

**MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
APRIL 16, 2013**

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Highland was called to order at 6:02p.m. by Chairman Hamerly, in the Donahue Council Chambers, 27215 Base Line, Highland, California.

Present: Chairman Randall Hamerly
 Vice Chairman Trang Huynh
 Commissioners Richard Haller
 Milton Sparks
 Michael Stoffel

Absent: Commissioner John Gamboa (Note: arrived at 6:18p.m.)
 Commissioner Michael Willhite

Staff Present:John Jaquess, Community Development Director
 Lawrence Mainez, City Planner
 Sean Kelleher, Assistant Planner

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Hamerly.

2.0 COMMUNITY INPUT

City Planner Mainez introduced Assistant Planner Kelleher and explained to the Commission that he has taken a position in another City.

Assistant Planner Kelleher thanked the Commission for the nine and one-half years that he has been with the City of Highland and will be going to the City of Redlands in a couple of weeks and that this is his last Planning Commission Meeting and that it has been a pleasure working with the Commission during his tenure here.

The Commission congratulated Assistant Planner Kelleher in his future endeavors.

There was no further Community Input.

09-18-12.PC

3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

3.1 Minutes of April 2, 2013, Regular Meeting.

3.2 Minutes of March 19, 2013, Regular Meeting.

A Motion was made by Vice Chairman Huynh and seconded by Commissioner Sparks to approve the Minutes of April 2, 2013, and March 19, 2013, Regular Meetings, as submitted.

Motion carried on a 5 – 0 vote with Commissioners Gamboa and Willhite absent.

4.0 OLD BUSINESS

4.1 A Modification to an existing Sign Program for the 76 Gas Station, and Canopy Alteration (ASR-013-002). The Project is generally located at the corner of Base Line and the 210 State Highway. The address is 27627 Base Line. APN: 1201-051-17-0000 [Continued from the Planning Commission's February 19, 2013, and March 19, 2013, Meetings.] Representative: Sorin Enache (Promotion Plus Sign Company).

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

City Planner Mainez gave the presentation from the Staff Report and PowerPoint presentation and explained the historical background and the proposed Project design to the Commission. When driving by the Site today, you may have seen the proposed Sign is not in a location that Staff is recommending so the Sign would have to be relocated / center it, install underground electrical and connect to the light standard. He 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 Commissioner Haller if Site was one (1) single lot and City Planner Mainez responded that the Site is three (3) parcels and the Sign is located on the Gas Station parcel. The parcel line is on the driveway between the Gas Station and Starbucks on the west side of the curve.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if Staff forwarded the comments to the Applicant from the Commission's last Meeting where the major points were brought up regarding the location of the proposed Sign, resolving / clarifying with Weights and Measures on whether or not that constituted an entry point. As part

09-18-12.PC

of the Sign Program, that the Sign did not reflect any architectural characters of the Buildings that are on the Site. He then said that this proposed Applicant appears to be the same as the previous one so that it appears that there were no modifications made to the Sign which makes it look like a temporary Sign. City Planner Mainez said that is correct and deferred that to the Applicant.

Chairman Hamerly reiterated whether or not the Applicant received the Commission's comments from the previous Meeting. City Planner Mainez responded that the Applicant was given a copy of the Minutes and the Applicant did talk with Staff on the comments made and indicated that the person is the Owner of the Gas Station and is not the Applicant's Sign Representative.

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

Mr. Howard Chung, 27627 Base Line, Highland, California, who is the Owner, addressed the Commission.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that one of the major points that was brought up at the previous Meeting is that the Sign does not appear to have a concrete base or architectural detail incorporated in the Sign. He then asked if landscaping was one of the Conditions of Approval (COA) and Community Development Director Jaquess responded affirmatively. Chairman Hamerly continued that typically, the Commission likes to see with the Sign Program is that the Sign reflects the architectural character of the Site and pulling its keys visually from the Buildings on-site and then provided an example to Mr. Chung and wants to ensure an equivalent level of quality.

Chairman Hamerly gave a Staff Directive that the upper portions of the Sign can stay, as is, but to least install a Sign base that would reflect some element(s) of the architecture on-site because the Sign has to go up against the existing light standard it is already going to have a base element to the Sign. So if the new Sign base would incorporate the existing light pole base, at least which would tie those two (2) elements together.

