

**MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 19, 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
 Richard Haller
 Milton Sparks
 Michael Willhite

Absent: Commissioner Michael Stoffel

Staff Present: John Jaquess, Community Development Director
 Jim Godfredsen, Project Manager
 Lawrence Mainez, City Planner
 Sean Kelleher, Assistant Planner
 Scott Rice, City's Landscape Architect
 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 June 5, 2012, Regular Meeting.

A Motion was made by Vice Chairman Huynh and seconded by Commissioner Haller to approve the Minutes of June 5, 2012, Regular Meeting, as submitted.

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

06-05-12.PC

4.0 OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

5.0 NEW BUSINESS

Note: Prior to the Meeting Staff distributed an added proposed Planning Condition of Approval (COA) No. 11 for Item 5.2 to the Commission for consideration.

- 5.1 A Sign Review Application (ASR-012-013) submitted by "Far West Meats" for a Freestanding Monument Sign. The property is located at 7759 Victoria Avenue, a two (2) parcel site located on the east side of Victoria Avenue between Cypress Street and Sixth Street. APNs: 1192-491-49 & 50. Representative: Jaime Murillo, Far West Meats

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

City Planner Mainez gave the presentation from the Staff Report on behalf of Planning Technician Tafolla. He explained that in the Staff Report the proposed Monument Sign says that it is thirty (30) square feet and that the Site Plan says that it is eighteen (18) square feet and that the Monument Sign should be reflect the eighteen (18) square feet size. He further explained the Project design and layout, historical background and the Applicant's request to the Commission and then concluded his presentation.

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

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that the stone base on one of the Exhibits looks like block on the Plan and asked if there was an example / picture had been submitted and City Planner Mainez responded that it would be a concrete formed block.

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. Jaime Murillo, 4220 Grid Avenue, Chino Hills, California, who is the Applicant's Representative, addressed the Commission. He stated that the proposed Monument Sign would be the same material as the City's Monument Signage.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the materials used would be then river rock base with a mortar set and Mr. Murillo responded that is correct.

06-05-12.PC

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the Mr. Murillo had anything other supplemental information to provide or present to the Commission and Mr. Murillo responded no.

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh regarding if the word on the First Page of the Plans under the parking calculations schedule was correct and Mr. Murillo responded no, that the word on the Plans is a typographical error and will be changed to "Warehouse".

Another question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh with the United States of America Flag shown on the Plan that is twenty feet (20') high is part of the approval and Community Development Director Jaquess responded that a Permit is not required. Mr. Murillo added that there will be a light to illuminate the Flag, as well as a light to illuminate the Monument Sign. Vice Chairman Huynh then thanked Mr. Murillo and Community Development Director Jaquess.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any further questions of the Applicant's Representative or Staff.

A question was asked by Commissioner Gamboa if the cows displayed are part of the Sign Program and City Planner Mainez responded no, and that they are already there. Community Development Director Jaquess added how the cows were originally on the roof, but after the Building was rebuilt, it would be too costly to place them back up on the roof and Staff agreed to allow the Applicant to place them on the ground.

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa how the cows are set now, that they are not six feet (6') apart in order to install the proposed Monument Sign between them and was unsure how the cows were to be placed – either the Sign was going to go behind or between the cows, sideways, lateral with the street instead of facing the street. Mr. Murillo responded that he did not see that and that he can shift the cows to the side and the Monument Sign is designed to face the street between the cows. Commissioner Gamboa wanted to ensure that the Sign did not end up either in front or behind the cows and wanted to ensure what it would look like is what the Commission is approving tonight.

A suggestion was made by City Planner Mainez to line up the Monument Sign between the cows' noses. Chairman Hamerly responded how Commissioner Gamboa was referencing the spacing between the cows parallel to the street and if the space was only six feet (6') then the Monument Sign would not fit and how the Applicant is showing plant materials between the cows and the Sign and would have to be spaced out between ten feet to twelve feet (10' – 12') between the cows in order to accommodate the Sign and landscaping, as shown.

06-05-12.PC

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa that it looks nice, but wanted to make sure that the cows were not already set in concrete and that there were not be the room for the Sign being six feet (6') between them. Mr. Murillo responded that he will adjust accordingly when they get the Monument Sign.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any further questions of the Applicant's Representative or Staff. 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 Haller and seconded by Commission Gamboa to Approve Sign Application (ASR-012-013) for a eighteen (18) square foot Freestanding Monument Sign, subject to Conditions of Approval, and Adopt Findings of Facts.

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

- 5.2 CUP 012-003 – A Proposal to permit the reestablishment of a Type 41 On-Sale Beer and Wine for Bona Fide Public Eating Place from the State Department of Alcohol and Beverage Control ABC for "Candy's". The Project is generally located on the north side of Third Street 600 feet east of Central Avenue. The address is 26998 Third Street and APN: 1192-631-21. Representative: Victor Lee McCarty.

