

**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE CITY OF DIAMOND BAR  
MEETING OF THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
CITY HALL WINDMILL COMMUNITY ROOM  
21810 COPLEY DRIVE, DIAMOND BAR, CA 91765  
JUNE 21, 2018**

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Chairperson St. Amant called the meeting to order at 7:20 p.m.

**1. ROLL CALL:**

David Busse, Teruni Evans, Mahendra Garg, Amy Harbin, Ching Liu, Cindy Liu, Lee Mao, Michael Ramirez, Victor Ramirez, Paul Sherwood, Dr. Tony Torng, Vice Chairperson Brian Worthington, Chairperson Mark St. Amant

GPAC Members not present: Larry M. Black, Gilbert Rivera were excused.

Chair/St. Amant introduced the GPAC's newest member, Michael Ramirez

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

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

**2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** Approved as presented.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**3.1 GPAC Meeting Minutes for April 19, 2018:**

Upon Motion by M/Sherwood, seconded by M/Harbin, the minutes of the GPAC Meeting of April 19, 2018, were approved as presented. Without objection, the motion was so ordered.

**4. DISCUSSION OF DRAFT GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR LAND USE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION POLICIES:**

**a) Presentation by Katherine Pan, AICP, Dyett & Bhatia Urban and Regional Planners:**

Tonight's presentation focuses on two elements, Land Use and Economic Development and Resource Conservation. Two meetings later this summer will

focus on additional elements including Circulation, Public Facilities and Services, Public Safety, Community Character and Placemaking, and Community Health and Sustainability.

The General Plan format includes eight elements which include background information including figures, tables, charts, images and summary of research on each of those topics to provide a background and foundation for the policies that will address each of those issues. There are two different levels of policies including Guiding and Implementing Policies. The Guiding Policies are broader statement of broad intent and direction and the Implementing Policies are more specific and intended to help guide decision-making on any given issue. To provide a sense of the context for the policies the GPAC is looking at today, a lot of background information supporting the policies was included in the 2017 Existing Conditions Report. That information will be updated and summarized in each of the elements to help people understand where the policies are coming from.

Land Use and Economic Development policies are organized so that the first set more generally addresses land use citywide. These attempts to create a balanced mix of land uses that support the needs of the residence for employment, lodging, retail, open space, community facilities, etc.; to encourage compact growth and infill development to avoid sprawl; to ensure quality design that contributes to city character; to provide for transitions between high and low-intensity land uses; to locate new residential growth in or adjacent to mixed-use centers; and to ensure the adequate provision public services and facilities by managing development and growth.

Policies specific to residential development focus on preserving existing residential neighborhoods and encouraging well-designed and complete neighborhoods, and promoting a variety of housing and neighborhood types to fit a variety of needs.

For non-residential land uses, the policies promote the development of distinct, well-designed commercial centers, provide for concentrating office and commercial uses near regional access routes, transit, and existing and proposed employment centers; supporting the long-term viability of existing commercial and office uses designated for continued use in the General Plan; and also allowing for the continued operation of any light-industrial uses in the Transit-Oriented Mixed-Use area, while providing for their orderly transition to the next generation of land uses.

General policies for mixed-use applies to all mixed-use areas previously discussed are intended to support commercial and residential mixed-use developments in aging commercial centers along key corridors; to encourage

compact mixed-use developments; to provide for multi-modal accessibility and connectivity; and foster development of nodes or clusters of mixed-use areas to promote identity and pedestrian-scale walkability.

Policies for Public Facilities, Open Space and Hillside look to designate adequate and equitably-distributed land for educational, cultural, recreation and public service activities and preserve open space land and hillsides to protect the visual character of the city, provide for public outdoor recreation and other open-space uses such as natural resource conservation, groundwater recharge and preserving public safety.

At the last meeting, the GPAC and staff directed the consultant to make certain policy edits which have been included as redlined items in tonight's packet as follows:

Neighborhood Mixed Use - new policies were included requiring commercial developments to incorporate outdoor green spaces and encourage traffic calming measures along Diamond Bar Boulevard.

Transit-Oriented Mixed Use – now includes a new policy restricting residential and mixed-use development north of Walnut Street until jurisdictional boundaries with the City of Industry have been adjusted to support such development in an orderly manner. In addition, changes have been made to the illustrative district map to remove icons that could be misinterpreted as proposing actual development.

Town Center Mixed Use – revised one of the policies to requirement that development incorporate landscaping and outdoor green spaces and discourage new drive-through uses; and, inclusion of new policies for evaluating parking ratios and requiring proposed hotel project feasibility studies. Additionally, the earlier illustration was replaced with a high-level diagram to more generally show how these policies might be implemented.

Community Core Overlay – revised to include parkland among the redevelopment options for the southern portion of the golf course in the event that LA County decides to stop operating that portion as a golf course.

Preferred Land Use Plan Revisions Map – Redrawing of the southern portion of the Golf Course to accommodate the planned Caltrans Right-of-Way for the SR57/60 Confluence connectors and the TOD district boundaries were redrawn to exclude the existing mobile parks, and retain the current RMH designations on those sites.

Revised Preferred Land Use Plan – for the Transit Oriented Mixed Use area where the maximum residential density was reduced from 40 to 30 units per acre.

**DRAFT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POLICIES:**

These policies focus on providing for new development opportunities and the reuse of existing vacant commercial space providing for the development of jobs and commercial uses within Diamond Bar and supporting the retention, rehabilitation and/or expansion of existing businesses and the attraction of new businesses. They also look into the development of flexible workspaces supporting the use of Metrolink and other local transit connections as a means for non-residents to commute into these employment opportunities in the City.

**DRAFT RESOURCE CONSERVATION POLICIES:**

These guiding policies look at balanced open space systems that will preserve scenic beauty and community identity and protect important biological resources, provide open space for outdoor recreation and the enjoyment of nature, conserve natural resources and ensure public health and safety.

The policies for Biological Resources are attempting to preserve biologically-significant and environmental sensitive areas including wildlife habitats and corridors, wetlands and riparian areas, mature native or culturally or historically significant tree woodlands and other areas of natural significance, protecting rare, threatened, endangered and other special-status plant and animal communities and promoting the use of native and drought-tolerant vegetation in landscaping. Policies included this section address the diversity of sensitive habitats in the City, including California Walnut Woodland, Coast Live Oak Woodland, Venturan Coastal Sage Scrub and Southern Willow Scrub, which are specifically called out in the policies. With the policy language the City is looking to protect anything that the California Department of Fish & Wildlife identifies as a “sensitive habitat” which will be updated for the General Plan and the EIR. The figures Special-Status Animal Species Occurrences and Special-Status Plant Species Occurrences can sometimes be difficult to parse; however, these figures are based on data from the California Natural Diversity database which records reported sightings which can be downloaded and mapped. What these figures show are more generalized areas where these sightings have occurred. In this case, the larger the mapped area, the less specific the information was, but what this indicates is the exact place where the City needs to be concerned about this precise species, many of which were found outside of the City. However, if there is suitable habitat for any of these species within the City even if there is no previously-documented sighting, there is the potential for any of these occurrences to also occur within the planning area. In the Existing Conditions report, there were many more species that are identified in the table (7 plant species and 27 animal species). This information

says that the City has to be on the lookout for their potential occurrence within the planning area in order to protect, avoid or mitigate any possible impacts to them and their habitats.

The Water Resources Draft Guiding Policies look to protect waterways and watersheds in Diamond Bar from pollution and degradation as a result of urban activities (stormwater runoff, sedimentation from grading of hillsides, etc.), minimize the consumption and waste of potable water through water conservation measures, working with regional organizations and other jurisdictions to manage groundwater resources and to pursue methods to control, capture and reuse stormwater runoff to help with groundwater recharge.

Air Quality Draft Guiding Policies are air-quality related looking to protect the City's air quality to every extent possible. Air quality is a regional issue, therefore, important to support efforts to improve regional air quality in the basin and to aim for a diverse and efficiently operated local and regional ground transportation system in a way that reduces emissions from vehicle miles traveled (VMT) to the extent possible.

#### **GPAC CLARIFYING QUESTIONS:**

M/Sherwood said he did not see anything in the presentation that addresses Parks and Recreation land use. Ms. Pan explained that at the next GPAC meeting scheduled for July 19<sup>th</sup>, the GPAC will be looking at Public Facilities & Services which includes parks and recreation. M/Sherwood asked for confirmation that specifics regarding acreage could be addressed at that time and Ms. Pan responded "yes".

M/Busse spoke off mike. Ms. Pan responded that this may be something that will need further clarification, but there are vacant natural areas that have been set aside and preserved in conjunction with development projects, but not necessarily designated as open space in the General Plan. Areas shown as Open Space land use designation are currently designated Open Space in the General Plan.

