

**MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
March 15, 2022 – 6:00 P.M.**

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Highland was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chair Hamerly at the Donahue Council Chambers, 27215 Base Line, Highland, California.

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

Absent:	Vice Chair	Chandra Thomas
---------	------------	----------------

Staff Present:	Lawrence Mainez, Community Development Director
	Kim Stater, Assistant Community Development Director
	Carlos Zamano, City Engineer
	Matt Bennett, Assistant Public Works Director
	Matt Wirz, Building Official
	Scott Rice, City Landscape Architect
	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 March 1, 2022 Regular Meeting.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Sutorus, seconded by Vice Chair Thomas, to approve the minutes. Motion carried, 4-0-1, with Vice Chair Thomas being absent.

PUBLIC HEARING

2. Adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for Public Works Project 'Line A Storm Drain and Bledsoe Gulch Outfall Reconstruction'; Environmental Review No. ENV 22-001. (6892 Cloverhill Drive).

Chair Hamerly opened the public hearing.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater presented the staff report.

Commissioner Amaya asked how long is the project going to take?

City Engineer Zamano stated once we begin construction, I anticipate that this is going to be completed within two to three months. This is being done because we had some issues back in 2012, this was after the 2010 floods. There was some sediment that's occurring in that area, so we had to go back out and do another repair. We did another repair, but unfortunately, it didn't quite fix the problem for as long as we thought it would. The challenge here is that outlet pipe currently outlets near the top of the slope and so that's not good design in my opinion. They should have gone down at the bottom, but that's how it was designed. Also, that whole slope of that area is all undocumented un-engineered slope. There's a need to redesign this area and do it in such a way that we hopefully will permanently address this situation, but what we think we found the most sensible cost-effective method to fix that area. What we're going to do is extend the pipe we're going to underground it down to the bottom of the Gulch and regrade that area so that we can also provide access to get down there because the contractor can't build this work as it stands today.

Commissioner Miller stated I'm looking at the profile of the storm drain, running steep about 30% and we've got flow velocities, 48 feet per second. In my experience with storm drainpipe velocity, once we start approaching 25-30 feet per second cavitation it starts becoming a concern of flows going so fast that it rips up the concrete. Is there any plan for an additional thickened section or concrete rings or something within that storm drain to try to mitigate that?

City Engineer Zamano stated yes, there's a note in the plans. The velocity of the reinforced concrete pipe must be increased to a certain minimum thickness to address that issue, where the velocities exceed 20 feet per second, so there is a note to that effect.

Commissioner Miller stated another item looking at the WSGP that was done for the storm drain I realize the main goal of the rip rap is to reduce velocities down to less than erosive. From a hydraulic modeling standpoint developing conclusions based on a boundary condition in a hydraulic model is highly suspect. I recommend having somebody going down a little bit further downstream to verify that those results are representative. Also, it looks like on the outlet of the basin there's also a distilling basin, like a retention area. Is that correct?

City Engineer Zamano stated that I do not know. I haven't been down there into that area and I'm looking at the plan sheet right now, but I'm not quite seeing that.

Commissioner Miller stated I was thinking of a distilling basin could be effective. When the water releases from that distilling basin I see some potential for erosion. The asphalt berm that runs down the north side of the access road slopes so the flows concentrate along that asphalt berm then it goes in outlets on the north side of the headwall and then will discharge over the slope.

City Engineer Zamano stated I see what you are saying.

Commissioner Miller stated the upstream condition and there not a lot of ponding at that upstream and only about 6 inches. If you are trying to maximize the amount of flow that gets into that pipe, I suggest taking that existing 6-inch curb and turn it into an 8 or 12 inch to allow a little bit more ponding on the upstream inlet. It is coming down with a high velocity so it would not take much to jump right over the 6-inch curb.

City Engineer stated good comments.

Chair Hamerly stated the access road that's going over the top of this pipe, what is the average slope of that? it drops off quickly there.

City Engineer Zamano stated it does, we were trying to maintain a certain slope to make sure it's drivable.

Chair Hamerly stated that is my concern.

City Engineer Zamano stated it is for that reason we cut back; we are shifting that inlet on top of the slope. We have shifted that over to the north because of the difference in elevation between the top and the bottom.

Chair Hamerly stated I was looking through the soils report and was trying to figure out where the test results were taken because on areas, they were going down 26 feet and then they were getting refusal. In other areas they said that they weren't going down more than about 8 feet, I was wondering how we're getting the settlement if they're basically the auger is tapping out at only 8 feet of depth.

City Engineer Zamano stated we do not know exactly what is down there. We did need to get an analysis as what is down there to be better prepared. We also consulted with contractors regarding the proposal that we are putting together to see what works.

Chair Hamerly asked are we going to relocate the orange trees before excavation begins?

City Engineer Zamano stated yes, we will relocate the orange trees.

