

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
August 20, 2024 – 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	Craig Graves
	Commissioner	Nicole McCance
	Commissioner	Jarrold Miller

Staff Present: Lawrence Mainez, Community Development Director
Kim Stater, Assistant Community Development Director
Angela Tafolla, Associate Planner
Tiffany Martinez, Assistant Planner
Matt Bennett, Assistant Public Works Director
Matt Wirz, Building Official
Camille Duarte, Administrative Assistant III
Scott Rice, City Landscape Architect

Chair Hamerly led the Pledge of Allegiance.

COMMUNITY INPUT (ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA)

None.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Minutes from the August 6, 2024 Regular Meeting.

A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Thomas and seconded by Commissioner Miller to approve the revised minutes as submitted. Motion carried 5-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. Conditional Use Permit CUP-23-009 for the development of a 243,323 square foot speculative industrial warehouse building, Variance VAR-23-002 to allow the building to exceed the maximum building height permitted in the Business Park Zone by 17.6', Design Review DRA-23-010 for the project's Site Plan, Building Elevations, Conceptual Grading Plan, Conceptual Landscape Plan, Mitigated Negative Declaration, and Vesting Tentative Parcel Map TPM 23-003 for the consolidation of twenty-four (24) parcels into one (1) parcel. **Continued from the 1-16-24 Planning Commission Meeting.** (Location: 11.33 acre site located between 3rd Street and 5th Street approximately midway between Central Avenue and Palm Avenue) (Applicant: CHIPT Highland 210 L.P.)

Associate Planner Tafolla presented the staff report.

Chair Hamerly asked when it is referred to the wall heights, especially to the northern side of the property, is that wall height measured from the finish elevation of the truck bay side or street side?

Associate Planner Tafolla stated street side, it will be measured by the highest grade.

Chair Hamerly stated regarding the parking analysis, they did make findings that the city has supported. The biggest point with a warehouse this size since it is speculative, there is a possibility in the future that someone would come in and build a larger office area than 7,000 square feet. Are we going to condition that the office area would never exceed 7,000 square feet, which would then keep them from going into a further deficit on their parking analysis?

Associate Planner Tafolla stated we can add a condition.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated it is an option to place a condition on a project that requires any modification of the mezzanine area and be revisited by the Planning Commission.

Chair Hamerly stated I am asking because we are already giving the applicant a variance from the parking standard that is in the Highland Municipal Code.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated it is the responsibility of the planning division for any business license that follows, we will look at the details and the operational characteristics if it deviates from this approval for us to reconsider those.

Chair Hamerly asked is that done at staff level?

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated there is a standard condition in all of our projects that state if there's modifications in the future, it may need to be reconsidered by the Planning Commission or the Community Development Director. It would really be based on the details that were presented to us at that time, unless we made a condition specifically saying any deviation from the mezzanine square footage returned to the Planning Commission.

Chair Hamerly stated it seemed like it would be prudent because any further analysis at staff level would have to be done per the Highland Municipal Code, and we are already deviating from that.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated we can make it equivalent to the plans that are presented to you this evening or if you feel comfortable with that 7,000 number.

Chair Hamerly stated I will leave the discretion of staff to how best resolve that. Regarding the variance, the figure cited in the staff report from finished floor elevation to the highest parapet was 43.6. I am assuming that accounts for the tallest parapet elevation at the southwest corner is where we find the greatest differential between finished grade immediately adjacent to the

building and the finished floor elevation. That is 5.2 feet, the truck bay is less than that, so that was our greatest delta. If we have the 43.6 + 5.2, that gets us to basically 48.8. I am wondering how we get the additional 4.5 feet of variance request based on the analysis that is in the staff report.

Associate Planner Tafolla stated I mentioned in the PowerPoint that although they are showing 43.6 feet, if you look from the actual lowest grade, I calculated 52.6 feet. It was adjacent to curb. Staff is supporting the variance because it is the new warehouse standards for equipment inside the building.

Applicant's Representative Jorge Garcia stated we have our team here to answer any questions you may have. Regarding the clear height definitely want to speak about that, there are major concerns if we limit our Mezzanine to 7,000 square feet potentially scaring off potential tenants.

Chair Hamerly stated do you think it would have been prudent to have your parking analysis state 1.5 times greater than we need?

