

**MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
SEPTEMBER 3, 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
 Commissioners Richard Haller
 Trang Huynh
 Mark Rush
 Milton Sparks

Absent: Commissioner Michael Stoffel
 Vice Chairman John Gamboa (Note: arrived at 6:10pm)

Staff Present:Lawrence Mainez, Community Development Director
 Kim Stater, City Planner
 Megan Irwin, Associate 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 July 16, 2013, Regular Meeting.

A Motion was made by Commissioner Huynh and seconded by Commissioner Sparks to approve the Minutes of July 16, 2013, Regular Meeting, as submitted.

Motion carried on a 4 – 0 vote .with the abstention of Commissioner Haller and Commissioner Stoffel and Vice Chairman Gamboa absent.

09-03-13.PC

3.2 Minutes of August 6, 2013, Regular Meeting.

A Motion was made by Commissioner Huynh and seconded by Commissioner Haller to approve the Minutes of August 6, 2013, Regular Meeting, as submitted.

Motion carried on a 4 – 0 vote with the abstention of Chairman Hamerly and with Commissioner Stoffel and Vice Chairman Gamboa absent.

4.0 OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

5.0 NEW BUSINESS

- 5.1 Amendment to Design Review Application No. 12-004 to Revise the Approved Colors and materials associated with the Development of a 73,779 square foot two-story building to accommodate sixty-eight (68) Assisted Living Units and sixteen (16) Memory Care Units, known as the Brightwater Senior Living Facility, which was previously approved through Conditional Use Permit No. 07-014 and is currently under construction. The Project is an approximate 5.2-acre Site located at 28807 Base Line Avenue, on the south side of Base Line Avenue approximately four hundred feet west of Church Street. (Assessor Parcel Number: 1201-251-12) Representative: Jack Lowry, Superintendent

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

City Planner Stater formally introduced Associate Planner Irwin to the Planning Commission and indicated that she will be presenting the Item.

Associate Planner Irwin gave the presentation from the Staff Report, provided the historical background of the Project and then explained the distributed Revised Colors versus the Original Colors regarding the differences between the Proposed Revised Colors and Approved Original Colors to the Commission. The Applicant's Proposed Revised Colors would be a lighter color palette.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if there was a Materials Board and Associate Planner Irwin said the stucco samples are glued onto the Samples Board and are not stucco material, but are the texture coat paint chips.

09-03-13.PC

Another question was asked by Chairman Hamerly what was the Applicant's rationale for the façade. Associate Planner Irwin responded that the Project's Superintendent is in the audience and indicated that the Approved Original Colors were not stucco colors, but paint colors and stucco cannot be painted those colors and that is why the Applicant is requesting different colors as they are actually stucco colors.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly which Stucco Company and Associate Planner Irwin responded ICI.

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.

Mr. Jack Lowry, who is the Project Superintendent, addressed the Commission. He stated that the Architect did not transfer the Original Colors that the Owner had selected. The Approved Colors were much bolder and that Proposed Colors are more subtle. The Applicant was concerned that the Original Colors would "stick out" when traveling on Church Street / Base Line. The Proposed Stucco Color is an Omega Stucco.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the Company is located in Corona and Mr. Lowry responded that Mr. Justin Holt is the Plaster Contractor and submitted gold for green and midrange.

(Note: Vice Chairman Gamboa arrived at 6:10pm)

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that the primary difference is the substitution of the gold for the green and the midrange color is a base color. Mr. Lowry said that the base color and the accent color is for the Stucco.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the Accent "Chocolate Kiss" Color is staying the same; and Mr. Lowry responded the Trim Color / Wood Trim around the window(s) / door(s) is "Chocolate Kiss". Chairman Hamerly said then the "Harvest Gold" Color is being substituted for the Sherwin Williams "Connected Gray" Color and Mr. Lowry responded affirmatively.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if there was an attempt to take the Sherwin Williams chip taken down to Omega and be created as a customized color and Mr. Lowry said no, in that the Colors would be too dark. It wasn't a question of matching it, but when a person is traveling up Church Street, and the Approved Colors were used, the person would see it and it would be too dark and with the Proposed Colors, they would blend in and not "stick out". And the Owners believed that they did not get their wishes transferred correctly and the Original Colors would be too dark.

