

MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
November 17, 2020 – 6:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Highland was called to order at 6:01 p.m. by Chair Hamerly at the Donahue Council Chambers, 27215 Base Line, Highland, California.

Present:	Chair	Randall Hamerly
	Vice Chair	Chandra Thomas
	Commissioner	Edward Amaya
	Commissioner	Jarrold Miller
	Commissioner	Jessica Sutorus

Staff Present: Lawrence Mainez, Community Development Director
Kim Stater, Assistant Community Development Director
Ash Syed, Associate Planner
Salvador Quintanilla, Associate Planner
Matt Bennett, Assistant Public Works Director
Camille Goritz, Administrative Assistant III

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Hamerly

COMMUNITY INPUT (ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA)

None

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Minutes from the November 3, 2020 Regular Meeting.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Thomas, seconded by Commissioner Miller, to approve the minutes as amended. Motion carried, 5-0.

The Planning Commissioners and City Staff introduced themselves.

PUBLIC HEARING

2. Amendment to the Mediterra Planned Development (SPR 20-001/PUD 13-001) to include a 1.6 acre parcel "annexation" and clarify the construction timing of certain park improvements, a General Plan Amendment (GPA 20-001), a Zone Change (ZC 20-001), an amendment to Conditional Use Permit (CUP 14-005), and an amendment to Tentative Tract Map 18893 (TTM 14-002).

Chair Hamerly opened the public hearing.

Associate Planner Syed presented the staff report.

Commissioner Miller asked is it anticipated that the proposed and pervious surfaces associated with this project will increase as well given the development of the 1.6 acres? Or is the change of dwelling units and the fourth phase going to offset the additional perviousness for the 1.6 acres?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett replied the plans for phase four has not been disclosed so I do not know what the pervious areas are going to be yet. In total, the site is still draining towards the basin on the south side of Greenspot Road. The area has been incorporated in the drainage study initially. It was within the boundaries, effectively if there is a net increase or decrease it is still within the sizing and capacity of the offsite drainage and offsite water quality feature. As far as the hydrology and the water quality it is covered.

Commissioner Miller asked is there adequate capacity for the storm drain system? Was this already planned to drain into that system?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated yes, the existing storm draining west towards Santa Paula and down the road is a 92-inch large capacity system. It is going to mitigate its overall flows. The concerns have been evaluated in the design to this point. The overall capacity is a concern, the site has extensive drainage to control it and the basin itself has mitigated those volumes.

Commissioner Miller stated I believe there is a significant portion of phase four that currently drains under Greenspot through East Valley Water District. Is that now going to be rerouted into the basin and be redirected to discharge to Greenspot Road storm drain system?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated yes, there is existing culverts that are going to be removed with widening of the roadway. The drainage will be contained within the project and then accommodated by the drainage facilities being constructed. The offsite flows along Greenspot will be draining along Greenspot Road picked up eventually by a catch basin that is going to be provided on the northside of Greenspot which will be connected into the system draining into the basin.

Chair Hamerly asked does that mean there would be no inflow into the eastern most settlement basins that are adjacent to Greenspot on the Water District property? The culvert is the only thing that feeds into eastern edge of those two pond features there.

Commissioner Miller stated that I designed those systems. I can tell you the basins along Greenspot Road collect run off only from Greenspot Road and then discharge back to Greenspot. The drainage that comes from the northside off Greenspot are conveyed underneath and are not discharged to the basins.

Commissioners Amaya asked if the end date for the whole project is March 8, 2022.

Vice Chair Thomas asked is there a reason why we would take our ability to withhold occupancy? In this situation is it because the park is delayed development?

Camille Bahri, Applicant gave a brief overview of the project.

Vice Chair Thomas asked the Mediterra park that is in the planning area one, will that be completed with planning area four?

Camille Bahri stated both the public portion and the recreation center, the private portion will be completed with planning area one and two.

Vice Chair Thomas asked will it be completed by then?

Camille Bahri replied yes.

Vice Chair Thomas asked what will be the mechanism to ensure that the park gets constructed if occupancy is not held?

Camille Bahri explained that building permits within phases 1 and 2 would be held at 140 if the park was not yet constructed.

Vice Chair Thomas asked what is the total number of lots for planning area one and two?

Camille Bahri stated planning area one is 98 lots and planning area two is 51 lots. All together is 149 lots.

