



AGENDA ITEM 2

- ☒ Public Hearing
- ☐ Old Business
- ☐ New Business
- ☐ Discussion

WALNUT PLANNING COMMISSION **AGENDA DATE: SEPTEMBER 18, 2019**

TO: Chairperson Dy and Planning Commissioners

VIA: Tom Weiner, Assistant City Manager – Development Services *TW*
Justin Carlson, City Planner *J*

FROM: Chris Vasquez, Senior Planner *CV*

SUBJECT: Continuance - Brookside Equestrian Center (Brookside): A proposal to subdivide a 25.8-acre property into twenty-eight (28) single-family residential lots and other on-site improvements at 800 Meadowpass Road (APN: 8709-093-001, 002, & 003)

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Planning Commission:

1. Open the Public Hearing;
2. Hear the Staff Report;
3. Solicit input on this item;
4. Planning Commission discussion;
5. Close the Public Hearing; and
6. Continue this item to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting on November 6, 2019.

APPLICANT/ PROPONENT:

Property Owner: Spring Meadows Homes LLC/Meadow Pass Estates LLC
Attn: Mr. Jack Su
18217 Gale Avenue, Suite A
City of Industry, CA 91748

BACKGROUND:

The subject property is a 25.8-acre site formerly known as Brookside Equestrian Center (Brookside) located at 800 Meadow Pass Road within the R.P.D. 28,500 – 1.3 DU; Residential Planned Development Zoning District. The subject property is located east of Lemon Avenue, with Meadow Pass Road and La Puente Road located to the north and south, respectively. Lemon Creek flows south through the central portion of the subject site with equestrian/hiking trails along the easterly

portion of the site and Lemon Creek. Various existing equestrian facilities, which include horse barns, stables, fenced corals, feed sheds, and a covered riding arena, are located throughout the subject site.

On June 5, 2019, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed Public Hearing to consider the Brookside Project and receive public input. Based on the input provided and correspondence received during the Public Hearing, the Commission continued the project to a regularly scheduled meeting in September. The continuance was provided to give the Applicant additional time to continue working with staff on refinements to the project, and to update the draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for consistency with prepared exhibits and technical reports, such as the Tree Preservation Report/Plan. A copy of the Meeting Minutes is provided for the Commission's reference (Attachment 1 – June 5, 2019 Meeting Minutes).

As of the writing of this report, staff is continuing to work with the Applicant on these items and additional time is needed to ensure that all items discussed during the meeting are addressed. Staff is recommending this item be continued to the regularly scheduled meeting to be held on November 6, 2019. Subsequently, staff will ensure notification is provided to all residents within the surrounding area(s) and to those whom have expressed an interests in the project.

Attachments:

1. June 5, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

ATTACHMENT 1

June 5, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

June 5, 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 Fernandez

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

ALSO PRESENT: City Planner Carlson; Assistant City Attorney Mann; City Engineer Gilbertson; Senior Planner Vasquez; Senior Management Analyst Guerra; Community Development Technician Katigbak.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

C/Perez opened Oral Communications for Public Comments.

C/Perez closed Oral Communications for Public Comments. Without objection motion passed 5-0.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. May 1, 2019 (Regular Meeting Minutes).

C/Perez motioned to approve the minutes of May 1, 2019. VC/Dy seconded. Motion passed 5-0.

C/Perez motioned to re-order the Agenda. VC/Dy seconded.

NEW BUSINESS:

2. **Site Plan Case/Architectural Review (SPC/AR) 2019-021 (Shing):** A request to construct a 1,745 square foot two-story addition, a 146 square-foot balcony, a 146 square-foot porch, and a 290 square-foot third-car garage space to an existing residence located at 258 Macalester Drive (APN: 8702-006-054).

SMA/Guerra presented the staff report.

VC/Dy questioned the second stove/cooking area located in the kitchen/dining room area.