M/Busse asked if these are areas that a developer can build houses on and Ms. Pan said that in many cases these areas were created when the development went in and would not be available for further development. CDD/Gubman said that the General Plan would show sites that have the designation as "Open Space" and there are land use policies that apply specifically to those areas. In the Open Space Resources Map there is some overlap, but for the most part, those areas that are vacant "natural" areas, if they are not already designated as Open Space, they are either city-owned, such as the area to the north of the Diamond Bar Center, or they are HOA areas which are deed restricted as common area lots and they are protected and cannot be developed because whatever development

rights that may have existed there were transferred to the developed part of the HOA.

M/Sherwood said he is looking at areas on the Open Space map such as the vacant natural area that is adjacent on the east side of Pantera Park. CDD/Gubman responded that that land is owned by the City. M/Sherwood asked if that was a case with “all of these” or is it a mish-mash of ownership? CDD/Gubman said that if one looks at the southwest part of the map, for example, where Brea Canyon Cutoff Road is, one can see areas that are owned by the homeowners associations and they are map restricted and cannot be developed. In all cases, it will be either City- or HOA-owned land.

Chair/St. Amant asked if that meant that areas that are known to be vacant that are not on the Open Space map are not deed restricted and could be developed, such as the strip between the SR60 and Armitos. CDD/Gubman responded that it is not deed restricted, it is part of a single family residential parcel and it currently is limited under the zoning by the topography and how much density could be yielded should a development be proposed. That strip does not have an “open space” designation or any other type of restriction at this time.

M/V. Ramirez asked if staff could provide a brief update on the Tres Hermanos litigation settlement discussions with Chino Hills and City of Industry as it relates to the planned area. CDD/Gubman said he could not because of the pending litigation.

M/Sherwood referred to the Special Status Animal Species Map and asked if in addition to those, if the general animal population is addressed in the planning that the GPAC is doing. Ms. Pan said in her experience has not been that any species that is not “special status” are called out. However, those types of species get addressed in some manner when the discussion involves wildlife corridors and habitats and suitable habitats will support a lot more animal species that just the special status species. There is no database for counting coyotes, raccoons, etc. M/Sherwood asked if staff could provide a wildlife corridor map to see where they are located in the planning area and Ms. Pan said she would look into it.

CDD/Gubman added that the special status species will address plant and animal communities that are listed at the state or federal level as being sensitive, threatened, endangered or having some other status. General animal populations, while they are not designated on the different registries, if a community had a specific population of wild animals (non-native wild parrots for example), the General Plan could include policies that addressed that from a City policy standpoint.

Ms. Pan added that because the list of Special Status Species is constantly changing, there are species that get put on and taken off lists and the team is relying on state and federal listings so if a more common species were to run into trouble over time, they would eventually get captured into any policy addressing special status species. As CDD/Gubman said, if there are any locally significant species that has not been captured on the list, it is something the team can look into if so directed and of importance to the community.

M/Sherwood said that wildlife is a big part of Diamond Bar and while the City obviously wants to pay attention to endangered and special species, in his opinion, the general wildlife also needs to be considered because it is part of this community and while deer, and bobcat as much as coyote, are problematic, they are still part of the environment.

M/Torng asked if Policy ED-I-12 was referring to a sports park in cooperation with the school district. Ms. Pan said that Policy ED-I-12 does not specifically address sports but rather about workforce development including skills training in order to develop skills locally that might be of interest to employers. If M/Torng is looking for policies about schools and recreational facilities for schools, programming and so on, that will be under the Public Facilities & Services discussion at the next meeting.

M/V. Ramirez said the GPAC received a packet regarding the Economic Development Guiding Policies and another document today that includes red comments and wanted to know where those comments originated and what the GPAC is looking at. CDD/Gubman said the copies M/ Ramirez references were not prepared by staff. Those were provided by a member of the audience and the public will have the opportunity during public comments to explain what the intent of these written copies are.

M/Busse asked if the purple area (on the map) just south of South Pointe Middle School that is shown as a public facility was for the expansion of South Pointe or other school facilities and CDD/Gubman responded that the area is school district owned property that has been identified as a potential opportunity for recreational, open space or some joint use between the City and the school district.

**a) PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

VC/Worthington explained that members of the public have up to five minutes to speak and he implored members to adhere to the time restraint for the benefit of the many members of the public who wished to speak.

Connie Barber showed a flyer left at her home that concerns her and the other residents of the Walnut Creek Estates. She said the flyer refers to the rezoning

of the property. She understands that her mobile home park has been rezoned for a different purpose and the flyer states, whether it is false news or not, Diamond Bar's Zoning Map amended 2014 shows that the Walnut Creek Estates is already rezoned as Office/Professional (OP) and she asked if the information was true or false. If it has been rezoned from residential to business, why now?

M/V Ramirez recommended that since this is perhaps an issue and a topic that many present are concerned about it might reduce the amount of time for public speaking if staff would address the allegation. Members concurred.

CDD/Gubman responded to the speaker and concerned audience members that his comments are specific to the City's two mobile home parks, Diamond Bar Mobile Estates and Walnut Creek Estates. Both of these communities are currently designated Residential. The preferred plan had previously incorporated those two parks into the Transit-Oriented Mixed Use area because they were viewed to be contributors to the intent of that district to provide a diversity of housing types. However, rumors spread that there was an actual intent to accommodate the redevelopment of those mobile home parks and in order to address those rumors which are inaccurate, staff has shown on the preferred plan, the removal of the mobile home park properties from the Transit-Oriented Mixed Use district so that they will retain their General Plan designation of "Residential". The reason they have been extracted and are no longer part of the Transit-Oriented Mixed Use district is to make it perfectly clear that no change and no intent to accommodate change to those existing communities would take place. The City does consider its two mobile home park communities to be important contributors to the City's diverse housing stock and there is no intent whatsoever to see those communities lost. The maps have been revised to be absolutely clear that there is no intent or motivation by City staff through its recommendations whatsoever, to see those mobile home park communities become redeveloped into any other use.

Douglas Barcon said he would submit his comments in writing. On the handout for the land use packet on Page 11 LU-I-47 it mentions hillsides but nothing about biological resources. He knows there is information throughout the packet in different areas but believed that portion should also mention biological resources because it seems to have ignored it for the hillsides. He also noticed that in Figure 3 of the packet it does not show the pocket park that is in development at the end of Sunset Crossing Road and should be added. The current proposal for the Town Center Mixed Use at Diamond Bar Boulevard and Golden Springs Drive including the Diamond Ranch Center is already showing problems that would be made worse by adding the mixed-use component. While the Coffee Bean and Tea Leaf is a welcome addition to the Ranch Center, it has become a study hall that it makes it difficult for others to patronize. McDonald's was remodeled and against resident comments, the City required a plan that downsized the lobby and

the number of seats to the point that customers have to leave and it also reduced the number of parking spaces and people have to decide whether to go to the McDonald's in Walnut or elsewhere. Of course it is opened up in the late evening or night but nothing during the day. In regard to the Transit-Oriented Mixed-Use concept, it is unlikely that Union Pacific Railroad will allow more commuter trains on its shared tracks through the City of Industry because freight at the ports is increasing every year which will require more freight trains. The Transit-Oriented Mixed-Use concept may be impractical because of that as it only works for residents that are able to use the train for commuting to work and are able to function with only one vehicle. Since this plan addresses the environmental issues, the warehouses along Ferrero Parkway (in Industry) are reflecting the train noise into the area around Sunset Crossing Road and Prospectors Road which has never been mitigated. The General Plan should include, that Sunset Crossing Road remain closed to the west, north and south from the City of Industry and Pomona. The baseball fields must remain as a buffer zone to prevent Lanterman from coming through into Sunset Crossing Road as part of Cal Poly. The Diamond Bar Tree Preservation Ordinance has a flaw in stating that any developer can remove virtually any trees and mitigate the loss by planting small trees in towns like Modesto or other areas away from Diamond Bar. The Ordinance needs to be addressed and the City needs to be proactive in the protection of the Coastal Live Oaks and other trees and not support their removal or replacement with "twigs". As for blight, what happens when businesses in the mix-use concept fail and there are no businesses to replace them which will then have homes above them that can only be used by the homeless or perhaps burned down. Diamond Bar needs to covet and protect its open space and stop allowing building on every square foot (of land) because all of this building will only lower the quality of life, endanger wildlife and add to traffic pollution and noise. In his opinion, the City is built-out and this plan should look more at redeveloping the blighted properties (also mentioned in the packet) and not become another El Monte or something similar. Diamond Bar should remain family-friendly, desirable, and a country living atmosphere.

