

**MINUTES OF THE CITY OF DIAMOND BAR
GENERAL PLAN UPDATE MEETING
OF THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CITY HALL WINDMILL COMMUNITY ROOM
21810 COPLEY DRIVE, DIAMOND BAR, CA 91765
NOVEMBER 30, 2017 – 6:30 p.m.**

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman St. Amant called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL:

Larry M. Black, David Busse, Amy Harbin, Ching Liu, Lee Mao, Victor Ramirez, Gil Rivera, Paul Sherwood, Vice Chairman Brian Worthington, Chairman Mark St. Amant

GPAC Member Cindy Liu arrived at 6:40 p.m.

GPAC Members excused: Teruni Evans, Mahendra Garg, Tony Torng, Joyce Young

Also present: Greg Gubman, Community Development Director; David Liu, Public Works Director; Grace Lee, Senior Planner, and Stella Marquez, Administrative Coordinator.

Others present: Sophie Martin, AICP, Dyett & Bhatia; Katharine Pan, Dyett & Bhatia; Paul Hermann, Fehr & Peers; John Muggridge, Senior Associate Fehr & Peers; Lance Harris, Pro Forma Advisors LLC; Steve Ledbetter, TKE Engineering; Jane Lin, Urban Field Studios; Kathy Ortiz-Cobian, Senior Project Coordinator, Arellano Associates

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA: As Presented.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

3.1 GPAC Meeting Minutes for June 15, 2017.

Chair/St. Amant requested Line 2, Paragraph 2 on Page 20 should read “would be necessary.” Upon motion by M/Rivera, duly seconded, the GPAC Meeting Minutes for June 15, 2017, were approved as corrected without objection.

4. FOLLOWUP ACTION ITEMS FROM JUNE 15, 2017, GPAC MEETING:

CDD/Gubman provided information on items requested by GPAC members at the last meeting on a variety of topics that were covered during that evening:

1. Requested that staff identify potential compensation sites for the Diamond Bar Golf Course;
2. Explain the significant increase in sales tax revenue after Fiscal Year 2014/15;
3. Provide more specifics on the proposed redevelopment of the oak tree plaza and Ranch Center properties;
4. Discuss the impact of the planned “fixes” along the SR57/60 Confluence; and,
5. Provide examples of mixed-use and high density developments within a reasonable driving distance.

The requested information was provided to the GPAC and posted on the General Plan website in a staff memo dated August 31, 2017, with the exception of the last item, examples of residential and mixed-use developments which was published and distributed in book form on November 8, 2017.

GOLF COURSE: As described in the memo, staff consulted with Supervisor Hahn’s office regarding potential alternatives to compensate for acreage on the Golf Course that may be redeveloped for non-recreational use. What staff found is that the County’s current position would be to require that a replacement golf course as opposed to any other recreational use, be granted in exchange for the land on which the current golf course sits. In light of that, staff believes that the most likely candidate sites would be the Diamond Bar portion of the Tres Hermanos Ranch property or the acquisition and conversion of the Royal Vista Golf Course in Rowland Heights into a public course. The pursuit of either of those alternatives would obviously be challenging.

To supplement what was in the August memo, regardless of which Town Center alternative is recommended, the Committee may wish to consider long-range planning policies for the eventual repurposing of the golf course for other recreational uses. Golf courses have been closing nationwide including in the San Gabriel Valley and Inland Empire and some plans to develop new golf courses have been canceled. Given that reality, it may be prudent for Diamond Bar to be proactive in expressing its expectations to the County, should they ever consider repurposing the golf course site. One example that might help folks envision future opportunities for the golf course site would be Craig Ranch Regional Park in North Las Vegas which was developed on a 170 acre former golf course site.

The jump in sales tax revenue from 2.7 million in FY 2014/15 to 4.2 million in FY 2015/16 which has thus far been sustained was largely due to Diamond Bar becoming the point of sale for business-to-business wholesale trade.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF OAK TREE PLAZA AND RANCH CENTER:

As requested, staff included conceptual plans for the condominium development proposed on the current site of those two shopping centers located on north Diamond Bar Boulevard and Highland Valley Road. As submitted, the current plan consists of 148 three-story townhomes and the retention at the south end of 12,000 square feet of retail, the portion of the property that included D'Antonio's Restorante as one of the tenants. This project has been inactive for well over a year and the applicant has thus far not moved forward with this application.

PROVIDE DISCUSSION OF THE IMPACT OF THE SR57/60 CONFLUENCE PROJECTS ON THE LAND USE ALTERNATIVES:

The August memo included as an attachment to the SR57/60 Confluence Interchange Improvement Feasibility Study that was prepared for the Southern California Association of Governments. The reasonably foreseeable components as to what is commonly known as the "Big Fix" are taken into account in the Transportation Impact Analysis for the three land use alternatives to be discussed this evening.

EXAMPLES OF MIXED-USE AND HIGH DENSITY DEVELOPMENTS WITHIN A REASONABLE DRIVING DISTANCE.

As mentioned, Diamond Bar's Planning staff prepared a Field Guide which was published at the beginning of November 2017. Staff hopes that the members find this document useful as they consider the Land Use Alternatives as well as, in the future as the City begins developing land use policies pertaining to density, building form, urban design and place making.

5. **PRESENTATION OF REVISED LAND USE ALTERNATIVES AND TECHNICAL FINDINGS** – Sophie Martin, AICP, Principal, Dyett & Bhatia Urban and Regional Planners.

The purpose of tonight's topic is the analysis of different land use alternatives/diagrams and how they fit into the overall process related to development of the City's new General Plan. These alternatives represent a range of options that illustrate how the City could grow and change over about a 20 year or so timeframe. This is a visionary document and at the same time intended to pragmatically guide the City as it grows and changes over time. Each of these land use alternatives present different concepts that visualize how the City could grow and how the community's priorities could be realized. From these three, based on community input, the GPAC members' input and ultimately, the Planning Commission and City Council direction this process will arrive at a preferred land use plan and that plan will form the basis of the rest of the General Plan itself. The General Plan is more than just a land use diagram, but the land use diagram really forms the underpinning/backbone of the Plan upon which many of the rest of the policies are based. It is also important to remember that all of these different concepts are developed in order to reflect and illustrate how the community

objectives that were heard during the first phase of outreach could be realized. Those include protecting and preserving existing neighborhoods and the existing character that people know and love about Diamond Bar; expanding options for local dining and retail and considering how development of some kind of a “Town Center” might be able to achieve that desire; protecting and enhancing environmental quality and environmental resources which draws so many people to this City; providing more spaces for public recreation, community gathering and particularly seeing if more spaces can be identified where community facilities can be provided so that the diverse population has an opportunity to meet, gather and use those places; and, improving mobility – making it easier to get around town regardless of what mode of travel one chooses, but in particular, addressing traffic and congestion such it has such a big impact on “quality of life” in this City. At the last GPAC meeting, three preliminary concept alternatives were presented to this group for consideration before the detailed analysis was performed. Those concept alternatives included three different potential locations for a Town Center: 1) Diamond Bar Boulevard and Grand Avenue; 2) Diamond Bar Boulevard and Golden Springs Drive; and 3) the Golf Course. After a fair amount of discussion the committee instructed the team to drop Alternative 1 and two of the original concepts were then carried forward – the Town Center at Diamond Bar Boulevard and Golden Springs Drive and the Town Center at the Diamond Bar Golf Course. In order to piece out some of the different choices that could be made with that third alternative, it was ultimately split into two parts to consider the potential for a Town Center both on the north side of Grand Avenue and on the south side of Grand Avenue, each of which present a different potential and different impacts. The discussion also included some of the new land use designations that the planners were proposing, specifically pertaining to mixed-use. The planners heard the committee’s feedback on what types of residential uses and densities were appropriate in different places, instruction on how those land use designations should be modified to de-emphasize housing in the Town Center and instead, focus higher density housing near the Metrolink Station. So the land use diagrams before the committee this evening reflect those changes as well.

To refresh the committee’s memory, when looking at land use diagrams it is important to keep a few things in mind. They are diagrammatic and not as detailed as the City’s Zoning Ordinance, but they do ultimately form the basis of the City’s Zoning Ordinance which is the primary regulatory tool that is used to implement many aspects of the General Plan. The diagrams show where certain types of development may be permitted to occur in the future. Types of development are ultimately regulated by Land Use Designations and they also express not only uses but intended densities and intensities. Examples of Land Use Designations include Low-Density Residential, Regional/Commercial, Parks, and so on. The City’s overlay map shows that the vast majority of Diamond Bar is residential and open space and parks which are intended to stay the same through this process. A big concept that was voiced by the public was how much people value their

neighborhoods and their homes which is carried forward in each of the alternatives. Where change is being considered is primarily in commercial areas and in the industrial area to the west. Again, the team has introduced some new land use designations that are being used in these alternative concepts. Currently, the City's land use diagram has only land use designations that are for a single use such as commercial, office, residential, etc. Mixed-Use designations allow for more flexibility and allow for more than one use to be located on a single site. They do not necessarily require a mix of uses to occur on a single site and it does not have to be a vertical mixed-use project with one use on the ground floor with something else above it. When applied to a broader area such as a "Town Center," what it is saying is that we are interested in a broader range of things occurring on this site and defining parameters through which that could occur. So the new list includes Mixed-Use Neighborhood which envisions and would allow Medium Density Housing with a limited amount of neighborhood supporting commercial uses such as a corner store, drug store, etc. and where this designation will occur is up in the very northern end of town similar to where CDD/Gubman showed the potential development project at Highland Valley Road and along Sunset Crossing. The location of that neighborhood mixed use stays the same in all three alternatives. The Town Center Mixed-Use designation identifies a place that would be a destination for Diamond Bar with a focus on retail, entertainment, hotel, and dining, etc., creating a place where people go park their car, walk around, go out to dinner, see a movie and have that kind of "main street" type of experience. There is also a potential for housing to be included here and based on the committee's direction at the last meeting the planners are showing a somewhat lower density of allowable housing in the Town Center site versus the density near the Metrolink Station. This is the key variable that changes from one alternative to the next where the Town Center goes. The last mixed-use designation being introduced is what the planners call Transit Oriented Mixed-Use which would allow higher density housing, some office and commercial uses and is focused in the west/southwest area on the north side of the 60 freeway near the Metrolink Station where there is currently a pretty similar mix of uses as well as, some older lighter industrial uses that this plan would envision being phased out over time (long range).

Alternative 1 envisions the Town Center being located at Diamond Bar Boulevard and Golden Springs Drive (old Kmart/current Sprouts location) and encompasses an area that includes a lot of the commercial areas in that general cluster. This would be an area that is fairly centrally located and somewhat further to the north, a flexible mixed-use neighborhood taking advantage of existing infrastructure and a site that is already developed. This site spans both sides of Diamond Bar Boulevard with the golf course in this alternative remaining unchanged.

Alternative 2 located the Town Center in the southern portion of the golf course on the south side of Grand Avenue. The actual lines are somewhat rough.

Alternative 3 shows a Town Center on the golf course; however, in this case it is located on the northern part of the golf course north of Grand Avenue. While the concept shows a significant area for the Town Center it is not envisioned that it would actually consume that much space.