SMA/Guerra mentioned that the applicant may have misprinted the plan.

Applicant, Jeffery Liu clarified that the proposed plan is correct and that the home owner proposes to have two (2) stove tops and that one will specifically be utilized to prepare oriental meals.

VC/Dy inquired if the Walnut Municipal Code (WMC) prohibits the installation of two (2) or more stove tops in one home, more specifically in the same kitchen.

SMA/Guerra clarified that the WMC does not prohibit the use and/or installation of multiple cooking equipment such as stove tops within a home. SMA/Guerra further stated that it is not uncommon for homes to have two (2) or more stoves in the kitchen areas when cooking oriental meals.

C/Perez opened the item for Public Comments.

Resident, Scott Newman suggested that Staff monitor homes in the Single-Family Residential Zone from becoming multi-family rentals.

C/Perez closed the item for Public Comments.

PC/Wu commended the applicant on the architectural design and has no opposition to the project.

MOTIONED ON ITEM 2

C/Perez motioned to approve SPC/AR 2019-021 subject to the attached Conditions of Approval (COA). VC/Dy seconded.

ROLL CALL:

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

PUBLIC HEARING(S):

3. General Plan (GP) Conformity Determination for the Proposed Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Fiscal Years 2019-2020 through 2023-2024.

SMA/Guerra presented the staff report.

VC/Dy questioned the funding of bicycle lanes.

CE/Gilbertson clarified that this only includes the re-striping and that there are no plans of additional bicycle lanes.

VC/Dy asked about the disconnected walkway between the driveway and Walnut's Teen Center, whether it should be added to the document or if it would fall under sidewalk repair.

CE/Gilbertson stated that it would fall under sidewalk repair.

C/Perez mentioned that the projected spending report illustrates that the department will spend forty (40%) percent over the budget between now and the end of next year; asked if the reason was due to the improvements or due to the deferred and/or preventative maintenance.

SMA/Guerra mentioned that it is a combination of improvements and preventative maintenance.

CE/Gilbertson further noted that this year there are several large scaled projects resulting in a higher budget and that funds lapse wherein if not spent, the State will confiscate it.

VC/Dy questioned if during fiscal years 2022 through 2024 if the City would be in danger of not being able to properly maintain streets, parks, and trails.

CE/Gilbertson stated that a majority of the streets are in great shape, further that a bid will be awarded by the City Council (CC) for a portion of La Puente Road in front of Walnut High School and Suzanne Middle School.

CE/Gilbertson noted the last section of Amar Road that will be rehabilitated in the next few years.

C/Perez opened the item for Public Comments.

Resident, Scott Newman mentioned installing white vinyl fences along the equestrian trails and attempting to maintain two (2) to three (3) trails in the forward year.

C/Perez noted that it is in the City's interest to continue to create horse accessibility through maintaining the equestrian trails.

C/Perez closed the item for Public Comments. C/Wu seconded.

C/Perez clarified that the item has been analyzed and that the improvement costs are to be made to execute this year.

MOTION ON ITEM 3

PC/Wu motioned to approve PC Resolution No. 19-06. C/Perez seconded.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Perez, Dy, Fernandez, Koo, Wu

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

Motion to approve passes 5-0.

4. Brookside Equestrian Center (Brookside): A proposal to subdivide a 25.8-acre property into twenty-eight (28) Single-family residential lots and other on-site improvements at 800 Meadowpass Road (APN: 8709-093-001, 002, and 003).

SP/Vasquez presented the Staff Report.

VC/Dy asked Staff for clarification regarding the Zoning of the project site.

SP/Vasquez stated that the property is Zoned under the R.P.D.; Residential Planned Development – 28,500 – 1.3 dwelling units per acre density. SP/Vasquez noted that the adjacent property located to the East is Zoned within an R-1; Single-Family Residential Zone which does not include this property.

VC/Dy recalled the proposed project site being Zoned R-1 – 15,000 and asked Staff to explain where that information originated from.