Chair Hamerly closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Amaya, seconded by Commissioner Sutorus, to: Adopt Resolution 2022-006, adopting the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program for ENV 22-001. Motion carried, 4-0-1, with Vice Chair Thomas being absent.

PC RESOLUTION NO. 2022 – 006

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR A PROJECT TITLED 'LINE A STORM DRAIN AND BLED SOE GULCH OUTFALL RECONSTRUCTION' LOCATED BEHIND THE EAST HIGHLANDS RANCH COMMUNITY CENTER AT 6892 CLOVERHILL DRIVE, HIGHLAND (ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW NO. ENV-22-001)

3. Design Review Application No. DRA 22-002; Review of the Site Plan, Building Elevations, Rough Grading Plan, and Conceptual Landscape Plan for 'Highland Park' Planned Development, a 46-unit single family home development within Tentative Tract No. 19915 (APN: 288-562-03)

Chair Hamerly opened the public hearing.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater presented the staff report.

Ray Dorame, Applicant stated we have been working on this since 2015. I would like to thank staff for all their work they have done. I'd like to go over just a couple of items on the architecture which is Plan 1 the Plan 1X has a straight slope and we decided to come up with a new plan. What we did is we add a little bit more to the porch, we shifted the upstairs, and we added a downstairs living area.

Commissioner Miller asked if there was going to be an HOA for this project?

Ray Dorame, Applicant stated that is correct.

Chair Hamerly stated regarding the park it originally had the underground water infiltration system and staff reports said that was deemed impractical. What are the technical aspects of that?

Ray Dorame, Applicant stated we spent a year studying to see what the best possible design would be for that park, and also for the chambers. Before it was a combination of chambers down below and then you'd have the grass on top and we envisioned that as a play area.

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated the gate must be open and closed at the proper times, putting that responsibility on HOA or others is problematic in it to a degree as far as when it's going to be closed. The area is viewable, it is an amenity as far as it's going to be landscaped, but as we were seeing it, it was not to be a park active area. Some of the reasons that it went from an underground infiltration system is it's an engineered fill up against a slope, not necessarily a soils Engineer's favorite condition. The infiltration was surprisingly low and did not have adequate capacity, so they looked at resizing, upsizing, dropping a lot, and moving this around. It was recognized that the infiltration could drop down on the hierarchy of BMP's because the infiltration was inadequate and if they were to use infiltration on a hillside at a location like this, it was going to take up greater than 10% of the site.

Commissioner Miller asked is the whole site draining to 27-inch storm drain and Base Line?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated I do not remember the size, however the concentration on that outfall was considerable due to the downstream impacts and if it is a 27 inch, the entire site is draining to that location. There may be some lost at the entry drive, but otherwise through the park, metered at the park and then discharged through that system.

Commissioner Miller asked was there a concern from the city over the capacity of the existing 27-inch pipes to receive flows from this development?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated not capacity, but as far as volume and discharge due to the downstream concerns of this of the system, so it's been reviewed and evaluated.

Chair Hamerly stated regarding the tract map, the corner lots one and two especially lot number one we really need to explore a four sided architecture, because it's not only

visible from Base Line, but it's also visible as you're heading westbound on Base Line. You see the back of that house. Any treatments that might be, whether it's a cottage style or a farm style, the detailing that shows typically on the front either stone or board and batten siding, I would wrap that all the way down the south facade. Also, any porch treatments that wrap around the facade on that one as well, just so it reads more as a four-sided architecture.

Commissioner Amaya stated I applaud Master Craft Homes for a lot of the detail and planning that went into this.

Commissioner Miller stated regarding the grading plan, adjacent to lot 17, it looks like there's a 25 foot roughly significant slope that's not draining in lot 17 direction. Does the city have a standard for providing benches on slopes at a certain interval or great breaks or anything like that?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated it looks like the descending slope there could be up above 25 feet. If I've got it right at 30 feet, you're going to have a break in a terrace, so we might be just under that.

Chair Hamerly stated on page 45 we have the wall and fence plan and per the comment of the Applicant, there is a lot of terracing within the tract, but they're the only tube steel fence that would be considered view fencing is around the park area. Is there an opportunity on any of these lots, that might be view lots, whether the tube steel fencing was explored on some of those lots to create additional views or are all the views just kind of down the street and through the natural corridors?

Ray Dorame, Applicant stated most of the views are downstream. Nothing really to the west or the east. I know we try to add as much wrought iron as possible just to keep the open look. I think we add it to the back of lots number 31-40.

Chair Hamerly asked so those are no longer masonry walls?

Ray Dorame, Applicant stated it shouldn't be.

Chair Hamerly stated that's nicely landscaped through there on those big slopes, and that would really open the back yards.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated those homes are number 16, 17, 31 through 40 that we will change to wrought iron.