Each of these alternatives allows for approximately the same amount of growth in terms of new housing units and new non-residential development over time. Both Alternatives 2 and 3 (golf course town center location) allow for slightly more non-residential square footage because of the larger and more flexible area the golf course provides. Where the plan envisions new parks, it refers to new parks the City would own and manage which is currently not the case with the golf course. So what each of Alternative 2 and 3 imagine is that the portion of the golf course that is not used as a "Town Center" site would then be turned into a community park operated by the City. So while in Alternative 1 there is only a slight increase in park acreage, this assumes that the entirety of the golf course would remain as it currently is. But again, a county park and not a City facility.

Planners also looked at not only net housing and square footage, but the number of potential new residents and new jobs. New residential growth is very much in line with what projections for this area foresee over the next 20 years. Each of these alternatives would allow for somewhat more job growth than SCAG otherwise projects; however, over a 20-year timeframe, there would be a net loss in industrial jobs because of the transition to the Mixed-Use designation from the Industrial designation. Overall, a greater increase in jobs and a more balanced ratio of jobs to housing than the City currently has.

Jane Lin, Architect and Urban Designer, Urban Field Studio, walked the committee through more detail of what might be seen at the various Town Center locations and at the Transit-Oriented development sites. Options include one of many possibilities and are by no means set in stone. What is being shown is very, very preliminary. They wanted to use something that could be tested and the rest of the team took these prototypes to perform better analysis by looking at the details.

Town Centers considered to be the most appropriate for the three alternative sites under consideration draw from different examples including The Shoppes at Chino Hills, Victoria Gardens in Rancho Cucamonga and Village West in Claremont and what a town center usually has is about 250,000 square feet of retail which is usually organized along a walkable street, a key and important factor to success. Most are about a quarter mile long and it takes about five minutes to walk up and down that main street. Placement of stores along that street is a very important pattern to maintain to provide a sufficient density of retail and activity. The mixed use is primarily horizontal which will show a mixture of retail and other uses side by side in a one-story building. In addition, each concept offers room for growth

depending on the balance. In the future, the City could see more vertical mixed use but this presentation is more conservative in the horizontal layout. In addition, parking will be a major issue and factor as the committee walks through the three concepts and the team attempted to stay within the required parking ratios under the current City policies.

Diagram 1 includes retail, Sprouts as it is today and parking and the concept looks out into the future to see how this could turn into a new town center main street. The main street is parallel to the arterial. South Diamond Bar Boulevard is a big street and there are shops fronting the street; however, it is not that walkable because there are too many lanes to cross. Going parallel there could be a slower street for walking and open space. In this instance, the parking is structured parking in three locations, one directly adjacent to Sprouts for accessibility. This also consolidates some of the sites for retail and completes the quarter mile distance.

VC/Worthington asked if the three incorporated drawings incorporate the Confluence project and the new expanded right-of-way and Ms. Lin said that would be shown in the next concept.

Ms. Lin continued stating that this is the most constrained site of the three alternatives with a lot of infill. Where possible, planning attempts to make the transition between retail and housing to be smoother. This would be a dining destination with some shopping available.

Alternative 2 is the southerly portion of the golf course which shows the future new onramp. This site is interesting because it lies next to a lot of retail and a hotel. Off of Golden Springs Drive would be three new entries into the site. It is a steep entrance into the site with a big grade change where people would drive down into an area where there is an opportunity to preserve much of the nice vegetation and open space within the surface parking lots that are there. This would be more of a hotel and shopping destination with more of a "visitor" vibe. All parking would be surface parking with no structure required which means that there would be no cost for the structure and that it would provide opportunity for future growth. While this concept includes one-story shopping, there are possibilities for more infill on this site including potential placement of new parking structures to make infill possible. This site has the least constraints and has room to grow.

Alternative 3 is on the north portion of the golf course nearest to the lake and the intersection of Grand Avenue and Golden Springs Drive. It does not take into account the northern part of the golf course which would remain as recreational or open space. This concept makes use of the existing buildings and some of the existing driveways with the addition of a couple of new entrances in an attempt to take advantage of the existing amenities such as the lake next to which a hotel

could be placed and a nicely curved “main” street for aesthetically pleasing walkways. In addition, this concept includes multiplex theaters for evening entertainment and dining as well as a parking structure which reduces the amount of surface parking to provide more open space. In all three alternatives, community buildings are shown. In this alternative the community building is directly aligned with the entrance and directly across from Sycamore Canyon Park which would offer the ability to tie this into other public amenities and events. This alternative is modeled after Victoria Gardens. The town center is modeled off of the same dimensions and acts as a core. In this alternative, there is room to grow and is not as dense as what is seen at Victoria Gardens.

Transit-Oriented Neighborhoods consist of three neighborhoods, each of which show potential unit layouts. Neighborhoods one and three meet the densities that are currently in the City’s policies. Neighborhood number 2 was tested to see what would fit which shows the parking separate from the buildings. In these scenarios, the buildings would be three to four stories high and because they are close to Metrolink there could be night-site enhancements to make a better connection. The City’s policy indicates thirty dwelling units per acre. The team tested slightly higher density to see what it would be like. As density increases, it has a different design and perception depending on how it is designed and as it is built out it is important as to how it gets treated in the landscape. Numbers are important; however, design can make a big difference in how densities are perceived.

Paul Hermann, Fehr & Peers said his firm would be conducting the Traffic Analysis for the project. To date, a fairly high-level analysis has been done comparing the three alternatives. He has lived in this area for about six years and is well aware of the peak hour traffic concerns in the area. With respect to comparing these three alternatives, the team is aware that more residents would be expected to move into the area and with those there would be an increase in daily trips which means more cars on the road. His team also compared VMT (Vehicle Miles Traveled) and found that though there are more trips, people will traveling less distance which would result in a reduction of the per-person VMT. The alternatives do not differ much in numbers and City wide traffic would increase roughly the same amount between the three alternatives. When the specific location of the “town center” is determined it will focus more significant congestion in that area at which point Fehr & Peers will be conducting a much more detailed traffic analysis for that alternative and specific roadways/intersections throughout the City.

M/Ramirez asked a question off-mike. Mr. Hermann said that to answer his question he would move to the next slide and show the future improvements that were assumed in the prospect which included the entire SR57/60 Confluence project completion with widening of Grand Avenue allowing additional capacity on the highway and more access points. They also assumed the SR60 Lemon Avenue Interchange improvements in the west portion of the City. In addition, the

City plans to undertake a citywide adaptive traffic signal coordination project which should connect most of the signals to help move traffic more smoothly throughout the City. At this time there is a lot of capacity on the roadways with the exception of the Grand Avenue bridge area at the northern portion of the City which is currently operating poorly. He would expect that area to improve with completion of the Confluence project. However, it is still not perfect and other areas of City are expected to increase in traffic as well and reach capacity. Thus, Fehr & Peers will begin planning for the future and make recommendations accordingly.

Lance Harris, Pro Forma Advisors, explained that his firm was charged to check the economics of the General Plan Update alternatives. The first task was to look at the General Plan Update alternatives from the fiscal impact perspective and the study tested the long term impacts from 2018 to buildout at 2040. What they found was that due to the general similarity between the alternatives, that all yielded a positive net fiscal impact to the City meaning that the land uses would produce revenues in excess of their costs which was largely due to the fact that there is a large amount of commercial and job-generating land uses which typically does two things: 1) produce fiscal revenue, and 2) produce less municipal cost than residential uses. The main differences between the alternatives is that in one, there was three acres of public actively maintained open space and alternatives two and three had 120 to 140 acres of open space which require more cost for the City to maintain. After completing the analysis, based on the commercial uses that were included in those alternatives, the net difference between Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is relatively little. Looking at the “big picture” at a high level there is a 10 percent difference over 22 years given assumptions that they are all treated the same for all intents and purposes.

The next charge was to do a financial analysis of the various hypothetical development programs that Ms. Lin spoke about which included the three “town center” alternatives and the three TOD alternatives. The major findings concluded that the TOD residential developments are feasible in today’s market. The other major finding concluded that structured parking is expensive which hurt the financial performance of those scenarios that included structured parking. Town Center sites 1 and 3 included the structured parking and rendered them not financially feasible and would yield a negative land value. TOD alternative 2 included structured parking which brought down the residual land value considerably and in order to adjust for that or to make the projects better from a development prospective some consideration could be given for adjusting parking ratios and densities in these areas. The team also looked at the fiscal and job benefit of the “town center” alternatives specifically to see if there were other justifications for going forward with this scenario because those land uses will produce a lot of revenue to the City. So the hotel uses and retail for example produce huge amounts of revenue relative to the amount of land used for those purposes which would account for about a quarter of the impact in the General

Plan. In short, those revenues could help offset development costs to help pay for maintenance of the active open space being considered in the scenarios.

With respect to total value based on the different alternatives on an apples to apples comparison, Alternatives 1 and 3 yield about the same negative \$4.00 per square foot value on a per square foot basis. Alternative 2 yields about \$6 per square foot because it is a much larger space. Again, Alternative 2 included surface parking and not structured parking. Alternatives 1 and 3 yielded a similar land value of \$36 where Alternative 2 yielded a positive value but it was marginal at only \$2 per square foot.

Steve Ledbetter, TKE Engineers, said his firm was tasked to do an analysis of the utility impacts based on the three alternatives.

Water Systems: All three alternatives are expected to result in an increase in water demand due to the overall increase in single and multi-family residential units. Generally speaking, residential units have a higher water demand than non-residential units. For example, a multi-family residential unit has about a 40 percent high water demand than typical non-residential land use alternative. Therefore, there will be an overall increase in water demand between .1 and 1 MGD (Million Gallons per Day), closer to 1 MGD overall, based on the population increase. Currently, the City's water demand is 6.7 MGD which means that over the planning horizon there will be about a 5 to 15 percent increase in water demand. This may seem high, but it is much lower than the actual water demand projections provided by Walnut Valley Water District which means that what is being proposed for the three alternatives is well within the means of meeting the water demands.

Waste Water System: With all three alternatives, they are projected to result in an increase in the waste water flow which is directly attributable to the increase in water demand. Generally speaking, when there is an increase in water demand there is about a .8 factor increase in waste water flows. What that relates to is that there will be an overall increase in waste water flows of about 0.8 MGD. Current waste water flows generated by the City are about 5.4 MGD which means about a 5-15 percent increase in waste water flows over the planning horizon.

Storm Drain System: With alternative 1 there are no impacts to the storm drain system because this alternative replaces existing buildings and parking lots with new buildings and parking lots which results in a zero increase of storm water runoff generated by this site. With Alternatives 2 and 3 converting from a golf course to buildings and parking structures, it means a higher storm water runoff. However, state and local regulations stipulate that all storm drain impacts

generated must be mitigated by the property owner and the developer which means there would be no impacts to the storm drain system because those impacts would be mitigated at the site.