SP/Vasquez stated that there was no discussion regarding the site being zoned R-1 – 15,000 and that the R.P.D. Zone has a mechanism to allow a proposal that is less than the minimum lot size through the process of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). SP/Vasquez indicated that the applicant is requesting to subdivide the property into individual lots with an average size of 20,000 square-feet.

PC/Wu commended SP/Vasquez for clarifying the process and stated that there is a nuance with alternative (1) one and that Staff has concerns with the CUP mechanism.

SP/Vasquez confirmed that Staff does have a concern with the CUP, however, there are no concerns with the project as presented in terms of developing the site.

VC/Dy asked if the PC were to move forward with Alternative (1) one of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) if maps and plot plans would be left to Staff for final review.

SP/Vasquez stated that any and all alternations would need to be made to the map to meet all of Alternative (1)'s requirements and will need to be reviewed by the PC for a recommended approval to the CC. SP/Vasquez mentioned that moving forward with Alternative (1) one would require the project to be redesigned in such a way to reflect Alternative (1) conditions.

VC/Dy questioned if the PC would be granting approval or a continuance.

SP/Vasquez stated that it would effectively be a continuance either if the PC decides to approve with recommendation or approve the project as presented, however, it will need to return back to the PC after working with the applicant on completing the COA's.

VC/Dy asked if any alterations to the map would essentially require a continuance.

SP/Vasquez confirmed that any alterations to the project would require a continuance.

PC/Koo asked SP/Vasquez to show what Staff's concern is regarding the CUP process.

SP/Vasquez commented that Staff's concern is regarding the reduction in lot sizes below what is required, also mentioning that the WMC does allow the CUP mechanism to be used, although Staff does not deem it appropriate in terms of recommending the specific mechanism to be used for the reduction of lot sizes.

PC/Fernandez questioned what the typical mechanism is when having to deal with the reduction of lot sizes.

SP/Vasquez stated that the project site is a unique case and the R.P.D. Zone clearly identifies a CUP as a mechanism that may be utilized. SP/Vasquez specified that in a traditional R-1 Zone, a re-Zone of the property, with the adoption of a Specific Plan or a Zone Variance may be utilized depending on the nature and/or condition of the deficiencies of the lot. SP/Vasquez indicated that the R.P.D. Zone wherein the project site is located, the WMC does allow for the use of a CUP to reduce the minimum lot size.

CP/Carlson confirmed that due to the location of the project site within the R.P.D., it utilizes the mechanism of the CUP.

VC/Dy questioned what the size range of the lots are within the R.P.D. Zone and if the PC has ever approved a CUP on a residential property.

SP/Vasquez mentioned that there are five (5) R.P.D. Zones within the City and that the lot sizes vary and smallest R.P.D. zone would be 28,000 square-feet and the largest would be located in Three Oaks at 61,700 square-feet. SP/Vasquez stated the CUP mechanism has been utilized in the past for the Three Oaks and Meadow Pass Heights developments to reduce lot sizes.

CP/Carlson confirmed that the CUP mechanism has been used on multiple occasions.

PC/Fernandez asked if the applicant were to pursue a Zone Change or Specific Plan, how it would differ from the CUP process.

SP/Vasquez stated that the Specific Plan and Zone Change would be done in a traditional R-1 Zone wherein there are no provisions to deviate from the lot sizes. SP/Vasquez indicated that the R.P.D. Zone does offer a clear process with the utilization of the CUP to pursue reducing the minimum lot size, which eliminates the need to re-Zone the property.

PC/Wu asked for clarification regarding Staff's concerns on utilizing the CUP mechanism.

SP/Vasquez stated that the main concern was reducing the lot sizes.

VC/Dy questioned if the issue with the CUP mechanism has to do with increased density.

ACA/Mann mentioned that the CUP mechanism will not increase the density and that the density of 1.3 dwelling units per acre will not change.