A question was asked by Commissioner Haller what architectural feature that would tie into the rest of the Site and Chairman Hamerly responded that currently, it is fairly totarian that it now has stucco base and if the Owner wanted to install a metal trim around the top of the stucco base, or install an accent band around the bottom, and basically, leave it up to the discretion of the Applicant to hand the details, but reiterated he wants the Sign to reflect the architectural feature of the Building. He then asked the Applicant if that would be acceptable. Mr. Chung responded affirmatively and Chairman Hamerly then said okay.

09-18-12.PC

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any further questions of the Applicant / Representative or Staff. Hearing none, he then opened the Public Hearing and asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on the Item. Hearing none, he closed the Public Hearing and then opened the floor for further discussion amongst the Commissioners. There being no further 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 approve ASR 013-002, a Modification to an existing Sign Program for 76 Gas Station, for an additional Gas Pricing Sign required by Weights and Measures, subject to the Conditions of Approval, with the Chairman's directives to Staff regarding the Accent Band and Base of Sign, and approve the Findings of Fact.

Motion carried on a 5 – 0 vote with Commissioners Gamboa and Willhite absent.

5.0 NEW BUSINESS

- 5.1. Accessory Sign Review Application (ASR 013-009) Amendment No. 3 to the Approved Sign Program for ARCO Gas Station Center. The Project is located at the southeast corner of Palm Avenue and Fifth Street. APN: 1201-311-48. Representative: Mr. Amer Quoi.

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

Assistant Planner Kelleher indicated for clarification that Attachment No. 2 in the Staff Report dated September 7, 2011, was the original COAs for the Sign Program as part of Amendment No. 1, and Attachment No. 4, those are the recommended COAs for tonight, if the Commission approves the Project. He then gave the presentation from the Staff Report and PowerPoint presentation and explained the historical background and the proposed Monument Sign (A-1) to the Commission. Assistant Planner Kelleher then concluded his presentation.

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

A question was asked by Commissioner Sparks if the existing Monument Sign is fifteen feet, five inches (15'5") in height. Assistant Planner Kelleher responded that he is unable to answer that because the Applicant had not submitted a Plan for it.

Mr. Amer Quoi, who is the Applicant's Representative, addressed the Commission. He stated that the existing Sign is fifteen feet, four inches (15'4") and indicated that the Sign be increased in height to sixteen feet, five inches (16'5").

Another question was asked by Commissioner Sparks that the Applicant wants to increase the Monument Sign height by one foot (1') and Mr. Quoi responded affirmatively.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly that the Applicant is elevating the entire Sign one foot (1') from where it exists and Mr. Quoi said right.

A comment was made by Commissioner Sparks that if the Applicant is going to add a base of one foot (1') and raise it up and that's it.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly if the Sign is going to look like the Sign on Page 33 of the Staff Report, is the Applicant going to be stripping out all of the Sign panels in order to achieve that. He then compared the different photographs on how the diesel price is located on the bottom and assumed that is being eliminated and relocated into the digital portions of the Sign and asked the Applicant if that is correct and Mr. Quoi responded to raise the entire Sign up and adding the one foot (1') of brick on the bottom and adding the accent on top and indicated that is all the Applicant is doing and is not removing any Sign panels or not changing anything else.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly that the Exhibit that is on Page 33 of the Staff Report is not what the Sign is going to look like, is that correct and Mr. Quoi responded that it pretty similar to what is on there. Chairman Hamerly said that similar is not what the Commission is after. If the Applicant submits something, a person should be able to hold this up and say that is the Sign and Mr. Quoi said right. Chairman Hamerly continued saying that it is not similar because the Commission has run into some major problems before where the Applicant has said that is what they meant to do, but we did not build it that way and then when a person drives by and how the Applicant had told the Commission that is what they were going to build, and was then told that the Applicant had changed their mind and did not bring it back so the Commission did not approve what was out there. Mr. Quoi responded and asked if they can submit what is actually on the Site and replace it with the proposed one with slightly changes. Chairman Hamerly responded that is what was behind the question because if the Applicant is going from sixteen feet (16') that the Applicant is saying what is existing fifteen feet, four inches (15'4") and add the cornice at the top which is who knows how thick and add another five inches (5")