Vinod Kashyop started with the intent of addressing air quality, surface water preservation and protection of ground water. But, in fact, he found that the policies do not correlate with the land use, open spaces, biological resources or water and air quality and he found no significant reference to this in the Diamond Bar General Plan. He did some research and found that the government's Office for Planning and Research, 2000 edition, has over 400 pages of drawings and appendices has issued General Plan guidelines which mandate detailed statutory requirements and recommended policy language with links to the city and county General Plans in order to adopt similar policies. For ease of use of the General Plan Guidelines, is text researchable and provides language for local governments to use and adapt. The update will allow the OPR to update text, links and other useful tools for information directly to the General Plan Guidelines. The General Plan is a

vision for long-term planning (reading from the OPR) so let's ask ourselves this very simple question. Why does a General Plan matter? The simple answer is, the General Plan matters because it allows the community to create a vision for its future because cities and counties are critical partners to achieve the statewide goal. California State Law requires that each city and county adopt a General Plan for physical development of the county or city or any land outside its boundary which bears relation to planning. The City of Diamond Bar General Plan does not meet with the guidelines mandated in the Governor's OPR of 2017. It is a pre-requisite of all General Plans to declare under penalty of perjury, that the General Plan has been prepared in conformance with the General Plan guidelines mandated by the governor's Office of Planning and Research, the 2017 edition. Any further work on the City of Diamond Bar's General Plan should be revised and resubmitted in compliance with the prevailing guidelines mandated in 2017 by the governor's office. In closing, zoning plans dated 2014 cannot possibly align with the guidelines mandated by the governor in 2017. That's just simple common sense. The governor's 2017 edition further states that the General Plan expresses the community's development goals and embodies public policy relative to the future land uses, both public and private. The California Supreme Court describes General Plans as the charter to which zoning ordinances must conform, but the General Plan goes beyond zoning and land use. We have done none of this, Mr. Kashyop said, and he believed the community should really look at what the City is giving the residents because what the City is giving the residents does not conform to the law. And these 15 members of the GPAC have not been appointed by, this is not a resident plan, this is a City Council plan with three GPAC members appointed by each City Council Member and the General Plan does not look anything like this, it is more a developer's plan. And furthermore, the requirement is, Land Use plan comes first and the offspring is the Zoning Plan. How can a zoning plan be born before 2017, as in the case of the mobile homes. To say it has been removed by magic by using some software that is in compliance with this is misleading because on the zoning map it still shows it as "general use". There has been a pattern of this. He saw it on Site D where oak trees were replaced by two.

Jim Hays asked to speak to water and air quality. With respect to water, one of his concerns is that the language has a lot about development which makes him nervous because it is saying that when we have this development we'll do this and when we have this development we'll do that. So it seems to him that it is unduly focused on the effects of development on water resources rather than how do we deal with the situation we have now and do better with what we have. How do we manage our water resources and not how we're going to have all of this development to manage so there is concern about how that flows. In some of the protections it says things like for protecting the waterways where feasible, and minimizing disturbances and he believes that language is too vague. Eventually, when it comes to being implemented there should be more specific language than

“where feasible” on how to manage the groundwater resources and protect the recharge areas and the spreading grounds. The policies should address the important role of open spaces to protecting watersheds, drainages and supporting natural hydrologic forces. The idea is, instead of everything being about how a new development will mitigate it, there should be more about how preserving open space and doing things like using cemented-over Alternative 1 versus building new cement and new asphalt onto the golf course, but having language that says “protecting open spaces will solve or protect the water resource issues. With respect to air quality, he is concerned about the whole thing because he has a sense the City might have a City Council that is packed with climate deniers and if you’re a climate denier and you read air quality and you read climate change, it doesn’t exist. So he would recommend any kind of language that could be added that would assure that some of these things are done for that reason. There is a lot of language for the air quality that talks about Transit-Oriented development but it does not address the increased number of car trips generated by high-density housing and commercial, so it has some general language about walkability, but there is a sense of more specific language that is more aggressively talking about walkability and not just walkability as we develop stuff, but walkability in the stuff we already have. So he is a little bit concerned that the general frame is how we’re going to develop all of this new stuff rather than how we can improve the quality of life – air quality and water resources, for the land we already have and the way the things already are. He formally requested that a motion be made to revise the language of the proposed General Plan Policies to address residents’ concerns. We request a commitment be made by the GPAC for public consideration of the revised policies before it is finalized.

Grace Lim-Hays said she provided the GPAC members with packets tonight. They contain comments about tonight’s policies that are noted in red. There are also some example policies from LA County’s General Plan and from Chino Hills’ General Plan. She stated that tonight, we need to acknowledge that our planet grows warmer causing severe weather patterns and it makes a lot of sense for the City to update the General Plan and do our part to make our world safer. Policies about land use and resource conservation should reflect nature’s contribution to controlling climate, improving air quality, water resources and providing spiritual rejuvenation. However, the proposed policies presented tonight, especially for biological resources, open space and land use, seem to undermine preservation goals. It is not possible to describe them all in the limited time she is allocated and she has provided a detailed list of that policy and concerns to the GPAC this evening. Following are some examples. The big use of the words “adequate” or “as necessary” to define park space could mean very little or maybe even no park space at all. Second, the contradictory land use policy on the golf course overlay “encourage the preservation of hillsides as open space, but allow residential development at permitted densities” and doesn’t this violate the requirement for internal consistency within the General Plan. Third, policies

for conserving biological resources seem to provide justification for destroying them when “it would not be feasible” to preserve them and what would be “feasible”? Policies specifically do mention minimizing the grading, adding tunnels for migration and replacing the plants. So, we kind of sense that the likely destruction of these sensitive habitats is what would be feasible. In addition, a 1999 City Council amendment to the General Plan provides for abandoning the open space if the City finds it beneficial. Why was this added to the original General Plan? This policy leaves our open spaces vulnerable rather than putting them safely away and out of harms reach of conflicts of interest and hidden agendas. Though many policies are based on the 1995 plan, noticeably missing are things like the park acreage and the acquisition of hillsides and extension of greenbelts – why were these left out? Please consider these missing policies which have been submitted to the GPAC tonight. So much devastation and destruction of our environment has already taken place because of policies that unravel like loose threads. Please tighten these policies’ language to secure our quality of life and future. She seconded the request for a motion to revise the language of the proposed General Plan and give residents an opportunity to consider them before they are finalized. She thinks CDD/Gubman tried to address the zoning map of 2014 but she is concerned that he was talking about the land use map. We understand the Land Use Map has an error but she does not think it has been explained why the Zoning Map was rezoned. It just says “last amended February 2014” and why the Walnut Creek Estates is a light blue color instead of a dark brown color like the other mobile home park. That was not clearly explained. Could that be better explained?

Allen Wilson said this land use document is a developer’s pipe dream and he has been to every meeting since Wednesday, November 9, 2016, and has heard the residents. He doesn’t know if the Planning Commission or the City Council is listening to residents. This should be “our” document and this is not becoming “our” document. He is concerned about LU-G-2 which was new. “Encourage compact growth in infill development to preserve open space within the City and its Sphere of Influence including Tonner Canyon and Tres Hermanos Ranch.” That is very vague. Compact growth and infill development. He is really confused. And when you see “red” that means new. On the next page, LU-G-3 is a new item “an area plan that accommodates new growth that ensures quality designs that make positive contributions to City character.” We have a very slow-growth community. Page 5, Community Core Overlay LU-I-1 – “Support the continued operation of Diamond Bar Golf Course of Los Angeles as a Public Community” and then went on to say, LU-I-2, “should LA County choose blah, blah, blah, as a public park, consolidate golf course and portions south of Grand Avenue (red) as a park, or, a walkable mixed-use community regional destination that offers retail, dining, etc.” Have you ever been on Golden Springs? Golden Springs is a nightmare for those coming home or trying to get to work. There are a lot of surprises in here. On Page 9, LU-I-37, “prior to development of any non-golf

course recreation related uses, undertake required preparation of cohesive site Master Plan that represents comprehensive use of office-residential uses that should be generally located on upper floors; however, permit those on level provided for concentration...” He really does not understand a lot of this and he thinks there needs to be a public hearing because they were just given this information and they have a lot of questions. He thinks the residents should be voting on this as a community as a whole in a general election. He is not very pleased with what he is seeing in here. And previous speakers alluded to the fact that we have existing developments that are blighted. What is funny about 20 years ago the City had a Redevelopment Agency and it was going to address blighted areas. But that particular part was challenged in court and they took the designated area out of the redevelopment project (area). He is trying to remain positive and he is very concerned about air quality, land use and traffic and transportation and there are a lot of things that are not being addressed. He cannot emphasize enough that this seems like a developer’s dream and a developer would like to have this. He has very limited hearing but he has heard a lot from the residents and it appears to him that the City Council and Planning Commission is not listening to the community. He does not know what’s going on. It seems like when we (the residents) say one thing it gets twisted with a lot of underlined red and gray highlighted areas and he thinks there needs to be another public hearing to really resolve these concerns from the community. If not, then the community will want to vote on this in a general election.

