

**MINUTES  
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING  
MAY 1, 2012**

**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:       Chairman               Randall Hamerly  
                  Vice Chairman       Trang Huynh  
                  Commissioners       John Gamboa  
  Milton Sparks  
  Michael Willhite

Absent:       Commissioner Richard Haller (Note: arrived at 6:06p.m.)  
                  Commissioner Michael Stoffel

Staff Present: John Jaquess, Community Development Director  
                  Jim Godfredsen, Project Manager  
                  Lawrence Mainez, City Planner  
                  Sean Kelleher, Assistant Planner  
                  Linda McKeough, Administrative Assistant III

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Hamerly.

**2.0 COMMUNITY INPUT**

There was none.

**3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR**

**3.1 Minutes of April 17, 2012, Regular Meeting.**

**A Motion** was made by Commissioner Gamboa and seconded by Commissioner Sparks to approve the Minutes of April 17, 2012, Regular Meeting, as submitted.

Motion carried on a 5 – 0 vote with Commissioners Haller and Stoffel absent.

05-01-12.PC

#### 4.0 OLD BUSINESS

- 4.1 Accessory Sign Review Application (ASR-012-007), Amendment No. 2 to the Approved Sign Program for the Arco Gas Station Center. The Project is located at the southeast corner of Palm Avenue and Fifth Street and is identified as Assessor Parcel Number: 1201-311-48. Representative: Amer Quol. (Continued from the April 17, 2012, Regular Meeting.)

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

Assistant Planner Kelleher gave the presentation from the Staff Report and PowerPoint presentation and explained the Planning Commission's prior direction and historical background and then concluded his presentation.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly since this is a continuation, does this require a full Public Hearing with public input or if this just a formality and Community Development Director Jaquess responded no, the Commission had closed the Public Hearing and for the Commission to take action. Chairman Hamerly responded that he wanted to make sure with following the process.

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh since the last Commission Meeting, did the Applicant contact Staff and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded that he did speak with the Applicant regarding the denial and had also forwarded a copy of the Staff Report and indicated that the Applicant may submit revised drawings in the future and would be done under a separate Application. Vice Chairman Huynh then thanked Staff.

Chairman Hamerly asked if there were any further questions of Staff. Hearing none, and there being no further questions or discussion amongst the Commissioners, he then called for the question.

**A Motion** was made by Vice Chairman Huynh and seconded by Commissioner Gamboa as Directed by the Planning Commission at its April 17, 2012, Public Meeting, that the Planning Commission Adopt Resolution 12-005 denying the Applicant's proposal to enlarge the size and design of the Monument Signage Approved on September 6, 2011.

Motion carried on a 5 – 0 vote with Commissioners Haller and Stoffel absent.

- 4.2 Design Review Application (DRA 011-008) for the City's New Fire Station No. 1 (First Phase) which includes a 16,107 square foot four (4) Bay Fire Station Facility, 1,152 square foot detached Storage Building, and twenty-five (25)

05-01-12.PC

standard Parking Stalls, and fifteen (15) secured parking lot Facility for City vehicles, and approximately 37,000 square feet of landscaping / open space  
The Project is located at 27177 Base Line (westerly and contiguous to the Highland City Hall Facility – previously the Highland Branch Library and Post Office)(APNs: 1192-421-01, 02 & 39) Representative: Joseph A. Hughes, City Manager; GV Salts, Architect (STK Architects, Inc.) [Continued from the April 17, 2012 Planning Commission Regular Meeting].

Chairman Hamerly identified the Item and said on recommendation from Staff, the recommended action is to allow Staff time to continue to process and City Planner Mainez responded that is correct.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the Commission should take a formal Motion or to continue the Public Hearing and City Planner Mainez responded a formal Motion. Community Development Director Jaquess interjected Staff recommends the Commission pulling the Item from the Agenda and that the proposed Project will be readvertised.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly that we are not continuing this and that we are pulling the Item and Community Development Director Jaquess responded pulling it.

Chairman Hamerly then called for the question.

**A Motion** was made by Commissioner Gamboa and seconded by Commissioner Sparks to pull this Item from the Agenda to permit Staff additional time to process the subject Application concurrently with a Zoning Change related to the Highland Civic Center currently in process.