09-18-12.PC

at the bottom, Chairman Hamerly is hearing at least seventeen feet (17') and that is not what the Applicant is applying for. The Applicant is applying for sixteen feet (16') and the Applicant is already at sixteen feet, five inches (16'5") and if the Applicant is adding the one foot (1') base and that is not with the cornice at the top. Mr. Quoi responded then the Applicant will be adding six inches (6") on the bottom to be within the height limitation. Chairman Hamerly said that he understood that, but with the seven inch (7") brick base, would be increased to twelve inches (12"), would then be at sixteen feet, five inches (16'5"). Mr. Quoi responded that the Applicant does not have any brick base right now. Chairman Hamerly said the Sign that is existing right now does not have a cornice, so measuring from the dirt to the top of the existing Sign and that the Applicant is at fifteen feet, four inches (15'4") in which Mr. Quoi concurred. Chairman Hamerly continued so if the Sign is elevated one foot (1'), at the brick base, would then be at sixteen feet, four inches (16'4"), and Mr. Quoi agreed. If a parapet cap is added, will then be going past sixteen feet (16'), and already at sixteen feet, four inches (16'4") and have not added a cornice yet. Mr. Quoi responded so if the Sign right now is at fifteen feet, four inches (15'4") now, and Chairman Hamerly said right, and Mr. Quoi continued by saying if adding six inches (6") of brick at the bottom which makes the Sign almost sixteen feet (16').

Chairman Hamerly reiterated to get to that point, the Applicant has to basically redo the body of the existing Sign and Mr. Quoi said no, that the Sign will be raised and build the concrete base, and install it and put the top design; it's still one (1) piece. Chairman Hamerly stated if the Applicant puts twelve inches (12") of brick on the bottom of the Sign, in the Staff Report, Staff has written the COAs that the Sign needs a twelve inch (12") base so that the Diesel price that is located on the bottom of the existing Sign is visible above the vegetation.

Assistant Planner Kelleher explained the differences between the existing and what is out in the field for the Sign base.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly it does not appear that they are the same and that is the point of confusion and would like to see this sorted out so the Commission would know exactly how tall the existing Sign is, what it is going to look like. He added if the Applicant is going to use the existing Sign this has an entire digital body in it that includes Diesel that is in the fourth (4th) row down, that is on the existing Sign out there, it is down under Car Wash. They are Sign panels and is not digital. Mr. Quoi responded that they can change out the Sign panels and can do that.

09-18-12.PC

A question was asked by Commissioner Sparks on Page 31 of the Staff Report, COA No. 6, states, "The Sign shall be modified to have a large brick base that is one foot (1') tall consistent with the Gas Pricing Signs. Resulting in the Monument Sign being sixteen feet, five inches (16'5") tall." Chairman Hamerly said right and that is the point that he is attempting to clarify because what is there now would not make accommodations for the cornice at the top.

(Note: Commissioner Gamboa arrived at 6:18p.m.)

A question was asked by Mr. Quoi if the Sign could be increased to seventeen feet, five inches (17'5") and everyone is happy. Chairman Hamerly responded that the Applicant is already "pushing the envelope" and how this is not a very big Site and how the Applicant has already gone well over the original approval that the Applicant requested in the original Sign Program and Mr. Quoi said correct and added there was no coordination between the Architect and the Sign Company and were a lot of issues with that. Chairman Hamerly responded how there were issues with the Canopy and the brick and a number of issues of coordination. Mr. Quoi said the place had just opened and wanted advertising space (the vacant white space) on the Sign and if the Applicant receives approval for the seventeen feet, with adding a brick base, and having an accent added to the Sign.

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa in that every time that the Commission has to consider this Sign, there is something different with it and every time that it comes back to the Commission, it is something totally different of what the Commission has approved. This has come to the Commission three (3) times now and has been totally different and that he is unable to support this unless there is more detailed drawings of exactly of what it is going to be.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly in that he was inclined to agree with that, at this point, because the Commission has had in the past, there has been quite a bit of confusion with this single Project and even the original Sign Program shows that the Sign is fifteen feet (15') tall and eight foot (8') wide and look at the Sign Summary and the Applicant has added padded labeling with the Monument Sign being six feet, nine inches by thirteen feet, eight inches (6'9" X 13'8") and reiterated that was the original approved Sign Program and said that it keeps "creeping up, up and up". Even when the items get built, they do not reflect what is in the approved document. He would love to be able to say everything is internally correct, the dimensions on the drawings and the exhibits that the Commission is approving reflect actually what the Applicant is going to build. Chairman Hamerly asked for the Applicant's indulgence and requested for the Applicant to ensure all of the documentation is consistent so the Commission knows exactly what the Commission is getting when a person drives by and the Commission can say affirmatively, that is what the Commission approved.

