

July 17, 2019

THE WALNUT CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

A Regular Meeting of the Walnut City Planning Commission (PC) was held on the above-referenced date. Chairperson Perez called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

**FLAG SALUTE:** Commissioner Koo

**ROLL CALL:** Commissioners: Perez, Dy, Fernandez, Koo

**ABSENT:** Commissioner: Wu

**ALSO PRESENT:** Assistant City Manager – Development Services Weiner; City Planner Carlson; City Attorney Leibold; City Engineer Gilbertson; Senior Planner Vasquez; Senior Management Analyst Guerra; Associate Planner Yang; Assistant Planner Munoz; Community Development Technician Katigbak.

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

C/Perez opened Oral Communications for Public Comment(s).

C/Perez closed Oral Communications for Public Comment(s).

**PLANNING COMMISSION REORGANIZATION:**

**1. Planning Commission Reorganization**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission elect a Chairperson and Vice-Chair Person to serve through June 30, 2020.

**Planning Commission Reorganization:**

CA/Leibold opened the nominations for Chairperson of the PC.

C/Perez nominated VC/Dy for Chairperson. CA/Leibold moved to close nominations. Without objection motion passed 4-0.

CA/Leibold opened nomination for Vice-Chairperson. PC/Fernandez nominated PC/Koo for Vice-Chairperson. Without objection motion passed 4-0.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**2. June 5, 2019 (Regular Meeting Minutes).**

PC/Perez motioned to approve the minutes of June 5, 2019. VC/Koo seconded. Motion passed 4-0.

**PUBLIC HEARING(S):**

**3. Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 2019-001 (Union 76):** A request to establish and operate a drive-thru car wash service as well as expand the existing service station and retail area at the existing gas and auto service station (Union 76) located at 18702 Amar Road (APN: 8735-026-026).

AP/Yang presented the Staff Report.

C/Dy mentioned that the Applicant is requesting for a continuance of the item off calendar and questioned if the item needs to undergo Public Comment and/or requires a PC vote for a motion.

CA/Leibold stated that because the item was publically noticed, procedurally it would need to go through the process of Public Comment(s).

**C/Dy opened the item for Public Comment(s).**

**C/Dy closed the item for Public Comment(s).**

**MOTIONED ON ITEM 3**

**VC/Koo motioned to continue CUP 2019-001 off-calendar. C/Perez seconded.**

**ROLL CALL:**

**AYES: Dy, Koo, Fernandez, Perez**

**NOES: None**

**ABSTAIN: None**

**ABSENT: Wu**

**Motion to continue passed 4-0.**

**4. First Amendment to the adopted 2013-2021 Housing Element of the Walnut General Plan.**

SP/Vasquez presented the Staff Report.

**C/Dy opened the item for Public Comment(s).**

**C/Dy closed the item for Public Comment(s).**

PC/Perez questioned Staff on the timing of the Amendment with relation to the next cycle of the Housing Element update.

SP/Vasquez stated that the time period will not change, however, an update to the General Plan (GP) will be required. SP/Vasquez elaborated that Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is in the process of assigning Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers and that once the numbers have been assigned to the City; Staff will begin the update to the Housing Element.

VC/Koo asked if the City receives credit upon issuance of Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) permits.

The Commission and Staff further discussed ADU's in relation to the Housing Element.

CA/Leibold stated that based on the Amendment to the chart listed in the Housing Element, The Terraces at Walnut Development would provide above-moderate income units and that the allocation for lower and moderate-income units would be moved to the proposed site four (4) (Mount San Antonio Center).

**MOTIONED ON ITEM 4**

**C/Dy motioned to adopt PC Resolution No. 19-07 to recommend to the Walnut City Council approval of the first Amendment to the 2013-2021 Housing Element of the Walnut General Plan. PC/Perez seconded.**

**ROLL CALL:**

**AYES: Dy, Koo, Fernandez, Perez**

**NOES: None**

**ABSTAIN: None**

**ABSENT: Wu**

**Motion to continue passed 4-0.**

**5. The Terraces at Walnut Development (49 Acres):** A proposal to subdivide a 49-acre property for the purpose of developing residential units, a commercial center, pocket parks, and open space (APN: 8709-023-006/007/008).

SMA/Guerra presented the Staff Report.

PC/Fernandez asked Staff if the PC will be receiving any Site Plan Case and Architectural Reviews (SPC/AR) for the residential units and the proposed future townhomes.

SMA/Guerra confirmed that the SPC/AR's attached to the Staff Report are for grading purposes on four (4) separate lots outside of the project site.