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 Condition of Approval (COA) No. 11 that was distributed earlier to the Commission and provided the historical background and the Applicant's request to the Commission.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the hours of operation were until midnight or 2:00a.m. and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded 2:00a.m and anything after midnight requires a six (6) month review. and then concluded his presentation.

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.

06-05-12.PC

Mr. Victor McCarty, 11177 Hillister Road, Oak Hills, California, who is the Representative, addressed the Commission. He is excited and stated that it is a great place for people to come and enjoy themselves and have a good time and will have good food and believed everything that is in the Staff Report is fact on how it has been and what is going to happen and is happy to answer any questions the Commission may have.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly how long was the ABC License vacated in the changeover and Mr. McCarty responded within ninety (90) days and that March 31, 2012, was the last time Third Street Station was in business.

Chairman Hamerly requested Mr. McCarty to describe the focus of the business and Mr. McCarty complied and explained there will be food, beer and wine for a Class 41 ABC License, and a Bona Fide Eating Place and will have a full menu and that the hours of operation would be from 11:00am – Midnight early part of the week and 11:00am – 2:00am later part of the week and have full meals scheduled during 11:00a.m. and 10:00p.m. on a regular daily basis and on the menu there will be specials and plan on having good food and maybe a BBQ and thought this would be unique to what had been there.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly that the use could be described as a Restaurant that serves alcoholic beverages as opposed to a Bar that serves hors d'oeuvres and Mr. McCarty responded that is correct.

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh if there is an area for dancing and Mr. McCarty responded the people can dance outside on the patio where there are tables / chairs and horseshoes and added that he could also see having birthday parties, weddings, special events, etc.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly regarding the Applicant applying for a Special Event Permit and Mr. McCarty responded affirmatively that and possibly having a Chili Cook-off, for live entertainment outside and added there is a small room on the side of the bar could be for dancing and karaoke can be played there. Chairman Hamerly stated that he doesn't want to have complaints lodged about loud noises and that the noise would be kept inside within the confines of the establishment and not outside disturbing the neighbors and Mr. McCarty responded affirmatively.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if Mr. McCarty had read the COAs plus the added COA and if they are acceptable and Mr. McCarty responded affirmatively and that added Planning COA No. 11 is needed.

06-05-12.PC

Chairman Hamerly asked if anyone else would like to speak on the item. Hearing none, he then left the Public Hearing open and opened the floor for discussion amongst the Commissioners.

A comment was made by Commissioner Willhite how he has known the Applicant and his wife for years does not believe that he has a conflict and Chairman Hamerly responded so noted.

There being no further questions of the Applicant or his Representative, or Staff, or discussion amongst the Commissioners, Chairman Hamerly then closed the Public Hearing and called for the question.

A Motion was made by Commissioner Haller and seconded by Commission Gamboa to:

1. Direct Staff to File a CEQA Notice of Exemption with the San Bernardino County Clerk of the Board; and;
2. Adopt Resolution 12-010 approving Conditional Use Permit 012-003, all subject to the recommended Conditions of Approval, as amended with the following:

Planning

11. The Applicant may have live entertainment, similar to Karaoke, and small Bands, performing during normal business hours within the Building. The Applicant shall submit for a Special Event Permit for outside musical entertainment, to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

and:

3. Adopt the Findings of Fact.

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

5.3 Conditional Use Permit (CUP-012-002), Design Review Application (DRA-012-003), and Accessory Sign Review Application (ASR-012-012) to construct a new approximately 8,320 square feet “Family Dollar” Retail Store. The Site is generally located on the north side of Base Line approximately 380 feet east of Palm Avenue. Assessor’s Parcel Numbers for Conceptual Master Plan: (1200-

06-05-12.PC

381-02, 03, 04, and 05). Assessors Parcel Numbers for Project Site: (1200-381-03 and 04). Representative: David Morse, Boos Development

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 there are two (2) Color / Materials Boards that are the same for the brick that are in front of Chairman Hamerly for the Commission's review and added that the Conceptual Master Plan is similar to that which the Commission has seen previously along Base Line associated with the Valero Gas Station and the Conceptual Master Plan will be coming forward in the future for an ultimate approval with Conditions for itself, but is for discussion purposes for tonight on how the proposed Project will tie into the future development of the Site. He further explained the proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP), the Design Review Application's (DRA) Project design and layout, parking and required agreements for reciprocal access parking, landscaping improvements, hours of operation, historical background and the Applicant's requests to the Commission. Assistant Planner Kelleher stated that the proposed Monument Sign does not include any architectural features that are on the proposed Building and is plain and the Building Mounted Signs exceed the Standards for maximum square footage and indicated that the Applicant 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 if the COAs lists the revision of the Sign's total square footage, as proposed by the Applicant, is 144 square feet and can go up to 100 for the Primary Sign located on the south side and 25 for the Secondary Sign and the Secondary Sign will be located on the east side and that the Signage is 125 square feet in aggregate and is part of the Sign Program. Assistant Planner Kelleher said that is correct and that it is so noted.