09-18-12.PC

A question was asked by Mr. Quoi what the next step is and asked if the Applicant return with a detailed drawing for the Commission and Chairman Hamerly interjected affirmatively, and Mr. Quoi continued by saying or if the Commission would approve it now and then come back. Chairman Hamerly said no, because the Commission “has been down that road” and wants assurance that the Commission is approving exactly of what is submitted so that there is not a Revision No. 4, because there is some kind of misunderstanding between the Applicant and Staff.

A comment was made by Mr. Quoi that there is not much difference in terms of height or size and the only thing is switching the panels on the bottom. Chairman Hamerly said right, and based on what Mr. Quoi has said, the Applicant is taking the existing Sign right now and increasing it by one foot (1') and that's it, that is what the Applicant is planning to do and to add brick on the sides, but that is not what is in this Application. He reiterated how the Commission wants to be assured of exactly what the Commission is approving.

A question was asked by Commissioner Stoffel blue painter's tape, or something, on the side and Mr. Quoi responded that this is a two-tiered pricing and depends on whether or not if the Applicant wants to run a promotion or not. The tape would cover the price “with car wash purchase”.

A question was asked by Commissioner Gamboa regarding if Weights and Measures allowed the Car Wash pricing. Assistant Planner Kelleher stated that it is permitted as long as it is broader than that and depends on how the Applicant does the two-tiered pricing and that is something that can be proposed and the Applicant already has two (2) Monument Signs on-site for this.

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa when the Commission first initially approved the Project, the one was approved, then the Applicant returned with this one the second time and reiterated every time there is something new. He reiterated that he is unable to approve something like this unless he knows what exactly it is because it is changing every time the Commission sees it. Mr. Quoi responded if the Commission looks at the original drawing, and what the Architect wants and what the Gas Station Owner wants, they are two (2) totally different things and, unfortunately, there is no communication between them which wasted everybody's time. If you put up a Sign for a Gas Station with no pricing on it, you are destroying their marketing efforts and that is what the Commission approved at the beginning. Commissioner Gamboa said no. Mr. Quoi interjected that if the Commission goes back to the beginning, and the new one, the Commission would see that there are two (2) different Signs. The one that was approved had no pricing on it whatsoever. Commissioner Gamboa said

09-18-12.PC

right. Mr. Quoi continued having a Sign on a corner of a Gas Station with no prices on it is really stupid and said to excuse him. Commissioner Gamboa responded that he is not going to get into it and the Commission knows how Commissioner Gamboa feels.

A question was asked by Commissioner Stoffel that the Applicant return for the Commission to see what the actual, correct drawing of what it is going to be when this exact same Sign is lifted six inches, (6"), twelve inches (12") or whatever it is going to be with the top piece around it is what the Commission is requesting and Chairman Hamerly said right and added if the Applicant takes the existing fifteen foot, four inches (15'4") Sign becomes seventeen feet (17'), is down to an appropriately scaled Sign for this Project and is that something the overall census of the Commission would be approvable Sign, as part of the Sign Program, if that were to occur. Commissioner Gamboa responded that he believes that it is too tall. Commissioner Stoffel said that the Sign looks nice, except for the blue painter's tape and seems odd to him to be on such a nice Sign. Commissioner Gamboa added that the Monument Sign needs to represent the architecture of the Building.

Mr. Quoi stated that can be solved with having adding material with whatever the message they want and is not a problem. Chairman Hamerly said if there is a special promotion is a removable portion of the Sign so it doesn't degrade the Sign and Mr. Quoi said absolutely. Assistant Planner Kelleher stated for the Commission's information, the previous Monument Sign that was proposed in May 2012, was for seventeen feet, three inches (17'3") tall and was denied then. Chairman Hamerly said that is why he had asked that question because the Commission had already denied one that was seventeen feet (17') tall so it comes back again to the seventeen foot, four inches (17'4") tall because of the cornice and because of the base, is the Commission going to deny it because it is too tall even though the Commission is requesting the Applicant to go back and make the changes, is the Commission wasting the Applicant's time because it would then be too tall because of adding the cornice and the base to the existing body of the Sign will it make it too tall to be appropriate for that location.

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Huynh how he had driven by the Sign the other day and said how tall it is and did not know how tall it was and when he read the Staff Report, it seems that the Applicant needs to have the Sign elevated and to do some more work on the bottom of the Sign and remembers in 2012, that was discussed and the Commission decided whatever the corner that is seventeen feet, three inches (17'3") or whatever it is, is too tall for that. He then stated if he had read the Staff Report correctly, he then asked if the Sign was installed without a Permit and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded affirmatively and Vice Chairman Huynh said that is the part that he doesn't like.