Motion carried on a 5 – 0 vote with Commissioners Haller and Stoffel absent.

## **5.0 NEW BUSINESS**

- 5.1 A Minor Sign Review Application (ASR-012-011) submitted by “Highland Family YMCA” for three (3) Permanent Building Mounted Signs on the existing Community Center Building located at 7793 Central Avenue. The parcel is located at the southeast corner of Central Avenue and Hibiscus Street. (APN: 1192-571-48-0000). Representative: Rob Hinderer, YMCA Representative

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

(Note: Commissioner Haller arrived at 6:06p.m., but refrained from stepping up to the Dais and did not join the Commission for this Item.)

05-01-12.PC

Assistant Planner Kelleher gave the presentation from the Staff Report and PowerPoint presentation and explained the proposed Project design and the Applicant's request to the Commission. He indicated that the Applicant's Representative is in the audience for any questions the Commission may have and then concluded his presentation.

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

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly with regards to distinction of the Primary Building Mounted Sign and the Secondary Mounted Sign and with Signs "A" and "B" locations on the Building seems that the Signs serve with an equal purpose and if adding the total amount of Building Mounted Sign square footage, they are still under the allowable Sign size limit and if Sign "B" could be designated as part of a Primary Mounted Sign since it is serving the traffic on Central coming from the south, as opposed to Building Mounted Sign "A" which would be serving the traffic coming from the north. Assistant Planner Kelleher responded that Signs "A" and "B" are based off of street frontages and the Third Sign not having street frontage.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly that the primary visibility for Building Mounted Sign "A" is that the Sign is advertising the Facility and the Sign is basically off of Central Avenue is considered Primary Frontage and its adjacency to the street and northerly parcel Assistant Planner Kelleher responded that is correct.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the Applicant is still under the allowable limit even on a key-noted total and under 100 square feet and if the Applicant still has the option to have a Secondary Sign and is still under 90 square feet and then provided examples. Assistant Planner Kelleher responded the formula for Signs "A" and "B" because of street frontage and the formula for Sign "C" because it is limited to percentage of the Building and that it has no street frontage.

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

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh if Sign "B" was reduced to 25 square feet, would that shrink the lettering and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded that it would reduce the entire symbol to a 5 X 5.

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

05-01-12.PC

Mr. Rob Hinderer, who is the Applicant and YMCA Representative, addressed the Commission. He stated that he agreed with Staff's assessment and would be happy to answer any questions the Commission may have.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any further questions of the Representative. Hearing none, he then asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on the Item. Hearing none, he then closed the Public Hearing and there being no further questions of Staff, or discussion amongst the Commissioners, he then called for the question.

**A Motion** was made by Commissioner Gamboa and seconded by Vice Chairman Huynh that the Planning Commission Approve a Proposed Sign Application (ASR-012-011), for three (3) Building Mounted Signs, subject to Conditions of Approval, and Adopt Findings of Facts.

Motion carried on a 5 – 0 vote with Commissioners Haller and Stoffel absent.

(Note: Commissioner Haller stepped up to the Dais at 6:12p.m.)

Note: Prior to the Meeting Staff distributed revised Planning Conditions of Approval for Item 5.2.

- 5.2 Conditional Use Permit (CUP-011-002), Design Review Application (DRA-011-002), and Accessory Sign Review Application (ASR-012-010) for a proposed new three thousand four hundred eighty five (3,485) square foot Multi-tenant Building, which will house a new Fast Food Restaurant with a Drive-thru and a new Bakery (Pepitos Drive-Thru Restaurant). The Site will also be improved with a new parking facility and new landscaping and Demolition of an existing Restaurant Building. The Site is generally located on the south side of Base Line approximately 200 feet east of Victoria Avenue, 26539 Base Line, Highland, California. Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 1192-331-05, 06, and 07. Representative: Robert Chagolla Construction; James Ramos, Property Owner/ Business Owner (Pepitos Drive-Thru Restaurant)

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

Assistant Planner Kelleher gave the presentation from the Staff Report and PowerPoint presentation and explained the proposed Project design and the Applicant's requests to the Commission. He further explained how the Applicant met with Staff regarding the proposed Revised Planning Conditions of Approval

05-01-12.PC

prior to the Commission Meeting and that the Revisions are acceptable to the Applicant. He indicated that the Applicant's Representative is in the audience for any questions the Commission may have. Assistant Planner Kelleher said as for the Revised Engineering Condition of Approval, Project Manager Godfredsen can explain said Revision and then concluded his presentation.