Applicant's Representative Jorge Garcia stated the intent of the parking analysis is to show if you go around other cities in the County of San Bernardino, City of Highland is probably a little bit more stringent applying that. If you go to city of Fontana, it is very similar with the ITE is providing on their level of code.

Chair Hamerly stated do you think it is possible that you could find another analysis that would have more than 28 spaces of excess capacity if we did want to go to a 10,000 square foot office?

Applicant's Representative Jorge Garcia stated there is always the ability to use the truck court as parking.

Chair Hamerly stated it is restricted for maneuvering space with 128 feet because you really do not want to limit the lifeblood of your warehouse and logistics.

Applicant's Representative Jorge Garcia stated would not want to restrict it and minimize it to 7,000 square feet.

Chair Hamerly asked what is the maximum potential parking requirement based on the analysis that has been provided?

Applicant's Representative Jorge Garcia stated I would suggest anywhere from 10,000 to 15,000 square feet and give us that flexibility.

Chair Hamerly stated can we write a condition to that effect that we will review it for a not to exceed capacity of 15,000 square feet and will need to provide a letter of support for amending their previous parking analysis?

Community Development Director Mainez stated this is a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), and it is speculative. You are going to go back and forth on this. Based on the tenant, we want to

analyze all the changes, and that could trigger us bringing it back to you to amend the CUP. The collective flexibility and discussion tonight because you are getting into those areas that staff will have to analyze for the new tenant. I appreciate the thought of the future; however, I do not want them to put themselves in the corner. I would suggest continuing this item, so they are able to conduct another study.

Applicant's Representative Charleen Soo stated we prepared the parking study. I want to provide some clarification on the parking. The parking studies finding was that the parking that was required for the warehouse component was at a maximum of 95. If you add that to the 28 office parking spaces required as the current site plan proposes with the 7,000 square feet, then you are at 123 spaces. The parking is overparked based on the finding of the parking requirement.

Chair Hamerly stated great information.

Applicant's Representative Jorge Garcia stated are we able to speak about the 36 foot height variance?

Chair Hamerly stated we are not disputing the 36 foot variance; it was more the methodology of how we determine maximum height.

Applicant's Representative Chris Savage stated I am with RGA Architects. The building height from finished floor to the top of parapet height which is set at 48 feet max. As you know, sometimes the perimeter grade around the building will vary. To the best of my knowledge that height from finished floor to finish grade outside the building is around 4 feet. A typical maximum height is 52 feet based upon a four foot dock height and other conditions.

Chair Hamerly stated 36 clear structure depth, approximately 3 feet, and the parapet height at 5 feet which is around 46-48 feet. I am showing the maximum delta between finish grade and finish floor elevation is 53.5 feet at the southwest corner. Are you comfortable sticking with the 52.6 feet?

Applicant's Representative Chris Savage stated I am comfortable with the line of sight analysis. I do not have a finished final grading plan in front of me to quantify exactly those numbers that has been stated.

Chair Hamerly stated we can give you a grading plan and speak about it tonight.

Applicant's Representative Chris Savage stated Chair Hamerly, the math was correct, however if we do not want to amend the height and variance, we can correct the grading for it to comply with the four feet change. Essentially, we can berm up the finished grade from the parking lot grade to the face of the building.

Chair Hamerly stated yes, that is what I was suggesting.

Applicant's Representative Chris Savage stated what the current plans are showing a 48 foot panel height from finished floor to top of panel at that southwest corner. The staff report identifies a variance that is a total height of 52.6 feet. I am suggesting that we are comfortable

with a maximum building height of 52.6 feet, which gives us 4.6 feet maximum from finished floor down to finish grade outside the building.

Chair Hamerly stated OK, so we have a four foot max grade differential and that would match the truck pay as well.

Applicant's Representative Chris Savage stated yes, correct.

Chair Hamerly stated now, we are going to go through the exhibits.

Vice Chair Thomas stated on the building elevations, I like the color of the glass, the shades of gray and how modern it is.

Chair Hamerly stated I like the plant selection, the major specimens were very well suited with their height and mass to screen not only on the north side, but also on the frontage to 3rd Street.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated on page 53 CUP, Conditions of Approval No. 9 be amended. As stated, reading revisions, modifications or deletions of associated plans must be submitted to the planning division for review and approval. Revisions may require additional reviewed by the Planning Commission, including but not limited to, an increase in the total office area in excess of 15,000 square feet.