PC/Wu mentioned that an increase to the lot sizes will maintain the amount of open space.

SP/Vasquez discussed the updated environmental table that illustrates the two (2) alternatives and how the lesser units and open space ratio is calculated.

PC/Wu indicated that it is difficult to envision maintaining open space and connectivity between amenities such as the trail with the increase of lot sizes; a highly detailed Tract Map would be required.

VC/Dy stated that it may be accomplished by utilizing some public easements through private properties.

SP/Vasquez referenced the Creekside and Snow Creek communities wherein some parcels extend to the Public right-of-way and have a restricted use area for open space and landscape easements.

VC/Dy questioned why there were ten (10) separate parcels.

SP/Vasquez deferred to the applicant.

PC/Koo stated that the square-footage on the Map and on the DEIR appear to be different; the DEIR mentions that portions of the proposed landscape easements will be recorded to some of the residential lots.

SP/Vasquez stated that the table represents the square-footages of the proposed lots and that the Map being presented is the most recent version, however, if there are any configurations to be made Staff will address what is necessary.

VC/Dy asked if the landscape preservation easements were to be included in the total square-footage of the individual lots.

SP/Vasquez confirmed that the landscape preservation easement from lots eleven (11) through fifteen (15) are incorporated with the private lots which is taken out from the lots buildable area.

CP/Carlson mentioned that Staff and the applicant worked on granting a portion of the private lot as an easement to maintain the dense foliage to provide adequate landscape screening and preservation.

PC/Koo asked for clarification on whether or not the landscape easement would be counted towards the private lot's total square-footage.

SP/Vasquez stated that the landscape easement is part of square-footage of the private lots.

PC/Koo stated that the open space lot ten (10) listed as nine point five (9.5) acres which include lots A through J, implies that they do not include the easement.

SP/Vasquez stated that the landscape preservation easements are not part of the open space lot but are included in the individual residential lots.

PC/Koo asked which ten (10) lots are considered as part of the open space.

CE/Gilbertson stated lots A through J.

PC/Koo stated that lots A, B, C and F are landscape easement lots.

C/Perez asked if PC/Koo's question was in regards to identifying the ten (10) open space lots.

PC/Koo mentioned that based off the Map, ten (10) open space lots are utilized for bio retention, land scape easement and some dedicated to the City.

CE/Gilbertson confirmed that the only portions that are accounted for towards the residential lots is the landscape preservation easement along lots eleven (11) through fifteen (15) which are adjacent to Meadow Pass Road and Lemon Avenue frontage.

PC/Koo referenced the DEIR page 1.6 which states that a twenty-five (25')-foot landscape preservation easement will be recorded on lots three (3), eleven (11) through fifteen (15) and a fifteen (15')-foot landscape preservation easement to be recorded on lot's eleven (11) and twenty-eight (28).

CE/Gilbertson further discussed what easements are in addition to the ten (10) open space lots.

SP/Vasquez noted that the light green area on the Map is nine point fifty-five (9.55) acres of open space area and that the dark green would be considered as the landscape easement.

C/Perez stated that in order to make a change to the R.P.D. Zone, the City would like to see more common open space, recreational areas, better trails and improved landscaping. C/Perez asked SP/Vasquez if the concern has to do with the fact that the CUP mechanism may be used in the future similarly to this project. C/Perez further explained that alternative one (1) proposes to reduce the proposed twenty-eight (28) lots to twenty-four (24) which still does not provide any additional open space or public and private streets; with twenty-four (24) private lots at a 28,000 square-foot lot size is still not achievable.

PC/Fernandez asked Staff for clarity that the approval is for the Tentative Tract Map (TTM) and the Draft EIR.

SP/Vasquez stated that the TTM, Draft EIR and CUP before the PC is for a recommended approval to the CC.

PC/Fernandez asked if any SPC/AR would be included.