**C/Dy motioned to open the item for Public Comment(s).**

Shea Home's Representative, John Danvers, introduced himself and further discussed the project's description, development challenges and public outreach. Mr. Danvers mentioned that through working with neighboring properties the proposed project was able to incorporate mitigation of environmental impact(s) by reducing the size of the walls and amount of excess dirt.

KTGY's Representative, John Moreland, introduced himself and further discussed the vision of the project's development. Mr. Moreland mentioned creating healthy outdoor activities, enhancing the gateway into the City and connectivity with the existing trail system for residents and guests. Mr. Moreland stated that if the project were to maximize the density allowed, per the Housing Element, at 36 units/acre it would yield approximately 760 units on the site; but the project proposes 290 units/acre – at the lower end of the range – and is still consistent with the Housing Element at 12.7 units/acre.

Mr. Danvers mentioned that Condition of Approval (COA) #78 states that all parks must be completed prior to the completion of grading. He notes that the proposed phasing plan (COA #52) – would indicate when the parks would be complete.

PC/Perez asked the Applicant if there is a joint venture with Shea Homes for this development.

Mr. Danvers mentioned that Shea Homes is acting as the project manager and that Sunjoint Development is the owner and Applicant for the property.

C/Dy asked for clarification regarding the conversion of the townhomes from three (3)-story attached townhomes to two (2)-story detached townhomes.

Mr. Danvers discusses the changes to the two (2)-story detached single-family homes.

C/Dy asked the Applicant if the proposal is consistent with what is illustrated on the map provided. C/Dy additionally asked if the two (2) building pads located on the lower portion with the commercial pad are fifteen (15') feet lower than the townhomes pad.

Mr. Danvers confirmed that the maps and the illustration of the commercial center being fifteen (15') feet lower than the townhomes is accurate.

Resident, Alexis Olivas asked which two (2) properties on Roundup Drive will be graded.

SMA/Guerra stated that 22166 and 22138 Roundup Drive are the two (2) addresses outside of the project site that would be graded.

Resident, Robert Anderson further discussed past concerns regarding the initial proposal of a thirty (30') foot wall abutting the project site's property line. Mr. Anderson mentioned after discussing options with Shea Homes, a solution was made to fill the valley between the project site and his property with the excess dirt from the proposed project grading.

Resident, Robert Deidrick expressed concerns regarding the grading of 22138 and 22166 Roundup Drive and questioned if the neighboring properties would lay thirty (30)-feet lower. Mr. Deidrick further asked if there will be access from Snow Creek into the proposed development.

ACM/Weiner mentioned that there will be a secondary access for emergency vehicle access only, in addition to a pedestrian access path to the proposed commercial development.

Mr. Anderson and the PC further discussed the grading on neighboring properties within the vicinity of the subject site.

Resident, Matthew Rzonca expressed concerns regarding potential vandalism on the proposed Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) walls. Mr. Rzonca further discussed the proposed three (3) story homes, where three (3) stories are prohibited in other portions of the City.

Resident, Larry Waldie commended the Applicant for the proposed development of the commercial center.

**C/Dy motioned to close the item for Public Comment(s). PC/Perez seconded.**

PC/Perez commented that the item proposal is for the subdivision of the land and not the architectural design.

C/Dy questioned if tonight's item is more than a Tentative Tract Map (TTM) approval.

ACM/Weiner stated that a General Plan Amendment (GPA), TTM, Specific Plan (SP), and an Environment Impact Report (EIR) are before the PC for review. ACM/Weiner mentioned that the final design of the homes and the commercial center will come back to the PC for review.

C/Dy shared concerns regarding the significant reduction of the commercial component, development of the MSE walls, and the grade differential between the townhomes and the commercial center.

**C/Dy re-opened the item for Public Comment(s).**

Mr. Danvers further addressed the public's comments and discussed clarification on project details with the PC.

C/Dy and Mr. Danvers go on to discuss the commercial component of the project.

VC/Koo asked the type of commercial development that is expected to be constructed and what are the target tenant(s) to utilize the space(s).

Mr. Danvers mentioned that the commercial development can range from a 16,000 to 17,000 square-foot building; which can support up to seventy (70%) percent food uses. Mr. Danvers mentioned that there are major vendors interested in the site, however, nothing has been finalized.

VC/Koo and Mr. Danvers further discussed potential businesses for the proposed development.

PC/Fernandez commended the developer for reaching out to the community. PC/Fernandez shared concerns about implementing denser townhomes and asked if the developer considered expanding vertically as opposed to horizontally with mixed-use commercial and residential.