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.

Ms. Kristi Kandel, of Boos Development, 701 Park Center, Santa Ana, California, who is the Applicant's Representative, addressed the Commission. She stated how the Family Dollar Store is relatively new to California, and the Family Dollar Stores are located in forty-four (44) other States and approximately one and one-half to two (1½ - 2) years ago, conducted a market research for California and plans to develop in different cities within California. The Family Dollar Store is similar to an ACE Hardware Store, Home Depot, Lowe's, Target, Walmart and

06-05-12.PC

expressed that it is not another Dollar or 99 Cents Store. There are over 6,000 Family Dollar Stores Nationwide and able to purchase their products at a low price and pass that cost onto their customers. She explained that the hours of operation have been revised since last speaking with Staff and are now from 8am – 10pm Monday – Sunday and indicated most of their Stores do that and their Staff Members include a Staff Manager, Assistant Manager and three to five (3 – 5) additional Employees. Ms. Kandel further explained to the Commission how the Employees are hired and how weekly deliveries are made to the Store. She indicated the Building design is a standard metal building as in the other forty-four (44) States and that the Headquarters is in North Carolina and for the California market, they wanted a new prototype / image in California. She further explained to the Commission how they kept with the metal building theme, and changed it to a gable design in order to gain additional interior space, the design layout inclusive of the enhanced Front Elevation and Parapet, sky lights, red awnings across the front of the Building, brick veneer and for being a Green Building. The proposed custom Signage is a standard Monument Sign as used in the other forty-four (44) States and would be happy to answer any questions the Commission may have.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the hours of operation would be modified to 10:00p.m. seven days / week and Ms. Kandel responded affirmatively and Assistant Planner Kelleher added the revised proposed hours of operation would then modify Planning COA No. 20.

A question was asked by Commissioner Sparks where is the location of the Distribution Center and Ms. Kandel responded that the current Distribution Center for California is located in Texas. Commissioner Sparks stated if there is an open Family Dollar Store located in Redlands on University and Ms. Kandel responded affirmatively and explained that Store's construction to the Commission.

A comment was made by Commissioner Willhite how he had seen the Family Dollar Stores located in Arizona, and indicated the proposed Project is nicer than those, but had issues with the front doors and asked if there will be a center pillar between the doors and Ms. Kandel responded how there is a column located between the front doors and how the doors on the Stores in Arizona are like the other Stores in the other forty-four (44) States and how they wanted to enter California differently and also change to the proposed gabled roof design.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly what was rationale using only one (1) set of double doors – one door for entry and the other door for the exit, as opposed to having two (2) sets of double doors going in each direction and Ms. Kandel responded that is more of a Family Dollar internal decision when they switched to the green prototype Building design.

06-05-12.PC

Another question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if shopping carts are used and if so, it would be easier to go in / out if there would be a wider egress with a shopping cart and with children and wasn't sure if the doors were fully automatic with a sensor or if they are manually operated. Ms. Kandel responded that shopping carts are used, but they are a smaller cart in size (18" x 24") than a regular shopping cart and that the doors are manually operated doors. Chairman Hamerly suggested that two (2) sets of double doors that be centered on the Façade and separate them out and with the pair of doors on either side of the column in that it would look more balanced and Ms. Kandel responded that she will take the suggestion back to Family Dollar Design Team.

A comment was made by Commissioner Haller about the Town Center's General Plan Description that it is supposed to be a destination place and how there was a lot of work put into the Town Center Description and feels that the Store appears to have been plopped down on a piece of property and doesn't see where it fits in with the Town Center Description and is not compatible with the architecture with the adjacent properties. He has never seen a new Building is a corrugated metal and reiterated that he does not understand that that will fit with the existing buildings and how the Building will fit into the Town Center's Theme. This parcel was supposed to be a part of a Master Plan and understands that a Site Plan has been developed, but how this will be incorporated into an overall development for this property and requested Ms. Kandel to explain. Ms. Kandel complied and explained that the Building is a prototype metal building and looked at the different design Standards was with the Historic District Model and how there are dormers were added along the Elevations and then deferred to the Applicant's Architect.