Chair closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Thomas and seconded by Commissioner Miller to:

1. Adopt Resolution No. 2024-016, approving Conditional Use Permit CUP-23-009 for the development of a 243,323 square foot warehouse/distribution facility and related improvements; and
2. Adopt Resolution No. 2024-017, approving Variance VAR-23-002, allowing an increase in the maximum building height for the subject warehouse from 35 feet to 52.6 feet tall, 17.6 feet greater than permitted in the Business Park Zone; and
3. Adopt Resolution No. 2024-018, approving Design Review Application DRA-23-010 for the Site Plan, Building Elevations, Conceptual Grading Plan, and Conceptual Landscape Plan, subject to the Conditions of Approval, and the Findings of Fact; and
4. Adopt Resolution No. 2024-019, approving a Mitigated Negative Declaration and direct Staff to File and Notice of Determination with San Bernardino County Clerk of the Board of Supervisors; and
5. Adopt Resolution No. 2023-020, approving Vesting Tentative Parcel Map Application No. 20616 (TPM-23-003) for the consolidation of twenty-four (24) parcels into one (1) parcel. Motion carried 5-0.

PC RESOLUTION NO. 2024 – 016

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP-23-009) FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A 243,323 SQUARE FOOT SPECULATIVE INDUSTRIAL WAREHOUSE AND ASSOCIATED IMPROVEMENTS GENERALLY LOCATED BETWEEN 3RD STREET AND W. 5TH STREET APPROXIMATELY MIDWAY BETWEEN CENTRAL AVENUE AND PALM AVENUE. APN's: 1192-631-09, -10, -11, -12, -13, -14, -22, -23, -24, -25, -26, -27, and -28; and 1192-641-08, -09, -10, -11, 15, -16, -17, -18, -19, -20, and -21.

PC RESOLUTION NO. 2024 – 017

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING VARIANCE (VAR-23-002) TO ALLOW AN INCREASE IN THE MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT IN THE BUSINESS PARK ZONE FROM 35' TO 52.6' TO CONSTRUCT A 243,323 SQUARE FOOT WAREHOUSE, LOCATED BETWEEN 3RD STREET AND W. 5TH STREET APPROXIMATELY MIDWAY BETWEEN CENTRAL AVENUE AND PALM AVENUE. APN's: 1192-631-09, -10, -11, -12, -13, -14, -22, -23, -24, -25, -26, -27, and -28; and 1192-641-08, -09, -10, -11, 15, -16, -17, -18, -19, -20, and -21

PC RESOLUTION NO. 2024 – 018

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION (DRA-23-010) FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A 243,323 SQUARE FOOT CONCRETE TILT-UP WAREHOUSE INCLUDING THE PROJECT'S SITE PLAN, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, CONCEPTUAL GRADING PLAN, AND CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN GENERALLY LOCATED BETWEEN 3RD STREET AND W. 5TH STREET APPROXIMATELY MIDWAY BETWEEN CENTRAL AVENUE AND PALM AVENUE. APN's: 1192-631-09, -10, -11, -12, -13, -14, -22, -23, -24, -25, -26, -27, and -28; and 1192-641-08, -09, -10, -11, 15, -16, -17, -18, -19, -20, and -21

PC RESOLUTION NO. 2024 – 019

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A 243,323 SQUARE FOOT WAREHOUSE AND ASSOCIATED IMPROVEMENTS LOCATED BETWEEN 3RD STREET AND W. 5TH STREET APPROXIMATELY MIDWAY BETWEEN CENTRAL AVENUE AND PALM AVENUE. RELATED ENTITLEMENTS INCLUDE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP-23-009), DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION (DRA-23-010), VESTING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP (TPM-23-003) AND VARIANCE (VAR-23-002). APN's: 1192-631-09, -10, -11, -12, -13, -14, -22, -23, -24, -25, -26, -27, and -28; and 1192-641-08, -09, -10, -11, 15, -16, -17, -18, -19, -20, and -21

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 020

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING VESTING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 20616 (TPM

23-003) TO MERGE TWENTY-FOUR (24) EXISTING PARCELS INTO ONE (1) PARCEL IN ASSOCIATION WITH CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP 23-009), DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION (DRA 23-010), VARIANCE (VAR 23-002) TO DEVELOP A 243,323 SQUARE FOOT INDUSTRIAL WAREHOUSE, LOCATED BETWEEN 3RD STREET AND W. 5TH STREET APPROXIMATELY MIDWAY BETWEEN CENTRAL AVENUE AND PALM AVENUE.