SP/Vasquez stated that when all entitlements have been granted the applicant will return with SPC/AR for the proposed homes.

PC/Fernandez asked how specific and what level can the PC regulate a TTM, Draft EIR and CUP.

ACA/Mann mentioned that COAs are standard and will need to return to the PC when completed.

PC/Fernandez explained that the recommended approval is for the subdivision of twenty-eight (28) lots and the Draft EIR with the intention that the developer returns to the CC with a full development plan.

SP/Vasquez stated that the TTM provides the infrastructure improvements such as roads and grading which would undergo a separate process if the Map is approved for the engineering and civil plan check. SP/Vasquez noted that any residential units will need to return to the PC for review.

VC/Dy asked if by removing lots one (1), two (2), and three (3) and keeping the existing layout to increase the open space area, would satisfy Staff's concerns.

SP/Vasquez specified that Staff's main concern revolves around the size of the lots not necessarily the number of lots.

Applicant, Jack Su introduced himself and briefly explained the project.

Land Use Attorney, Tim Paion discussed that Staff's concerns regarding the lot size do not reflect the concerns written in the General Plan (GP), additionally, mentioned that lesser lot sizes are good if open space is preserved. Mr. Paion stated that in order to pursue the route of an R-1, Single Family Zoning, each lot must comply with a 1.3 DU/Acre and meet a minimum lot, moreover, with the CUP the minimum lot size requirement does not need to be met.

Community Outreach Consultant, Larry Pierce stated that the project conducted a door-to-door walk for outreach abutting the project specifically along the East side of the subject site, a two-hundred and thirty-four (234) mailing to residents and hosted a community meeting at the Walnut Senior Center. Mr. Pierce mentioned that there were positive responses, thirty-six (36%) percent stating that they were in support of the project with the remainder requesting to stay informed. Mr. Pierce further discussed outreach data and questions from residents.

Landscape Architect, Scott Ashlock discussed how the proposed design was created to preserve open space and maintain the existing equestrian trail system. Mr. Ashlock mentioned that precautions were taken to minimize visual impacts to the surrounding community by providing native landscape material.

Planning Coordinator, Randy Jackson mentioned that the applicant intentionally chose the R.P.D. ZOne and applied for a CUP because the twenty (20%) percent requirement within the CUP was not enough to set aside, moreover, explained how the project proposes thirty-seven (37%) percent of open space which exceeds the demand. Mr. Jackson specified which portions of the lot area are allocated towards private lots and open space. PC/Koo requested the applicant to further discuss the project's timeline if approved.

Applicant, Jack Su mentioned that when granted approval, the plan is to move forward as soon as possible, however, it also depends on the market's conditions. Mr. Su indicated there will be one (1) infrastructure phase according to the project's engineer.

PC/Wu requested the applicant to discuss the advantages and/or disadvantages regarding the approach to providing the open space through dedication as opposed to the easement.

Mr. Jackson mentioned that it is currently still open and is marked as a lettered lot which would be part of the nine point fifty-five (9.55) acres. Mr. Jackson further mentioned that the applicant would like to see it continuously maintained collectively as one property and not as a series of properties; as a lettered lot it would not be able to be sold or developed on – the intention of the easement is to maintain this portion as a lettered maintenance lot.

VC/Dy commended the applicant on the proposed trail improvements and asked if the private road would be maintained by a Home Owners Association (H.O.A.) and why the ten (10) open space lots cannot be part of the same parcel as the private road.

Mr. Jackson mentioned that the private road and open space areas serve two (2) different functions and the proposed private road may establish different maintenance and funding standards than the open space. Mr. Jackson explained that the maintenance of the proposed private road would be dedicated towards the individual property owners. Mr. Jackson indicated that as a lettered lot the open space region may have several futures for development.

VC/Dy asked if the proposed open space region would be maintained by an H.O.A.

Mr. Jackson stated that the project would need to return with the proper conditions.