Mr. Patrick Jacobs, who is the Applicant's Architect, addressed the Commission. He stated how he had spun more with the two existing buildings of the CVS / Baker's design style / elements and attempted to match the finishes with CVS / Baker's. With regards to the metal Building, it is a Family Dollar design and seen as one of the Agricultural Building style and then explained about the materials / colors to the Commission.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if he had a sample(s) with him of the corrugated product and explained typically, there is a Materials Board and asked for the actual materials and not a computer simulation of what might be the color and as he would like to see the proposed actual materials and Mr. Jacobs responded that he does not have them physically with him. Chairman Hamerly asked if Mr. Jacobs could ensure that he provide that to the Commission and Mr. Jacobs responded affirmatively.

06-05-12.PC

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that the overall Site concept is not on the Agenda because it is a part of a future development that the Commission is not reviewing tonight. There is a narrative in the City's General Plan of what the Town Center is supposed to have and is supposed to be a destination, each of the components within the Town Center needs to have gathering places and encourage pedestrian flow, have interconnectiveness and to treat it as a destination. He concurred with Commission Haller's comment that it seems like box was plunked down in one corner of a much larger parcel without a lot of creativity or thought given to a tightly construed Site Plan Concept. Mr. Jacobs responded that he is unable to speak on the overall Site Plan, but on the PowerPoint display, he explained that there is a continuation of the historical walk from CVS / Baker's and that the pedestrian path and is the intent as the rest of the Site is developed, the pedestrian path will continue to be part of that development and will be using the elements of stamped concrete on the ground and some of the graphics with the orange crate art incorporated along the Building.

A comment was made by Commissioner Willhite that the Building looks like a packinghouse with dormers located at the back of the Building and reminded him of the old packinghouse that was torn down north of Pacific years ago and understand what the Applicant is saying, but thought maybe that is what the Applicant was going after.

A comment was made by Commissioner Haller that he understands that now after the Applicant's explanation, but does not envision a packinghouse in the Town Center located on Base Line is now struggling how it will fit into the overall Town Center Concept and it does not feel like a destination. He appreciated the historic walk, and how he picks up on those details and reiterated how he doesn't see how it will tie into the overall Town Center development where this is all fits together when it is completed. Other than the historic walk, he didn't see any architectural features that would be common throughout the development. A corrugated metal Building is unique and unsure of how it would tie that to other buildings and the brick is something that can be worked with.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that he understands that there is an historic walk, but he doesn't want this to be Highland Town Center's Bridge to Nowhere because it looks like the walkway dumps people right into the parking lot and how the Buildings are located at the north end of the Site on the Overall Concept Plan, and if so, there needs to be a dramatic strong link either through Site kiosks, a lot of trees or something that would pull people back further to the south of the adjacent Site and this pulls the people further to the street which is the opposite of what is trying to be achieved with being interconnective of the pedestrian thoroughfares on the overall Town Center Concept and want them

06-05-12.PC

going back into the Complex ideally. Some of the public's comments and vision statements how there is a "wish list" with the Town Center Area being a gathering area, i.e. public common green, etc. So to have a big box located at the back of the Site with a sea of asphalt in front of the Building is absolutely not what they are after for the Town Center. It does not have any interconnectiveness with Base Line and doesn't have a sense of place on that Site which is just another big parking lot and is exactly the opposite of what the City is trying to achieve. Chairman Hamerly requested for the Applicant to go and study the vision for the Town Center before returning with an overall Site Master Plan and he understands that is at some point in the future. Ms. Kandel responded with regards to the overall Site Master Plan and design is under control with Mr. William Buster and the existing property owner. She explained when they were putting this together to work with Staff, the property owner of the rest parcel had no current or immediate future plans for anything that he would develop with that property and that she has no control over how he is going to develop that property, or even if he would sell that property. They had used the existing Plans that were in place that had been discussed previously. What she was trying to do and could be was to match up to what was existing with CVS / Baker's with being closer to the street and having the historic walk and how then tried to tie it in since there is not a timeline, or have control over the future development and is at a crossroads.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that he understands that and knowing that the overall Site Master Plan is not on the table tonight, but this is the first element towards achieving some future vision for that overall property. Whether or not any of the Team here tonight is going to play a part of in those future plans or not, he assumed that the Minutes and comments are going to end up back on the desk of person who is making all these decisions and that is why he wanted to spend some time re-enforcing what the City's vision is for this key piece of property on the most important street in Highland because it is a key component of developing the downtown Master Plan concept. This is a key part of the overall puzzle. One of the primary things is that each of the parcels that are developed within the entire stretch of Base Line there needs to be the interconnectiveness. Unfortunately, there were two (2) small sites that tried their best to cooperate when CVS / Baker's were developed, they were far from ideal because one was a Drive-thru Restaurant that threw a wrench in trying to establish a destination how a people would drive through, get their food and leave the site and was counter productive with the Town Center Concept and the Commission did its best to make the best of the plan that the Commission was given. So patterning the Applicant's Plan after those two (2) is matching something that is less than desirable, but the Commission made the best that it was given and is an unfortunate set of circumstances. In addition, he doesn't feel that the Applicant's proposed materials are appropriate whether they are colors or otherwise. He said yes with the Applicant using brick, but is a different brick, different color and palette on the Building and will take a little more work.