09-18-12.PC

This has come to the Commission different times for consideration and how someone out there has installed a Sign and now has back to the Commission and is now asking the Commission to allow more on it and that is not the way it is. His position is for it to stay whatever the Commission has approved and to figure out another way on how to dress up the Sign and does not have any sympathy for this. Mr. Quoi responded how Mr. Haddad has already spent a lot of money on this Site and the Commission should work with the Applicant and not against the Applicant. The Applicant is trying to work within the limitations of the Commission and indicated that gas is a tough business. If the Applicant does not use all of his marketing efforts in producing signs, fifteen feet (15') really does not really make a difference from sixteen feet (16'). The Commission approved the dimensions at fifteen feet, five inches (15'5") and the Applicant maintained those dimensions in height. Then the Commission requested the brick layer on the bottom and the cornice and that is what it is going to make the Sign at seventeen feet (17').

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa that the Commission requested the fifteen foot, five inches (15'5") with the cornice and the brick face and this Sign was built without that to those specifications. Mr. Quoi responded because that is not going to be within the Guidelines of the BP and BP is not going to approve it if the Applicant is going to maintain those sizes. He knows that it is going to look funny compared to other BP locations.

A question was asked by Commissioner Gamboa so it does not matter what the Commission says, the Applicant is going to build it and put in on there. Mr. Quoi responded that it does matter what the Commission says and that is why the Applicant did it at fifteen feet, five inches (15'5").

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly the Sign that was approved was fifteen feet (15') and included the brick and the cornice in the body of the Sign to thirteen feet, six inches (13'6") and that is the Applicant's Sign Program that the Commission approved and Mr. Quoi said right and this is unfortunately, nobody saw that. The Architect went and presented that and he knew about it later and that the damage was already done and that there was a lot of confusion.

Another comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that this is a second generation. The first generation was a little more than thirteen feet (13'). Then the Applicant returned with an Amended Sign Program in that the Applicant had changed his mind and wanted to go taller and the Commission approved that one again and Mr. Quoi said right. Chairman Hamerly continued that the third time is when the Applicant changed his mind and wanted to go to seventeen feet (17'). He stated the Commission is trying to work with the Applicant and does not see

09-18-12.PC

how the Applicant does not feel that the Commission is not being accommodating, but the Commission is trying to figure out exactly what the Commission is going to approve and what is going to be built. Mr. Quoi said if the cornice and brick base is added, it will look exactly like that and indicated that the Applicant needs three (3) tall Signs and how the Commission said no and the Applicant needs to live with one. Give the Applicant the one, at least and that is all he needs.

A question was asked by Commissioner Stoffel regarding the Lotto Sign that is located back there are the ones that come in / out every night. Assistant Planner Kelleher responded the Lotto Sign(s) has never been removed and has been grown over by shrubs and do not allow temporary signs and believed that Mr. Haddad had received tickets on that Site.

A comment was made by Commissioner Stoffel is that he does not know how much difference one foot (1') would make on the Sign, if the Sign looks the way the Commission wants it to look, but at the same time, he does not like the fact every single time that it is done, then it returns to the Commission for further consideration. Mr. Quoi responded then let's do it once and for all and do it right.

Chairman Hamerly said that is what the Commission is asking and said what the Commission will do is to continue the Item and have Mr. Quoi go back and direct the Sign Company, Architect, etc. whoever need to coordinate with and show the Commission exactly what the Commission is going to get; dimension the cornice, dimension the base, dimension of the Sign, show the body of the Sign exactly the way it is portrayed on the Site and reiterated to let the Commission know exactly what the Commission is getting so this way, the Applicant does not have to return if the Applicant decides that he needs eighteen feet (18'), nineteen feet (19') and for the Applicant to do it once and do it right and Mr. Quoi said okay and responded that he appreciates that.

Commissioner Stoffel added about the blue painter's tape and Chairman Hamerly said to recommend ensuring that the blue tape "stays away". Commissioner Stoffel then asked about the other signs that are not in compliance located on the Site. Chairman Hamerly responded that the Applicant has been put on notice that the temporary signs need to come down. He then asked if it is in the COAs regarding all of the Temporary Signs and Auxiliary Signs come down and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded affirmatively. Community Development Director added that Code Enforcement has been working with the Property Owner on knows that there has been some Administrative Citations issued and is unsure of the current status. He spoke with the Property Owner last week and got the impression that he is going to comply.