Commissioner Amaya stated that Planning Area 5 contains estates. In the research in your last five six years, is there is demand for the estates?

Camille Bahri replied correct. It is not only a bigger lot but also the character. The topographical distinction between the main project area access is a little bit more challenging, therefore you cannot stack up a lot of units.

Chair Hamerly stated you had mentioned that Planning Area 4 had not been fully resolved. If there is a plotting for Phase 4 are the nine lots that are being removed from there are going to be a part of a common area feature?

Camille Bahri stated no, we are not setting aside land. The impacts that are assessed under the CEQA process is for 316. The number of units in Planning Area 4 instead of being allowed 108 would be 99.

Commissioner Miller abstained on the vote due to a conflict of interest with DR Horton with whom he has a business relationship.

Commissioner Sutorus thanked the developer for the architectural design features.

Community Development Director Mainez wanted to thank Commissioner Miller for speaking up about the conflict of interest on this item. Normally, we would like Commissioners to abstain at the beginning of the item. Staff will now escort you out of the room while we vote on this item.

Commissioner Miller left the dais.

Chair Hamerly closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Sutorus, seconded by Commissioner Amaya, to approve Resolution No. 2020-009 to:

1. Adopt Resolution No. 2020-___ approving an Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Mediterra Planned Development (PUD 13—001) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA);
2. Adopt Resolution No. 2020-___ approving General Plan Amendment (GPA 20-001) changing the Land Use Designation from Agriculture/Equestrian (AG/EQ) to Planned Development (PD);
3. Introduce Ordinance No. ___ to amend the City's Official Zoning Map, Zone Change (ZC 20-001), changing the zoning designation of the site from Agricultural/Equestrian (A/EQ) to Planned Development "PD 13-001";
4. Adopt Resolution No. 2020___ amending Conditional Use Permit (CUP 14-005) to incorporate a 1.6-acre parcel and deferring certain park improvements for the Mediterra Planned Development; and
5. Adopt Resolution No. 2020-___ amending Tentative Tract No. 18893 (TTM 14-002).

Motion carried, 4-0-1.

RESOLUTION NO. 2020 - 009

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA 20-001), ZONE CHANGE (ZC 20-001), AMENDMENT TO CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP 14-005), AND AMENDMENT TO TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 18893 (TTM 14-002) RELATED TO THE ADDITION OF A 1.6 ACRE PARCEL INTO THE MEDITERRA PLANNED DEVELOPMENT AND CLARIFICATION FOR THE DATE OF CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC PORTIONS OF MEDITERRA PARK.

Commissioner Miller returned to the dias.

3. Design Review Application (DRA) No. 17-006-A2 a request to amend the Real Journey Academies Design Review Application Nos. 17-006 and 17-006-A1 to establish a canopy for the lunch area, golf putting area and drive, sand volleyball court, super court, and tennis court located at the south and east side of the existing charter school campus.

Chair Hamerly opened the public hearing.

Associate Planner Quintanilla presented the staff report.

Development Director Mainez stated the city is proud of this project, it is one of the first adaptive reuse projects in California. Prior to this project it was an abandoned K-Mart that was a public nuisance to the community and now it has redeveloped into a junior high and high school. I would like to thank the applicant.

Commissioner Amaya stated in the staff report had mentioned the construction, and I was wondering if the project will be completed by the beginning of the 2021-2022 school year?

Javier Adrian, Representative of REAL Journey Academies stated yes, we will be submitting our plans for plan check very soon and the contractor is on board. The contractor is estimating a 6-8-week construction time, so we are hoping to start early in the spring and wrap things up in the summer.

Commissioner Amaya stated as far as charter school funding is based on enrollment. With COVID-19 a lot of the enrollments are low. Will the project be financed with a loan?

Javier Adrian stated it is a bond that has been fully executed and the money has been dispersed. The funding is in place for this project.

Commissioner Sutorus asked if there was a concern about security and vandalism?

Javier Adrian stated all the fencing in this project is within the larger fencing security in the campus. They would have to hop the fence that is already in place for security around the campus.

Chair Hamerly stated there is a 10-foot fence that is right behind the goal standard for the futsal goal. Is that an eight-foot goal and anything is tipped do you think a ten foot just along there is going to be tall enough to contain the kicks?