Mr. Danvers mentioned that vertical expansion was analyzed earlier and due to the market demand and topography, it would not be feasible for the project.

PC/Fernandez inquired why a private drive aisle was not created between Lots #29 and #30.

Mr. Moreland stated that between Lots #29 and #30 are the proposed MSE retaining walls and that by creating more breaks in the walls it could potentially compromise the structural integrity.

PC/Fernandez suggested eliminating Lots #29 and #30 to create a private drive aisle for better vehicular circulation. PC/Fernandez expressed concerns about the usability of the proposed pocket parks and suggested enlarging Lots E, F, and G by removing residential Lots #29 and #91. PC/Fernandez further discussed improvements to the pedestrian circulation by connecting the pocket parks to the commercial development.

C/Dy suggested connecting the pocket parks with the proposed commercial development by constructing switchback walls as opposed to a stairway, and that each pocket park should have its own character by implementing different components. C/Dy recommended increasing the commercial component by adding more building square footage.

Mr. Danvers further discussed the equipment and amenities of the pocket parks.

VC/Koo discussed the uneven distribution of guest parking.

Mr. Moreland mentioned that the SP requires all detached single-family residences to accommodate parking for a minimum of two (2)-cars. Mr. Moreland further stated that the project provides head-in parking between every other unit; the TTM illustrates triangular cut-outs that indicate where guest parking will be located.

PC/Fernandez inquired about on-street parking along the private drive aisles.

Mr. Moreland clarified that on-street parking will be prohibited, except along Street B between Lots #1 and #12.

CE/Gilbertson mentioned that the street is too narrow to accommodate curbside parking. CE/Gilbertson verified that the drive aisles are comprised of twenty-six (26') foot wide rolled curbs.

PC/Fernandez inquired about feasibility and removing Lots #29 and #30 in order to provide a private drive aisle.

CE/Gilbertson stated that it would require a substantial redesign; the grade between Lots #13 through #50 would need to be significantly lowered.

The PC and CE/Gilbertson further discussed details regarding conceptual grading to accommodate a private drive aisle and potential issues of circulation with the proposed plan.

Mr. Moreland stated that Lot B will provide an emergency vehicle access and there will be two (2) points of egress for emergencies purposes.

PC/Fernandez asked if there was a reason this emergency access was not to be utilized by the public.

Mr. Moreland indicated that due to the grade and width of the street, it does not meet the minimum requirements to be utilized for purposes other than emergencies.

PC/Dy suggested eliminating lots as residential units in order to create additional parking zones.

CE/Gilbertson mentioned that the guest parking is spread throughout the development and does meet the minimum requirements. In addition, some of the pocket parks do have designated guest parking areas.

PC/Koo suggested the alternative of creating additional pocket parks near the Northeast corner of the terrace to better distribute guest parking.

Mr. Moreland provided details regarding available guest parking.

PC/Fernandez questioned if the Home Owner's Association (HOA) will regulate guest parking.

Mr. Danvers verified that the HOA will regulate each property owner's utilization of the garage and driveway space(s).

C/Dy suggested that the HOA provide a mechanism to limit over-night parking completely along all of the streets as it relates to guest parking.

PC/Fernandez inquired about pedestrian connectivity from Lot H to the commercial center.

CE/Gilbertson discussed walkability and pedestrian enhancements along the private drive aisle on Street A and B.

C/Dy suggested that the bio-retention area be converted into a decorative storm water drainage area wherein residents can utilize this area similarly to the proposed pocket parks.

Mr. Danvers further discussed the proposed on site storm water basins.

VC/Koo questioned if the project proposes to construct a parkway.

Mr. Moreland confirmed that a parkway will be constructed and that Street B1, along the Northeast side of Valley Boulevard to the next intersection will not consist of a sidewalk.

PC/Fernandez suggested a stairway from the middle of the townhomes pad to the commercial center.

Mr. Danvers stated that development of a stairway from the townhomes lot to the commercial center has not been studied.

PC/Fernandez noted that the SP promotes walkability and in order to properly achieve this method is to construct accessibility from the townhomes to the commercial center.

CE/Gilbertson distinguished that creating access from the townhomes to the commercial center may be possible, however, a site plan would be required to assess its feasibility.

PC/Fernandez requested a COA in order to construct a stairway from the townhomes to the commercial center when the final Tract Map and Site Plan are submitted. PC/Fernandez suggested constructing larger pocket parks by dedicating six (6) residential lots to Lots F, G, and H respectively.

