

**MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
JULY 5, 2011**

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Highland was called to order at 6:00p.m. by Chairman Hamerly in the Donahue Council Chambers, 27215 Base Line, Highland, California.

Present: Commissioners John Gamboa, Milton Sparks, Michael Stoffel, and Chairman Randall Hamerly

Absent: Commissioners Richard Haller, Michael Willhite, and Vice Chairman Trang Huynh

Staff Present: John Jaquess, Community Development Director
Ernie Wong, City Engineer
Lawrence Mainez, City Planner
Bruce Meikle, Senior Planner
Sean Kelleher, Assistant Planner
Linda McKeough, Administrative Assistant III

2.0 COMMUNITY INPUT

There was none.

3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

There were no Items.

4.0 PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 4.1. Conditional Use Permit (CUP-010-005) and Design Review Application (DRA-010-005) for the Master Planning and Expansion of an Existing Religious Institution (Saint Adelaide's Catholic Church).

Phase One includes: a three thousand nine hundred and sixty five (3,965) square foot addition to the existing Church Building, construction of a new Plaza and Arcade; construction of a new Storage Building; and construction of other Ancillary Facilities such as Parking and Landscaping.

PC 07-05-2011

Phase Two includes: the demolition of the Existing Ministry Building; construction of a New Ministry Building housing Church Offices and Meeting Rooms; construction of a stand alone Meeting Building, construction of a Meeting Building / Storage Building / and Youth Office; construction of a New School Office; and construction of other Ancillary Facilities such as Parking and Landscaping.

The Project is located at the southwest corner of Base Line and Church Avenue, 27457 Base Line. (APN: 1201-011-07-0000 and 1201-011-23-0000.)

Representative: Daniel White, Daniel D. White Architects

Chairman Hamerly identified the Item and then asked for Staff's presentation.

Assistant Planner Kelleher gave the presentation from the Staff Report and PowerPoint presentation. He explained the Applicant's request for the proposed Project's design details of Phase 1 and Phase 2 and the Parking Analysis, and further explained issues noted and certain Conditions of Approval (COAs) to the Commission. He stated there was a concern for a potential future Sign Program, but none is proposed now and indicated that Mr. Dan White, who is the Applicant's Representative is in the audience and then concluded his presentation.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any questions of Staff.

A question was asked by a Commissioner on Planning COA No. 68 and if labeling a new number on a Building "D" would trigger a Sign Plan other than addressing and Staff responded yes, it would.

Discussion ensued between the Commission and Staff regarding there would be an extra fee for the Applicant for a Lot Line Adjustment Application and the time lapse between Phase 1 and Phase 2 would be approximately ten (10) years due to funding.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any questions of Staff. Hearing none, he then opened the Public Hearing and asked if the Applicant would like to make a presentation.

Mr. Dan White, of Daniel D. White Architects, 1290 East Center Court Drive, Covina, California, who is a Representative of the Parish, addressed the Commission. He gave the historical background on how the Parish came to him to beautify the interior of the Church and increase the seating. He stated how the Parish is not growing and that the Diocese wants to look at the entire Site for extra capacity and that he is doing more work that intended. With regards to the

PC 07-05-2011

property, the Administrative Building houses the daily operations and is in the middle of the Site and circulation is difficult and wanted the Church to be the Worship Building with a Phased Plan, is a good thing to do and does not have to be torn down later. He addressed Staff's concerns and the Parish is increasing the costs issue and how everything to do is with funding, loans, etc and that he agreed to do more Site work than he intended. He explained how the Playground will be relocated, additional landscaping, relocating the Storage Buildings, etc. Mr. White appealed to the Commission to reconsider the following because of the increased costs: 1) The Entrance is in Phase 2 and is to be designed different than Phase 1 from Base Line into the Parking Lot and is losing the parking near the Entrance and how there is a lot of elderly people, families and will be difficult for them as well as the church in regards to expense. Because of this, we would like to keep the design as is. 2) Adding the landscaping fingers on the west property in Phase 2 and not Phase 1 and was unable to provide a cost estimate to the Commission. 3) The landscaping in the Playground Area is impossible to maintain and the tree wells is fine, but had concerns with them in the Playground Area. 4) The Lot Line agreement between Bonita and Base Line has an elevation change of eight feet (8') and is not part of the Master Plan and preferred not to tie it into with the Church and the Church / Diocese may want to sell it in the future and is an added expense with the LLA. He then said he is happy to answer any questions the Commission may have.