09-03-13.PC

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly the architectural style is a Craftsman Bungalow and that the Original Colors would capture the Craftsman Style that was presented during the Design Review portion of the Hearing, as well as with a nice Sign presentation which also captures the Craftsman style. Mr. Lowry responded that the Owners were looking for something that was more indigenous to Southern California and would "stick out". Chairman Hamerly added this is one of the "hot beds" of the Craftsman style in Southern California in general and is not out of character and is entirely appropriate for the Region. He was asking which direction are the Owners wanting to push it without re-detailing the Building and appears to be a "skin change" without any architectural feature changes. Mr. Lowry responded all of the features are there, that the stone work matches the palette and would still be stacked stone and not a veneer stone.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any further questions for the Applicant's Representative.

A comment was made by Commissioner Huynh in that he liked the Old Colors and the New Colors makes the Project look like a military base or some type of institution. Mr. Lowry responded that when the Project is completed, you won't say that with the Old Colors and Commissioner Rush agreed with that.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that the green, brown and blends in with the trees, grass, etc. and is more natural what is on the Site rather than with introducing a lighter, brighter Colors that would stand out more, unless the landscape palette or other things on-site will take on a lighter hue. Mr. Lowry said that the landscaping is not going to change.

Vice Chairman Gamboa apologized for being late and then asked if there was a chip sample here that the Commission could see rather than the one that was listed in the Agenda Packet. Chairman Hamerly explained that the Applicant did not have any Color chips with him and then Vice Chairman Gamboa agreed that the Proposed New Colors would be too bright.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if a mock-up could have been made with stone / shades for the Commission's review and City Planner Stater responded that it was inappropriate for the Applicant due to time constraints. Mr. Lowry explained that they are wrapping and doing the drywall inside and will be ready in one – two (1 – 2) weeks. They are doing a scratch coat right now and will be done with that in seven (7) days. There would be plenty of time to prepare a mock up with stucco and to do both the Approved Original and Proposed Colors.

09-03-13.PC

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly said that a person does not want to paint over a scratch coat. Mr. Lowry said that he is not asking of doing it, and the last thing going to be the Window / Door Trim would be stucco.

Another comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding the Original Color submitted probably would not have been the Sherwin Williams product that is on the Color Board and would have been a stucco product in that tone. Mr. Lowry responded within the range and match the custom color. The Stucco Chip doesn't show up and would be happy to prepare a mock-up.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if then the Commission continue the Item and go visit the Site. City Planner Stater responded that could be arranged on September 17, 2013. Mr. Lowry said there would be two (2) pieces of plywood with two (2) mock-ups – both with the Original Colors and the Proposed Colors. It appeared that the Commission was in concurrence to go visit the Site. Community Development Director Mainez added with Building and Safety and Fire would be safe for public access and for handicap and to confirm if there needs to be any special provisions for the Site. City Planner Stater said there would be one additional Item on the September 17, 2013, for the Commission to consider besides this Item. Mr. Lowry agreed and invited the Commission to visit the Site.

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

A Motion was made by Chairman Hamerly and seconded by Commissioner Rush to continue this Item to September 17, 2013, and to go visit the Site for the Two (2) Sample Mock Ups showing the Original Colors and New Colors for reconsideration.

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

5.2 Building Mounted Sign for the Highland Police Station. The location is 26985 Base Line, Highland.

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

City Planner Stater gave the presentation from the Staff Report and explained the Project design and layout, and historical background to the Commission. She then concluded her presentation.

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

09-03-13.PC

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly regarding the material of the Sign letters and City Planner Stater responded that they are acrylic channel letters and Community Development Director Mainez added they will have metal sides.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding durability and style for the channel letters is to get away from acrylic and go with offset metallic or something like that. Acrylic is prone to fading, but prone to warping and durability issues. City Planner Stater responded that a Sign Company has not looked at the Plan yet and Staff is looking for the Commission's advice and then said okay.