Javier Adrian stated we thought was in the worst case it goes in the school yard. It is not going into the neighbors' yard.

Chair Hamerly closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Thomas, seconded by Commissioner Miller, to approve:

1. Direct Staff to file a Notice of Exemption with the County Clerk of the Board; and
2. Adopt Resolution No. 2020-010 Approving Design Review Application (DRA No. 17-006-A2), for the development of the student's recreational and lunch area at REAL Journey Academies, subject to the Conditions of Approval, and the Findings of Fact.

Motion carried, 5-0.

RESOLUTION NO. 2020-010

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION (DRA) 17-006-A2, TO CONSTRUCT A 1,230 SQUARE FOOT METAL CANOPY WITHIN THE LUNCH AREA, GOLF PUTTING AREA AND DRIVE, SAND VOLLEYBALL COURT, SUPER COURT, AND A TENNIS COURT LOCATED AT THE SOUTH AND EAST SIDE OF THE EXISTING CHARTER SCHOOL CAMPUS, LOCATED AT 26655 HIGHLAND AVENUE, CITY OF HIGHLAND, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO (APN NOS.: 1191-241-36 & 1191-241-38)

4. Accessory Sign Review Application (ASR) No. 20-007 is a request to establish a sign program for the existing Rio Ranch Market building within an existing shopping center.

Chair Hamerly opened the public hearing.

Associate Planner Quintanilla presented the staff report.

Commissioner Amaya asked the two secondary plaza signs will be business also?

Associate Planner Quintanilla replied the secondary signs will remain. The two new ones will be the business names.

Commissioner Sutorus stated you mentioned that the monument sign is not going change, but they are going to add a cabinet.

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated where the arch is, is where the cabinet will go for the four tenants.

Chair Hamerly stated since there are no details for the execution of those four tenant panels, were they going to be brining that back for a design review application when the cabinet is intended to be installed?

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated you are approving the sign program which when the tenants come in staff will review internally. We will take care of the construction and how everything is going to attached to the existing monument sign itself.

Chair Hamerly stated usually there is a little bit more of specificity with a sign program. It gives actual design guidance on what the signs are going to look at, so we know that the different sign elements are tied together visually. These are schematic. From a design standpoint I would be really interested to see how that infill panel is going to look when they are doing a 2x2 grid to fit within that cavity that is existing.

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated that is correct. Typically, we will see that when we submit for the plan check.

Chair Hamerly stated that the Planning Commission does the design review to make sure that it is relating to the architecture. In terms of the sign program it is a little on the thin side for giving us any visual information. The monument sign is a streetscape, and it is an important feature and we always look at monument signs. That is a major element not only for the plaza but for the City of Highland.

Community Development Director Mainez stated staff always tries to do what it can to get out of the applicant the components that we believe is important to the city as well as Planning Commissioners.

Jay McCormack, Applicant stated I would agree with everything that you said. We would gladly bring it back for a design review. We have been there for 22 years and have not changed a sign since we have been there, and we do not plan on changing them. We did have requests from tenants coming in that they might require a monument sign.

What we would look to do is put the sign program into place and then bring any tenant that we were going to put there back to the city and have that approved before we did it.

Chair Hamerly closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Amaya, seconded by Commissioner Sutorus, to approve an accessory sign application as modified.

1. Adopt Resolution No. 2020-011 to approve Accessory Sign Application (ASR) as modified No. 20-007 to establish a sign program for the existing Rio Ranch Market, subject to the Conditions of Approval, and Findings of Fact as modified; and
2. Direct Staff to file a Notice of Exemption with the County Clerk of the Board.

Motion carried, 5-0.

RESOLUTION NO. 2020-011

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING ACCESSORY SIGN REVIEW (ASR) NO. 20-007, TO ESTABLISH A SIGN PROGRAM FOR THE EXISTING RIO RANCH MARKET FREESTANDING BUILDING WITHIN AN EXISTING SHOPPING CENTER. THE SITE IS LOCATED AT 25745 BASE LINE (APN: 1192-011-04).

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Assistant Community Development Director Stater announced to the Planning Commissioners 7-Eleven staff report will be continued at our next scheduled meeting.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Hamerly declared the meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Camille Goritz, Administrative Assistant III
Community Development Department

Randall Hamerly, Chair
Planning Commission