VC/Dy mentioned concerns regarding the proposed lots being sold individually. VC/Dy suggested that the lot be one (1) contiguous parcel alongside a street with easements indicating what is a private street, open space and community amenities.

Mr. Jackson specified that when a development agreement is submitted to the City, it will allow the PC to review the disposition of each of the parcels and how they are maintained and operated.

CE/Gilbertson stated that the purpose of lettered lots on a Tract Map are so they cannot be sold as private lots, on the tract map they are designated either under the H.O.A. or City maintained. Typically, the private street would dedicated to its own lettered lot because of the public utilities.

Mr. Jackson indicated that the project included a proposed public street to retain the existing barn for the community.

PC/Fernandez further discussed concerns on the proposed project and the amenities that will be provided to the community.

Mr. Jackson stated that the project envisions the trails to be enhanced, installation of more aesthetic amenities such as water fountains, seating areas and exercise facilities. Mr. Jackson additionally mentioned that the applicant is open to suggestions from the PC regarding amenities.

PC/Fernandez questioned if there are any plans for the existing stable and if it would be dedicated to the City.

Mr. Jackson mentioned that the purpose is to refurbish and maintain the architecture of the stable and reiterated that the stable will not be utilized in any way.

PC/Fernandez agreed that the stable is in a deteriorating state with no usability and questioned what the City would gain in return of granting an additional four (4) lots.

Mr. Jackson stated that the City would attain an additional four (4) acres of open space with a maintained and connective trail system.

PC/Fernandez further discussed the COA's and the potential future improvements for the community.

Mr. Jackson stated that the next step alongside the development plans is working with landscape architects to refurbish the existing condition of the subject site.

PC/Fernandez requested confirmation that the applicant plans to return with full development plans.

Mr. Jackson confirmed that the applicant plans to return with full development plans.

VC/Dy mentioned that there are five (5) lots that are short of the minimum lot size of 15,000 square-feet and questioned if the applicant would be interested in lot line adjustments to meet the minimum lot size.

Mr. Jackson stated that there is an opportunity to alter the proposed site layout to meet the minimum lot size requirement.

VC/Dy questioned if there are opportunities to implement parking spaces for the community located on lot (4) four.

Mr. Jackson stated that the public street is large enough to accommodate public parking and that lot (4) four has internal parking; developing additional parking spaces may exceed the demand. Mr. Jackson explained that the idea of the development is to create a more walkable community.

PC/Koo asked if the owners plans to renovate the existing stable and retain ownership.

Mr. Jackson confirmed that any alterations must undergo PC review and that the intent is to retain ownership for continuous maintenance.

PC/Koo declared that if the PC were to approve the project, lot four (4) will be conditioned to be developed first. PC/Koo also mentioned that the DEIR states lots D and H would be dedicated to the City and that the rest of the property would be maintained by the H.O.A.

Mr. Jackson stated that any and all lettered lots would be under the responsibility of the H.O.A. PC/Koo questioned if all intricacies be settled before the Map is approved.

Mr. Jackson further discussed that the applicant and Staff will work together to illustrate what portions of the subject site would be regulated by the H.O.A. versus the City.

The PC, Staff and the applicant further discussed the connectivity of the existing trail to the trail within the project's boundaries.

PC/Koo suggested reducing the size of lots three (3) and four (4) to accommodate the existing trail located to the South in addition to continuous maintenance and trail improvements. PC/Koo mentioned inconsistencies between the Tree Survey/Arborist Report and the DEIR as far as how many trees are to be replaced.

Mr. Ashlock stated that the surveyed area indicated the area of impact of the grading operation.

SP/Vasquez stated to the PC that the item will return with all inconsistencies will be addressed.

C/Perez opened the item for Public Comments.