C/Dy expressed interest in increasing the amount of parking and density of the commercial center by encroaching into the area of the proposed townhomes. C/Dy mentioned increasing the size of the pocket parks and amount of guest parking available to residents.

ACM/Weiner commented that during staff's attendance at the International Council of Shopping Center's (ICSC) Convention developers deemed that the front is viable, however, the rear portion would mainly consist of medical offices or other non-retail/restaurant uses.

ACM/Weiner stated that at the rear of the commercial component is a storm drain easement and by encroaching into the rear it may compromise the parking requirements. ACM/Weiner briefly discussed the Development Agreement (DA).

The PC and Applicant's representative(s) further discuss parking and the commercial lot.

Mr. Moreland stated that based off project related financial impacts, more discussions would have to occur with the owner (Sunjoint). Mr. Moreland further discussed the analysis of the commercial viability of the project.

ACM/Weiner briefly discussed the City's characteristics and desires for commercial development and mentioned that recommendations to the City Council (CC) can be made in the form of COA(s). ACM/Weiner further discussed what would be in the form of a COA and/or what should be directly discussed with the CC.

The PC and Applicant further discussed the development of a potential 30,000 square-foot commercial component and how it would meet the minimum parking requirements.

PC/Fernandez clarified with Staff that the approval is for the TTM and asked if the adjustments to the size and massing can be made when the SPC/AR's are submitted.

ACM/Weiner confirmed that all SPC/AR's shall be subject to review and approval by the PC. ACM/Weiner mentioned that the DA does not allow the Applicant to propose anything less than what has been documented in the SP.

C/Dy asked Staff if the PC can approve a specific portion of the project and place comments and conditions on the commercial and townhome region that the project must return back to the PC for review.

ACM/Weiner suggested that the PC create flexibility regarding alterations to the SP in terms of what could occur, such as future lot line adjustments.

C/Dy requested clarification on what the PC was specifically reviewing/approving.

CA/Leibold stated that the review is for a TTM, SP, GPA, DA, a SPC/AR for grading, and the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

ACM/Weiner reiterated that the SPC/AR for the design of the residential units and commercial development are subject to review and approval by the PC at a future date; when the Applicant formally submits to Staff for review.

PC/Fernandez questioned what assurances have been implemented within the DA in order to avoid an additional undeveloped lot, noting the Shea development off Suzanne Road and Valley Boulevard.

ACM/Weiner mentioned that the DA specifically states that half, approximately 8,000 square-feet, of the commercial development must be built prior to permits being issued for the residential units; an extension fee will be assessed on behalf of the commercial site if it is not built during a certain time frame.

The PC and Staff further discussed the DA and project timeline.

CA/Leibold reiterated that when the first 8,000 square-feet of phase one (1) of the commercial is complete, then the City will allow up to an additional fifty-eight (58) building permits for residential units prior to completion of the second phase of the commercial component. The developer has the option to continue up to one-hundred and fifty-one (151) residential units by paying an additional DA for each of the units without the development of half of the commercial component.

Mr. Rzonca expressed concerns and suggested placing a COA in order to prohibit the further subdivision of the commercial lot and questioned the landscape maintenance of the slopes within the residences.



The PC and Staff further discussed Mr. Rzonca's concerns and the potential issues of fragmented ownership due to additional subdivision(s).

PC/Perez commented on the enhancement of the pedestrian experience, especially to support the commercial aspect of the project and the complete parking plan provided throughout the development.

PC/Fernandez stated that the PC can place a COA to not allow further subdivision of the commercial lot and/or leave the land as is and let the developer return to the PC to request further subdivision if so desired. PC/Fernandez asked Staff if the landscaped portion of the development will be maintained by the HOA

SMA/Guerra confirmed that all the landscape within the project site shall be maintained by the HOA.

Mr. Olivas requested clarification that the residents of Snow Creek will have access to the emergency road that connects the Terraces to Roundup Drive.

C/Dy recalled that Staff mentioned the access road would be available for emergency vehicles only, however, residents may utilize the pedestrian pathway.

VC/Koo further discussed concerns regarding the available guest parking. VC/Koo requested additional guest parking spaces between Lots #124 and #125, #194 and #195, and between #208 and #209.

Mr. Moreland stated that the lots discussed are utilized as locations for the utility transformers.

C/Dy questioned if it would be possible to locate the utility transformers underground in order to leverage the above ground use.

Mr. Danvers discussed that Southern California Edison once had BURD transformers wherein the utility transformers would be placed underground, however, due to safety hazards and maintenance standards, this was discontinued.