06-05-12.PC

Chairman Hamerly understands the packinghouse and historic motif that the Applicant is trying to do with the proposed Building, but he is not seeing it and there would be more integrity even if the Building did not have the Façade Element on it. If the Applicant is trying to describe a warehouse / packinghouse, then go for it; do historical lighting, large sliding barn doors, something like that, then that is authentic and has a flare to it. But this is the worst of both worlds where a person is trying to match something that is contemporary with CVS / Baker's, but trying to make it fit a template of Family Dollar Store. In his opinion, the Family Dollar Store design needs more work. The Front Façade is trying to establish layers, but when a person views it from the side, there are different materials changing on a flat Façade and needs more layers. If the historic walk is the Applicant's backbone is the Applicant's Site concept is the continuation, make it more pedestrian friendly and needs canopy / awning a pleasant place to be at rather than walking up against a metal-sided Building on the south side will be getting baked in the midday sun and need to think of all of these considerations and adding some human scaled elements i.e. overhanging lighting, signage, etc. that plays off of the connection with the pedestrian would go a long way enhancing this concept.

A question was asked by Ms. Kandel if the Commission wanted the Applicant to step away from the historic theme with considering the overall shopping center development and Chairman Hamerly responded the he is playing off of the Applicant's representation concept and that the Commission is not trying to force a concept on the Applicant, but if the Applicant provides a concept to the Commission, the Commission will play off that and make suggestions based on what the Applicant is trying to achieve and how it will fit within the template of the City's Master Plan and the vision for the Site and for the entire street and provided examples and indicated there is nothing wrong with the historical context and Ms. Kandel said okay. Chairman Hamerly continued and provided an example of the City's proposed Fire Station No. 1 design that was approved by the Commission and was the general consensus of the Commission was that a nice artistic job of doing a contemporary structure that fit the program of the Fire Department with its industrial use and made it fit within the historic context / design through the use of materials and patterning of the windows. With the Title 24 aspects for the Applicant to consider if looking for daylight value, try ridge skylights that run the length of the Building, rather than have four (4) skylights distributed on the roof. The ridge skylights would have a little more historic character where there is a high roof on a gable and then with a lower roof that is stepped down and would have a continuous band of light, but would also have

06-05-12.PC

that nested gabled effect and is seen a lot with warehouses i.e. provided a chicken coop as an illustration for ventilation and heat dispersal and was achieved and in this case, that vented gable design would be a more contemporary version when adding a continuous band of light would free up the interior, but architecturally, would be an apparent solution for the outside of the Applicant's Building.

Concerns were raised by Commissioner Gamboa regarding the huge, red awning on the Front Façade and then having the crimson brick on almost the entire front of the Building and stated that is a lot of red color. Chairman Hamerly responded that he had not gotten to the color palette yet and wanted to address the Building's overall concept issues and how it sits on the Site first and then the color palette and believed the color palette needs some work on also.

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa regarding if there were multiple dormers on the Building would give it a sense of a packinghouse and that he liked simulation of the barn doors / huge sliding doors concept and Chairman Hamerly responded even if they are security gates, they still have the top track, the bar hardware, etc. and could do an interesting design with packing crate motifs on the doors and when they open up, the design is still on display to the east / west of the Store front and the Applicant would be creating more authenticity in terms of historic motif. Mr. Jacobs responded with the large overall Site Plan more from the existing two (2) buildings there and is not a sea of parking, but will have landscaping and reiterated there is a continuation and shared access on all three (3) uses with the two (2) buildings and establishing a setback and hope to maintain and Site circulation.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding that his comment was directed at with the property being such a large parcel to the east. He understood and respects the Applicant is maintaining consistent flow through the Site, the streetscape needs to be consistent with the historic walk and is a continuation and has no problems with the Building's setback. There needs something better to happen once the connection is made to the property to the east and he understands that is not on the Agenda tonight for discussion, but needs to be in the Minutes reiterated that the Project is a stand alone project and is relating to what is existing and the Project is going to be a premise for what is assumed on the next project to the east and need to have something in the record to say please stop this, think about it and then move forward with the concept that is going to go back to the original vision for the Town Center Concept. City Planner Mainez responded regarding the Conceptual Site Plan. The General Plan is a vision / policy and Staff had struggled with that early on