Resident(s), Mack and Donna Mann mentioned that the proposed project directly impacts their property and stated that the project site was supposed to be a public park. Mr. and Mrs. Mann indicated that the open space in which the State requires for public parks was not included into their property because it was proposed as a public park. Mr. and Mrs. Mann requested access to the bottom of the slope for property maintenance and asked if all the open space is illustrated on the Brookside open space map.

C/Perez stated that the light green color on the Map indicates open space and the dark green color is reserved for landscape preservation easements.

Mrs. Mann states that the Map illustrates the open space encroaching into the private property's slope.

Mr. Ashlock further explained where the project's site and the resident's property abut.

C/Perez asked if the portion of the slope Mr. and Mrs. Mann are inquiring about would be dedicated as open space and if the H.O.A. would be held responsible for maintenance.

SP/Vasquez confirmed that it would be maintained by the H.O.A. if it falls within the development and that the City Engineer is noting access to the sloped area to conduct necessary maintenance of the region.

PC/Koo asked how the City maintains the sloped area currently.

SP/Vasquez stated that the City accesses the site from San Vicente Road and that all proper precautions will be made to minimize impacts to all abutting properties.

CE/Gilbertson mentioned that Staff will work with Community Services and if in the case there are existing landscape areas of concern, Staff can request an access easement from the private street within the development which can be added to the COA's.

Resident, Scott Newman commended the applicant on the proposed development and further discussed the importance of the minimum lot size and how it affects homeowners who also own horses. Mr. Newman questioned if there is a requirement to construct a horse trail for developing such a large project.

SP/Vasquez stated that the WMC does not require developers to provide new trails, however, the GP states that whenever there is an opportunity to expand and/or make new connections to the existing trail systems, it will be explored.

Mr. Newman and Staff further discussed trail maintenance responsibility and the timeline of the proposed development.

Resident, Lorraine Francis inquired about the duration of trail closures and the connectivity of the existing trails located on both the Northern and Southern portions of the subject site.

Resident, John Scarsi mentioned concerns with impacts related to vehicular traffic along Meadow Pass Road.

Resident, Phyllis Kruckenberg expressed concerns related to vehicular traffic along Meadow Pass Road in addition to the existing circulation issues due to St. Lorenzo Ruiz Catholic Church.

Resident, Marilyn Caldwell mentioned the maintenance of the trees and vegetation of the project and that currently the subject site is a fire hazards. Ms. Caldwell stated that the horse stable is a historic stable to the community and requested that it be properly maintained rather than being discarded.

Resident, Carol Coy requested that the developer construct a lighting and landscape district to serve as a mechanism to properly maintain funding and care of the open space.

Resident, Linda Wilford expressed concerns regarding the preservation of lot four (4) wherein the barn is located.

Resident, Richard Saretsky mentioned further setback requirements of the proposed lots to preserve and protect the creek corridor. Mr. Saretsky suggested dedicating a portion as a Landscape Open Space Maintenance District (LOSMD) to ensure that the environment is protected.

C/Perez motioned to close the item for Public Comments. VC/Dy seconded.

ACA/Mann requested C/Perez for a five (5) minute recess.

C/Perez stated that the design and layout of the proposed development and time spent working on preserving the natural environment of the project site is exceptional. C/Perez suggested to Staff to continue with the level of interest to acquire lot four (4) for preservation and mentioned inclination of approving the proposed project.

VC/Dy suggested reducing the sizes of lots three (3), eleven (11) and twenty-eight (28) and removing the easements along the lots to add more to the open space feature. VC/Dy also mentioned dedicating lot four (4) if not entirely, at least a portion, to alleviate the possibility of it being divided into smaller individual parcels.

PC/Koo mentioned a City lot located South of the subject site and recommended Staff to be innovative and possibly create a staging lot for trail visitors.

SP/Vasquez confirmed that Staff will look into the alternative and see if it can be incorporated into the project.