A question was asked by Community Development Director Mainez if Chairman Hamerly was talking about the channel letters and Chairman Hamerly responded affirmatively and added they can have return studs so they are actually off and would have a relief with giving off shadows underneath, rather than sticking them flush with the Building Face. Community Development Director Mainez added how each letter would be faceted to the wall and ground the rough surface down to make the channel letters look like they are complete and coming out of the wall and won't be sitting on the wall.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly to offset the studs and not having to grind because it is somewhat of a split-face block and will not set clean if channelized letters are used and grinding the wall would be labor intensive and why he suggested using offset letters because of the uneven wall surface. Community Development Director Mainez said he would look at that.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if there was any architectural input to the design lettering and the feasibility to pull in colors that are already in use of the Building and trying to create enough contrast of the light tan / buff color concrete that is used on the Building's Masonry Unit. He suggested using a rust color, or darker colors that are on the Building and would be something other than a brushed aluminum or black color that would provide a nice contrast to the Building. He said the within the tone, wanting to see a contrast between the Masonry Units and the Sign encouraged Staff to get a little creative with it so since it is one of the City's Buildings and give a good example of what can be done for a Sign, as opposed to saying, here is the "typical old sign". He added the Masonry Monument Sign in front of the Sheriff Station Building is a good example since the Sheriff Station Building is a City Building.

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Gamboa that he does not care for the proposed Sign and how the City constructed a nice Building and it looks like that someone could graffiti "Highland Police" as the Sign. The Sign is not done properly and believed the Commission should not allow this because it is such a nice City Building and has nice apertures and it looks like someone had just slapped some black letters onto the Building saying "Highland Police". City

09-03-13.PC

Planner Stater responded that options were given of black channel letters / white channel letters and illuminated or non-illuminated and of those choices, that came from the Public Facilities Subcommittee. Vice Chairman Gamboa said he went to look at the Building and his personal opinion is if you are going to have a nice Building, you don't just slap some black letters onto it.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly who gave the options to the Subcommittee and City Planner Stater responded between Public Works Staff and Planning Staff and taken direction from the City Council of what they wanted. It went from City Council, to Public Works, to Planning, to Public Facilities Subcommittee to the Commission.

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Gamboa regarding how the address is illuminated, and having the "Highland Police" not illuminated. Chairman Hamerly said that he believed that it is also a public safety issue to illuminate the Building's address. Vice Chairman Gamboa continued regarding the feasibility of illuminating the Sign and reiterated how the City spent a lot of money and effort for a nice Building, and then it looks like slapping letters onto it.

Chairman Hamerly agreed with Vice Chairman Gamboa's comment and added that he believed that the acrylic channelized black letters does not do justice to another Facility.

Another comment was made by Vice Chairman Gamboa that no letters will look decent on the Building. As if the Sign was put on the Building with no rhyme or reason and does not blend in with the Building. As the Planning Commission, the Commission has done more / requested more with people placing signs on buildings in Highland. This is a City Building, and with slapping black letters on it saying, "Highland Police" and this does not fit in with the Building and he is against the Sign, as proposed. He doesn't mind "Highland Police", but it should be nicer and recommended a backlit Sign. He understands there are no Deputies there and there is a nice Monument Sign out in front of the Building. City Planner Stater responded that issue was brought up with backlit signage several times and the issue of illuminating it attracts perception that the Building is open and that no one is at the Station 24 / 7 for assistance. She added that there is an emergency box located out front since the Station is not manned 24 hours / day.

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Gamboa that he understands that it is unmanned 24 / 7, but the Sign is tacky and looks like San Bernardino. This is Highland and the Commission needs to hold the City of Highland to a higher standard and he is against the Proposed Sign and not going to slap some letters on a City Building that says "Highland Police". He suggested to go back with the backlighting of each letter to make the Sign look nice and the feasibility of having

09-03-13.PC

the City Logo up there. The City Council requests the Planning Commission hold other businesses to a higher standard since they are in or coming to Highland and yet with our own Building we just slap black letters up there.

A question was asked by Commissioner Rush if the slope / roof is an accurate representation of the Sign on the Plan and both Chairman Hamerly and City Planner Stater said no. City Planner Stater added that the Sign Company will provide a proposal when the Sign will go out for bid and the Sign Contractor will look at the basics then prepare a more detailed Plan.