06-05-12.PC

when the Applicant came in and the problem that Staff has is that Staff not having all of the property owners at the table for discussion, i.e. Mr. William Buster, KZ Holdings, the Denny's Site, and that is critical and indicated for years, Staff has tried to get all of the property owners together to help Master Plan for that area. The City received a Grant from SCAG to study the issue and in August, there will be a Joint Study Session with the City Council and the Commission regarding Master Planning the Town Center, because without that, it is hard to get the property owners to commit to anything and how there are no incentives and no RDA funding. The Town Center is a Mixed Use District with commercial / housing and it could be some conductivity in the future i.e. reciprocal access, parking, etc. City Planner Mainez further explained in defense of the Applicant, Staff did force the issue and tried to get the Applicant to think about future planning with very strict limitations unfortunately, and Staff appreciates the "advanced warning" because that is what Staff needs to order to advise the City Council, with the Council setting the policies, and if the Council starts saying no to all of the stand alone commercial boxes, and will advise them that the Commission has given Staff an "advanced warning" that the Commission wants a Master Plan for the Site with wanting the open space, gathering destinations, outside dining areas, linkages, the character that it feels like it is a sense of place, and believed to stop it here and that this is the last freestanding structure that is not Master Planned in the Town Center and wanted to plant that seed for the record, and hopefully, will be able to get past that discussion of the Master Planning and that Staff will work on that in the future. Chairman Hamerly responded that he knows that the Master Plan is not on for discussion tonight, but it is providing background to the comments that he is going to make on this specific Site and City Planner Mainez interjected and said okay. Chairman Hamerly continued because in the absence of a true Master Plan, the Commission is kind of a "gate keeper" to save the public's intent about how they want this key portion of the City to be used, because the Commission is also the Design Review Board, as well as the Planning Commission and is kind of the last line of defense for the preserving that vision in the absence of developers getting together and creating something special there and the rest of the Commissioners take that very seriously and City Planner Mainez responded how Staff recognizes that and wanted to provide the Commission some background before the Commission decided tonight .

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding the detailed portions of what the Commission has tonight for review understands how the Building is a rectangle even on a prefabricated metal Building, it is still possible to introduce some relief to the Façade and suggested to add elements i.e. shadow lines and some visual effects that would enhance the prefabricated metal Structure and encouraged the Applicant explore different treatments with the South Facade and

06-05-12.PC

create some actual layers because it is going to read as a flat Façade just being tacked onto the end of a gabled Building. Mr. Jacobs responded and explained about the parapet and Chairman Hamerly stated that is a good start, but the parapet is on the exact same plane as the brick that is below. Mr. Jacobs said that he could make it between eighteen inches and two feet (18" – 2') and can be accommodated. Chairman Hamerly said that eighteen inches and two feet (18" – 2') are better than being flat is what they have now.

A comment was made by Mr. Jacobs regarding awning goes out three feet to four feet (3' – 4') and Chairman Hamerly asked about the one standing seam vertical or the standing seam roof or standing seam vertical on the awning and then asked if the standing seam is the roof and then continues down the fascia or if the fascia is vertical and there is another roof element or if that is an open awning is a cream color and Mr. Jacobs responded that the prefascia is a standing corrugated and that the red awning is a two foot (2') standing seam that is the same pattern and would match.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding if a person was standing underneath that awning and looking upward would see the exposed trusses, and the roof element is flush with the top edge of the awning's fascia and is the continuation of the standing seam pattern that runs down and then runs vertical and then asked if there any details on the vertical and Mr. Jacobs responded the finish is behind. Chairman Hamerly asked what is the awning's underside standing seam is red or bare metal and provided some examples. Mr. Jacobs responded that it will be red and the trusses are red and indicated the intent of the brick is to play off the two (2) adjacent buildings with a seven foot (7') brick band and with a six foot (6') primary material for the pedestrian view and will wrap around the Building. If the overall massing is predominantly exposed metal, and if that is a significant reservation that the Commission has, it doesn't have to be and the feasibility to propose finishes that would match the adjacent buildings and a little more depth, as appropriate, with the locations in the front and look for a more unified material palette that would respond directly to the adjacent buildings.

Another comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding if the Applicant was going for the historic packinghouse in the east end of the valley, a person would see concrete columns and then the brick infill that would be a regular module at intervals between twenty feet to twenty-five feet (20' – 25') down the Façade's side and would be in contrasting colors and reiterated in that would be similar to the recently approved City's Fire Station design, as well as other historic structures in Highland and would have the large doors that would be the