Kathy Ortiz-Cobian, Arellano Associates, Public Outreach Consulting Firm, explained that the focus of the Phase II Outreach was to present the three alternatives and to gather input from residents and business-owners which took place over a five-month period from June 14 through November 17, 2017. To promote the General Plan Update, the Community Workshop and Survey, it began with newspaper ads, Weekly News promotions and the Bullseye. The City Hall downstairs and upstairs lobby monitors also promoted the workshop, the project and the survey as did the electronic sign board at the fire station on Grand Avenue. Five fence banners were located in highly visible areas (four major parks and Diamond Bar Center). Two project postcards were developed to promote the Community Workshop and Survey. Project business cards were also developed that contained information about contacting her firm, where the General Plan Update was, how to stay connected and where to get more information including the websites. The project website was used to promote the Community Workshop and provided descriptions of the alternatives, provided an overview of the General Plan Update, provided a link to the survey and housed all project materials. Social media information was pinned to the top of the City's official Facebook page. In order to provide extended outreach, her firm provided a list of key stakeholders including educational institutions, school principals, HOA's, markets, major developers and were requested to help promote the workshop and survey. There were a total of 123 organizations that were willing to help who were provided a Social Media Toolkit which included text, a widget and article they could post on their website or Instagram, Facebook, Twitter, or send it out to their database. There were two direct mailings, one of which was the General Plan Update Newsletter which was sent to all Diamond Bar addresses as was a postcard promoting the survey. The DB Connection continuously featured articles and information about the General Plan Update, Workshop and the Survey. There were also news releases to promote the Workshop and Survey which were provided through local media outlets and housed on the City's website. Some of the more exciting outreach was the informational booths and popups. They participated at the Concerts in the Park, Barkoberfest, and Parent's Symposium. Additionally, her firm hosted six popup booths throughout the City at Albertsons, Smart & Final, Market World, Starbuck's next to HMart and at both high schools to promote the Workshop, take the Survey and get people excited about the project. And, staff added a clickable link to the Survey on their email signature so all recipients of the City's emails were able to use the link to participate in the survey.

Sophie Martin said that the outreach strategy was multi-pronged and intended to take advantage as much as possible, of the City's existing outlets, and the communities existing outlets and with the popup booths, to be able to capture

people at places they were already attending such as festivals, schools, grocery store, etc. to spread information about the project, to raise its awareness and to encourage people to attend the project's specific events and fill out the survey.

Workshop and Survey Results: The second workshop was held on October 19, 2017, and was advertised through all of the different means aforementioned. The turnout was very good and exceeded the turnout for the first workshop which was held last year which to her was surprising. Often what the team sees when they do General Plan Updates is that the first workshop sees the greatest surge of participation and tends to taper off as the project goes on. So to have even more participants at the second workshop is great news. People were organized into 13 small groups of about 10 people each. First, the alternatives were presented followed by small moderated group discussion that asked people to comment on what they liked and did not like about each of the alternatives, share their preferences, their ideas and concerns, and then to report back out to the group as a whole.

Snapshot of the Results: (Complete information contained in the full workshop report included in member packets and available on the General Plan Update website). At the workshop, more than half of the 13 tables indicated a preference for Alternative 1 and retaining the golf course as it is and focusing on revitalization of the existing commercial area. Three tables expressed a preference for either Alternative 2 or Alternative 3, stated the reason they liked the town center sites on the golf course was the flexibility these places offered giving more opportunity for new retail, civic uses and a new larger community park facility. Alternative 2 (Town Center on the south part of the golf course) was often favored over Alternative 3 primarily because its adjacencies seemed more palatable – across the street from existing commercial uses which people thought would mean less of an impact, rather than the north side which would be across the street from residential uses. The remaining tables indicated a pretty even distribution in preferences. People were told they did not necessarily have to come to a consensus and at many of the tables, each individual thought something completely different. In short, there were many different views expressed.

People also brought up a broad range of topics that were of interest and/or concern across all of the different alternatives. Not surprisingly, traffic and congestion was at the top of the list and a zeroing in on the need for more community spaces for different segments of the population – teens, seniors, sports facilities, recreation centers, places where people could rent a room, etc. Another concern was about the regional market and taking a look at Diamond Bar's position amongst all of its neighbors and wondering how a "town center" could remain viable when there are so many other strong retail centers nearby. There was a lot of concern over what the City of Industry was doing across the way and if they were to propose something much, much larger, could that consume the energy from something that

might occur in Diamond Bar. Finally, housing was a topic that was discussed a great deal with a pretty big range of opinions. A number of people at the workshop expressed a desire to see more housing, specifically for a broader range of household types than exists with the current housing stock provides such as housing that is suitable for renters, for younger generations (lower price point), lower income individuals, seniors, and so on. At the same time there were a lot of people who said they believed there was no need for more housing.

Online Survey Results: The survey was structured in order to get similar feedback to how the alternatives were presented at the workshop. The survey was available online in three languages (English, Korean and Chinese) for about a month from the middle of October through the middle of November. About 640 responses were received, the vast majority of which were in English with a handful of responses in Chinese and Korean. It is important to remember that this survey was not designed to be a scientific survey – it is not statistically valid to the population because anyone could choose whether or not to fill it out. Statistically valid surveys are a lot more expensive to conduct and are typically done by telephone which does not portend well to the type of visual information. However, the team believes it is important to ask a couple of demographic questions to have a sense of comparison between the survey respondents to the City overall to see how well they match to further determine response bias. Generally speaking, the people who chose to participate in the survey were generally older than the population as a whole and somewhat less ethnically diverse. The survey asked participants to rate the alternatives on a scale of one to five with five stars being the best and similar to the workshop, Alternative 1 received the highest number of five star ratings followed by Alternatives 2 and 3. Survey participants were asked to rank priorities in order 1 to 5 of what types of impacts they considered to be most important in making their decision. People ranked infrastructure needs first, transportation, then fiscal health, and job opportunities and housing last. When talking about infrastructure the survey was not specific as to which infrastructure was being discussed and from the nature of the responses and because people were able to write in open ended responses people were not thinking about infrastructure as was earlier discussed but instead conflated infrastructure and roads as well as, parks and open space. As a result, many of the comments related to infrastructure had to do with roadways, roadway maintenance, parks, open space, community facilities and so on. It was clear from the responses that this is what they meant by infrastructure. People also had the opportunity to suggest additional priorities and in this instance there was a lot of mention of parks, recreation, open space, environmental impacts, safety and City character and maintaining quality of life.

Finally, there were a couple of additional themes revealed in the open-ended responses. Again, many of the open ended responses had to do with traffic, many also mentioned reluctance to develop on the golf course citing it as an amenity

from an environmental and open space standpoint and something that really created “city character” as something they identified with. At the same time, those that preferred Alternatives 2 and 3 focused a lot on the flexibility which came up most frequently in talking about what advantages those alternatives offered. Housing continues to be a divisive issue. In open ended responses there was a huge range of opinions expressed with regard to housing. Many people said no additional housing was needed as well as, those saying the City could really use a broader range of housing to meet the needs of the whole community. The last topic that came up frequently in the open ended responses had to do with transit in general, orientation toward transit and the need for alternative modes of transportation over a variety of types going hand-in-hand with frustration about traffic congestion with people looking for easier ways to get around.

Similar to the workshop, the survey results are summarized in a detailed report to the Committee including full responses to all of the open ended questions and is available for the public on the project website.

Ms. Martin said that the remainder of this meeting will consist of Q&A from the GP, open the meeting to Public Comment and return to the GPAC for deliberation on the alternatives with the intention to arrive at a preferred alternative and to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council for consideration at their next joint meeting to be held at the end of January 2018. If the committee decides that none of the three alternatives is the right answer, it may suggest a hybrid or different solution. The team took the committee’s direction from the last meeting and analyzed it for this meeting, but with the new information the GPAC may choose to continue modifying any of those alternatives.

M/Sherwood referred to a graphic that shows how the survey participants gave their star ratings to each alternative and announced that Alternative 1 received 197 five-star rating; Alternative 2 received 177 one-star rating and Alternative 3 received 196 one-star rating. There was a high rating for Alternative 1 and low ratings for Alternatives 2 and 3.

M/Ramirez asked if the consultant team did an assessment of what will happen with the City of Industry project west of the SR57 and what influence or impact that would have. In his opinion, that project and its scope might draw away from something the GPAC might want to consider.

Lance Harris responded that in this analysis, that was not looked at directly. It was almost a year ago when the market analysis was done and some of those issues were considered. Fundamentally, retail is tricky because there are no rules that say that just because someone builds something means that it will get more demand. There are plenty of examples of a better products oriented toward a more diverse RD&E (Retail, Dining and Entertainment) that may not be completed

without an outlet project. Specifically, it was not looked at. From an economic perspective in this context the task was to evaluate differences between the alternatives and not serve more site-specific development and opportunities.

M/Ramirez asked staff what they know about the City of Industry project and what its effects might be. CDD/Gubman explained that there is complete absence of transparency with respect to what Industry is doing there. Staff has attempted to discern what their intentions are for that site and the only information the City had access to was what the public-at-large also saw which was some renderings for a potential regional outlet and staff's understanding is that at the moment, that project is not going forward for the present. Beyond that, staff is unaware of their intentions.

M/Ramirez commented that there is a lot of work going on for a project that isn't going forward.

M/Black asked if it was correct that all three Alternatives are net positive from a fiscal standpoint and Ms. Martin responded affirmatively. M/Black asked if the team had checked the project examples such as The Shoppes, Victoria Gardens and Brea to see if those were net positive. Mr. Harris said he worked on The Shoppes project and confirmed that it is net positive but cannot speak to the other projects. M/Black asked Mr. Ledbetter if the waste water figure of 5-15 percent was an acceptable percent and Mr. Ledbetter responded yes, that it is well within the planning horizon numbers. M/Black mentioned that he too is concerned about walking blindly not knowing what Industry does.

M/Busse asked the team to describe what the border would be like between the commercial and residential area in Alternative 3. Ms. Martin responded that for that site there is a big grade change at the edge of the golf course. Along Golden Springs Drive there is also a grade change so people accessing the golf course at that point would enter and drive down into the site. Next to the residential there is a very generous buffer that would be green space and landscaped to provide an opaque border between the residential and commercial. M/Busse asked if the locations of the TOD's was appropriate being next to Metro stations. Metrolink is contractually limited to five round trips per day on this line because they do not own the tracks and he wondered if people would want to live in a transit-oriented development with that limitation. Ms. Martin wanted to be sure to establish a distinction between the town center sites which are not intended to be transit-oriented and the TOD sites for which a quick feasibility analysis for higher density housing was performed. While it is true that in its current operations the Metrolink Station does not operate at headways that many would consider to be convenient for all users, there is certainly potential for that service to improve in the future. That being said, it is a very large area that already has quite a bit of fairly dense housing on a lower scale with very small lots. It is a very diverse area with a lot of

employment, smaller shops, a school and so forth. So the prototypes that would be able to be developed under the land use designations that the team is broadly calling TOD because of its proximity to the train station are things that would be feasible in the market today and would fit into this area even if people who choose to live in this part of town but do not necessarily use the train station. She said she did not believe it could be assumed that all of the people in the neighborhoods there now necessarily live there because they use the train every day. Perhaps some do, perhaps some do not. It was more a response to the committee's desire to see this as an area that could potentially support some higher density housing but she did not think that the rail and operations of such is critical to projects like this moving forward and being successful.