Project Manager Godfredsen explained to the Commission that the Applicant has requested flexibility and the proposed Revised Engineering Condition of Approval No. 23, and read the proposed verbiage to the Commission. He further explained that the Applicant could then defer the immediate cash payment which would minimize the impact for the up front cost for the Applicant.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any questions of Engineering or of Staff and hearing none, Assistant Planner Kelleher then explained the reasons for the proposed Revised Planning Conditions of Approval to the Commission.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly regarding the proposed Revised Planning Condition of Approval No. 68 if the concrete is in lieu of recycled material or is it saying the concrete content has also to include recycled materials since both are options and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded they are both options.

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

Mr. Dave Cooper, of Tuttle Engineering, who is the Applicant's Civil Engineer and the Applicant's Representative, addressed the Commission. He stated how Staff has been very responsive and appreciated the opportunities and have met with them several times in person and have been very responsive on the telephone and have been able to work out the little details that they thought would be important to the Commission and for the Applicant and then thanked Assistant Planner Kelleher for the effort he has done. Mr. Cooper then said that he would be happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have and believed that everything is straight-forward and provided all of the Studies that were required in order for the Commission to make a decision tonight and hopes that the Commission sees this as a new opportunity for that end of town and added that he hopes the Project would be a catalyst for the City.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if Mr. Cooper's Firm did the Noise Study and Mr. Cooper responded no, that Michael Brandman and Associates that prepared the Noise / Air Quality Studies. Tuttle Engineering prepared the Engineering and the Water Quality Management Plan.

05-01-12.PC

A question was asked by Commissioner Willhite if the existing Building was going to be removed first then build the proposed Project and Mr. Cooper responded no, that the existing Restaurant would remain while constructing the new Project, then the existing Restaurant would be removed.

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Huynh that this is one of the first Projects he has seen that proposes a Fountain outside the Building and is a substantial water feature and more than just a Building and a trellis and Assistant Planner Kelleher distributed a Color and Materials Board for the Project and the proposed Fountain for the Commission to review. Mr. Cooper added that the Applicant wanted the old Spanish Style Building design, and deferred to the Applicant's Architect. .

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh what was the inspiration for the Project's architectural design.

Mr. Gary Stegemann, who is the Applicant's Architect, addressed the Commission. He stated how Mr. Ramos wanted to proceed with the Spanish Revival Style architectural design and Vice Chairman Huynh responded that it is good and that it is different.

Mr. Stegemann explained the design of the proposed Spanish Fountain to the Commission.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the basin around the Fountain is for water or is it going to have plant materials around it and Mr. Stegemann responded they would be separate and mini-rocks and plants would be installed around the base due to health and safety issues.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any further questions of the Applicant's Representatives.

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa that the Elevations for the patio looked like the patio was going to be covered, but the overall sketch looked like the patio was not going to be covered and he then asked if the patio is going to be a solid covered patio and Mr. Stegemann responded affirmatively that it would be a solid cover.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly about what type of windows are being proposed and Mr. Stegemann responded conventional dual pane, and have not been specified and Chairman Hamerly recommended if it is still yet to be specified, the Spanish Revival is kind of the Old World charm and if the Applicant could go with a more authentic divided light and not a true divided light, because he believes that product is probably rare in the commercial line, but with

05-01-12.PC

something with a little thicker frame on the mullions would be preferable and Mr. Stegemann responded that he was planning to do that.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly the parallel concern also with that style of architecture is usually there is more detail windows that ranges from anything from the hand painted tiles all the way to the more ornamentation and he did not see any of that to have more detail around the windows and Mr. Stegemann responded in agreement.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that he does not have a specific recommendation, but to have the Applicant articulate the windows more and do with a profile / material of whatever is appropriate and direct Staff to work with the Applicant on that detail with the windows.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any further questions of the Applicant's Representatives.