Carmen Rosales said she wanted to address the Sphere of Influence. As you know, the Sphere of Influence is a critical part of the wildlife corridor that contributes to the missing middle in the Puente/Chino Hills wildlife corridor and the Chino Hills State Park, tracing across to Tres Hermanos Ranch and beyond. Zoning the Sphere of Influence as protected open space would discourage developers from purchasing the land from the City of Industry to avoid going through the hassle of having the property rezoned. The hills in the Sphere of Influence area are too steep and rugged. As a sensitive ecological area, any developer that writes an Environmental Impact Report is open to lawsuits. Zoning the Sphere of Influence as protected open space would enable Diamond Bar to have a significant carbon sequestration offset. Zoning the Sphere of Influence as protected open space would make it affordable and feasible for purchase by a conservation land trust or to be included in the Chino Hills State Park. In conclusion, given the rugged hills in the area, a plethora of protected oak tree habitat, combined with the sensitive ecological area designation, it only makes sense to leave this bio-diversity hot spot as protected open space. She agrees with the previous speaker and supports the motion to revise the language in the proposed General Plan and an opportunity for the public consideration before it is finalized.

Yuwen Wang said her concerns are addressing transparency and communication issues regarding the General Plan Update website. While looking through the website she noticed some discrepancies. On the “about” page of the website there is a project schedule graphic at the bottom of the page and when she clicked on that graphic it took her to another page with a bigger version of the graphic. At first glance, the graphic on the website and the graphic she saw when she clicked on it looked almost identical, as one would expect; however, she soon discovered several inconsistencies between the two schedule graphics which are supposed to carry the same information. For sake of clarity, she addressed the first graphic she encountered as the altered version and the second as the original version because it has the Dyett & Bhatia logo at the bottom. She provided copies of the graphics and pointed out the inconsistencies which she had circled. In comparing the two schedule graphics to a more detailed schedule she found on the GPAC website, she came to the conclusion that the original version with the Dyett & Bhatia logo on the bottom is accurate while the altered version has multiple errors which means that anyone viewing the website may be led to an incorrect graphic and they would need to click on the incorrect schedule to reach a page with the correct schedule which is extremely misleading and confusing. If she were a citizen who had no idea what the General Plan is and she looked on the website for more information, she would be led to an incorrect schedule and be confused about the entire schedule of the General Plan Update process. She asked why the General Plan website displays an incorrect General Plan Update schedule, did the City intentionally alter the original graphic, and will the City fix this information by updating the website with consistent versions of the schedule for the sake of transparency? If the City wants the General Plan to accurately reflect the interest of Diamond Bar citizens and residents, it must ensure that information regarding the General Plan Update process on the website is accurate and clear. In addition, she has noticed that Community Workshop #3 was supposed to take place in March 2018 and why has this not yet occurred? She will be emailing her questions and concerns to the City along with the two graphics which she has been referring to and would like to receive responses to her questions by July 15<sup>th</sup>.

Robert Velasquez said that in the 1995 General Plan Objective 1.5 states that “maintaining of feeling of open space within the community by identifying and preserving an adequate amount of land.” As a previous speaker said, that is where some of the vague language comes in – adequate amount of land and how adequate is it. But despite that, he is hopeful that the new proposed General Plan land use diagram does become reality because it is the spirit of the previous plan. But at the same time, he is concerned because past actions are indicative of continued practices. For instance, there are two other maps that voices what the previous speaker says – the Zoning Map that was adopted in 1995, amended in 2014 and what is online which is being referred to as the 2016 General Plan. All three maps are very different with different colors. To an average resident, it is difficult to follow. One has to go back and forth and he doesn’t know if it is

intentional. He hopes not. His other point is that the open land on each of the maps are different as well. It is very confusing. His first request is that the proposed General Plan map be consistent with similar colors of at least one of the other maps so that the average resident can see the changes and easily understand it. Also, we need the amount of open land to be defined. Currently, it is not quantified which means that as time passes it is not a measurable goal and no one is accountable. A good example is our neighbor, Chino Hills. In their General Plan, it states that it maintains a ratio of five-acres per 1,000 residents. That's a really good definition. Diamond Bar defines it as "an adequate amount." What is adequate? Over the years, the open land has been decreasing rapidly. For example, the Arciero Development at Brea Canyon Road south of Pathfinder Road, the 2014 Millennium project in The Country, Willow Heights Development on Diamond Bar Boulevard and Brea Canyon Road. His request #2 is that he would like to have the open space defined and measurable so the City can protect residents' interest and hold the City Council accountable for the residents' interests. A highlight implementing policy within the proposed General Plan titled Public Facilities, Open Space and Hillside, is LU-I-45 which is to ensure "adequate" parklands and provide specialized recreational facilities as identified in the Parks Master Plan and actively pursue the acquisition of additional parklands. Request #3 is to implement LU-I-45 to maintain the open space policy. Request #4 is the same as what others have voiced. He formally requests a motion to be made for GPAC's commitment to revise the language of the proposed General Plan Policies to address residents' concerns before it is finalized.

Amanda Tropiano, a Principal Planner, De Novo Planning Group, is representing her client, Foremost Companies, a land investment firm that targets strategic real estate opportunities throughout California. Foremost owns the Oak Tree Plaza and Ranch Center shopping centers located at the southeast corner of Highland Valley Road and Diamond Bar Boulevard. As a professional planner, she has the opportunity to work with public agencies and private developers to envision the futures of cities. She works at both the policy level managing General Plan projects like this, preparing specific plans, but working with developers on real development applications. So she deeply appreciates the complexities that are involved in creating a long term vision and the challenges and opportunities that you face when you are considering development projects. She has also had the opportunity to work with GPACs across California and she definitely applauds the commitment you have made to improve your community through time and energy dedicated to this committee. Tonight she wanted to share some brief background on the Oaks and Ranch retail centers, a timeline of what the Foremost Team has been up to since they acquired the sites in May 2015 and call your attention to only three specific draft Neighborhood Mixed-Use implementing policies that they believe warrant some additional attention from the GPAC in order to ensure that the City of Diamond Bar can actually realize the type of vibrant mixed-use

development that it would like to see in this focus area. And although she will be sharing details regarding the Oak Tree and Ranch Centers and the planning application associated with that project, they are definitely not present this evening asking the GPAC to weigh in on the proposed development or provide direction specific to that project. They understand that is beyond the scope and role of the GPAC membership. Rather, she is providing this information so that the GPAC can use it to see how the policies you are considering actually result in implementation of real projects. Rest assured that when a project is proposed at this site, it will go through the City's standard procedures of staff review and public hearings with the community, Planning Commission and City Council. Together, there are two sites that compose this property. They equal approximately 10.5 acres and include 120,000 square feet of commercial space. However, due to their isolated location and age, these centers have long struggled to maintain regular occupancy. Today, Oak Tree is 70 percent occupied, largely due to the bowling alley while the Ranch is less than 20 percent occupied. Foremost submitted a planning application to the City in August 2016. Based on staff's review of the application and other unique site constraints, her team has been working for the last 18 months to update its development plan, grading, architecture, landscape palette and amenities package in order to address the concerns of staff and also reflect the guiding principles that the GPAC has been considering for this focused area. They submitted an updated application last week and even since that time, have made additional refinements they believe better reflect the GPAC's vision for this area which is what has been presented to the GPAC today. They reviewed the land use alternatives and appreciate the definition that the GPAC established for the mixed-use neighborhood center and believe that this area is a very special area of Diamond Bar and warrants the attention the GPAC is giving it through this process. Staff has also brought to their attention the Draft Land Use Policies and Implementing Policies as well as the Neighborhood Mixed-Use conceptual illustration, which provide more detailed direction regarding this focus area. After careful review of the 14 guiding policies and 22 implementing policies she and her clients believe will apply to this project site, they have identified only three for which they are asking the GPAC to provide additional consideration this evening. Those items are LU-I-8/LU-I-16 which are the same, related to the consolidation and location of parking spaces; LU-I-9 related to Commercial development along the majority of Diamond Bar Boulevard within 1000 feet of the north and south ends (of the City) and LU-I-14 related to the location of building frontages along Diamond Bar Boulevard. They have included in the distributed packages some recommendations for the GPAC's consideration as part of tonight's discussion and will be available to answer any questions the GPAC may have. Ultimately, they understand that the City would like to see some catalytic change in North Diamond Bar Boulevard and they want to be part of that change and help the City see its implementation of its vision for this area and would welcome consideration of these specific policies to ensure the City's vision for this area can actually be implemented.

