

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
December 6, 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
	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
Matt Bennett, Assistant Public Works Director
Matt Wirz, Building Official
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 1, 2022 Regular Meeting.

A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Thomas, seconded by Commissioner Amaya, to approve as amended. Motion carried, 4-1, with Commissioner Sutorus abstaining.

2. Minutes from the November 15, 2022 Regular Meeting.

A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Thomas, seconded by Commissioner Amaya, to approve as amended. Motion carried, 4-1, with Commissioner Sutorus abstaining.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. Amendment to Design Review Application DRA 22-012 for revised Building Elevations related to the development of a contractor's equipment rental business approved on October 18, 2022. (Related entitlements: Conditional Use Permit CUP 22-009 and Parcel Merger PM 22-001 also approved October 18, 2022) (APN No. 1192-641-12,22, & 23)

Assistant Community Development Director Stater presented the staff report.

Chair Hamerly opened the public hearing.

Chair Hamerly stated regarding the finished schedule, the notes that are indexed to certain elements on the building doesn't seem to be relating to the finished schedule. Most significantly, the glazing, the PPG on the plan is referenced as both four and two. The roll up doors are indicated as being glass, we might want to insert a door of color scheme #6 unless the intent is to try to match the glass color. The height to width ratio is an improvement on the north elevation.

Chair Hamerly closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Amaya, seconded by Commissioner Miller, to adopt Resolution No. 2022 - 044, approving an amendment to Design Review Application DRA 22-012 for revised Building Elevations in compliance with Planning Division Condition No. 29. Motion carried 5-0

RESOLUTION NO. 2022-044

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING A REVISION TO DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION (DRA 22-012) TO AMEND BUILDING ELEVATIONS FOR A CONTRACTOR'S EQUIPMENT RENTAL BUSINESS LOCATED ON A 1.25 ACRE SITE ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF 5TH STREET, 900 FEET WEST OF PALM AVENUE.

4. Accessory Sign Review (ASR 22-006) to establish a comprehensive sign program for the installation of one (1) 22-foot-long building mounted sign, two (2) 7-foot-tall monument signs, and one (1) 16-foot-tall monument sign for a fueling station and convenience store lot. (APN No. 1192-641-01)

Associate Planner Syed presented the staff report.

Chair Hamerly asked where will the tall monument 16-foot sign be located?

Associate Planner Syed stated the sign will be on the corner of the property.

Chair Hamerly asked will the sign project into the sidewalk or are we flattening that wall?

Associate Planner Syed stated one sign will be angled towards 5th Street, another will be angled towards Palm Avenue and the other sign will be on the corner.

Commissioner Sutorus asked how tall is the wall?

Associate Planner Syed stated the wall according to the original approval was supposed to be 3 feet in height. There is CMU block on the corner statement and above that was supposed to be one foot of wrought iron.

Representative Sorin Enache stated the orientation of the sign is going to be perpendicular to the street and be visible to each side.

Chair Hamerly stated ok, it's perpendicular to the tangent point of the wall. It makes sense from a visibility standpoint. I'm concerned because of the tight corner and the fueling positions were reconfigured because the fueling trucks were going to have a very difficult time with the queuing and the canopy to make the turn to get out. I'd like to see

C2 plotted on there and the circulation on site to make sure that really works. I'm not opposed to the size because I think it's a very high visibility corner and think it's within context of other signs that are at that intersection, but it is clearly a site logistics issue for me.

Commissioner Miller stated I see the two signs already proposed, what is the benefit of having the 3rd C2 sign?

Sorin Enache stated it is a requirement by weights and measures to have to be visible on all three sides of the property.

Chair Hamerly asked how do the other Commissioners feel about the orientation of the C2 sign?

Vice Chair Thomas stated we were concerned at the last meeting when this came before us about how many pumps they had and the traffic going in and out. It's an obstacle for traffic and could be an issue for people to get through.

Commissioner Amaya stated where the pumps are located the turning is very tight.

Sorin Enache stated it is 24 feet distance from the canopy all way to the beginning of the base. The base is six feet two inches.

Chair Hamerly stated the time this item was before us, we were looking at a variety of options and site plans for Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and Design Review Application (DRA) which presented large scale drawings. It plotted the truck maneuvering space, and they reconfigured the site plan because there were some that didn't work, that's how we got to the two canopy solutions instead of the one canopy. There were some issues that were identified on circulation and the northeast corner of the site was one of those critical points.