M/Ramirez added that Foothill has also turned this area into a bus transit as well. As someone who has ridden that line for over 20 years and watched other lines, it really is demand driven and they can add as many trains as they wish without revisions to the Union Pacific contract. There are limits with respect to the number of additional trains but there is no reason why what is being operated now cannot be expanded with more cars.

VC/Worthington felt that the committee was most interested in what the residents of Diamond Bar have to say and why he attended the Community Workshop. Attendance from the community was incredible. In the interest of the folks who were at the workshop as was mentioned, more than half of the tables had preferred Alternative 1. His count was 10 out of the 13 tables wanted Alternative 1 and wanted to be clear that for the record, it was the broad majority of participants.

M/Rivera asked how the current analysis accommodates what could happen in the future with Tres Hermanos Ranch and with the Sphere of Influence Diamond Bar has at its southern portion. CDD/Gubman said the current approach is to not propose any changes to the current General Plan designation that covers the Tres Hermanos Ranch area. Currently, the General Plan states that before any development can occur in Tres Hermanos, there would have to be a comprehensive Specific Plan developed for that site. Currently, the General Plan establishes a density limit for all but 16.3 acres of Tres Hermanos at one (1) dwelling unit per five-acres and that remaining 16.3 acres would allow a higher density all clustered just south of Diamond Ranch High School. Again, this plan does not touch the Tres Hermanos area. There are other factors that are influencing the fate of Tres Hermanos and being that the entirety of the 2,450 acres that span the cities of Diamond Bar and Chino Hills are owned by City of Industry, there are very few options to consider at this point beyond the physical characteristics of the site which may accommodate a replacement golf course if that is ultimately what the alternative preference is to develop on the current golf course site. Presently, Diamond Bar has a pin on Tres Hermanos as one of the replacement opportunity areas.

M/Mao asked the team if they considered how difficult it might be to convert the privately owned buildings in Alternative 1. Ms. Martin said they could not be forced to do so but presenting a vision is one of the first steps toward doing so and finding a developer who wants to consolidate it is a very important step toward getting that done. There are moves toward such a vision such as putting infrastructure in the streets or requiring certain parts of a development to be built in such a way that make it more possible for that to happen. There are definitely a lot of moves in order for that to happen. As far as logistics and getting such a development to happen this is probably the more complicated alternative. The golf course is one-owner. In Alternative one, there are multiple owners and it will probably take a long time to phase in which would probably be done over time.

M/Mao said that he was not stating a preference but that the golf course was only being enjoyed by the golfers and if it was open to everyone it would provide more uses.

M/Martin asked that this session be limited to Q&A with discussion to follow.

M/Ramirez said that for a town center to be successful it would need to incorporate a walkable space. He likes the idea of having neighborhood mixed-use adjacent to Alternative 1 and it makes sense that if symmetry was created where people could walk. If Alternative 1 could be converted into a true "town center" that is walkable that would make sense but he is concerned that with the SR57/60 Confluence project, Alternative 1 is not really a solution or Big Fix because it does not have any connectors for the 57/60 and it will continue to dump 57 traffic onto the space between the neighborhood mixed-use and the town center mixed use. He asked for the team's opinion about having that much traffic between these two really important projects.

Ms. Martin said that traffic obviously continues to be a big concern and M/Ramirez is correct that even with the improvements Caltrans has in mind there will continue to be a big funneling of traffic onto this area which is one of the reasons the team chose to design Alternative 1 in such a way that it did not have the "town center" face onto Diamond Bar Boulevard because it would not function as a real "main" street. It does have an advantage in its location of being highly visible. While traffic is certainly a pain to residents, retailers really like it. The more eyes that go by on a street, the more retail attracts so it presents an opportunity from that standpoint. M/Ramirez is right that from a circulation and access standpoint, it may continue to be a challenge.

Mr. Harris agreed that if Alternative 1 was to go forward it would require very specific designs in order to account for all of the traffic on Diamond Bar Boulevard including buffers between pedestrians and the roadway, safety improvements,

crossing concerns as well as, routing traffic into specific driveways that would keep vehicles and pedestrians separate.

Someone spoke off-mike about traffic coming down Diamond Bar Boulevard at a high rate of speed and asked if Mr. Harris would recommend that traffic be slowed down to discourage cut-through traffic.

Mr. Harris said it was a very good point for which he did not have an answer about whether or not the rate of speed should be slowed down especially when there are considerations underway about the signal coordination which is intended to move traffic from intersection to intersection at a higher pace. Speeds next to pedestrians is a major concern, especially in a town center area which will be a high concern in this case.

M/Sherwood wanted to understand the process that would be involved in moving the golf course, getting land to put it somewhere else, who would acquire the land where it currently exists and develop it and at the same time build a golf course somewhere else and who would pay for it?

CDD/Gubman said that Mr. Sherwood asked a very good question. This is a long term planning document that looks out 20 years into the future and is clearly not something that will ever be logistically easy to do. The General Plan would at least establish the policy and the vision for that to happen and it would potentially telegraph the desire for a town center to be established there. But it will take a lot of work by the City leaders through economic development and lobbying efforts to find a private sector partner who would have the wherewithal to undertake such a complex effort. There is no delusion about how difficult it would be to pull that off. One thing he mentioned earlier was the trend that has been observed about declining interest in developing golf courses further or closing existing golf courses and repurposing them for other uses, so with that in mind, if the town center alternative on one of the golf course pieces is preferred and there is a change in views about what kind of recreational amenities would be appropriate within the county park system, there may be a smaller replacement acreage that would need to be sought. If the portion of the golf course at the south part of Grand Avenue was to be redeveloped, the remaining portion of the golf course could either be reconfigured for a smaller golf course or for another palate of recreational uses, the replacement acreage would only be that 35 or so acres on the south end. But clearly, this has to be something that is going to require the initial vision, establishment of a policy and a long commitment to see it come to fruition. Aside from the golf course, there are many examples where town centers or downtowns were developed that required years of commitment and political will. The Birch Street downtown area in Brea took over 20 years for the City to assemble parcels in order to make that plan come to fruition. The Village West project in Claremont also took years and a lot of persistence through the process and the challenges to

get to the end point. Realistically, it has to be decided whether or not the City wants to go there and once that policy is set the real work would have to move it forward.

M/Sherwood said that CDD/Gubman said that golf courses were on the decline. However, M/Sherwood did not believe that applied to public golf courses because most golf courses are private.

CDD/Gubman cited the Empire Lakes project in Rancho Cucamonga was a public golf course and there are other such examples.

M/Cindy Liu said that the team indicated there would be job creation in the neighborhood of 300-575 and would those be direct jobs and what would the indirect impact be to jobs. She was curious to know the methodology used.

Mr. Harris responded that imbedded in the fiscal impact are assumptions based on the amount of people per square foot of some space such as office space. In the town center development alternatives there are commercial uses they are generating jobs in the sense that they are building commercial space that would generate employment. The analysis did not look at economic impacts in terms of secondary benefits of having that employment but used simple ratios that were imbedded in both the planning work as well as the fiscal model to calibrate any noticeable differences between the three alternatives from the job perspective.

M/Black said it seemed to him when reviewing the packet that during the workshop there was little overall concern for the TOD entities because it appeared there would be little or no disruption of the public by having them and that it would be a good thing.

Ms. Martin said that the entire first phase of the General Plan Update process was really about issue identification and visioning focus and asking community members what their interests were, what their priorities were and what they wanted to see the General Plan tackle. One of the things that came up frequently in the first phase of visioning and issue identification outreach was the desire to be able to do things like go out to restaurants, have a shopping experience and remain in town in order to do so rather than having to drive to neighboring communities that have been mentioned throughout this presentation. The alternatives that were developed including the preliminary concepts that were presented to the GPAC at its previous meeting were all based on those desires the team heard expressed from the community. This is not something that staff or the consultant team came up with, they are all attempting to address topics, priorities and issues of concerns from Diamond Bar residents throughout the process. Initially, one of the preliminary concepts that was put forth for the GPAC's consideration at the very beginning of this process (about six months ago) was an alternative that showed

a town center at a place where most people would consider to be Diamond Bar's center right now which is at Diamond Bar Boulevard and Grand Avenue. The team called that location the "no town center" alternative. In other words, strengthen what most people consider to be the town center today and not look at intensifying any of the other areas. She said that largely due to traffic concerns, the GPAC instructed the team to not carry that alternative forward. So the alternatives that are seen today and ones that the team analyzed are based not only on a few different concepts that could be used to help people see how their priorities could be manifest over time but also based on the GPAC's direction from its previous meeting.

M/Black said he was speaking about the Transit Oriented aspect, not the town center that in his assessment of the report he saw very little public concern over a Transit-Oriented alternative that have been presented this evening. It seems to be well-accepted that that might be a necessity or would be welcomed, to have residential perhaps close to the Metro, bus and freeway system to keep the traffic off the street. It seemed that was more acceptable even with a mixed-use residential as is seen in the Brea area or in the Village in Claremont with residences above and retail below.

Ms. Martin said that M/Black was correct. One of the other points of conversation at the last GPAC meeting was what shape should the area near the Metrolink Station take. Several of the original concepts involved retaining more of the industrial character and seeing that more as an employment center and in the discussion with the GPAC as well as, many members of the public, there was an expression of interest in saying no, it doesn't make as much sense to have that be an employment center, that's a place where higher density housing would be more appropriate than in the town center site.

M/Sherwood said that currently Diamond Bar has three main areas of retail, the Golden Springs/Diamond Bar Boulevard area, the "current" town center at Grand Avenue and Diamond Bar Boulevard and on the south end, the H-Mart Plaza Shopping Center. What consideration has been given to if a new town center is developed (Alternative 1, 2 or 3) could it possibly have a negative impact on the other retail areas of the City drawing business away from those businesses.

Mr. Harris said that when the market analysis was done the critical question is that under all metrics the City is losing retail spending because residents are going other places to shop which puts Diamond Bar at a disadvantage compared to all of its neighbors. It could happen that when you add more retail it will take away from other retail. However, the bigger point is that there is a lot of demand that is not being captured in the City which the team found in its market analysis. If it was a different circumstance that would be a totally appropriate concern, but given the deficit Diamond Bar has on a per-capita basis citywide and given residents' income

level and spending behavior the team observed, it really should not be something of utmost concern. In addition, retail comes in different typologies and this is not strictly interchangeable retail. This discussion involves a more diverse setting with dining, entertainment and other amenities that attract a different kind of spending than more of the utility spending that would be on a day to day needs basis.

M/Sherwood said that according to the statistics, currently 45 percent of the acreage is residential, 10 percent is schools, parks and open space, 30 percent is agriculture and 4 percent commercial. The report says that with Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 the commercial would stay at roughly 4 percent so he does not see how retail sales would be increased with commercial staying at 4 percent.

Ms. Martin said that the table Mr. Sherwood quoted referred to overall gross acreage from a land use designation basis and does not necessarily have to do with the footprint of the buildings and how big or dense they are.