Craig Borchard had questions regarding the mobile home parks and could not hear CDD/Gubman's statement from the back of the room. He asked the difference between the Diamond Bar Zoning Plan of 2014 and the General Plan. Before this meeting he went to the General Plan Update webpage and found a notice about rumors regarding mobile home parks in Diamond Bar. Apparently, a concerned citizen had written a flyer in which that person discussed the possibility that under the new General Plan, Diamond Bar's mobile home parks might be razed. That led him to this meeting's information packet where in the midst of the last meeting there were comments about the previous TOD maps. Since the mobile home parks are close to the TOD, he wondered if the concerned citizen's fears about the mobile home parks being razed was simply a charting error of the Zoning Map because the Zoning Map lists one of those parks as Office/Professional, not as mixed use. It did not look like a false rumor to him. Instead, it appeared a simple misunderstanding. He asked around and found out that a representative of the City called the flyer writer despicable. He has no idea who the flyer writer is, but he wanted to know what was so despicable about a citizen voicing an honest concern. Please answer this question for him because frankly, the City's over-reaction concerns him much more than anything contained in the flyer. Was the City trying to stifle legitimate dissent? But then he re-read the City's letter to the mobile home park owners and noticed an interesting turn-of-phrase – the letter said that no changes are planned and then it dawned on him. He checked out the current Diamond Bar Zoning Map dated September 2014 and the one he saw he wasn't surprised to see that one of the parks had already been zoned for Office/Professional. Please provide a public answer to whether the current zoning for that mobile home park is accurate and why would the City go out of its way to create such a fuss over what was basically an honest concern for mobile home park residents. Because it looked to him like the City was talking out of both sides of its mouth – they say no changes are planned. Well, no changes are planned because zoning for the one mobile home park has already been changed. It's true the City isn't selling the mobile home park people down the road now because it appears that the mobile home park people were already sold down the river in 2014. Please explain.

CDD/Gubman responded that there was a question initially about what's the difference between the General Plan and the Zoning. The General Plan is the prevailing, superseding policy document that identifies the land uses that are permissible in the designated areas shown on the General Plan Map. The Zoning Map identifies for each zone what the specific development standards and list of permissible uses are. So, where a General Plan designation might say Commercial, the zoning map would break that down into C-1, C-2, and C-3 and for each of those zones there are different types of commercial uses that are allowed. If there is a discrepancy between the General Plan designation and the Zoning designation, the General Plan designation prevails. The Zoning Map

shows that the Walnut Creek Estates property has a zoning of Office. That is an error in the Zoning Map. The General Plan designation of Residential Medium-High Density is what prevails. That Zoning designation was not done in 2014. There was an update to the Zoning Map in 2014 to accommodate the high-density residential zoning that is directly south of Diamond Ranch High School which is what the 2014 adjustment was for. Right now the City is updating its General Plan and one of the first implementations of the General Plan will be to update the Zoning Map and in doing so, we will identify, as we have already begun to do, where those discrepancies are to make sure that the updated Zoning Map is consistent with the General Plan designations. So, although there is currently an inconsistency on the Zoning Map, we are currently focusing on the General Plan and the intent is for the mobile home parks to retain their Residential Medium-High Density designation and when the Zoning Map is updated, the zoning will be corrected from that error that currently shows Office so that it is shown as a Residential Zoning District that conforms to the existing land uses which are the mobile home parks. Yes, the Zoning Map is incorrect, but the General Plan designation is the prevailing policy document and that is what the long term intent is for that mobile home park.

Robin Smith said her neighborhood is zoned RL. They have lived in their home for 30 years. On the Zoning Map, it has been changed to RLM. In various planning meetings she has attended and asked CDD/Gubman about this, especially with regard to mansionization in her neighborhood which is the building of these giant houses that are not consistent with the neighborhood's look. She asked once if these projects were inconsistent with the General Plan designation and CDD/Gubman said yes, they are inconsistent. And then she asked why they (the projects) were approved and his response was because there are other projects that are inconsistent. She asked CDD/Gubman to correct her if she was wrong about her recollection. What she is concerned with is that her zoning in her neighborhood has been "up-zoned" and it has been increased, not to her knowledge or neighborhood's knowledge (she didn't know if she missed the meeting or what), but it is a question because the material point is, have neighborhoods in her community been zoned up to be denser in the future to allow for things like these giant houses. And that's just a question and why she's looking at these two maps, one of which is called The Preferred Plan which she is assuming has the old land use – it doesn't say, it just says 2016 Dyett & Bhatia. It has RL in her neighborhood but the Zoning Map dated 2014 is RLM and she does not know if that is a mistake. She is concerned because it has changed the character of her neighborhood. That's a side note and she would like an answer to understand that. What she is here about is the Habitat Map. She sent a six page letter with 19 or 20 corrections to the Habitat Map when the Existing Conditions Report was done. She gave it to CDD/Gubman and she thought the GPAC Members were supposed to have had a copy. She is not seeing any of those corrections. If one goes to the Habitat Map, one of the big things is all of

the yellow that is there should be pink because we do not have dominant Walnut Woodlands in all of the yellow stuff, we have Coast Live Oak dominant. And that can be known by looking at the percentage of the plant community like how many oak trees per how many walnut trees, etc. What is interesting is that her property is pink and she has Coast Live Oaks with walnut and so forth so she is at the top where the pink is. That's her neighborhood and the City knew that she had mapped her oak trees by the state of California so she does not know if that's what you've got to do or what. But the yellow habitat is inaccurate and there are a lot of other things in there that are inaccurate. So, she is wondering why we are dealing with inaccurate information and by the way, she never got an answer to her letter and so did that go into the black hole? What's that about? Now, she is with Sierra Club and they are mapping species and she has talked to the CNDDDB and it takes about eight or nine months to record a species – it goes through a long process. So she wants to remind everybody, when one looks at these maps for species and habitats and all of that, they're not accurate – they are not to be used as a reliable reference. They have a disclaimer on there that says they don't have everything that is listed. So FYI on that. And the final thing she wants to keep in mind with everybody is, these habitats are communities – they are plant communities. We don't have random oak trees just sitting out there twiddling their thumbs. We have oak trees, willow trees, coastal scrub, riparian, it's an amazing mosaic that is finely designed and it creates an ecosystem, a functional ecosystem and so, in answer to M/Sherwood's question about what about the regular species? They are part of the ecosystem and that's why we have too many coyotes because we damage those ecosystems. They are out of balance. And human activities do that. And so, the huge question for all of us is, are we going to continue to fragment our habitats. For example, the lizards we have mitigate disease. Think about plant communities. She doesn't see any of it in the language yet.

Diego Tamayo said he highly agreed with many of the concerns voiced by earlier speakers. He is not clear about the results of the Open Space Map discussions. Are the vacant open spaces that are indicated on Figure 3 in the packet protected for perpetuity? We need these open spaces to be protected and based on how they are mapped, they could be developed in the future if, as it says in the General Plan, in Diamond Bar's history it would have some sort of great use that the City could use for development. Therefore, we need to ensure that these open spaces will not be developed because the land use they are given right now does not seem to be upholding that. He recently toured the new Larkstone development by South Pointe Middle School and they are very horrendous because they are causing the home views and values to plummet dramatically. These huge walls that are being built to hold the earth are causing the value of the homes to plummet \$150,000 each. In the General Plan that is being updated it says that the homes will retain their value and that they will be able to preserve existing communities, but this development is not doing so. So, if there will be more development in the

future of this type we need to be made aware of it. And I believe the development that would take place in the Oak Tree Lanes would be of that same type. He is concerned about that. He thinks it is upsetting. Another thing is that the EIR that was conducted for Diamond Bar was grandfathered by a 2006 EIR. That is not accurate. Science has changed. Now it is more accurate. You need to update the EIR to make sure that developments and General Plans are based on the very current science and the best accuracy you can have. And he also has a solution because in the General Plan Update, you guys are saying let's sustain communities and foster people living here by creating new developments – mixed use, entertainment centers. What he is not seeing is fostering memories – fostering sustainable communities. He does not see that language in there. So he is offering a solution. The City has not celebrated its biodiversity. It does not have any festivals or workshops or gatherings about the biodiversity it has here. That is something residents can celebrate. That can add a value to the residents' lives being here. If you want Diamond Bar to continue being viable, you've got to have value that perhaps a place like El Monte doesn't have. And biodiversity is a big one that I have noticed. That's why his family came here. So using values like these can really help to stem the growth of the City and make sure it doesn't fall into despair and sprawl and plummet into what El Monte has become. So there's a solution for you. Don't allow improper developments like these to occur. Use the updated EIR's and the open spaces need to be protected. Just because it is considered big open space does not mean it is not valuable.

RECESS: VC/Worthington recessed the meeting at 8:58 p.m.