06-05-12.PC

size of the packinghouse. Whether or not the Applicant is trying to create a patterning for the large doors from the green mesh location on the side for the growing vines and is a good start in creating a pattern down the side in order to break up a long, metal Building and further encouraged the Applicant to integrate elements an integral part of the architecture i.e. pilasters with a relief pattern and running them up higher so that they relate to the roof, extending eaves out, etc. and that there are things the Applicant could do in order to soften it up and currently, it looks like something that was just stuck down into the landscaping and does not relate to the architecture, and indicated that it is just an added visual element, but is not telling a story and provided examples. The details are not followed through with the overall integrated concept. Mr. Jacobs responded in review of this and future approval, asked if the refinement is the basis for the idea being an historical building and Chairman Hamerly responded if that is the intent of the Applicant's direction is going, then yes. Mr. Jacobs stated if the Commission is looking to approve is a full implementation of schemes or does its best in being a good neighbor and Chairman Hamerly responded speaking for himself, yes to all of the above – being a good neighbor it does not have to mimic what is already there in that it could make its own statement in how the this particular Chain Store wants their particular style communicated in their Stores so there is a kind of “branding” – in that what the Applicant is trying to achieve with the Commission and that the Commission is trying to fit the Applicant's design into a pattern.

A question was asked by Mr. Jacobs if CVS / Baker's had an overall Master Plan and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded that he had not reviewed CVS / Baker's. Chairman Hamerly added they were not selling them as a historic structure, but did have some historical with the connection of the pedestrian path and explained about the Historic District located on Palm Avenue north of Base Line. City Planner Mainez added how Staff had provided the Historical Book by Bill Calvert and how the Architect for the Fire Station had used that book. The policy is to respect the character of the Historic District, as part of the linkage / connectivity.

Another question was asked by Mr. Jacobs if the Commission will approve the Project and that the Applicant is willing to work with Staff and Chairman Hamerly responded and polled the Commission with the Project's current state is it approvable, or given these types of changes if it is something that the Commission wants to review the Project again and Commissioners Gamboa, Haller and Sparks concurred to see the Project again. City Planner Mainez then recommended in continuing the Item to August 7, 2012. Chairman Hamerly stated that the Commission has specifically requested the actual materials samples of the product the Applicant wants to use for the corrugation for the Commission to consider and City Planner Mainez responded that will be done.

06-05-12.PC

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa that it is a good start, but there are elements that are missing that could be incorporated like Chairman Hamerly said.

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh regarding if the Sign's design of the metal panel was a Corporate policy and Mr. Jacobs responded affirmatively for an Agricultural / Industrial Building.

Another question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh if the Building is an energy efficient / green building which is a small component and asked if that was a Corporate decision and Mr. Jacobs responded this is a standard Family Dollar Store and will see this with California, but typically, would not have as much brick and would have brick on the base, and have the same general massing, the dormers would not be included in the base, but metal finish is the standard.

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh instead of metal paneling, if stucco / plaster was considered and Mr. Jacobs responded that it is an option and can do as with other Stores located within the central valleys of California that also had specific reservations as well with the specific materials, if the Commission is reluctant for the Applicant to use metal for the Building.

Another suggestion was made by Chairman Hamerly if the Applicant wanted to be historically correct, that the Applicant could also use the board and the vertical batons and would relate to an "Old West" Façade if the Applicant wants and do a gable that has a Façade over the gabled roof and that would also relate to the architecture that is behind it. He reiterated the Commission is not forcing the Applicant to go into a certain style that the Applicant is uncomfortable with, but will encourage the Applicant once the Applicant tells the Commission that is the direction that the Applicant is going, and is willing to work with the Applicant and improve it.

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Huynh how the side wall and back wall are plain and that it looks like a typical industrial building and Chairman Hamerly responded that is what it is.

Another comment was made by Vice Chairman Huynh regarding the proposed Project for that type of Site and the Applicant's vision with it being a "warehouse" and stated that the Applicant needs to dress the Building up with some other architectural features.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that there is lots of landscaping if we cannot correct the architecture and Mr. Jacobs responded for the Applicant will focus on specifically on the language the materials and how they are telling a story and indicated that he will take photographs of the Historic District area.

06-05-12.PC

Another comment was made by Chairman Hamerly within that style of architecture, suggested if the Applicant is to install the wall mounted lighting that extends out from the Building that it is a pure style that one would encounter with that type of architecture and would add that pedestrian element, etc. which would help to communicate the story.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly how long would it take for the Applicant for the proposed revision and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded that Staff would need the Revised Plans by July 16, 2012, in order to prepare the Staff Report for August 7, 2012.

Another question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the Applicant would be comfortable with that time frame is, and Mr. Jacobs said affirmatively. Assistant Planner Kelleher said if that is the direction the Commission desires.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any further questions of the Applicant / Representative or Staff. Hearing none, he then asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on the Item. Hearing none, he left the Public Hearing open and opened the floor for further discussion amongst the Commissioners.