A question was asked by Commissioner Gamboa if the Drive-thru Menu Board is going to be large enough and wants to ensure that the Applicant does not have to come back for that and Mr. Stegemann responded that he is willing to work with the Sign People.

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh regarding the North and West Elevations if the tall parapet has a opening at the top and if you could see through the opening and Mr. Stegemann responded no, that it will be tile and would be solid – quad foil

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Huynh that he liked the design and is very different from other buildings in town and Mr. Stegemann said thank you.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if there was any particular structure in Redlands that the Applicant borrowed the roof line from and Mr. Stegemann responded that type of the parapet detailing is throughout both Redlands and San Bernardino. Chairman Hamerly responded that he liked the roof detailing, but there are a couple of structures in Redlands that look nice and was wondering if that was the inspiration and commented that the proposed Project looks nice and Mr. Stegemann said thank you.

A question was asked by Commissioner Haller what was the rationale for the "Bakery" Signage not to be included in the Sign Program at this time and Mr. Stegemann responded that there is not a Tenant at this time.

A comment was made by Commissioner Haller the feasibility of having a Monument Sign on the street would have a space for the Tenant on whatever it ends up being and Chairman Hamerly responded there is still allowable square

05-01-12.PC

footage for the Signage and would make sense if the Applicant would want to add an additional Placeholder with a thicker base treatment that could be modified at a future date if the Applicant would want to install a Sign Panel in place of that and that the Applicant could have a thicker Monument Sign base treatment and add a Sign Panel and how the Applicant has allowable room since the overall height of the Monument Sign by City Standards is eight feet (8'). Mr. Cooper responded that he didn't apply for that and a question by Mr. Stegemann asked what about the Conditions of Approval and Chairman Hamerly responded that Mr. Stegemann would have to discuss that with Assistant Planner Kelleher and would be an amendment to the approved Sign Program and how the Commission considers those amendments and Mr. Cooper added that sounds like a better option.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any further questions of Staff. Hearing none, he then asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on the Item.

Mr. James Ramos, who is the Property Owner / Business Owner, addressed the Commission. He thanked both the Commission and Staff working with the Applicant and the Applicant's Representatives and how this will be something that will be enjoyed in Highland and with other communities coming together. The water feature is an added plus to bring people in and how he likes the Spanish Style architecture in that it brings back a lot of history and culture from this area and having add into some of the different things that we have been able to do. He reiterated his thanks to the Commission for the opportunity and is looking forward to passing this.

Chairman Hamerly then asked if there was anyone else in the audience who would like to speak on the item. Hearing none, he then closed the Public Hearing and opened the floor for discussion amongst the Commissioners. There being no further questions of Staff, or discussion amongst the Commissioners, Chairman Hamerly then called for the question.

**A Motion** was made by Vice Chairman Huynh and seconded by Commissioner Haller to:

1. Adopt Resolution 12-006 Approving Conditional Use Permit (CUP-011-002), Design Review Application (DRA-011-002), and Accessory Sign Review Application (ASR-012-010), all subject to the recommended Conditions of Approval, as modified with the following:

05-01-12.PC

Planning Conditions of Approval:

- 11.d. One hundred percent (100%) of all landscape areas or exposed soil shall be covered with either shrubs or groundcover or as approved by the City Planner and City's Landscape Architect.
- 38. Parking Lot Light Standards shall be a maximum of fifteen feet (15') in height measured from grade. In no case shall Building Mounted Light Standards extend above Building eaves.
- 54. Landscaped island shall be designed to meet the following standards: (Note: Only this portion that was amended, not A,B,C.)
  - a. Landscaped islands shall have a minimum dimension of 5 feet by 16 feet, exclusive of curb and twelve inch (12") step out, and be of sufficient size to accommodate the growth of trees.
  - b. Within the landscaped islands, a total of one canopy-type tree shall be provided for every five vehicular parking stalls.
  - c. Parking lot trees shall be clustered with a minimum of two trees per cluster.
- 68. (NS) Site furniture shall be installed, such as benches and tables within the Business frontages. Said furniture shall be made of 100% recycled content, or other Material (i.e. Concrete), as approved by the City's Public Services Division.