RECONVENE: Chair/St. Amant reconvened the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

VC/Worthington said he did not want to speak for everyone on the committee, but there was a comment earlier that somehow we are an extension of the City Council and he wanted to clarify that even though the GPAC Members were appointed, this is a volunteer position. If you can imagine what that means, it is a major commitment to the City and how one gets on this committee is that you invest in the City and believe in the City. He knows that everyone loves open space and also do not want to see blighted economic conditions – everyone wants the best for the City. He wanted to make sure everyone understands that as GPAC Members they care about the same things every residents cares about. He asked for other GPAC Members to comment on what brought them to this Committee and what their thoughts are on being in this position.

M/V. Ramirez said that the GPAC really appreciates the constructive criticism residents bring to this body during public comments. However, he wanted to encourage everyone to take the example of the way the planners for the Oak Tree development presented their comments and suggestions. GPAC Members are volunteers and get their materials about the same time the residents get them. GPAC

Members review the packets, look through the comments and try to make independent judgments on things. When the public comes up and criticizes, that's great. He notes it, attempts to identify it, and make his edits to the General Plan. He suggested that members of the public take a page from what the Oak Tree Plaza/Ranch Center planners did and come to the microphone and give the GPAC specific language and tell the GPAC what the public wants put into the plan, the language everyone wants. He will consider it and if it meets what he wants and what the public wants he will make a motion to add that language. What the (Oak Tree Plaza/Ranch Center) developers came and presented tonight he does not agree with it, but they did it the right way and he encouraged public speakers/residents to do the same.

VC/Worthington noted that M/Harbin left the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

M/Sherwood agreed that GPAC Members are here voluntarily and we are all concerned about Diamond Bar. He moved here many years ago and watched the City change and cities will change. He believes that one of the things the General Plan does is it provides guidelines and guidelines are just that. They are not necessarily hard and fast, they are targets – what people would like to see happen. But we can only make suggestions and it is up to the entities of the City to follow through on those suggestions. He hopes they continue to pursue the General Plan as it is and as it becomes, but that's all we can do is that we can hope they follow the General Plan guidelines. Yes, he agrees with some of the comments tonight that some of the language in this document is vague, but that gives flexibility which he believes the City needs to have in some areas. If you make things too rigid it may backfire. He is a fan of flexibility. Some of the comments like open space are things that will definitely be addressed in the next session along with Parks and Recreation. The comment was made about five-acres per thousand with which he agrees and is stated in the 1995 General Plan. He presumes that will be the requirement going forward. But that is something that will be dealt with in the future. He thinks everyone here has the interests of Diamond Bar at heart, both the audience and the GPAC Members. He believes everyone also has to realize that with respect to "development," homes get developed and remodeled – businesses get developed, redeveloped/remodeled, so Diamond Bar is morphing. It changes over time and we have to realize that and go with change and hopefully, it is change for the good. But we cannot go backward. We cannot stand still. We have to look to the future and make this City what is best for everybody including developers, residents, and people who work in Diamond Bar. There are a lot of issues that will have to be addressed, but we have to address them with the future in mind and with flexibility in mind.

M/Garg said he agreed with what GPAC Members have said. He is a resident of Diamond Bar since 1979 and Diamond Bar has changed a lot and it is changing for the better and he believes if the City keeps moving forward it will be good. He appreciates Mr. Kashyop's comments who told him he does 40 hours or more a week

to do his research. The GPAC really appreciates everyone's comments and that is how we will make Diamond Bar a better place to live.

VC/Worthington thanked M/Garg and other speakers. In sharing his thoughts, one of the biggest sources of pain for him, driving through Diamond Bar since moving here in 1996, is the blight that is on north Diamond Bar Boulevard by Highland Valley which used to be the Acapulco. He used to go there every week, not because he could sing Karaoke well because he can't, but because it was a really great social gathering spot for north Diamond Bar. And so, he needs something to go there. He does not need to develop new shopping centers, but he wants to take ones that are rundown in areas of the City that can manage that and see those thrive again, not because he wants to see more cars, but because the vibrancy of that community could be really something and Acapulco was a real mainstay for the community and that's what he is interested in seeing – rundown business areas developed into something great again, just like in the former Kmart Shopping Center that is undergoing revitalization.

M/Torng said it has been a great meeting today and he commended staff who did a great job. Without their effort, it would be impossible and they are really patient to listen to everyone. He commended the citizens as well because without their participation, perhaps the GPAC would not come up with certain points. The GPAC's goal is really the same. We are really trying to build a General Plan that will fit the City and residents in the future so let's do this together because everyone is part of the team.

M/Cindy Liu said that GPAC members are volunteers and came to this as volunteers because of their passion and love for Diamond Bar. She has lived here since 1996 and she really appreciates so many neighbors doing so much homework and providing the GPAC with a lot of details. GPAC really appreciates residents pointing out mistakes and misinformation and that can be corrected. The thing is, the GPAC members are not professional planners but we have good will and we are trying our best to understand what is involved in this process and provide staff with the best comments. We all love Diamond Bar and we should all work together like partners. So any mistake can be corrected and whatever decisions are made are made with the best intention.

M/V Ramirez said he appreciates staff's work and the consultant's work because the best intentions are clearly in the work product. He encouraged staff to fix the inconsistencies in the website and public documents that are released. In fact, he would make a motion to that effect. Not just because he needs to know that it is done but so that staff and consultant can engender trust from the public. What he hears a lot from the public is a lack of trust and the trust in part from the inconsistencies in the maps and drawings.

M/V Ramirez moved that for the next GPAC Meeting that inconsistencies in maps and the website be corrected so that the public has a clear understanding of the General Plan and recommendations made by staff.

M/Torng asked if M/V Ramirez could clarify his motion with specifics. For example, if people feel that some of the language is “vague” do we have to really specify it and he would like to know when CDD/Gubman will respond to Public Comments for everyone to know if this development fits into the requirements of the General Plan or not. So for the motion, he felt it should be continued until after comments from CDD/Gubman.

M/V Ramirez said he is open to amendments to the motion, but to clarify his intent, there were several comments that addressed inconsistencies in maps on the web page and people’s inability to get accurate data and information from the website and in his motion he is specifically referring to documents that are released to the public, that they be consistent within the website so that the community feels confident that what they are getting is accurate. That takes a little extra effort, perhaps, in scrutinizing what is released. He is not suggesting that the language in the General Plan some find to be vague needs to be changed, he is simply referring to documents that are available to the public and that we try to eliminate inconsistencies as possible.

M/Sherwood asked to first hear from CDD/Gubman his comments addressing public comments. Chair/St. Amant agreed stating that should have happened immediately prior to GPAC Members comments.

**Response to Public Comments:**

CDD/Gubman addressed comments about the Zoning Map being inconsistent with the General Plan. There are pre-existing conditions where there are errors from the Zoning Map that were adopted decades ago that have been identified through the process of studying parcel by parcel and going through this General Plan Update process. Staff is aware of a few instances on the Zoning Map that are inconsistent with the current General Plan. Whatever is ultimately adopted as the General Plan Land Use Map will dictate how the Zoning Map will be updated to correlate with the General Plan. Going back to the example of the mobile home park, presumably, once the General Plan Update is adopted, those mobile home parks will retain their General Plan designation of Residential Medium-High Density and when the Zoning Map is updated those Zoning designations will be corrected accordingly. There are inconsistencies in other areas as well. There are RL Residential Zoning District land use designations that have an RLM Zoning designation and other nuances of that sort. Those will be addressed after the General Plan is adopted and the Zoning Map Update occurs following the General Plan adoption.

CDD/Gubman proceeded to provide some clarification about density and the size of residential dwelling units. Density is a metric that determines how many dwelling units are permitted per acre. It is not a metric that deals with development standards of a building's square footage or how much of the lot the building can cover. So if there is a Zoning designation that has an RLM designation on the Zoning Map and the General Plan is RL and one is looking at existing housing stock, the development standards are the same with the underlying General Plan designation prevailing. If it has a lower density designation, the land cannot be subdivided to increase density.

To what Ms. Smith had recited about a conversation purportedly with him, he is sorry that he does not recall having a conversation where the things that were quoted back that were attributed to him and those quotes do not comport to how projects are reviewed. She did make a reference to a long list of comments that were pointing out issues with the Existing Conditions Report and he recalls responding that those comments were accepted at that time to be early NOP comments. So, those types of comments are typically solicited when the Notice of Preparation for the Environmental Impact Report is sent out and those comments have been filed and will be incorporated as part of the body of NOP comments received and will be published accordingly. For example, there is the observation about the woodland areas and whether that should be designated oak or walnut, and that is something that can certainly be responded to in the General Plan EIR preparation process. Staff has received those comments and references to those areas which will then be addressed which is how the process works. The timing is such that we are reaching the point in the process where those comments would then be incorporated into the administrative record.