Chairman Hamerly inquired about COA 67, "Removal of the Modular Structure." It was not addressed in Phase 2.

Mr. White, expressed his desire to leave the building there, however he presumed it was nonnegotiable and would need to be replaced. Because it is part of Phase 2, those funds will be raised for that time.

Community Development Director, John Jaquess, asked if the modular building has been fire rated with sprinklers.

Mr. White replied no but it was State approved like most other modular building for that use.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any questions of the Applicant.

Mr. George Einfeldt of 29311 Henderson Ln. Highland California, spoke in favor of the adoption of item 4.1. For years, he has pondering how to improve the site. What started out as a conservative project has turned into building a facility with close to 1,000 seats for future growth of the Church. Mr. Einfeldt expressed his gratitude towards the City and their response towards this project. He asked for strong consideration to approve the item.

PC 07-05-2011

Chairman Hamerly asked if there were any other comments for the Public Hearing.

Chairman Hamerly asked if there been any preliminary estimates base on the cost impact to the proposed budget.

Mr. White said no. The Parish did not want to invest money into getting estimates.

Chairman Hamerly stated that determining how much over the budget they are, it could be considered a contingency allowance or a deal breaker; this would help determine their case.

Mr. White claimed that if the items were completely removed, they would still be over their budget. While they are trying to raise money to finish the project, the increases will delay the project.

Chairman Hamerly asked that earlier it was discussed that the diocese had plans to do large scale projects, were these improvements to the increase the usability of the site and increase the congregation size.

Mr. White stated that those plans were independent of this site. Within the region, the Diocese would consider improving a parish to have a larger capacity to compensate for the growing population and draw more people into that church.

Chairman Hamerly questioned if the big picture development plans focus more on church use as apposed to school size.

“Mr. White claimed that the Parishes and Diocese feel content with the school size.

Chairman Hamerly asked if these meeting rooms were proposed as classroom space or church activities.

Mr. White answered for church activities.

Chairman Hamerly discussed the tree wells in the playground, expressing that trees offer desirable shade on a playground of asphalt.

Chairman Hamerly asked if there were questions for the applicant or Staff.

Assistant Planner Kelleher stated that to accommodate COA 52B, they will modify the second sentence to state tree wells instead of landscape islands.

PC 07-05-2011

Commissioner Gamboa expressed his concern that any kind of landscaping, including tree wells, in a playground will be torn up by the kids.

The Commission discussed the ratio of shade and the description of the trees relevant to the project.

Scott Rice, representing the City's landscaping architect, stated the trees are generally 15 gallons, 6'-7' tall and a 2' canopy, 24" box getting up to 3'-4' wide, when initially installed. Depending on the tree species, the growth rate could be significant, having shade within a couple years.

Assistant Planner Kelleher informed the Commission that the Brisbane Box, would have a span of 20' diameter in about 10 years.

Chairman Hamerly stated the trees would help eliminate heat on the playground. He also stated the applicant agreed to tree wells rather than raised planters, which would cause a tripping hazard.

Commissioner Sparks inquired about the size of the tree well.

Assistant Planner Kelleher stated that the tree well's dimension is 4'x4' to 5'x5'.

Mr. George Einfeldt informed the Commission that the area of discussion is currently asphalt and kids have put up with the heat for a long time He doesn't see any changing factor with the addition of the church expansion.

Assistant Planner Kelleher stated that the plan proposes the removal of a canopy structure on Building B, for Phase 2, as well as a line of trees, that the kids use.

Mr. White reiterated the preference for not having trees, that there are better ideas than trees. However, if the trees are a requirement, the tree well makes more sense than a planter.

Chairman Hamerly stated that there is a required ratio of tree to parking lot / parking space and are trying to come up with a solution that doesn't do away with that standard. Chairman Hamerly asked if Staff would support a complete relief of trees or planters from the playground / parking lot or would they want to see in lieu planting, provide trees somewhere else.