Mr. Sherwood asked how the City can address the fact that it is surrounded by two counties that have lower sales tax than LA County. He believes that the two percent difference drives people out of the county to shop in Chino Hills or Brea because of the lower sales tax.

Chair/St. Amant asked how feasible Alternative 1 is financially. Alternative 1 requires parking structures which gives it a negative RLV of something like \$154,000 per acre and does that make it unattractive to developers.

Mr. Harris responded "yes." The residual land value says that if the land was given away for free for which you received a residual land value of zero, built into the model is the developer's profit, etc., so it would be an attractive investment. If it is a negative number what that means is unless the City subsidizes the project to that degree it would not be beneficial from the developer's perspective to move forward with the project. As previously stated, given the structured parking costs it makes it cost prohibitive now. That is not to say that in the future with real appreciation and being more attractive it can be better, but it is based on today's rents and today's market.

Ms. Martin said that as Ms. Lin said, the concepts that were developed are illustrative in nature and are intended to show a handful of ways in which these sites could be developed. There are certainly other configurations that could be done differently. She said that it is true that on site 1 the constrained nature of the properties, existing roadways, existing developments, mean that if the City were to continue to require its same number of parking spaces per square foot, yes, probably structured parking would be required for practically any purpose at that site. However, as Ms. Lin said, the development concepts that are shown here are actually quite conservative from a density and intensity standpoint and mostly

envison single-story developments. Certain as value is added by adding saleable or rentable space to a project, the revenue side increases. So if the consensus was to proceed with pursuing a town center at this site in the long term, what the team would do is not say well, gosh, this one concept we drew up isn't feasible as drawn this way in today's market, and therefore, it is not possible. There are different levers that could be pulled in order to make that feasible. And with parking structures in particular, those are commonly things that are developed through a public/private partnership because the city does tend to see a great benefit from having a parking structure and they are very expensive for developers to provide. So when we see these types of town centers in other places, often that biggest ticket item – the parking structure, is developed through a partnership with the City which helps offset some of the cost. We often see development that is permitted at slightly higher density than what the team has shown to allow more revenue to return to the developer. So, there are ways in which this could be modified, but as drawn and if this were to happen tomorrow which is the point in time snapshot that analysis shows, it is not feasible in this configuration today.

Recess: Chair/St. Amant recessed the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

Reconvene: Chair/St. Amant reconvened the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Melanie Paulson, 21919 Santaquin Drive, stated that as per the 1995 City of Diamond Bar General Plan under the topic of promotion of viable commercial activity, it states that the City will play a proactive role in business and economic development, availability of a full range of desired retail goods and services and production of needed City sales tax revenue will be addressed by an economic resource strategic plan. Today, our City experiences economic blight to say the least. The Diamond Bar Chamber of Commerce faded approximately 10 years ago and since that time, our City has been supporting the Regional Chamber of Commerce, San Gabriel Valley. She asked the following questions: 1) why did the Diamond Bar Chamber of Commerce fail? 2) Is the Regional Chamber of Commerce San Gabriel a City of Industry affiliate? 3) Assuming the City of Diamond Bar has been working with the aforementioned SGV Chamber, why is our City in a downward economic spiral as seen by the vacant businesses all throughout town? 4) What is our City doing to fix the problem aside from appearing to depend on new development, to save us? 5) Can we go back to the local City Chamber of Commerce? 6) What was the Economic Resource Strategic Plan promised in the 1995 General Plan and why did it apparently fail? 7) Will the projected jobs provide salaries large enough to support the employees to live in Diamond Bar? And because this probably won't be enough to allow them to live

here, that's going to make traffic even worse. How do we rectify that? She would appreciate written answers to her questions no later than December 19, 2017, and she will mail her comments to the City.

R. Lee Paulson, 21919 Santaquin Drive, said there has been a lot of conversation about Alternatives 2 and 3 and a lot about how the current plan is to land from Tres Hermanos to replace the golf course. But there is one key point which is, if the Tres Hermanos property is owned by a private individual or a private corporation, then the Diamond Bar General Plan applies to how that land is used. But if the land by another governmental entity such as the City of Industry, which it is, then that entity has the say in how that land is used and local control is basically lost. Given the fact that the City of Industry has been less than transparent about their intentions and given the fact that they have a very different objective for what they wish to do with that land, why is this body even looking at Options 2 and 3 at all when the possibility exists that the City may not be able to acquire on land necessary to move the golf course there (Tres Hermanos). The issue with Alternative 1 is building a parking structure that could have a negative impact on the profitability of the developers but he has not heard any options for 2 and 3. Somebody has to pay to move the golf course and somebody has to pay to build another golf course, it seems to him that when all of that is sorted out it ends up that Alternative 1 does not look as bad as it is made out to be.

Allen Wilson said he was concerned about a meeting that took place with Supervisor Hahn which was not disclosed and stakeholders in the community should be invited to participate in such meetings and have a voice and know what is happening. Someone alluded to the fact that City leaders will make a decision on this and he wants the GPAC to know that the community members will make the decisions and that they should lead the vote on deciding what project they want. He is concerned about Alternative 2 and 3 and a lot of talk about Tres Hermanos. Tres Hermanos has been brought up tonight a couple of times about what to do with it, move it and so forth. He lives across the street from the golf course and those who live on Golden Springs and Prospectors will be impacted. The GPAC needs to consider environmental health and livability. He believes in a free market system and a clean environment for everyone in Diamond Bar. There has been a lot of talk about increasing revenues and services. He wants to be sure the City government can provide essential services to Diamond Bar. An interesting proposal about a community building for Alternative 1 for 16,000 square feet and Alternative 2 and 3. Diamond Bar's Community Center was completed in 2004 and the City is still paying for that building and losing money on that building. It's a negative cost to the taxpayers and that needs to be considered. The City needs to maximize the use of what it has and he believes Alternative 1 is the best solution for the community for the development the City has. He has a concern about the parking structure of 1200 spaces and three levels because it will have a negative impact. He wants the GPAC to listen to the community. It is nice to have

staff input. Staff has a lot of power but we have a say too because we live here. Some staff live here, some staff do not live here. He wants the GPAC to understand residents live here and hopefully that the golf course would stay in place. That is his biggest concern. We can leave it the way it is. Election by Council districts is becoming more distrustful with assets and people like him are going to be impacted. The golf course is his only environmental buffer.

Douglas Barcon said that the drawing showing the parking structure (Alternative 1) appears to take out a restaurant. Gentle Springs is a private street and the map shows a new street continuing onto Prospectors which is going to open up traffic flow into Prospectors and the neighborhood north of that area with cut-through traffic and so forth. Most of his comments tonight are based on traffic. Regarding the golf course, Alternative 1 seems to be the best alternative; however, looking at the other alternatives with the golf course, moving that golf course to the area on Tres Hermanos off of Phillips Ranch Road means the golf course will benefit Chino Hills and not Diamond Bar. Any housing in that area will also favor the restaurants and businesses in Chino Hills even though it is Diamond Bar. Putting the golf course over there does not really serve Diamond Bar. Looking at sustainable infrastructure, not just infrastructure, retail is basically contracting. If the City is trying to build new retail in a situation or environment where it is contracting it will end up with businesses that are going to fail which means that they are not sustainable and the City will have more blight. Looking back at traffic there are more traffic signals on Diamond Bar Boulevard and Golden Springs Drive and at the northern end there is Lanterman which was purchased by CalPoly and Highland Springs that crosses over the SR57 will be the only eastern access point for that and that is going to run traffic in and out of Lanterman and it is going to conflict with the traffic along Highland Springs and all of that proposed building with the multiple housing development south of that is going to be a traffic nightmare he suspects. In looking at Lorbeer Middle School if a town center is put there with a hotel across the street it will increase the likelihood of vehicular/pedestrian collisions which means this body may wish to look at the cost and feasibility of putting pedestrian overcrossings over Golden Springs Drive and Diamond Bar Boulevard in order for children to cross. It looks to him like Smart & Final and CVS will be taken out and housing is put behind the current Smart & Final location which he is not sure can happen with the property owners. Rancho Cucamonga on Foothill Blvd has coordinated signals and they are coordinated in such a way that when you get one red light you get all red lights and it does not work too well. People really don't need a nine-hole golf course so if you do Alternative 2 or 3 it will end up taking out the whole golf course because it would no longer be viable at that point. Tres Hermanos is a wildlife corridor and regardless of whether Industry wants to put something on there in the way of a solar farm or whatever, it is still a wildlife corridor and we don't want to impact the wildlife like Industry already

has by topping the hills east of Grand Avenue and north of the SR60. The impact so far is that it has driven all of the mice, rats, raccoons, skunks and coyotes into the neighborhood to the east.

Grace Lim-Hays, 21323 Cottonwood Lane, said she participated in the last community outreach meeting after receiving an invitation to do so which was a very enjoyable session for her to know that so many like-minded citizens of Diamond Bar were invited to speak. Many feel that Alternative 1 is the best choice because it respects the character of the City, its history, values and needs although she does question the mixed-use transportation corner adjacent to her neighborhood because she can barely turn left or right as it is and sees an even bleaker future with the purple color designated to their corner. The concerns raised about Alternative 2 and 3 are not just significant, they are powerful and difficult to contain and predict. A lot of these studies might sound good on paper but she is glad that people have pointed out that the City of Industry's plans are some kind of dream they sometimes share with Diamond Bar. Historically, the EIR was never completed and Industry is exempt from things that have happened in the past. Residents have to know those forces that are critical to our City are hard to contain and hard to predict, especially with the traffic and how building affects the environment. The loss of trees and land mean more flooding and changes in temperature. For Alternatives 2 and 3 although it holds the promise for potential parks, that is actually very specious in her view and an uncertain promise. To her it is a carrot that might never materialize because the land as indicated on the map (purple) means mixed-use which really means potential for money and profit which really means instead of playgrounds for children it will be a playground for developers. Diamond Bar is really gambling on its character and could potentially lose it to retail and overdevelopment. Residents have already heard it is going to be herculean to establish a new golf course and we already have one and to imagine that Tres Hermanos can remain as it is, is also specious. Alternatives 2 and 3 unleash severe conflicts of interests in the City and a potential Pandora's Box because in truth, although it is flexible, citizens do not really get to vote on the kind of flexibility they would like to see. It is really in the hands of political agents and unfortunately, based on past experience for some citizens, political agents can be agents for other interests outside of the City. Alternative 1 makes the best use of existing space and builds on the progress of the existing Sprouts and the direction it takes. It truly defends the City's character, its legacy and the meaning of "who we are" and it makes sense to pursue a gradual evolution for which Alternative 1 provides that opportunity. Alternative 2 and 3 are on steroids which is dangerous and harmful to the City's health.

Jim Hays, 21323 Cottonwood Lane (near the Metrolink), said that he and his family have lived in Diamond Bar for a couple of decades and are concerned about the potential for mixed-use development which does not seem to be a variable in all three alternatives. He gave the following reasons why he believes Alternative 1 is

best for the people. First, one of the goals with the City of Industry surrounding them, there are already more-doors in terms of the green space. So open space is important to them which is what drew them to Diamond Bar. Alternative 1 seems to preserve more open space than Alternative 2 and 3. Second, Alternative 1 utilizes space which is already developed with a huge parking lot by the old Kmart/Sprouts location. Third, Alternative 1 would not require removal of a lot of trees and if there was building permitted on the golf course location there is a nice canopy of trees on the border, some of which would likely be taken out. The “town center” sounds exciting and it appears all three alternatives provide about the same revenue so with Alternative 1 there would be the least amount of damage to the existing green and open space. He urged the GPAC to recommend Alternative 1.