VC/Koo asked if it would be possible to create additional guest parking towards the Northeast edge of the development.

Mr. Moreland explained Lot #135 may be a viable site for additional guest parking spaces.

PC/Fernandez requested that the Applicant submit a formal guest parking plan for the CC to review and for Staff and the Applicant to conduct a feasibility study of the connectivity from both Lot H and the middle of the proposed townhomes pad to the commercial center. PC/Fernandez also requested that the pocket parks Lots E, F, G, and H be enlarged by eliminating residential lots and possibly adding additional guest parking on those lots.

C/Dy asked for clarification on whether the PC can add COA(s) regarding parking restrictions being included in the CC&Rs.

CA/Leibold requested that the PC condition for a formal parking plan to be submitted and further described within the CC&R's, and that the revocation of any and all parking regulations for the development would be prohibited without City Consent.

The PC and CA further discuss the possible restrictions and COA(s) that can be included in the CC&Rs.

PC/Perez questioned how the project can increase the size of the proposed pocket parks.

PC/Fernandez suggested that by reducing the amount of residential lots by eight (8) it will allow the increase of space that can be allocated towards the pocket parks and additional guest parking spaces.

VC/Koo commented that there shall be at least one (1) pocket park per terrace.

C/Dy reiterated the importance of increasing the density of the commercial component in order to create a vibrant street frontage off Valley Boulevard.

PC/Perez asked PC/Fernandez for clarification on increasing the size of pocket parks on Lots F and H.

PC/Fernandez confirmed the request to increase the size of the pocket parks on Lots F and H.

The PC further discussed the amount and which specific residential lots were to be reduced to accommodate the concerns regarding the guest parking and pocket parks.

C/Dy suggested that if the amount of residential lots were reduced by eight (8) then every other pocket park will gain two (2) extra residential units on each side, rather than every pocket park increasing in size.

#### **MOTIONED ON ITEM 5**

**PC/Perez motioned to recommend to the Walnut City Council the certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) which includes the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). C/Dy seconded.**

#### **ROLL CALL:**

**AYES: Dy, Koo, Fernandez, Perez**

**NOES: None**

**ABSTAIN: None**

**ABSENT: Wu**

**Motion passes 4-0.**

ACM/Weiner further discussed with the PC the option to increase the size of the pocket parks.

PC/Fernandez sided with PC/Koo's suggestion to allocate four (4) lots to the left and right of lots F and H.

**C/Dy motioned to approve the General Plan Amendment (GPA) 2016-02, The Terraces at Walnut Specific Plan (SP), Zone Change (ZC) 2016-02 and Tentative Tract Map (TTM) 78210 to include the following conditions:**

- **The two (2) lots adjacent to F and H be removed from its general residential use and be allocated towards the pocket parks.**
- **Increase the available guest parking opportunities throughout the development, specifically around Lot #135.**

- The applicant must work with Staff to further study pedestrian connections between the proposed townhomes pad and pocket park H to the commercial component.
- A parking plan must be provided and be included in the CC&R's.
- The applicant must look for all opportunities to increase the commercial aspect to the 30,000 square-foot range as opposed to the minimum 16,000 square-feet.

VC/Koo added that Exhibit 3.3 be updated to reflect that private street B1 contains a parkway located on the Eastern portion of the street and that paragraph 3.3.2.3 be updated to reflect that the private drive shall require a sidewalk on both sides. PC/Fernandez seconded.

C/Dy amended the motion to include VC/Koo's comments. PC/Fernandez seconded.

**ROLL CALL:**

AYES: Dy, Koo, Fernandez, Perez  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: Wu

Motion passes 4-0.

VC/Koo motioned to approve DA 2019-01 and SPC/AR 2018-097, 2018-109, 2019-060, 2019-061. PC/Perez seconded.

**ROLL CALL:**

AYES: Dy, Koo, Fernandez, Perez  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: Wu

Motion passes 4-0.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

NONE SCHEDULED

**DISCUSSION/TRANSACTIONS:**

NONE SCHEDULED

**REPORTS AND COMMENTS:**

- CA/Leibold congratulated the new Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the PC.

**ADJOURNMENT:**


**This meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m. The next Planning Commission Meeting is set for a regular meeting on Wednesday, August 7, 2019, at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers at Walnut City Hall (21201 La Puente Road).**

**Passed and Approved on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2019.**



---

**Tom Weiner, Assistant City Manager – Development Services**



---

**Chairperson, Heinrich Dy**