09-18-12.PC

Another question was asked by Commissioner Stoffel regarding the Administrative Citations that it does not matter i.e. people smoking in the bars that a ticket is given and is not that big of a deal and people keep doing it. Mr. Quoi responded if you are a business owner, you want to try everything possible to make your business work successfully. Commissioner Stoffel, as a business owner, he also has to follow the rules too.

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Huynh that he needs verification on exactly how tall the existing Sign is and Mr. Quoi responded that is what the Applicant is going to do with verifying all of the measurements and return with Plans for the Commission's approval.

Discussion ensued between the Commission, Mr. Quoi and Staff regarding continuing the Item to a date specific.

A Motion was made by Chairman Hamerly and seconded by Commissioner Sparks to continue this Item to May 7, 2013.

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

Mr. Quoi thanked the Commission.

- 5.2. 2014-2021 General Plan Fifth (5th) Cycle Housing Element Update (GPA 012-001) Planning Period of June 30, 2014 – January 1, 2021. The location is City-wide.

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

City Planner Mainez gave the presentation from the Staff Report and explained the historical background and that the City received a letter from the State Housing and Community Development (HCD) that the City's is in compliance with the Housing Element and is now going through the formality of certifying the Housing Element to the Commission. He indicated that Staff received a telephone call from Building Industry Association (BIA) and that they were concerned about the Program No. 5 includes Inclusionary Housing Fee and does not have other issues with the Housing Element. Staff was also contacted by San Manuel Band of Mission Indians regarding the forty-five (45) day review period for the Tribe to review the Amendments per SB 18. City Planner Mainez indicated that Staff will postpone this Item going to City Council in order to meet

09-18-12.PC

the forty-five (45) day review period in order to consult with the Tribe and does not have an issue with the Housing Element. Staff also received telephone calls from Property Owners asking whether or not if their properties had been rezoned. After responding to their questions and after responding to their questions, the Property Owners did not have an issue with the rest of the Housing Element and he then concluded his presentation.

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

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the City was the first City in the State to receive approved action and City Planner Mainez responded that in San Bernardino County, the City of Highland would have been first in the County of San Bernardino, if not for the Environmental Document so Highland will be second behind the City of Yucaipa. Chairman Hamerly then congratulated City Planner Mainez.

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh regarding which Chapter of the BIA is working with and City Planner Mainez responded the Baldy View Chapter Region.

A question was asked by Commissioner Stoffel regarding his relationship between BIA and the City and possible conflicts of interest, as a Realtor, Chairman Hamerly responded that the BIA just commented on Element and does not have any direct financial arrangement and Community Development Director Jaquess added that it would have to be a financial interest in a project.

A comment was made by Commissioner Haller stating how City Staff did a great job in getting this approved in a timely manner and with receiving a response letter from the State commending the City and was a major effort. City Planner Mainez also wanted to thank Assistant Planner Kelleher for all of his efforts also. Commissioner Haller also said that City Staff should be commended for being Number 2.

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 Stoffel that the Planning Commission Adopt Resolution 13-005, recommending the City Council take the following actions:

1. Adopt a Negative Declaration for the 2014 - 2021 General Plan Housing Element Update and Direct Staff to file a Notice of Determination with the San Bernardino County Clerk of the Board, and;

09-18-12.PC

2. Adopt a City Council Resolution certifying the City's 2014 - 2021 Housing Element in accordance with the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) Comment Letter dated March 9, 2013.

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

6.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS

Community Development Director Jaquess explained the Items that are tentatively scheduled for the Commission's Regular Meetings for May 7, 2013, at 6:00pm.

Discussion ensued between the Commission and Staff regarding Sign Program and the Landscape Median for the Brightwater Project located on Base Line and Church Street. There is a possibility that there may be grass installed and having to keep the vegetation low growing due to visibility issues located from Base Line to the west to their driveway to the traffic signal at top of the hill at Church Street.

City Planner Mainez explained the displayed light standards to the Commission and that the City Council wanted to receive some feedback from the public.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that it is a nice light standard design.

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Huynh regarding the green color of the light standard.

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa how in the City of Redlands has installed some new light standards located at Orange / State Streets are nice and are brightly lit.

Community Development Director Jaquess responded that this will be the City's first LED lights.

A concern was raised by Chairman Hamerly that the lack of the patina in that it looks a little plastic and when you get into the greens they will get to the weatherized, oxidized and Community Development Director Jaquess responded give it six (6) months.

09-18-12.PC

7.0 ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chairman Hamerly declared the Meeting adjourned at 7:00p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Linda McKeough, Community Development
Administrative Assistant III

Randall Hamerly, Chairman
Planning Commission