CDD/Gubman stated there were some comments about omissions or topics that were not addressed this evening. The General Plan will be comprised of eight Elements and tonight we focused on Land Use, Economic Development and Resource Conservation and the team provided the Draft Policies for those Elements. During the next two meetings in July and August the team will bring forward Draft Policies for Public Services and Facilities which includes parks and that is where there would be the requirement for how much parkland acreage per 1000 persons would be the goal. Currently, the (1995) General Plan requires five acres per 1000 residents and it is staff's intent to perpetuate that in the Draft Public Services and Facilities Element. There will be new General Plan Elements that currently do not exist in the 1995 General Plan document including Community Health and Sustainability and Community Character and Placemaking going beyond the land use designations, and uses how intense or how dense they can be. There will also be policy language about the healthy communities and reviewing development and ensuring that we are establishing places or settings where people want to visit, not just to park and pick up their retail items and leave, but create "places" that go beyond that scope with such things as the GPAC and public have asked, to incorporate green areas, plazas and open spaces. Those are the ingredients that go into Placemaking and they will be

coming forward. Staff brings forward two or three General Plan Elements at a time to enable the GPAC to focus on more manageable chunks. Ultimately, these Elements will be compiled into one internally integrated General Plan Document which is what the team is working through during these summer months to get the GPAC and public's initial feedback on the Draft Policy language. If the draft language is acceptable to the GPAC along with whatever deletions or additions the GPAC deems necessary, staff and the team will come back early next year with a Draft General Plan document that fleshes out all of that direction and everyone will have the opportunity to go through that document to see if the direction the GPAC provided staff has been appropriately reflected in the draft document. As soon as staff gets the "green light" that the language that has been presented to the GPAC along with whatever direction the GPAC provides will then be what the GPAC and public sees when the Draft General Plan Update document ultimately comes forward.

CDD/Gubman offered to respond to any other comments or questions.

**b) GPAC Deliberation and Motions:**

M/Torng asked CDD/Gubman to comment on the developer's presentation. Does the GPAC have to adjust anything in order for this project to be accepted or does the developer have to change their plan to comply with the new General Plan.

CDD/Gubman responded to M/Torng that the current 1995 General Plan designation and Zoning designation for those two shopping centers on which this project is proposed are "Commercial" and under the current policy and regulatory documents adopted by the City, this development that is shown on the site plan is not permissible and it would require a General Plan amendment to accommodate and incorporate a residential component. The merits of the project will ultimately be reviewed by the Planning Commission and City Council, but the project would have to be consistent with the General Plan that is in effect at the time that the final decision to approve or disapprove is made. At the last GPAC meeting, the committee was presented with Neighborhood Mixed-Use Guiding and Implementing policies that would affect this proposed development. The policy language the GPAC accepted at the last meeting for the Neighborhood Mixed-Use designation included requiring that parking be located at the rear of buildings, and that the majority (50-plus percent) of the first 1,000 feet of frontage at the endpoints of the district would have to be commercial frontage. Said another way, from Highland Valley 1000 feet down, at least 501 feet of that frontage would need to be commercial. The developer's representative presented the GPAC with some alternatives to that policy language. If the GPAC is prepared to direct staff to accept any of those changes or whether the GPAC is comfortable with what has already been reviewed, or if the GPAC would like for staff to take their recommended alternatives and come back to the GPAC with staff's

advice, that can be done. It is up to the GPAC how they would choose to direct staff with what was presented.

M/V Ramirez commented on the proposed language for the development at the Oak Tree Lanes stating he would prefer that the GPAC hear staff's recommendation on the language. He personally disagrees with the developer's proposed language and believes the language established by the GPAC of creating at least 51 percentage "Commercial" frontage creates true mixed-use and that's what this community wants—true mixed-use.

M/Garg asked the time line for finishing the Zoning Map after the General Plan is adopted and CDD/Gubman responded that based on past experience, about two years after adoption of a General Plan, a Comprehensive Zoning Code update would follow because we are not just updating the Map but also the entire Zoning Code including development standards and land use zoning tables.

M/Ching Liu said that there are many things to plan and draft and the public has time for public comments. She asked if there was a more efficient way of putting these documents together.

CDD/Gubman responded to M/C Liu that ultimately, the Maps that were provided in the report show—for example, habitat areas, open space inventory, watersheds, etc.—and those are the background data sets that inform what the preferred General Plan Map is and Figure 1, the preferred plan, is a reflection of the different maps that identify where the undeveloped land is or where watersheds are. There was the map that inventoried just the parkland and the undeveloped land. And then the preferred plan shows all of the areas that are City-owned or privately owned and are already restricted by their homeowner's association (designated open space). All of those other maps and information provided in them get filtered through to the Preferred Plan which reflect all of those ingredients. Staff can try to draw the path from how all of those different maps ultimately coalesce into becoming the Preferred Plan.

Katherine Pan said that if M/Ching Liu is asking for a more efficient way to do the revisions based on what the GPAC has discussed today, what would be helpful for her is to have some direction on the types of issues that the GPAC thinks should be looked into further. For example, should the GPAC Members disagree on certain things, if the team can identify the overarching issue it can be research on what other communities have done about that issue, for example, and make appropriate revisions. The way that the summer meetings are structured with two more meetings that will include even more policies for different elements will continue as scheduled rather than bring revisions each time. There was a set of revisions presented this time because they are related to the land use policy for the mixed-use areas. Due to the timeline, the consulting team will continue moving forward with new policies, get feedback from the GPAC and public and take everything cumulatively that has been

said and try to make a revised version which will be presented later prior to anything being finalized. After review of the next revision it should be okay to move on to the Environmental Review as the next step for the Planning Commission and City Council to address any lingering questions. M/C Liu asked if there might be a way to have more conversation with the public.

Katherine Pan responded that there will be another public workshop.

VC/Worthington said that someone commented that there was no public workshop in March 2018.

CDD/Gubman responded no. As the work product developed, deliverables have caused adjustments to the scheduling. The second community workshop was held in October 2017. The updated schedule lists Community Workshop #3 in the winter of 2019. Based on the current progress, that is the more likely date for the workshop. Advance notice of the exact date, time and location would be publicized about a month prior to the actual workshop.

VC/Worthington asked if would be possible to have a fourth quarter 2018 workshop and CDD/Gubman responded that he does not see how there could be a workshop without a work product ready to present.

SP/Lee provided an estimated future timeline of the General Plan Update schedule and stated that there would be additional opportunities for the public to comment on the Draft General Plan:

Two more meetings to cover the policies only for the remainder of the Elements (July and August) after which the Draft EIR and Draft General Plan will be prepared. Once the Draft General Plan document is written there will be three additional GPAC meetings to review and discuss the Draft General Plan. Following or between the three GPAC meetings there will be a third Public Workshop on the Draft General Plan. There will be an additional Public Workshop on the EIR and there will be a Public Hearing before the Planning Commission to review the Draft EIR.

Chair/St. Amant asked if there was a mechanism in place for the GPAC to take areas that are already built out due to clustering that have land left over. For instance, the piece of land on Diamond Bar Boulevard south of Mountain Laurel and east of Diamond Bar Boulevard north of the apartments can be designated Open Space – land which is owned by them but is built out. Or, the area south of Longview Park on the east side of Diamond Bar south of Grand Avenue. If so, could these locations be reflected as open space on the Map because there is a lot of open space that looks like it cannot be developed, some of which is already built out.

CDD/Gubman said that the Diamond Bar/Mountain Laurel area may already be physically encumbered because there is a detention basin in that apartment complex that is part of that parcel and it may have been developed where the overall density was clustered into where the units are so that the permissible development capacity may have already been exhausted where open space designation may be possible. It is private property and there are some Constitutional issues that arise when looking to imposing an "open space" designation on privately-owned property. Staff would have to look into this and come back to the GPAC for further discussion. This property is not as straightforward as the Crestview Homeowners Association common areas where there is already a tract map restriction prohibiting development. There is no "taking" that would occur if there was an open space designation placed on it. At this time, he cannot comment on what legal exposure or Constitutional challenge may arise if that was done but staff can look into the matter.

Chair/St. Amant asked the GPAC if there was any interest in changing any of the items that were brought up earlier (LU-I-8/16, LU-I-9 and LU-I-14) or would the GPAC prefer to stay with staff's recommendation.

M/Sherwood was curious why these changes were suggested. Perhaps Ms. Tropiano could provide the GPAC with insights as to why the changes were requested.

M/Torng felt the GPAC had made the decision judging from CDD/Gubman's remarks. As far as the language regarding M/V Ramirez motion, he believes there have been many, many varying comments. The consultant also mentioned that the GPAC could add on to the motion that in addition to his clarification and ask staff and the consultant to review all of their comments and at their discretion, make appropriate adjustments and include it in the revised General Plan to review in the future.