Diego Tamayo, 1653 S. Diamond Bar Boulevard, said that concerned youth and citizen activists have been conducting ongoing informal interviews with many sources regarding their general impression of the City. Survey interviews began April 2016 addressing local and sphere of influence sources. One question received general impression feedback. The question is “regarding land use and planning, what is your impression of the City of Diamond Bar?” These are responses that have come in from various sources, organizations, agencies, etc. From Fullerton University Urban Planning Department – Diamond Bar hillside developments are a good example of what not to do. The City of Glendora staff and residents, referring to the hillside ridgeline overdevelopment called it – “the Diamond Bar effect” with a negative connotation. A land use attorney from Upland said that “Diamond Bar has not fulfilled its environmental obligations considering its existing natural resources. And various residents, city staff, planners, environmentalists, conservations, allies from San Dimas, Brea, Walnut, Montebello, Glendora, Claremont, La Verne state and county conservation agencies said Diamond Bar has terrible planning. The City of Industry owns Diamond Bar. It is no accident that Diamond Bar's City Council does nothing. Diamond Bar has never fulfilled its General Plan. Diamond Bar is foolish to wreck the hills he values which make it desirable. Diamond Bar favors brutal development of Valvalos to fill in a pristine canyon for a failed housing development is deplorable. And from a Diamond Bar citizen moving away, he would never move to The Country Estates – it is ugly and overdeveloped. I'm leaving The Country Estates after 40 years. It breaks my heart to see my neighborhood completely ruined. These few impressions speak to the opportunity and responsibility the City has to perform its due diligence in working toward the best planning practices to move toward resiliency.

Robin Smith, Bellows Court, said that Diamond Bar now has a Diamond Bar/Pomona Valley Sierra Club Task Force which provides a structured environmental effort to try to preserve the very important environmental features. She pointed out that there are ongoing environmental surveys that are ground

trothed and protocol surveys to look at more sensitive species in the City as well as, in Tres Hermanos. The task force does not trespass, members peer over the fence and take documentation. There is serious sensitive species distributed throughout Diamond Bar including the California Gnatcatcher, coastal wren, eagles that go in and out through Tres Hermanos as well as, palm turtles and they are looking for the San Gabriel snail. When she was a young person in the City of Huntington Beach, her father was an avid golfer and he drove the distance to play at the Diamond Bar Golf Course. Not to ignore all of the regular social events that are held at the golf course, that facility is an historical venue that gives Diamond Bar identity, whether or not one plays golf. About the traffic, she asked if Fehr & Peers could comment on the scientific studies that prove that road widening does not reduce traffic but actually increases it. These studies have been done by Caltrans and this concerns her greatly because road widening never fixes congestion. The thought was that the widening of Grand Avenue would fix traffic problems and we are here again. If there is some improvement she has been told it is temporary. The future stats on whether or not it will relieve the traffic is questionable. The main business of the City of Industry is "goods transit" and Diamond Bar is in the middle of a goods transit artery and that is the problem. She has attended City of Industry meetings and they have said in their meetings they have no idea what they are going to build there. And they are very flustered by it because they are in debt according to that project and they look forward to the Tres Hermanos property to get them out of debt. She is very disturbed that the City of Industry gamed the system for the NFL stadium so they could get around CEQA. They have violated CEQA and she has investigated this and they owe mitigation for at least 10 acres of coastal scrub, three acres of oak woodlands and it is a blue line stream which is Diamond Bar Creek which goes past her house, through Steep Canyon, through Sycamore Canyon and it will go through Alternatives 1 and 2. Her question is, how does the City mitigate the 100 percent protection of a blue line stream? Is Diamond Bar going to be like City of Industry and ignore CEQA? She has talked to the federal agency that holds the mitigation permit for CEQA and she was told the City of Industry just ignores them. So there is an entity that is apparently acting above the law and that concerns her greatly when she sees the influence on her City. She does not think that Diamond Bar can treat the City of Industry like a City – it's a corporation and they do whatever they want to do. But that really disturbs her when she thinks Diamond Bar is going to do speculative real estate just like they do. Speculative real estate is not good planning and we cannot afford to make assumptions. Does Diamond Bar have the money to pay for plans that are assumptions? She questions the wisdom and prudence of that expenditure. And the citizens deserve better. She would like for the GPAC to just think about these important issues because there is no second chance when all of this is gone.

Virginia Prantik, 364 S. Prospectors Road, said she is very impressed with the seriousness everyone is putting into this project. She wants to call attention to Fall

Creek Condominiums because on the Alternative 1 map it is the big green area on South Prospectors. Fall Creek is a condominium community of 144 units and Alternative 1 will have an impact on it. On the original maps it was shown in white as a change area so the condominium owners are very nervous and worried about losing their homes to eminent domain. Or, is that outside the plan. Palomino when it crosses Diamond Bar Boulevard becomes the private street Gentle Springs and on this scheme, it will end at the parking structure. But with the new street put in it will take away part of the Fall Creek land including at a minimum, her carport and that of her neighbors as well. She is very concerned about the status of Fall Creek and what it means to property values. She purchased her home in 1980 and she would lose money if eminent domain went into effect meaning she would get \$70-75,000 which would not allow her to park her car in a space and she would have to live in her car were that to happen. Many of her neighbors who recently purchased would not only get a small amount of money, they would have a mortgage they would have to pay and the integrity of their community is very important to them. Please take that into consideration as you make your decision.

Janet Peets, 445 Golden Prados Drive, thanked Ms. Martin who is so well-spoken and so articulate when describing the details and her efforts are appreciated. She asked M/Black who has been in the real estate business in the City for Diamond Bar for a very long time, if he took a listing for a property on Golden Prados that backs up to the golf course today, would he give a premium to the price that he would ask for the house and in a couple of years when the land use changed, would he still be able to get that premium amount. She recently refinanced their house and there was definitely a difference given to their house because they had the golf course view. There is a lot of concern with the other properties as well, but there are a lot of houses that back up directly to the golf course and they all have a real big concern about it.

Greg Fritchle, Walnut resident, said that as a candidate for the State Assembly last year out of the 55th District he is concerned about issues affecting the entire region so this discussion is relevant to him as is the discussion about Tres Hermanos who joins other speakers in opposing any compromising of the land there. He thinks people need to understand the distinction between undeveloped open space and parkland. Building a golf course in Tres Hermanos would have an environmental impact because there will be pesticides and other things that will foul the water there. Granted we are dealing with that issue with the existing golf course, but if you build structures there those are likely to increase the negative impact on the flowing water to a greater degree which he believes speaks against Alternatives 2 and 3. He tends to agree with people who have spoken that believe Alternative 1 is the best alternative. His question deals with pedestrian traffic which he believes is already an issue before redevelopment of that area because of the foot traffic from Lorbeer Middle School. The idea of a pedestrian overpass makes sense but he wonders if when studying that particular alternative whether redesigning that

and the other intersections along Diamond Bar Boulevard to include a “pedestrian only” portion in the signal cycle that allows diagonal crossing might be a consideration for mitigating some of the traffic problems including the ability to make a right turn on red.

Bobby Lee, 20541 Crestline Drive said he has lived in Diamond Bar since 1999 said he attended the first GPAC meeting and commented that everyone should not forget why they are living in Diamond Bar. He does not mind going to Brea or Chino Hills but he comes “home” to Diamond Bar. It seems to him from looking at the material the emphasis is on how to get a town center built and it is lost on him how the discussion got to this point. When looking at Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 one has to wonder if people were offered Alternative 4 or 5 that says “do nothing” they might prefer that alternative. Another alternative could be to maximize what we have. Strengthen what the City is good at and fill the holes in the things we’re not as good at. He wondered how many people would choose those over the three proposed alternatives because if one actually reads the comments from the workshops and the surveys people tell you what they want because the best is the worst choice. He wanted to challenge the GPAC to “keep it simple.” This seems like a very complicated process and most likely nothing will happen anyway to any degree. He lives very simply and has no agenda. He likes living in Diamond Bar and looks forward to retiring soon and living in the City forever. He would prefer things not change too much. If you ask people, who wants to move to Chino Hills or who wants to move to Brea. If you want one of those cities, move, don’t build it here. He believes the City needs to maximize what it already has. Someone said the City was under water on the Diamond Bar Center. He had a chance to visit and hiked the area. The only thing they are booked for is weddings. In his opinion, the Center is much underutilized and there is a lot of open space. He has probably visited only half the parks in this area and how often are they overflowing with people and one can’t get in and can’t park? Diamond Bar has enough open spaces. About the golf course, he came to Diamond Bar 10 years before he moved here because his in-laws live here. He maybe golfs three or four times a year but Diamond Bar Golf Course is one of the few that is a very good golf course and very reasonable. If the golf course could be enhanced to have additional dining options it would be a great way to maximize the area. And, retail is dying. Most people shop online.

John Martin, 1249 S. Diamond Bar Boulevard, said he has resided in Diamond Bar for 44 years. One of the takeaways he got from the October 19th meeting was that the center which is now considered Alternative 1 has been such a crappy place for such a long, long time and he can remember it being junky 30 years ago and he can also remember when the HMart Center, when Ralphs stopped all of the people from going in there, how that was a dead center for years. But what is that now? It is a vibrant center – a wonderful center. And what would happen to the Kmart Center if Alternative 2 or 3 were chosen? It would die. Absolutely crushed. His

only thought is, why not create with Alternative 1 a wonderful shopping area and people say retailing is dead but if one visits the Brea Center on a weekend it is vibrant. There are restaurants, movie theaters and all sorts of stuff going on. Retail as one used to think of it in the Kmart era yes, it is dead. But retail as it can be is not dead and why would the City not just want to make that Alternative 1, put in overpasses with elevators and make it pedestrian friendly and yes, have an actual parking structure, but make that a vibrant area so that both sides of Diamond Bar Boulevard are included and it would be a wonderful center and it would continue the tremendous growth Diamond Bar has had.

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Response to Melanie Paulson: CDD/Gubman said there were a number of questions that Mrs. Paulson said she would be forwarding via email and staff will be glad to respond in writing via email as requested.

Response to Lee Paulson: CDD/Gubman said the comment from Mr. Paulson regarding the costs that would need to be factored into the effort to replace the golf course is noted.

Response to Allen Wilson: CDD/Gubman said there was a remark from Mr. Wilson regarding staff meeting with Supervisor Hahn's staff. City staff routinely meets with the City's elected representatives for consultation meetings. The meeting in question was to find out what their office's position was on the golf course site. The outcome of that discussion was fully disclosed in his August memo to the GPAC.