Assistant Planner Kelleher stated that in lieu would be appropriate to relocate trees around the sandbox staying out of the large field.

Chairman Hamerly reiterated that this plan would reach the 1:8 ratio for the parking spaces within the playground and no planters would be in the hardscape playground.

PC 07-05-2011

Assistant Planner Kelleher agreed, stating a total of 15 trees, being mixed between the sandbox area and the dining area would be appropriate. Assistant Planner Kelleher took this as a directive to work with the applicant on modifying COA 52B.

Chairman Hamerly asked the applicant if the landscaping, adding the fingers to phase 1, further keep it to phase 2, is pertaining to the realignment of the entry.

Assistant Planner Kelleher stated the areas of consideration for the trees according to COA 52A.

Chairman Hamerly stated that with item No. 4, the Lot Merge, to allow the Church to have flexibility, any future users would have to comply with the General Plan if they were proposing an alternative use for it or using the existing structures. Chairman Hamerly asked if that condition could be relieved.

Assistant Planner Kelleher stated that the Staff Report discusses in lieu of doing the lot merger, removing the existing structure, opening it to future development rather than maintaining it onsite.

Chairman Hamerly claimed that if it is being utilized, even for offsite "storage", it is not in violation of the zoning or land use since it not being used for residential purposes. Any further use by a future user would have to comply with the land use and zoning standards.

Assistant Planner Kelleher agreed.

Chairman Hamerly stated that going through the trouble of a lot merger then having to reverse it, if they do need to raise money, this could be an option for them to consider.

Assistant Planner Kelleher stated Staff is willing to relieve them of the Lot Merger Condition. The primary concern for Staff would be in the future, the property would be marketed as a residential use, which has been discontinued many years ago. If the property is purchased on its own, it would be difficult to remove the structure and develop it singularly without the adjacent property south of it, on Bonita, which is also zoned for mixed use. There are a lot of issues surrounding this piece of property with an existing single family home or office use, as originally a single family home, staying there. There are a lot of difficulties, not having direct access to Base Line, lack of adequate parking to satisfy another use, and true use of it as an office for the church, there is no condition requiring reciprocal access.

The Commission and Staff discussed the lot size, the extra expense for tearing

PC 07-05-2011

down the building, merging the property, and resubdividing the lot in the future.

Chairman Hamerly stating that the church doesn't have plans to incorporate that as part of Phase 2, in order to make that property more usable to a future use, he agrees with Staff's desire to be consolidated with something that would optimize the condition on that site. With the pattern of development for St. Adelaide's property, it does not make the most sense to merge the property to the east, but rather to the south because of the grade separation.

Assistant Planner Kelleher said that potentially they could do a lot line adjustment to move the line from the south up to separate the two.

Chairman Hamerly stated the deletion of COA 14 and modification of COA 52B.

Chairman Hamerly stated that the modular building should fall into an existing nonconforming use.

Assistant Planner Kelleher stated because the site is open for review of their use, they have a Conditional Use Permit and are looking for a new entitlement, they must be in compliance with today's code. In the review, the modular structure was found which the code does not allow. Due to it being an existing structure, it is open to interpretation if the structure should be removed or not. The current direction is to remove the structure in Phase 2.

Commissioner Stoffel asked if the building was up to health and safety standards.

Assistant Planner Kelleher stated it is reviewed by Community Care Licensing in California for the use of a preschool. The state agency reviews it, not the city.

Assistant Planner Kelleher stated that Immanuel Baptist has modular buildings as their offices. They have been maintained on the site for years yet they now have sprinklers. They went with the Phase 2 clause because Immanuel Baptist has the same sort of clause with them constructing their primary sanctuary building in the future.

Chairman Hamerly asked if Staff would consider supporting a condition similar to Immanuel Baptist where they had to comply with current life safety standards and give them an extension of used permit.

The Commission and Staff discussed the COAs for Immanuel Baptist and the Life and Safety standards between the buildings.

The Commission concluded that building would have to be removed in Phase 2.