M/V Ramirez said he welcomed that friendly amendment to the motion.

M/Sherwood asked for a point of order. If you have a motion, don't you vote on that motion first? Chair/Amant said that amendments can be offered to the original motion. M/V Ramirez reiterated that it is a friendly amendment which he would welcome and encourage a second on the amendment.

M/V Ramirez restated the motion as follows: Motion for staff to review the existing figures and maps associated with public documents including the website to correct discrepancies where possible, or to note that maps cannot be changed until the Final General Plan is adopted to make clear notes so that people understand that these are maps that cannot be changed.

M/Torng restated his amendment as follows: direct staff and consultant to wherever possible and at their discretion, revise the language of the policies based on public comments. M/Evans seconded the amendment.

M/Busse	yes
M/Evans	yes
M/Garg	yes
M/Harbin	yes
M/Ching Liu	yes
M/Cindy Liu	yes
M/Mao	yes
M/M Ramirez	yes
M/V Ramirez	yes
M/Sherwood	yes
M/Torng	yes
VC/Worthington	yes
Chair/St. Amant	yes

M/Sherwood asked what “allow clustering or transferring of all or part of the development potential of a site to a portion of the site to preserve significant environmental resources such as vegetation, etc.” means as stated in the Implementing Policies (LU-I-2) Page 2 of the Land Use Document.

Chair/St. Amant offered M/Sherwood the example of a 10-acre site where 1 dwelling per acre is allowed, clustering means a developer could put all 10 of those dwellings on one acre and leave the other nine acres open.

M/V Ramirez proposed language for GPAC’s consideration. He said he liked Figure #3 of Attachment 1 of the Preferred Plan for the Town Center Mixed-Use and he would like to insert language in or between LU-I-32 & 33 on Page 9 to wit: Study the introduction of safe pedestrian connectivity between the north and south sections of the Town Center Mixed-Use project site including the possibility of a pedestrian bridge or bridges which he introduced as a motion that was seconded by M/Mao.

M/Sherwood asked M/V Ramirez to consider amending his motion to include and at Lorbeer Middle School to which he agreed which was seconded by M/Evans. Motion carried by the following Roll Call vote:

M/Busse	yes
M/Evans	yes
M/Garg	yes
M/Harbin	yes
M/Ching Liu	yes
M/Cindy Liu	yes

M/Mao	yes
M/M Ramirez	yes
M/V Ramirez	yes
M/Sherwood	yes
M/Torng	yes
VC/Worthington	yes
Chair/St. Amant	yes

Chair/St. Amant offered the addition of language under Air Quality on Page 7 Implementing Policies RC-I-28b to wit: whole house fans, variable speed pumps for pools and citywide LED lighting.

Katherine Pan said the Greenhouse Gasses/Climate Change related General Plan Policies will be included in the Community Health and Sustainability Section at the next meeting and if there is a place for them to be listed it can be worked in. If it seems better to include them here, that can be done. Also, once the GPAC gets into the Climate Action Plan if there is some distance between the projections and state targets, that plan would propose measures to get those down to the state target levels and those strategies tend to be more specific because they have to be quantified in a model. Yes, there is a place for this language in one of the three aforementioned areas.

Chair/St. Amant said he knows that the state will also require solar and is it necessary for Diamond Bar to include that for any new developments. Ms. Pan said that solar will be addressed in Energy Efficiency Climate Change Policies.

CDD/Gubman suggested that something like a whole house fan and LED lights not be specified because technology may come up with something equal or better in the future. Chair/St. Amant offered to include instead “energy efficient cooling and energy efficient lighting” and CDD/Gubman said he believed the metrics that would be defined in the Climate Action Plan would say to ensure that greenhouse gas emission generated by residences meets those targets through whatever technologies come online.

CDD/Gubman asked for clarification on the recommended policy modifications from the Foremost and Chair/Amant said there was consensus to go with staff’s recommendations.

M/V Ramirez said he would like to hear staff’s recommendation. He has his personal opinions about the edits requested by the developer’s planner, but he would like to hear staff’s views as well. M/V Ramirez said he prefers the existing language because the existing language creates a true Mixed-Use Neighborhood and developers want to make money and so if they can create more units and less

commercial and less parkland, great, they make money. But the community has spoken and he believes it wants a true mixed-use neighborhood.

M/Sherwood said that the GPAC has been given this suggestion and if Ms. Tropiano can have a couple of minutes he would like to hear her rationale for the changes.

VC/Worthington said the only issue is that if Ms. Tropiano comes back up to speak, the meeting may have to be opened back up to public comment.

CDD/Gubman said that if a GPAC member has a specific question Ms. Tropiano could respond. M/Sherwood said he would pass.

M/Mao said he would like to hear staff's comments about the proposed changes rather than open it back up to public comment.

CDD/Gubman said that staff has provided its recommendations regarding this project and continue to be comfortable with those recommendations. He is not prepared to evaluate the merits of the alternatives that are presented this evening and short of giving staff specific direction to evaluate the alternatives that were suggested, staff would need to look at this and provide analysis because staff drafted recommended policies previously based on what staff felt was appropriate.

M/Cindy Liu said she would like to change her vote to "no" on the recommendations for connectivity with the south and north town center because at this time, traveling between the two sites is good because if you require the connection people would have to walk back and forth. Chair/St. Amant said that one would not have to walk, one could drive if they chose to. M/Cindy Liu said that in that case, her original vote was good.

M/Sherwood commented that he is good with the language we have for the Neighborhood Mixed-Use designation and he thinks any issues this developer (Foremost Companies) has can be taken up with the Planning Commission.

M/Evans asked Ms. Tropiano a question off-mike.

Ms. Tropiano said she is not asking the GPAC to make a recommendation on this specific project tonight and the GPAC is not being asked to evaluate the merits of the project. She said she would answer the questions that meets the objectives of the GPAC's rule. Based on the information that her firm has reviewed as part of the Land Use Alternatives report and the Draft Guiding Principles and Implement Policies, there are over three dozen her firm feels apply to this project. She brought to the GPAC's attention only three specific policies that warrant some additional attention. The remainder of those, her firm has worked hard to achieve that are articulated in the Land Use Alternatives Report and in the Implementing Policies and Guiding

Principles included in this draft plan. Those that we have asked for specific consideration of are really the result of developing a very complicated set of policies and seeing how they apply to a site when you start to design a site including a variety of uses which they hear the community wants to see here. As you start to integrate these benefits – commercial, residential, and a public park there are logistical considerations that need to be given as a result of on the ground development in a proposed project her firm feels represents the majority of a Mixed-Use idea at this location that also complies with the community’s vision to single family detached housing projects that are in compliance and conform well with the surrounding neighborhood which she heard loud and clear. For those components they are asking the GPAC to consider, it is really with the intent to develop a project that they feel accurately represents the vision the community has for the mixed-use neighborhood area. In short, Foremost has worked hard on this matter and wants to prepare a project that truly reflects the vision for the community that is also a feasible beneficial project that stimulates the revitalization and investment in north Diamond Bar in a positive light that really helps the community grow and achieve the visions the community has laid out for this specific area. They have included a mix of commercial and residential development along with a dedicated public park that will be available to the project residents as well as, all residents of north Diamond Bar.

Chair/St. Amant echoed what a lot of GPAC members have said about everyone who works on the GPAC. We are all volunteers. He has lived in the community since 1980 and began working in the City since 1990 as a Deputy Sheriff on regular patrol, as team leader, liaison between the City and the Sheriff’s Station, liaison between the schools and the Sheriff’s Station with crime prevention, community relations and special projects and the last six years as a reserve. He did not think anyone knew more about Diamond Bar than he did because he is here all of the time and has been everywhere in the City and then he was given this document which is just maybe half of what the GPAC has to do which opened his eyes to the fact that he did not know the City as well as he thought. While much of it was not his expertise or interest, but he knows a lot more in the last year and a half than he did in the last 38 years of living here. No one on the GPAC is getting paid for this, we are all volunteers and we all want to see this City improve. We all love Diamond Bar or we wouldn’t be devoting the time and energy. Reading these documents is not like reading a novel – it is not easy reading and it requires days and nights of reading. He thanked the committee members for the work they have done and will do.

**7. REVIEW OF NEXT STEPS:**

As stated during GPAC comments.

**8. DATES FOR FUTURE MEETINGS:**

The next GPAC meeting is scheduled for July 19, 2018.

**ADJOURNMENT:** With no further business before the General Plan Advisory Committee, Chair/St. Amant adjourned the meeting at 10:40 p.m.

The foregoing minutes are hereby approved this 19<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2018.

Attest:  
Respectfully Submitted,

---

Greg Gubman  
Community Development Director

---

Brian Worthington, Vice Chairperson