and I can make this work and this is what we propose to do, with our guiding policies he would rather have something that is viable and can function because it is going to happen, than something isn't viable and can't function and sits there and erodes. With that, he has to lean to the City and give them the latitude.

He would rather see the units on the other side of Diamond Ranch High School not be affordable housing which is designated or is conceptually that now. We have this in the transit-oriented area which has more utility to it.

M/Sherwood said that to the point that the GPAC is an advisory committee, if the City has an ordinance that it can only put up a retaining wall of four feet, but you go over to Willow Heights and there are 30 foot retaining walls. You go over to Vantage and there are 30 foot retaining walls. The City is going to do what the City is going to do. He believes the GPAC are not just representing the City, but also representing the people who have told the GPAC what they want and they want lower density. They don't want packed in neighborhoods. And so, the GPAC can advise the City that it wants low density because that's what the people want and put a cap on it and the Planning Commission can grant a variance so you can put up 100 units. He would say that the GPAC should not go any higher than 30 for that particular area. He understands it is conducive to that nature of development, given its location. And it is difficult to create a low-density development in that area but he believes the GPAC needs to attempt to mitigate high-density as much as possible.

Chair/St. Amant restated the motion for 30 units per acre unless it needs to go to 40 to be viable with a second from M/Black and called for the question. Motion failed 6- 4 by the following Roll Call vote:

M/Black	yes
M/Busse	yes
M/Evans	no
M/Garg	yes
M/Harbin	no
M/Ramirez	yes
M/Rivera	no
M/Sherwood	no
M/Torng	Absent
VC/Worthington	no
Chair/St. Amant	no

M/Sherwood moved that the area be capped at a density of 30-units per acre. Motion carried 8-2 by the following roll call vote:

M/Black	yes
M/Busse	yes
M/Evans	yes
M/Garg	yes
M/Harbin	no
M/Ramirez	no
M/Rivera	yes
M/Sherwood	yes

M/Torng	Absent
VC/Worthington	yes
Chair/St. Amant	yes

SP/Lee said that for the record, the committee asked to incorporate “character” and have staff come up with information about Diamond Bar’s character and staff will follow up on that request.

CDD/Gubman stated that before moving forward, there was an observation that a high-density residential icon was placed at one of the two mobile home parks and that is a mapping error. Existing residential areas are not proposed to be redesignated, so the icon should be removed. An appropriate opportunity site not highlighted is the Walnut Valley Unified School District offices and bus yard which is considered to be an underutilized valuable piece of land appropriate for repurposing and could potentially be a residential site. Staff wants to go on the record as striking icon on the map which happens to coincide with that mobile home park location. The GPAC can revisit this issue in June after staff revises and posts the corrected land use designation map for the TOD area. The GPAC concurred to revisit the matter at its June meeting.

Neighborhood Mixed Use Area:

SP/Lee restated the previous motion: Motion by M/Ramirez, seconded by VC/Worthington to adopt traffic calming strategies to promote support of neighborhood interaction, pedestrian walkability and commercial patronage along Diamond Bar Boulevard from Sunset Crossing to Temple Avenue. There were no comments or questions. Chair/St. Amant called for the motion: Motion carried 8-1 with one abstention by the following Roll Call vote:

M/Black	yes
M/Busse	yes
M/Evans	yes
M/Garg	yes
M/Harbin	abstain
M/Ramirez	yes
M/Rivera	no
M/Sherwood	yes
M/Torng	Absent
VC/Worthington	yes
Chair/St. Amant	yes

M/Black moved, M/Harbin seconded to accept the Neighborhood Mixed Use if it is accepted with the draft guiding policies and draft implementing policies as augmented by previous votes. M/Sherwood amended the motion to include incorporation of green

space into the portion of the mixed use area which was seconded by Chair/St. Amant and accepted by M/Black and M/Harbin. Motion carried unanimously by the following Roll Call vote:

M/Black	yes
M/Busse	yes
M/Evans	yes
M/Garg	yes
M/Harbin	yes
M/Ramirez	yes
M/Rivera	yes
M/Sherwood	yes
M/Torng	Absent
VC/Worthington	yes
Chair/St. Amant	yes

Community Core Overlay Area:

No prior motions for this area.

Motion by Chair/St. Amant, second by M/Sherwood to amend the second Draft Guiding Policy to also allow for the continued use of the portion of the golf course property as parkland, to wit: “and the portion south of Grand Avenue as a park, walkable mixed-use community and regional destination offering retail dining and entertainment uses, plazas and community gathering spaces, supporting residential uses and civic and other supporting uses. Motion carried unanimously by the following Roll Call vote:

M/Black	yes
M/Busse	yes
M/Evans	yes
M/Garg	yes
M/Harbin	yes
M/Ramirez	yes
M/Rivera	yes
M/Sherwood	yes
M/Torng	Absent
VC/Worthington	yes
Chair/St. Amant	yes

M/Black moved, to approve the Community Core Overlay draft guiding policies and draft implementing policies as instituted in the profile. Motion carried unanimously by the following Roll Call vote:

M/Black	yes
M/Busse	yes
M/Evans	yes
M/Garg	yes
M/Harbin	yes
M/Ramirez	yes
M/Rivera	yes
M/Sherwood	yes
M/Torng	Absent
VC/Worthington	yes
Chair/St. Amant	yes

M/Black asked staff to clarify why the overlay addresses only the north and south portions and not the entire golf course? CDD/Gubman said that what staff heard was that the City Council expressly wanted to preserve the northern portion as either a golf course or park and recreation open space use. So what staff did in the map to avoid any misinterpretation or ambiguity, was not put any crosshatching there so that it is absolutely visually unambiguous that that shall not be touched for any of those community core type uses. For the sake of clarity, staff created a new land use designation because it is currently "golf course" and we are proposing in the legend to create a designation called "golf course/park".

7. REVIEW OF NEXT STEPS:

Ms. Pan stated that this summer the GPAC will meet to discuss other topics and move away from the focus on the mixed-use areas to cover such things as Land Use overall, Economic Development And Resource Conservation, Circulation, Public Services And Facilities, Community Health and Sustainability, Public Safety, and Community Character And Placemaking. In addition, prior to the June 21st meeting, staff will be scheduling the Scoping meeting for the EIR and working on the Notice of Preparation for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to come out prior to the June 21st meeting. Over the course of the fall policies will be revised, finishing the General Plan, working on the Environmental Impact Report and have drafts prepared for early next year (2019).

CDD/Gubman said that in June, staff will come back with a cleaned up map with the icons properly placed. The Scoping meeting for the EIR will likely happen on June 21st, the same evening in the Windmill Room prior to the regular GPAC meeting. The EIR is not only going to cover the General Plan but will include a Climate Action Plan which is a long-range plan that usually goes hand-in-hand with the General Plan to establish policies to meet greenhouse gas emission targets to implement policies to roll back greenhouse emissions in accordance with California legislation.

8. DATES FOR FUTURE MEETINGS:

The next GPAC meeting is scheduled for June 21, 2018.

ADJOURNMENT: With no further business before the General Plan Advisory Committee, Chair/St. Amant adjourned the meeting at 10:56 p.m.

The foregoing minutes are hereby approved this 21st day of June, 2018.

Attest:
Respectfully Submitted,

Greg Gubman
Community Development Director

Mark St. Amant, Chairperson