Engineering Conditions of Approval

- 23. Make a cash payment, or submit an alternative financial commitment, to guarantee the design and construction of a landscaped median across the Base Line project frontage, as approved by the City Engineer.

And;

- 2. Findings of Fact.

Motion carried on a 6 – 0 vote with Commissioner Stoffel absent.

05-01-12.PC

5.3 Annual Review of the City's General Plan Implementation in accordance with Government Code Section 65400 and 65588.

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

Community Development Director Jaquess stated while waiting for City Planner Mainez, he would provide the Announcements to the Commission.

(Note: the Commission went to Item 6.0. and Assistant Planner Kelleher left the Chambers at 6:36p.m.)

**6.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Community Development Director Jaquess explained the Items tentatively scheduled for the Regular Meeting for May 15, 2012, inclusive of the Housing Element Workshop and a request for Revisions for Conditions of Approval for the Dairy Queen Project relating to the Landscape Median and irrigation. A question was asked by Commissioner Haller if it was not built with requirements and Community Development Director Jaquess responded that it was built appropriately, but the issue is with the Landscape Median and irrigation.

Community Development Director Jaquess further explained how Staff will be attending International Council of Shopping Centers (ICSC) Conference in Las Vegas at the end of the month and indicated that is all for Announcements and then turned it back over to City Planner Mainez for Item 5.3.

(Note: the Commission returned to Item 5.3.)

5.3 Annual Review of the City's General Plan Implementation in accordance with Government Code Section 65400 and 65588.

City Planner Mainez gave the presentation from the Staff Report and explained the historical background to the Commission. He indicated there will be a Study Session on May 15, 2012.

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh if it will be a Joint Study Session with the City Council or just with the Commission and City Planner Mainez responded just the Commission and a Joint Study Session is tentatively scheduled in October with the City Council.

05-01-12.PC

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if this is to start the process and do the Housing Element and what the City is to expect for the next five (5) years and City Planner responded that is correct.

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa regarding how much was affected by the City's loss of Redevelopment Funds and Community Development Director Jaquess responded there is some legislation currently going through in Sacramento that would benefit the City, if it passes, from a Redevelopment housing standpoint in the short term. There is also some legislation that the Housing Element will have to deal with on longer term solutions, but are remote in terms of passing right now.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly about the State slamming us for not executing implementation and how badly it could go for Cities that are trying to revise what is realistic expectations to implement a Housing Element and Community Development Director Jaquess responded there are 400 letters that will be written to Cities in California that all will be suffering the same problem sue to the loss of Redevelopment Funding.

A comment was made by Commissioner Haller how we never met the numbers and that the main thing is to put together a good Plan and did not think the State would grade on an actual performance or results and Community Development Director Jaquess responded the numbers were met in the sense that the City was obligated to accommodate and Commissioner Haller responded how we had a good Plan, and the next Plan will be hard since there is no Redevelopment Funds.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly how we will be unable to do this since there is no Redevelopment Funds and the only saving grace is that nothing was built so there is no percentage of zero that you have built all these units and City Planner Mainez responded that is correct for terms of new construction and how fifty percent (50%) of the Housing Element is to preserve the existing housing stock and that is where Redevelopment came in and now what are we supposed to do with that loss of funding and that every 400 Cities in the State will be competing for Grant Funding and that is the dilemma that we are dealing with today.

There being no further questions of Staff, or discussion amongst the Commissioners, Chairman Hamerly then called for the question.

**A Motion** was made by Commissioner Gamboa and seconded by Commissioner Haller that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council Receive and File the Subject General Plan Implementation Annual Report.

Motion carried on a 6 – 0 vote with Commissioner Stoffel absent.

05-01-12.PC

## 7.0 ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chairman Hamerly declared the Meeting adjourned at 6:42p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

---

Linda McKeough, Community Development  
Administrative Assistant III

---

Randall Hamerly, Chairman  
Planning Commission

05-01-12.PC