Chair Hamerly stated basically your whole west slope area that goes down to the V ditch and the wall. I was reading as existing as on the condo side and the ditch is at the bottom of that to handle the existing drainage.

Community Development Director Mainez stated I believe this project is a high fire overlay zone (aka requiring a block wall boundary).

Chair Hamerly stated the permitter, if you look at the property line, the extent of the project, there is an existing masonry wall plus a concrete V ditch that's substantial, so technically there is a perimeter of masonry around the project.

Community Development Director Mainez stated I think this is going to be fine, there is enough buffer there, but I want to make sure the Fire Marshal is comfortable with the code.

Chair Hamerly stated regarding the elevations, I would like to reiterate the concerns at the featured lots make sure we've got some of the details that are on the front, whether it's shutters, gables, wrought iron architectural detailing be placed on the sides. Regarding the Spanish style, the rear elevation on that is stark, there's one gable that's offsetting, but the rest of it is flat and the second story is going to be visible on a good portion of the perimeter of the project. Make sure we have some architectural detail up there that's commensurate with the front. There are quite a few attractive details in your planned development document, so use some of those details. On the cottage style, the color board looks nice. One of the things that you typically see on cottage style is a little bit of whimsy on columns and architectural elements. The columns on the elevations is just basically square straight up and down. Introduce some flares at the stone veneer or introduce some sort of a tricked-out archway across the top. There's usually some sort of whimsical element to the cottage style. Maybe add some shutters on the exposed sides on the 2nd floor just to pull the front side details back and wrap it around three to four sides. Same thing would go for the rear elevation there is a gable up there, so the architectural treatments going on the front facade dress up the rear gable on the rear facade step, where that's exposed. Typically, with the farmhouse style you've got the board and batten. It's common to see a combination of the horizontal siding with the board and batten. Whether it's around the garage or a gabled accent introducing the horizontal siding to kind of take that farm style a little bit further on your elevations. On the rear elevation on corner lots that gable element in the rear might be an opportunity to run the board and batten up that element to kind of play off what's going on in the front facade.

Chair Hamerly stated regarding the landscape elevations, the areas that are shown in green, those are HOA maintained?

Ray Dorame, Applicant stated no, the only areas that are maintained by the HOA is lot A, B, and C. Everything else is either on a lot maintained by the homeowner.

Commissioner Miller stated it looks like we are promoting a lot of trees on those slopes. I was wondering if we could hear from our Landscape Architect as to the compatibility of the tree species that are identified here and how they will work with the slope that's being proposed.

City Landscape Architect Scott Rice stated I'm looking at three species, at this stage they've proposed a variety of species to kind of pick and choose. Regarding the trees on the slope especially if it's in a cut slope, it's dependent on the planting pit. If the pit is not dug two or three times the root ball, and the ground beneath doesn't allow for some of the water to seep that's what usually makes the tree die. It's not so much the species, it's the preparation of the soil pit.

Chair Hamerly stated on Base Line the detail that is running down is calling for a V ditch alongside the sidewalk on the east side. There's a very shallow or narrow landscape buffer between the wall on Lot 1 and the walkway. I want to clarify and see if the V ditch was going alongside the walkway, or if that's all going to be landscape? The walkway slopes up and there's hardly any slope at that end of the project, unlike the park where there's a significant slope.

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated the section that we're seeing is for the eastern side, so you're maybe looking at a different detail labeled for the section on Base Line.

Chair Hamerly stated I was referencing the landscape sections, the street sections, not the grading civil drawing segments.

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated the detail on the grading plan is section II and I think that concrete V ditch will taper out at some point in its use along that portion of Base Line and where the sections cut it just had that V ditch as part of it.

Chair Hamerly stated it didn't seem like there was a need for it along the frontage of lot 1 because that's relatively level referenced the sidewalk.

Chair Hamerly closed the public hearing and clarified for the record there are modifications to Planning Conditions #9 and #14.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Amaya, seconded by Commissioner Sutorus, to adopt Resolution No. 2022-007, approving DRA 22-002 subject to the Conditions of Approval and Findings of Fact. Motion carried, 4-0-1, with Vice Chair Thomas absent.

PC RESOLUTION NO. 2022 – 007

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION DRA-22-002 INCLUDING THE SITE PLAN, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, ROUGH GRADING PLAN, AND CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN FOR 'HIGHLAND PARK' PLANNED DEVELOPMENT, A 46-UNIT SINGLE-FAMILY HOME DEVELOPMENT WITHIN TRACT NO. 19915 LOCATED AT 29300 BASE LINE, HIGHLAND. ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO. 288-562-03

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled April 5, 2022.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Hamerly declared the meeting adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Camille Goritz, Administrative Assistant III
Community Development Department

Randall Hamerly, Chair
Planning Commission