PC 07-05-2011

Chairman Hamerly stated that the microphone was open and invited people to speak. Seeing none, the Commission continued.

Chairman Hamerly stated that this was a Design Review Application so there would be plans and elevations.

Chairman Hamerly asked why the Church's roof style did not match to the architectural style.

Mr. White explained that although they are shown next to each other on the drawing, the building are diagonally opposite sides of the property and the storage structure is more relative to the school structure.

The Commission and Mr. White discussed the architectural style of the building in regard to the site.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the storage building was proposed for Phase 1.

Mr. White answered yes.

Chairman Hamerly asked if they would like to reexamine that in light of tonight's hearing.

Mr. White said no, since there is playground equipment and a sandbox in the middle of the site. They want to remove and clean up the site and utilize the site better.

Chairman Hamerly claimed that based on that information given, it would be considered a temporary structure and is less critical of what it is going to look like. It was then stated that if they wanted to unify the site in its use and architectural style, the work on the church facility is excellent. If the building is going to be incorporated in the future, the style is easy to incorporate because it will not have to be modified as much in the future.

Mr. White explained that the building is going to stand out since it looks like the building on the other side of the site, not the buildings next to it.

Chairman Hamerly claimed that the alternative, requiring a masonry building to be constructed, would cost more when the building is going to go away.

Mr. White said the Church has character and is the center of what the Parish community does so they want to embellish it to the other buildings. They will keep going with it on the 2nd Phase when looking at the elevations.

Commissioner Gamboa suggested leaving it the way it is so in the future, when

PC 07-05-2011

the building is removed and the new building is established, they can make it better at that time. The buildings would look funny.

Chairman Hamerly said he concurred and is thinking this will need to be revisited in the future when Phase 2 comes around.

Chairman Hamerly stated there are no other items on the design review side of it and invited people to participate in the public hearing.

Assistant Planner Kelleher stated the two concerns brought up by the applicant; the parking lot in front of the church in Phase 1, the current condition requires a redesign of that parking lot, the parking lot fingers in Phase 1 or incorporating that into Phase 2 or the area to the west of the site as well as along the playground, either they will be required or will strike them.

Chairman Hamerly reiterated the issues Staff stated, additional landscaping of the parking lot islands and the reconfiguration of the entry / parking area, in Phase 2.

Assistant Planner Kelleher stated that Staff recommends striking the COA 52A, removing the requirement of the landscape fingers and striking COA 59. 52B will become 52 and staff will work with the applicant to determine the final language of the COA to include the requirement of 15 trees.

Chairman Hamerly stated that the Public Hearing is closed.

A Motion was made by Commissioner Gamboa and seconded by Commissioner Sparks to:

Adopt Resolution 11-006 Approving Conditional Use Permit (CUP-010-005) and Design Review Application (DRA-010-005), all subject to the recommended Conditions of Approval, as amended with the following:

Delete Planning COA 14.

~~(NS) Prior to the Issuance of any Building Permits in Phase One, the Applicant shall record a Lot Merger with the County of San Bernardino merging Assessor's Parcel Numbers 1201-011-07-0000 (27427 Base Line) and 1201-011-23-0000 (27397 Base Line).~~

Modify Planning COA 52.

(NS) Landscape Islands Every eight (8) parking stalls and at the end of each row of parking as detailed ~~below~~ in Phase Two, Landscape Island shall be installed as is shown on Landscape Plan Sheet L 1.4. However, in-lieu of incorporated

PC 07-05-2011

Landscape Islands at the ends of three (3) parking lot rows adjacent to the School the applicant shall install fifteen (15) additional trees in various locations of the School play area including around the Sandbox / Playground, field, and lunch area near school Building A.

a. ~~In Phase One, Landscaping Islands shall be installed in the westerly most parking area, the parking area between the Hall and Rectory, the parking area between the rectory and the Proposed sand box Playground, and the row of parking stalls directly north of the Proposed Sand Box Playground. The Areas Identified on Landscape Plan sheet L 1.3 as basketball courts and the row of parking stalls directly south of the Ministry Building shall not have landscape islands installed as part of Phase One.~~

b. ~~In Phase Two, Landscape Island shall be installed as is shown on Landscape Plan Sheet L 1.4. However, additional Landscape islands shall be incorporated at the ends of three parking lot rows adjacent to the School.~~

Delete Planning COA 59

~~(NS) In Phase One, the existing parking lot located east of the Church Building shall be reconstructed to match the proposed design of Phase Two.~~

Motion carried on a 4 – 0 vote with Commissioners Haller, Willhite, and Vice Chairman Huynh absent.