A comment was made by Commissioner Rush regarding the methodology and how it looks to him, agreed with Vice Chairman Gamboa and Chairman Hamerly. If a person misses the Monument Sign out front traveling on Base Line, why was the Sign not located in the middle of the wall, rather than at the end of the wall and looks like the Sign was an afterthought like it sort of is and Chairman Hamerly said, in all fairness, it is. Commissioner Rush continued that it looks to him, addressing this with a little better comprehensive view. Think about when the Building was being built and where a person would put a sign on it and how it would have been done, rather than address it after the Building was built. City Planner Stater responded that is not what they are doing, but that this is the first step and once the Sign Company is chosen, will provide a more detailed Plan on a professional level.

A comment was made by Commissioner Haller what are the common features of the City Facilities among the Signage. There should be some common elements, yet with the new Fire Station, Police Station and Public Works Facility, they are all architecturally different styles, and reiterated there should be some commonality i.e. the City Logo, etc. Chairman Hamerly said it's with the Monument Sign's type face and size / City Logo and then with the name of the Facility on it.

Another comment was made by Commissioner Haller for Staff to look at the Master Plan for City-owned Buildings and needs a commonality of common features for Signage and goes through the thought process of a Master Sign Project. Community Development Director Mainez responded the commonality is the same concrete Monument Signs with City Logo on it and was a City Council directive to do that for every Facility the City builds, they all have to have the same Monument Sign. The Fire Station has a dominant "No. 1" on it, but with the same Monument Sign. The recommendation is only from the Subcommittee and ended up being very basic, not illuminated, boxy, black color and that was the site they had selected for the Sign. Staff did not get creative, looked at the square footage, what the Code would allow and wanted them to be more creative and Staff did not want to design it for them, but they accepted this proposal and

09-03-13.PC

that is why this is being referred to the Commission. Community Development Director Mainez said there were a lot of different proposals there and narrow down to a few options and City Planner Stater will work with the Sign Company with styles and return to the Commission with a more detailed Plan. He believed that it is not an urgency, but was a City Council directive. There had been complaints with the public driving by and how the Monument Sign was hidden by landscaping. The trees are small, but once they mature, they will obscure the proposed Sign on the wall.

A comment was made by Commissioner Sparks that he would like to see more than one (1) Sign saying, "Highland Police" and would like to see other designs and other Sign locations. Chairman Hamerly said something that would be seen by both eastbound and westbound traffic.

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa that he was not chiding Staff, and City Planner Stater responded that this is the first conceptual for the Sign's process and Staff does not look at it that way.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly how Staff is aware of how hard the Commission has hit with some of the Applicants especially if they have the address covered by groundcover or shrubs, if they have a Sign Program, the Commission allows them more latitude to elevate the Sign so it is more prominent and people can see the business name when a person is driving by. This is a location that people will be looking for and that signage is even more critical and especially if the person has missed the Monument Sign and means falling back on the Building Mounted Sign to do the work that the Monument Sign is not doing because it may be obscured with either landscaping or traffic. Community Development Director Mainez responded it appears that Commission's consensus is the wall and maybe Staff will go back and look at the landscaping and maybe have to make some modifications to it. He added how some trees have died and reiterated that Staff will look at that again and maybe replace the ones that have died.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly what is the time period from when the trees were planted and thought it was within a year and Community Development Director Mainez responded affirmatively. Chairman Hamerly said there is a Condition of Approval (COA) how there is a time period of planted materials being one (1) year and would have to install / replace the landscaping in one (1) year. City Planner Stater said she believes it has been one and one-half (1½) years. Chairman Hamerly said that the COA says to replace it and blend with the existing landscaping and how there has been a twelve (12) month

09-03-13.PC

window. Community Development Director Mainez said the point is to maybe re-evaluate the placement of the trees. Chairman Hamerly asked if these were not street trees the Commission is looking at and Community Development Director Mainez said no, it was an addition to the street trees regarding the clustering of trees around the corner.