Response to Douglas Barcon: CDD/Gubman said that Mr. Barcon and others raised good points about the potential issue regarding pedestrian safety with respect to Alternative 1 and Lorbeer Middle School. It is a very good point. There are currently vehicular and pedestrian issues at that intersection during am/pm peak hours with school crossings and so forth. Again, these presentations are very high-level conceptual layouts that basically program a menu of uses into that site and incorporate the parking requirements to serve those uses and provide some conceptual circulation plan. The more specific development related issues such as whether or not an elevated pedestrian crossing and other design features would have to be incorporated into an actual project, would be part of a project-specific review if, for example, Alternative 1 is the preferred alternative and in the future that alternative is implemented. As suggested by one of the speakers, it is likely to be an incremental buildout of that alternative to its maximum potential

Response to Grace Lim-Hays: CDD/Gubman said there were concerns expressed regarding the transit-oriented or higher density residential developments. Again, there would be project-specific issues that would have to be evaluated based on

actual projects that come through to implement. Any General Plan policies and any new development of any substance would be subject to CEQA so traffic, safety and accessibility would be issues that would be part of that.

Response to Jim Hays: CDD/Gubman acknowledge Mr. Hays' comments regarding Alternative 1.

Response to Diego Tamayo: CDD/Gubman acknowledged Mr. Tamayo's comments.

Response to Robin Smith: CDD/Gubman acknowledged comments from Robin Smith. With respect to her question regarding road widening and whether or not that is still considered a best practice was addressed by Paul Hermann who responded that yes, his firm is well aware of the concept that is known as "induced travel" – when you build more lanes that provides more capacity and people who may or may not have been driving at the time may see more opportunity to drive and that concept brings more traffic to the roads; however, it is still Caltrans objective to provide as much capacity as possible on the roadways.

PWD/Liu said that Diamond Bar has been experiencing cut-through traffic for decades. As a matter of practice and of the City's policy, when looking at certain roadways such as Brea Canyon Road for example, years ago Diamond Bar had the opportunity to widen that roadway from a two-lane to a four lane. This is a stretch of road that is used by cut-through traffic from neighboring cities as well as local residents and the City made it a point to enhance that area for the neighborhood residents and ended up widening the parkway which created a greenbelt that separated the roadway traffic which created a buffer zone between the residential neighborhoods and the freeway. Another example is Diamond Bar Boulevard where there are striped bike lanes which could have easily been converted to third and fourth lanes. The City did not do that. In addition, the City has the landscaped medians and parkways people enjoy as they travel the streets daily. As a matter of practice and City policy, staff continues to believe that there is a balance here in Diamond Bar.

Chair/St. Amant said that he and PWD/Liu worked on the question of having a pedestrian crosswalk at Golden Springs Drive and Diamond Bar Boulevard for Lorbeer where the light is turned red for pedestrian only crossing about 20 years ago and determined that based on the age of the kids and the amount of traffic it would not be feasible. They have those kinds of crosswalks in places like Pasadena and other cities where the pedestrians are generally older and it works where the speeds are not as high and the traffic volumes are not as high. With the amount of traffic at that intersection, it was deemed not to be safe.

Response to Virginia Prantik: CDD/Gubman thanked Virginia Prantik for her comments pertaining to the Fall Creek condos. He stated that there is no intent to touch the Fall Creek property. If the site concept indicates any encroachment into the Fall Creek property that was not intentional. The intent was to illustrate one way that the available commercial land inventory surrounding the Fall Creek condos could be developed. Again, there is no intent to incorporate any of the Fall Creek land into Alternative 1 and the City would, in principle, be loath to even consider eminent domain when residential properties are concerned. CDD/Gubman said there was feedback on how Gentle Springs provides secondary and/or emergency access out toward Diamond Bar Boulevard for the Fall Creek condos and maintaining that secondary access would have to be retained in any master planning of a “town center” concept.

Response to Janet Peets: CDD/Gubman stated that Ms. Peets directed a question to M/Black and when CDD/Gubman completes his responses he will turn the meeting back to Chair/St. Amant and ask him to direct how he would like that question to be responded to.

Response to Gregg Fritchle: CDD/Gubman said there were a number of comments expressing the pros and cons and if he heard correctly, his conclusion was that Alternative 1 would be the least invasive from different perspectives than considering developing on the golf course property. There was also a reference to how to address pedestrian circulation near the Lorbeer site and Chair/St. Amant addressed the geometrical design of that type of crosswalk and how it is really context-based and would be something to be considered at a project specific level.

Response to Bobby Lee: CDD/Gubman responded to comments from Mr. Lee regarding the fact that the committee can certainly consider an Alternative 4 which would be the “no project” alternative or the defaults – keep Grand Avenue/Diamond Bar Boulevard intersection as the de-facto town center and as we discussed previously, about complete street and place-making enhancements to make that a more attractive center of the City.

Chair/St. Amant recognized M/Black to respond to Ms. Peets. M/Black said that in order to respond to her comments one would have to actually see a particular property with a particular viewpoint in a particular setting. In general, if one is looking at a property that backs up to a commercial entity it would have some effect on a property value where you are comparing a view of a golf course versus a commercial entity. The view of a golf course versus a park may have no effect but again, it would be specific to a specific property.

M/Ramirez said that in the swap of the golf course he thought there was a good question regarding the residual land value and whether or not the swap of the golf

course and the need to develop another golf course was factored into the RLV and was not sure he got a clear answer on that question.

Mr. Harris said not specifically because what is being tested in this instance is what the value someone could pay for that land so in order to be specific we would have to know what the replacement cost would be. If one uses the purchase amount of \$42 million it equates to \$17,000 per acre (2400 acres) or 40 cents per foot. That is not the market value but assuming it could be purchased for that amount. This does not include the cost of actually developing the golf course and water features. The task was to understand the differences between the alternatives and not specifically the feasibility of a development.

M/Ramirez asked if Mr. Harris would agree that just like a parking structure, in order for Alternative 2 or 3 to occur and the City had to build or replace the golf course or to buy property from private owners, there would still be that cost.

M/Black said that in this case it is a county golf course and the City is negotiating a swap, the negotiating aspect could be that a developer would buy that particular section and perhaps only parts of that section would have to be swapped out. There are so many potential factors, how do you get your arms around what the cost factor would be. However, most likely, the developer that goes in to develop that piece of property will play a strategic part in financing that operation.

VC/Worthington asked the consulting group if in Alternative 1 there would need to be a structured parking. Apparently, that presents a challenge for everyone as it would have a negative impact on value. If the density of Alternative 1 were lessened, would it require a three-tiered parking structure?

Ms. Lin said that the current parking ratios for retail is 4 spaces per 1,000 feet of retail. Roughly, that is about 1 to 2 times the amount of space that would be provided. If there was retail the City would have to provide 2 times that footprint for parking. This is a really high number which obviously makes a big difference because you are starting to have to reduce that footprint by putting in multiple parking levels. This is a pattern that is very typical to suburban places but it is being challenged more and more in urban settings that that number is reducing and the need for parking is also reducing, thereby reducing the number of levels that would be needed in the future. Because that is not currently in the City's policy, she followed the City's policy and showing one level of retail with a density that is exciting enough for a stroll down a main street. In this instance the storefronts are 50-100' and if it is any further than that distance it begins to feel like an "auto-oriented" retail like it is now with a big field of surface parking and not a bunch of stores next to each other which is a completely different design and feel of what that retail experience is. As such, it would be a tradeoff. If you want to have the parking ratios that are in the current Diamond Bar policies we have to

provide structure parking, especially on an infill site like this which is so compact in terms of the amount of land being considered versus Alternatives 2 and 3.

Ms. Martin said that generally speaking, anybody who has been involved in real estate development knows that the first question you ask is “how much parking do I have to provide?” And that is what drives the rest of the design of a project. With the amount of parking that is required in the City’s Code right now, the development pattern that that produces is what you see on that site today. In order to arrive at a development pattern that is more conducive to a “main street” type environment, there are two ways to do it. You can either provide less parking or you can stack the parking on top of itself.

Chair/St. Amant said that Alternative 1 has five separate property owners. CDD/Gubman responded that there are at least five property owners on the northerly side of Gentle Springs. Each parcel is separately owned. And there are currently three property owners (McDonald’s, Sprouts project area and the shopping center at the southerly border) not including the water district and pump station and the owner of the Sprouts Center owns the northwesterly corner of Diamond Bar Boulevard at Golden Springs Drive and when you cross the street you find a similar plurality of property owners. This is a challenge. It is common when a City is trying to either acquire through Redevelopment when it existed or to provide incentives for property owners to consolidate their land to produce something that would be better than the sum of the parts. It has been done and it would not be unprecedented to make something big happen out of those small pieces, but implementing the policies that might ultimately be established regardless of the alternative would be where the work would begin.

M/Ramirez asked the consultants to opine on what level or quantity of parking would be necessary to make it a viable project and how does that differ from the current policy for the City.

Ms. Lin said with the current policy it would of course make it viable. What is not seen here is a high level of transit in the community which could change and it would probably change if there was more transit or more alternative ways to arrive at this destination which could possibly help make the case for lowering the number of spaces. She is unable to provide a firm ratio because It is something that developers have played with over time and at this time her team is seeing a significant change in the number of spaces developers think is reasonable for retail or other kinds of land uses. While it is in flux at this time she knows it would be less than what is currently the policy. What she has attempted to do is find a density of storefronts and to make that happen they are trying to minimize the amount of footprint we can have for parking.

M/Ramirez asked staff whether there was political will and perhaps the recommendation could include looking at all factors including policy for parking and creating additional transit opportunities and fostering other methods of transportation all of which would then perhaps factor in to policy changes in parking. Is that something the City is open to looking at as part of an overall recommendation? CDD/Gubman responded that staff would be open to everything that has been said about changing the attitude about parking minimums to urban areas that now have parking maximums and the trade there is a lot of discussion and actual case study data which is out there to validate the legitimacy of reducing parking requirements. As his staff knows, because he is talking about autonomous vehicles all of the time and although we may not know when self-driving cars will actually dominate the roadways, self-parking technology is already well established. So there is an opportunity in the near future where the self-parking technology could allow us to condense surface parking and it could allow surface parking to be in low value of a site and staff can instead emphasize as part of the parking requirements, drop-off areas at convenient locations and let the cars park themselves in a parking facility. And obviously, when no one has to open doors when a car is parking itself, parking spaces can be narrower. He has no problem thinking outside of the box on that issue.

M/Sherwood commented that there has been a lot of focus on the golf course as an alternative for a town center but there is a lot we do not know. We don't know the County's position on the matter and there is no indication they want to get rid of the golf course. As he understands it, the City would be required to provide substitute land and there is no plan in place for that which would be an expensive proposition. As stated, Tres Hermanos sold for \$42 million which equates to \$17,000 an acre and there is no place in southern California one can purchase land for \$17,000 an acre. It is a real scheme that went on in this instance. So, it would be extremely expensive for the City to acquire that much acreage. And then to move the golf course and build a new golf course would be very expensive and who pays for that. And we don't know what the City of Industry has planned for the development along Grand Avenue. So it appears the golf course option is based on a lot of speculation and a host of unknowns. So at the October workshop, participants wanted to keep the golf course for several reasons and the latest survey results also support keeping the golf course and with all of this he questions why the GPAC is even discussing the golf course as an option when there is nothing to indicate that developing it is realistically probable and possible and for the community outreach undesirable.