A question was asked by Assistant Planner Kelleher regarding the Commission's concern for the landscaping and not with a palette and Chairman Hamerly responded that trees need to be added for shading the parking lot and the Applicant needs to show that would be achieved on an exhibit. Chairman Hamerly added for clarification, there is a COA that the landscaping to match the Base Line Corridor Landscaping and would be helpful for the Commission to see how that is achieved for the Site Landscape Plan shows the exhibit to include the Base Line Corridor Landscaping because there are a couple of trees that are large that are part of the Site package that may / may not be in conflict with some of the Fan Palms and for the Commission to review both packages to be shown on the Site Landscaping Plan.

A comment was made by Assistant Planner Kelleher regarding the rooftop down drainage to be placed inside the Building and how the Applicant has expressed concern that is unachievable with this type of architecture and how it would encroach on the floor space if it was incorporated into the Building and was thinking about running the gutter along the roof's edge and then have a down spout at the rear of the Building if the Commission was open to that or the need to other modifications. Chairman Hamerly responded right on both accounts with the gutter with the exposed down spout and/or a scuffer that catches the down spout and then routes it down to grade and is appropriate for the style of architecture. If the Applicant chooses to use patterned pylon pilasters that would

06-05-12.PC

simulate infill panels would have the opportunity to conceal within the down spouts within the pilaster elements, and the Applicant has both options available dependent on how the Applicant wants to solve it architecturally.

Another comment was made by Assistant Planner Kelleher regarding what about outdoor cart storage and the feasibility of having that shown on the Site Plan and Vice Chairman Huynh asked how many carts and Ms. Kandel responded fifteen to twenty (15 – 20) maximum and the cart storage would be located at the front sidewalk of the Building and that the carts would have the magnetic strips on them so they are unable to leave the property.

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh if there was some type of outside shopping cart screening and Ms. Kandel responded the use of the metal pipe cart corral and Chairman Hamerly said the Applicant may want to think about using a bright red color and would go with the red bollards and inner accent and would be acceptable to show it on the Site Plan and how it is going to be treated.

A question was asked by City Planner Mainez if this would be outdoor permanent storage for the shopping carts and Commissioner Gamboa responded that he was apprehensive about that and if it was temporary storage, that is different and did not want it to start looking tacky

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly would the shopping carts be brought into the Store if the Store is closed and then move them back out when the Store was open and Ms. Kandel responded that she didn't know. Both Chairman Hamerly and Community Development Director Jaquess responded that more information is needed and how the shopping carts would be addressed and Ms. Kandel asked if the exterior storage for the shopping carts and not pull them in at night into the Store, then what would happen. Vice Chairman Huynh responded that maybe a four foot (4') high block wall, if it would be permitted, that the shopping carts hide behind a block wall and used as a screening wall and Chairman Hamerly added that has been done on a larger scale i.e. Costco, Home Depot, etc. and is a vestibule space area at full height and looks like from the parking lot a part of the building, but that does not appear to be a workable option for this style of Building and suggested the Applicant to take some thought with the shopping carts without having a big queue of them stacked in front of the Store along the historic path and how those elements relate to each other.

A comment was made by Commissioner Willhite that the cart corral screen wall looks like a block wall shown on the Plans. Ms. Kandel responded and requested for the Commission to explain what a cart corral is and Commissioner Gamboa responded the design of a cart corral and how he has seen a cart corral with carts stored in it and Ms. Kandel responded with it being an ADA requirement / design.

06-05-12.PC

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that he concurred with Staff's comments regarding the Signage needs to be worked on and needs to relate to the architecture a lot more. Ms. Kandel responded that the red color is the Family Dollar Store color and then asked what design / color would the Commission desire. Chairman Hamerly stated that it's a start and that the Monument Sign needs to reflect the architectural character of the Site and suggested that the Applicant take the cream color corrugated Sign and use as the box and take the Signage whether it is bright red or whatever and Ms. Kandel interjected maybe the Sign Face, but not the entire cabinet and Chairman Hamerly said that is correct and for the Applicant to use the materials that are being introduced in the architecture, pull them out so that the whole Site ties together. Commissioner Gamboa suggested that Ms. Kandel to check out the Jack in the Box Sign design and she said okay.

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

A Motion was made by Commissioner Haller and seconded by Vice Chairman Huynh to continue the Public Hearing and this Item to August 7, 2012.

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

6.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS

Community Development Director Jaquess explained there will be no Planning Commission Regular Meetings or City Council Regular Meetings for the month of July and the Items tentatively scheduled for the Commission's Regular Meeting for August 7, 2012.

Both Community Development Director Jaquess and City Planner Mainez explained there will be a Joint Study Session with the City Council and Planning Commission on August 14, 2012, at 3:30p.m. regarding the Base Line Corridor Blueprint Compass from SCAG and will have the results of a previous Study Session, as well as a presentation of the Town Center area.

06-05-12.PC

7.0 ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chairman Hamerly declared the Meeting adjourned at 7:28p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Linda McKeough, Community Development
Administrative Assistant III

Trang Huynh, Vice Chairman
Planning Commission