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Gamboa regarding that a person would be unable to see the Sign if traveling eastbound and not westbound. He suggested the feasibility of mounting the Sign on the Rotunda above the Station entrance where it would be viewed by both eastbound and westbound traffic.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly regarding how much damage would be done to the masonry face if the channelized letters and wanted them illuminated and getting power to the letters by drilling through the CMU and what is being done inside the attic. There is power in the area because of the illuminated address, but it is probably on one (1) stub and on a small transformer. He suggested one effect is not actually illuminating the letters, but can either up-light the Sign and have the whole corner of the Building illuminated. Another effect is to backlight the Sign with Micro-LEDs and would be silhouetted and have a halo effect. With the basic metal letters, they would stand out because of the sense of shadowing. Shadowing is fairly contemporary and is a neat way. He added that it could be $\frac{3}{4}$ " LED strip lighting and could work on the wall or on the Rotunda above the front door. City Planner Stater responded that would be between Public Works and the Sign Contractor.

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Gamboa with placing the Sign on the Rotunda above the front door and to consider illuminated letters in that it would make it look nicer at night. Community Development Director Mainez responded that City Council did not want not so much illumination at night, but it is people do not know it is a Police Department when they travel by the Facility and it is for identification purposes. Both Community Development Director Mainez and City Planner Stater said to improve the aesthetics of the Sign and are unaware if there is a budget for the Sign. Internal illumination, edge detail, another style are changes to an exhibit the Commission is going to want to see.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that the Sign's individual letters is not a graphic style and appears to be cost neutral. It is the letter size / material that will determine the cost. He concurred with Staff that the acrylic aluminum box channelized letters are probably the lowest cost way to go short of the acrylic offset mounted directly on the Building face which he believed that City Council was not recommending. The Commission would like to see more style points for more than simple block letters. Both Community Development Director Mainez

09-03-13.PC

and City Planner Stater said that would be Directive from the Commission to Staff in that the Commission would like to see more Sign details / exhibits. City Planner Stater added the Commission need not to take action and Staff is unable to advise the Commission when it would return before the Commission for further review. Chairman Hamerly said to also Direct the Sign Contractor to have some physical samples i.e. metal chips, materials, etc. that the Commission could review for further consideration.

6.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS

City Planner Stater reminded the Commission of the Volunteer Dinner scheduled for September 26, 2013, at 5:30pm and asked if any of the Commissioners would want Staff to RSVP on their behalf and would be at the San Manuel Events Center located at Highland Avenue / Boulder Avenue.

Community Development Director Mainez explained the Items tentatively scheduled for the Regular Meeting for September 17, 2013.

A question was asked by Commissioner Sparks regarding the Storage Facility located on Boulder / Jasper and if the Digital Sign was brought up by the Commission. The Digital Sign is located south of the Fitness 19 Building. City Planner Stater responded regarding the Date / Temperature Sign in that it is not an advertising Sign.

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Gamboa that he was on the Design Review Board (DRB) before the Commission and the Sign was not there. City Planner Stater responded that Staff was approved for it. Vice Chairman Gamboa said that was before his time.

A comment was made by Commissioner Haller how he has been on the DRB / Commission and that he doesn't remember it. City Planner Stater responded that she will follow-up and with a direct reader with no advertising. Community Development Director Mainez said the Applicant applied for a sign and then made it electronic and reiterated that Staff will follow up. City Planner Stater added that she would have an update for the Commission at the next Meeting.

A request was made by Commissioner Huynh at some Meeting in the future to have City Engineer Wong provide a presentation to the Commission regarding the paving on Third Street / Fifth Street. He had asked about following this up from the July 16, 2013, Meeting and how he is interested in knowing what the cooperation is between San Bernardino / Highland and with the pot holes. Vice

09-03-13.PC

Chairman Gamboa said that had something to do with the Tiger Grant and Community Development Director Mainez added in addition to the elimination of the Tiger Grant, but also with the elimination of various Grants 1, 2, 3, RDA funding, Airport Authority, and the City not having a chance to obtain additional funding.

7.0 ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chairman Hamerly declared the Meeting adjourned at 6:46p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Linda McKeough, Community Development
Administrative Assistant III

Randall Hamerly, Chairman
Planning Commission

09-03-13.PC