Mr. Einfeldt thanked the Commission.

5.0 LEGISLATIVE

- 5.1 A request for a Second Extension of Time for Design Review Application DRB-006-037 which proposes the development of two (2), one-story Buildings with approximately 8,643 square feet of combined area, along with associated parking and landscaping, for Industrial / Business Park type uses. DRB-006-037 was originally approved on June 5, 2007. The location is an approximate 0.77-acre Site consisting of two (2) adjoining parcels located on the north side of Fifth Street approximately six hundred feet (600') west of Palm Avenue (Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 1192-621-13 and -14).
Applicant: Mr. Barry St. Peter, Property Owner

Chairman Hamerly identified the Item and then asked for Staff's presentation.

Senior Planner Meikle gave the presentation from the Staff Report and PowerPoint presentation. He explained the Applicant's request to the Commission and then concluded his presentation.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any questions of Staff.

PC 07-05-2011

A Commissioner stated that normally he is in opposition for a Time Extension, but due to the economy, he is in favor and another Commissioner concurred.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any questions of Staff. Hearing none, he then called for the question.

A Motion was made by Commissioner Gamboa and seconded by Commissioner Sparks to:

1. Approve a second Two (2) Year Extension of Time for DRB-006-037, all subject to the amended Conditions of Approval, and;
2. Approved the Extension of Time Finding of Fact.

Motion carried on a 4 – 0 vote with Commissioners Haller, Willhite, and Vice Chairman Huynh absent.

City Planner Mainez thanked the Commission.

(Note: City Engineer Wong, Senior Planner Meikle and Assistant Planner Kelleher left the Chambers at 7:36p.m.)

5.2. Status Report on Senate Bill 375 - 2012 RTP / SCS Implementation.

The Planning Commission Received and Filed this Report.

Chairman Hamerly identified the Item and then asked for Staff's presentation.

City Planner Mainez gave the presentation from the Staff Report. He explained this is an Annual Report and is forwarded on to City Council and then concluded his presentation.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any questions of Staff.

Chairman Hamerly asked how aggressive did they think Sacramento was going to get about implementing sustainable communities portion of this legislation.

Community Development Director Jaquess stated that Staff is equally concerned with the issue. They will follow SCAG's lead and put efforts towards working with them on a plan that the City of Highland can live with and still meet the requirements of AB32 and SB375 in terms of greenhouse gas reduction targets.

PC 07-05-2011

Chairman Hamerly asked if this was achievable if there isn't a job base to support 100% of the population without additional funds for expanding a mass transit system.

Community Development Director Jaquess stated he did not know. The way the law is written is that if you can't make it work, then there could be an alternative planning strategy.

Chairman Hamerly wondered if those alternative strategies had any hope of being certified.

Community Development Director Jaquess stated that you almost have to look at it from a regional perspective and not get bogged down in deciding if a subdivision will or will not meet the plan by itself, but how we will fit into the bigger regional picture.

Chairman Hamerly asked if they were playing both sides of the coin by forcing arena standards but SB375 states that they cannot do high density residential out there because it is inappropriate to have it outside an urban area, wanting people to relocate to an urban hub.

Community Development Director Jaquess stated that there are conflicts between the two.

6.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS

Community Development Director Jaquess explained the Joint Study Session between the City Council and the Commission on July 12, 2011, at 3:30pm and the Items tentatively scheduled for the July 19, 2011, Regular Meeting.

There were no further Announcements.

7.0 ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chairman Hamerly declared the Meeting adjourned at 7:50p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Brandy Littleton, Administrative Assistant I

Randall Hamerly, Chairman Planning Commission

PC 07-05-2011