PC/Koo requested a detailed maintenance agreement between the developer and the City, the open space lots D and H to be rehabilitated, a connected equestrian trail to the existing equestrian trail located behind lots three (3) and four (4) even if the lot sizes were to be reduced, lot four (4) shall be one of the first lots to be developed and a complete and consistent tree replacement plan. PC/Koo mentioned that the PC is faced with either approving the City's recommendation of twenty-four (24) lot without a plan or approve the plan submitted by the developer without any COA's.

CP/Carlson mentioned that with the PC and public's comments, Staff is requesting a direction on whether or not the PC is comfortable with the twenty-four (24) or twenty-eight (28) lot subdivision and ensured that all comments made by the PC and the public will be addressed to best of Staff's capability.

VC/Dy questioned if the PC can approve the proposed project with the Condition of dedicating lot four (4) as a whole or partially to the City.

CP/Carlson commented that prior to working with the dedication of lot four (4) the PC should decide on the amount of lots so that Staff can work with the applicant.

Mr. Paion suggested that with multiple variables in play that it would be best that the PC give direction to Staff so that the applicant and Staff may discuss the necessary alterations.

ACA/Mann asked the PC if they are comfortable with the R.P.D. and CUP paradigm wherein the lot sizes will be smaller than the minimum requirement.

The PC and Staff further discussed the PC's decision options on the item.

PC/Fernandez inquired about the process.

CP/Carlson stated that Staff will work with the applicant and comeback with a Map that meets the recommendation of the PC.

PC/Fernandez requested confirmation that a design review and review of all recommendations including but not limited to amenities and landscape maintenance, will be conducted after the Tract Map approval.

CP/Carlson confirmed that there will be a SPC/AR to be reviewed by the PC.

PC/Fernandez commended the applicant on the development's layout and briefly explained how the project would be beneficial to the City.

PC/Wu commended the applicant on the project's design layout and mentioned that by meeting the minimum lot size requirements, the open space will be minimal. PC/Wu is inclined to approve the twenty-eight (28) lot subdivision.

C/Perez asked ACA/Mann if the PC can make a decision on the amount of lots allowed.

ACA/Mann requested the PC not to make a definitive decision towards the TTM, but rather pose a motion and/or direct to Staff to prepare the COAs and a CUP with Resolutions consistent with the discussion made here tonight.

VC/Dy summarized all comments and recommendations made by the PC.

PC/Koo mentioned he is comfortable with the CUP process within the R.P.D. Zoning District.

PC/Fernandez confirmed that he is comfortable with the development of twenty-eight (28) lots.

MOTION ON ITEM 4

C/Perez motioned to continue the Brookside Equestrian Center project which proposes to subdivide the 25.8 acres into 28 individual lots including all other on-site improvements including but not limited to the protection of trees, the use and maintenance of trails, consideration of multiple entrance and exit ways to the project site, creek preservation and setback requirements, conditions of approval related to lot four (4) and it's use and the opportunity of the City to obtain ownership of lot four (4) in the future. VC/Dy seconded.

ROLL CALL:

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

Motion passes 5-0.

C/Perez amended the approved motion to include the following.

MOTION ON ITEM 4

C/Perez motioned to continue the Brookside Equestrian Center proposal to the September 4, 2019 PC Meeting with established COA's for the twenty-eight lots. VC/Dy seconded.

ROLL CALL:

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

Motion passes 5-0.

OLD BUSINESS:

NONE SCHEDULED

DISCUSSION/TRANSACTIONS:

NONE SCHEDULED

REPORTS AND COMMENTS:

- CP/Carlson stated that the July 3, 2019 PC meeting has been cancelled and rescheduled for July 17, 2019.


ADJOURNMENT:

This meeting was adjourned at 10:31 p.m. The next Planning Commission Meeting is set for a regular meeting on Wednesday, July 17, 2019, at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers at Walnut City Hall (21201 La Puente Road).

Passed and Approved on the 17th day of July, 2019.



Tom Weiner, Assistant City Manager – Development Services


Chairperson