M/Black opined that much has been discussed about the high level aspect of what the GPAC is looking at. If he remembers correctly, this was initiated as a 20-year plan and is an update that needs to be done for the City. We are envisioning taking a blank piece of paper and looking at what the City should be 20 years in the future with a view of what should have been done differently or what should be done

going forward. Numbers we hear are not exact numbers but conceptual numbers at this high level because we're saying "what if" this was here. Given the guidelines for parking numbers, for example, we know what that is so it can be stated but it could change. This is a concept and whether a town center might go here or there or elsewhere, that is an unknown at this time because it is a "concept" for the future. So, would it seem conceptually likely that Alternative 2 fits? Perhaps. Would people like it there? That's something he believes the GPAC would look at. Perhaps, perhaps not, but he wants to make sure everyone is headed in the same direction that this is conceptual. Everybody seems to agree that Transit-Oriented having residential on top of retail because it functions near transit is something everyone can get their arms around to say they would like to see that 20 years from now. While we perhaps need to determine where the "town center" might be (Alternative 1, 2 or 3) he sometimes feels that the process is getting too deep into the weeds instead of saying look, it does fit here and let's just design it so it does.

M/Rivera agreed with M/Black that this is a concept for the future and this process should not get too far into the details because a developer will come along and see money and a way to make the project happen. However, it can't happen unless there is community support and it can't happen unless there is political will and it is clear to him based on all of the public input, especially today, that the only alternative the GPAC has is Alternative 1 and for that reason he submits the following motion:

M/Rivera moved that the GPAC find that Alternative 1 is the preferred alternative.

M/Sherwood said he would like to agree with M/Ramirez on what he just said and would also like the GPAC to consider taking a step back in time. As he said earlier, anything that is developed in Alternative 1 could have a negative impact on the other retail centers so it might be an idea to say the City has three main retail areas and let's try to conceptualize how all three can be improved going forward and not just focus strictly on an Alternative 1. That could be a major buildout but there is also Grand Avenue and Diamond Bar Boulevard that is still viable and things could be done for that area to ensure traffic mitigation, etc.; and, the HMart which is very viable on its own. He believes that the GPAC should not forget the other areas of retail and commercial development by focusing on one alternative.

Chair/St. Amant said that M/Sherwood took the thought out of his head because the more he read the packet and the comments about Grand Avenue and Diamond Bar Boulevard actually being the considered the center of town and it serves both the north and the south. A lot of comments were that if Alternative 1 is adopted it doesn't help the south part of town and if Alternative 3 is adopted as the "town center" it is more central but not when compared to Diamond Bar Boulevard and Grand Avenue. If Alternative 2 was adopted, it helps the south but not the north. Diamond Bar Boulevard and Grand Avenue seems to be something the GPAC

should look at again. He knows there are traffic issues, but when considering Alternative 1, the traffic is equally bad at that location.

Chair/St. Amant asked if M/Sherwood was seconding M/Ramirez's motion and M/Sherwood said he believed there needed to be more discussion.

VC/Worthington said that one of the most exciting moments in the City was two months ago when Sprouts opened which he attended. He saw three hundred people standing in line to walk into that supermarket. It was phenomenal. He has lived in Diamond Bar since 1996 and had never seen anything like it. When Walmart opened it had a good following, but nothing like he saw with Sprouts. That entire shopping center is "born again." There is Chipotle, Coffee Bean, The Habit, McDonald is revamping to two stories, etc. and that will be a center that will develop for this City regardless of what the GPAC does. He believes people are going to go there and that entire area and market will be an economic boon for Diamond Bar. His biggest issue is that he wants to be able to eat, shop and dine in Diamond Bar and he really can't do that because it is very disjointed and very disconnected. He has had this conversation with 500 people who all say the same things – they would love to be able to go have a cocktail and be able to eat, get a steak, and maybe listen to a jazz pianist. Diamond Bar doesn't have any of that or a neighborhood community – he gets it and he understands. But the City should have one center that allows that to happen. There are a lot of "if then" statements for all of these alternatives. There is an "if then" statement about Alternative 2 and 3 about what might happen with Tres Hermanos Ranch and what might happen with the City of Industry and so he cannot bank on what might happen. All he can do is take the current alternatives presented and consider those. With Alternative 1 he is very much concerned about the parking structure and the negative value. And the density levels of Alternative 1 are very concerning. That said, to him, Alternative 1 is the most viable option but it requires further mitigation and further conversation.

M/Rivera said he would support VC/Worthington's comments about Alternative 1 being the primary site he would support. He would never support anything on Grand Avenue and Diamond Bar Boulevard because one cannot get through the traffic that exists there now and he does not see any way of improving that. Chino Hills is building like crazy and the people that are coming from Chino Hills are coming right through Grand Avenue. To say that Alternative 1 should have other possibilities with the parking structure, we cannot have it both ways. We can't have our cake and eat it too. If we want a vibrant, exciting and wonderful place to go to in that shopping center but we don't want a parking structure it is not going to happen. We have to accommodate the people who will visit. As an appraiser, he does not see any particular residences that will be affected any more than they are now. The people at Fall Creek already have a view to commercial. From an appraisal standpoint seeing a parking structure there will not negatively affect the

center any more than it is already affected by people seeing the back of Sprouts or Ace Hardware. His recommendation would be Alternative 1.

Chair/St. Amant felt it would increase the value to have a vibrant town center at that location for those who live in that community and have access to the center.

M/Sherwood said he too is thinking that Alternative 1 is the best option but he does not want this process to forget about the other retail areas because he believes this process should focus on helping them to be successful, vibrant and viable as well.

Ms. Martin said she believed M/Sherwood's comment is very good. It is true that this discussion this evening and the discussions the team has been having with the community over the last few months have focused very much on the "town center" concept. She wants to make sure that everyone remembers this is not the "town center" plan, this is the General Plan which is a citywide plan. And the reason that town centers have become an area of focus is because most of Diamond Bar is great. It's great. It's open space, residential areas that people love that are not really going to change and this is really one of the few variables the City has to consider. But Mr. Sherwood is absolutely right that regardless of what alternative is chosen the location of where a town center may go in the future is going to be one aspect of an overall plan that considers ways in which all aspects of the City can be improved over time by focusing on existing shopping centers, improving traffic throughout the City, how neighborhoods can continue to be strengthened no matter where they are. She wants to make sure that everyone in this room understands that while we have been focusing a great deal on the "town center" the actual General Plan will take a very holistic view and the "town center" will be one part of that, but all of the other topics people have raised will get equal weight and equal treatment in policies.

VC/Worthington seconded C/Ramirez's motion that the GPAC recommend that the City Council and Planning Commission find that Alternative 1 is the preferred alternative at their Joint meeting to be held on January 30, 2018. Motion carried 9-1 with the following Roll Call vote:

M/Rivera	Aye
VC/Worthington	Aye
M/Black	Aye
M/Busse	Aye
M/Harbin	No
M/Liu	Aye
M/Mao	Aye
M/Ramirez	Aye
M/Sherwood	Aye
Chair/St. Amant	Aye

9. REVIEW OF NEXT STEPS:

Ms. Martin said that this is a big step and after the City gets through the selection of a preferred alternative preparation of the General Plan will begin. There will be a few steps where the team comes up with what it calls a “preferred” plan which is essentially a refinement of the recommended plan that came out of this alternatives phase. That will then form the basis for the rest of the General Plan which covers topics ranging from Transportation, Open Space, Safety, Noise, Recreation, Housing, etc. After that the team will be writing the Environmental Impact Report that goes along with the General Plan and following that, there will be adoption hearings.

In the nearer term, the GPAC recommendation will be going before a Joint Meeting of the Planning Commission and the City Council on January 30, 2018. After that, the preliminary preferred plan will be prepared which will consist of a finalized land use diagram and members of the consultant team and particular Fehr & Peers getting to work on doing more of the detailed analysis. What was presented to the GPAC tonight was pretty high-level and the Fehr & Peers team will begin looking at individual intersections to flesh out that analysis in more detail and doing a lot more of the baseline work that will go into forming the General Plan policies. The team will be coming back to the GPAC with a Draft Preferred Plan after the joint meeting. As of this evening there is no set date for the next GPAC meeting. However, it is likely that it will be later winter for a check-in after which the actual writing of the General Plan will commence.

M/Ramirez asked if as the team launches into a more detailed assessment of Alternative 1 would be looking at available funding (Measure M) that may change the SR57/60 Confluence project that would allow for a “true” fix so that traffic does not get dropped off at the doorstep of Alternative 1 which could make it a truly walkable area instead of a major traffic hindrance to Alternative 1. He believes that the City of Diamond Bar should look at ways to object to the current environmental plan for Phase III of that project and find a way to get the money to create connectors for the SR57/60 freeway to get people off the streets.

M/Black asked when the GPAC would be responding to the new designations such as TCMU, etc.

Ms. Martin responded that the preliminary land use designations, and densities and intensities associated with them are all part of the Alternative 1 package. Alternative 1 was more than just the “town center” and there is absolutely time for review and refinement of those that can be fleshed out at either the “preferred plan” or “policy” level. If this is something the GPAC would like to take up at its next meeting that can be done.

M/Black asked if he was correct that Alternative 1 adopted the Transit-Oriented plan as well and Ms. Martin said she would use the word “recommended” rather than “adopted” all of which are part of the same package. While those land use designations are carried over from the last meeting the GPAC had in March there have been no changes made. She sees no problem with continuing to refine the land use designations in those areas and in any other parts of the City as the GPAC continues to work on the preferred plan.

M/Sherwood asked when the GPAC would be environmental – parks, recreation, open space concerns.

Ms. Martin responded that when we prepare with the preferred plan tends to be what she would consider to be a sort of “Executive Summary” of the General Plan. The team will bring back a land use diagram, preliminary open space and parks diagram, circulation diagram and so on. The time at which we delve into those from a policy level will come after that – likely spring and summer, and what we will do with the GPAC as we start to work on drafting those individual Elements, because there are whole Elements in the Plan devoted specifically to those topics, what we like to do is bring those Elements in a few batches to the GPAC and talk about the goals and policies and devote more specific time to those topics at that point.

VC/Worthington cautioned everyone that although the GPAC members have chosen Alternative 1, ultimately, the GPAC is not the final decision-makers. This is a process and there are a lot of other folks who will have their opinions that must be heard and considered.

10. NEXT MEETINGS:

CDD/Gubman said the next GPAC meeting date is To Be Determined. The next scheduled meeting is the Joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting on Tuesday, January 30, 2018, at 6:30 p.m. in the City Hall Windmill Room.

Chair/St. Amant thanked staff and consultants for their usual excellent presentations and the GPAC members and residents who participated in tonight’s meeting.

ADJOURNMENT: With no further business before the General Plan Advisory Committee, Chair/St. Amant adjourned the meeting at 10:15 p.m.

The foregoing minutes are hereby approved this _____ day of _____, 2017.

Attest:
Respectfully Submitted,

Greg Gubman
Community Development Director

Mark St. Amant, Chairperson