Commissioner Miller stated it would be great to see the footprint of the sign.

Community Development Director Mainez stated all these comments are very helpful. On behalf of the staff, we apologize, we assumed that it was parallel to the street. I would recommend we continue this item to a future date so we can get the right dimensions.

Chair Hamerly stated the existing reddish tone fits pretty well with the bronze glazing, and kind of the earth tones, but now we're talking about primary colors, bright red, bright blue on the signs. That does not complement well with the beige undertones of the building's exterior that are very muted. The Applicant may wish to consider a new color palette for the building.

Chair opened and closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Thomas, seconded by Commissioner Miller to continue this item to January 17, 2023. Motion carried, 5-0.

5. Design Review Application (DRA 21-001B) for revised building elevations related to the construction of a 4,050 square foot multi-tenant drive-thru restaurant building on

approximately 1.1 acres at the northeast corner of Base Line and Buckeye Street previously approved under Design Review Application (DRA 21-001) on January 18, 2022. (APN No. 1200-421-02)

Associate Planner Syed presented the staff report.

Chair Hamerly stated the elevations are a definite improvement over the previous DRA presented. The pop outs and some of the base elements on the floor plan if there's a hierarchy of the eyebrow elements on the vertical pop outs with the horizontal elements. There doesn't seem to be a hierarchy that I can identify and the clues for that can be found on the north and south elevations. The line of the south elevation goes straight from the wood siding straight up through the parapet and in the background the dominant eyebrow that's over the main entry and the main Habit sign that wood portion is aligning with the cantilevered portion of that lower projecting element. There should be about 5 to 6 layers within that hierarchy to avoid having the plane of the upper projecting elements meeting flush with the cantilevered awning elements. How do we resolve those hierarchies so that the elements stay distinguished?

Chair Hamerly opened the public hearing.

Architect Harris Shapiro stated there are four to five planes on this elevation. The biggest concern we have is the Habit elevation, that projection has to stay behind the turning radius to exit the drive thru. If we were to push that out even further, there's a good chance it would be hit by a van or a truck, and both entries have a projected awning that equally projected on both the adjoining tenant space and the Habit. The architectural pop outs, we have designed the building accordingly, the plans have gone through plan check, they're approved except for the elevations. We are on the verge of pulling permits and starting construction, but as far as the projections there is no flat plane. This is a very intensely designed facade to give it that character.

Chair Hamerly stated I think the layering is nice. The left-hand side of that tallest pop out is going to be well above the drive thru turning radius, so if that thing hung out five feet beyond the building, nobody's going to hit it.

Harris Shapiro stated the awnings over the entry doors pop out four feet. By code, we're required to have 4-footer projection which we are losing that extension of that pop out because of the corner pop out.

Chair Hamerly stated I am talking about the uppermost elements, the roof planes which I am calling those the awnings.

Harris Shapiro stated those are projected building elements, not necessarily part of the projection for entry protection, and those do have multiple planes. The largest one which is in the middle projects out two feet and the others go back 6 inches and merge.

Chair Hamerly asked if all of the wood elements and the section of grey is all respectively in the same plane?

Harris Shapiro stated not 100%. On the east elevation on the left side, they are in plane, but the right side the grey is slightly recessed where it shows tenant and in between the Habit sign.

Vice Chair Thomas stated it is a beautiful design.

Chair Hamerly stated it is a massive improvement.

Harris Shapiro replied thank you.

Chair Hamerly closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Thomas, seconded by Commissioner Sutorus, to:

1. Adopt Resolution 2022-045, to approve Design Review Application (DRA 21-001B), subject to the Conditions of Approval and Findings of Fact; and
2. Direct staff to file a CEQA Notice of Exemption with the County Clerk of the Board of Supervisors. Motion carried 5-0.

RESOLUTION NO. 2022 - 045

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION (DRA 21-001B) FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 4,050 SQUARE FOOT MULTI-TENANT DRIVE-THRU RESTAURANT BUILDING ON APPROXIMATELY 1.1 ACRES AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF BASE LINE AND BUCKEYE STREET.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled December 20, 2022.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Hamerly declared the meeting adjourned at 7:24 p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Camille Goritz, Administrative Assistant III
Community Development Department

Chandra Thomas, Vice Chair
Planning Commission