3. Design Review Application No. 24-005 (DRA-24-005) A Public Hearing of the Planning Commission to consider Planning Area 2 (PA2) of the Greenspot Village and Marketplace Specific Plan. The Design Review Application seeks approval of the Site Plan (Option A & Option B), Building Elevations, Conceptual Landscape Plan, Rough Grading Plan, recreation areas, and amenity building. In addition, a Tentative Tract Map No. 24-001 (TTM-24-001/TR 20698) for the subdivision of three (3) parcels to create six (6) new parcels across 25 acres for the purpose of finance and conveyance. (Location: approximately 25 acres located on the north side of Greenspot Road between the SR 210 and Boulder Avenue.) (Applicant: Mission Communities and Mossa Investments)

Commissioner McCance recused herself because of a conflict of interest.

Commissioner McCance left the Council Chambers.

Associate Planner Tafolla presented the staff report.

Commissioner Miller stated the FEMA mapping for this area shows it is protected from flooding based on the existence of the levee that runs along City Creek. Who maintains that levee?

Assistant Public Works Direct Bennett stated it is maintained by Flood Control.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated we received a comment letter from TREH Partners and provided a copy to the Planning Commissioners. What they were asking for is a revision to the Conditions of Approval Engineering Condition No. 39 and they are requesting a shared access on the westerly road of the project.

Chair Hamerly stated yes, I was wondering if there was any kind of a reciprocal agreement there that allowed a gated community, essentially to come through that residential community. Is this in the Design Review Conditions of Approval?

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated yes, it is. There are two resolutions, one for Option A and Option B, and they are the same in both sets. The letter that you received gives you the condition in full and then highlights additions. TREH Partners requested an amendment, it stated in accordance with Greenspot Village and Marketplace Specific Plan grant by separate instrument a reciprocal private easement in favor of the parcels within Planning Areas 1, 2, 3 southerly and westerly adjoining properties for pedestrian and vehicle access. Including pedestrian, vehicle access, including emergency access from the southwest corner of Planning Area 2 with the westerly adjoining TREH development project. Most of that is in place on your existing conditions and they added Planning Area 2 They added the word westerly adjoining property and highlighted pedestrian comma, vehicle access. Staff and Applicant have received this. Staff has no objection.

Chair Hamerly stated the staff report cited the Applicant had a meeting with the residents to the north that they had increased the setbacks of the units along the north edge of the development. I did not see any revision for the majority of the northern boundary along the west and it has been consistently 10 feet, but in the northeast corners all of the setbacks were increased?

Associate Planner Tafolla stated that was part of the request to continue at the last meeting. They were collaborating with the Applicant and had increased setbacks from the original plan.

Chair Hamerly asked what was the original plan?

Associate Planner Tafolla stated the original plan had five foot setbacks along the northwest.

Chair Hamerly asked regarding the parking analysis, are there a contingency in case the 104 residents of the JDUs do not avail themselves of public transit?

Associate Planner Tafolla stated no. That is part of the state requirements that we are not permitted to.

Chair Hamerly asked if Option A is the preferred option, and Option B is the contingency plan?

Associate Planner Tafolla stated I am going to defer that to the applicant.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated the way the conditions are written now is Option A is mandatory for approved by HCD, however, if not, then Option B will apply. The Applicant will address that and also, make a request for a time limitation on that.

Community Development Director Mainez stated the state has had it for about two months and they usually takes 60-90 days to get back to us. There was an emergency to get some entitlements on this property and so we tried to expedite it before tonight's hearing. I was hopeful, a little disappointed that the state did not come through. I did reach out to them again and it is such a unique request. It tests the legislation, and their intent is to reduce regulation. When I say regulation, they assume setbacks, lot coverage, and density are barriers in the law to provide low income housing or affordable house. We thought this was a very unique approach and that is why we created the Option A and B instead and if that works or does not work, we will come back with another option in the future. The legal department is looking at it to see if we can use this product towards density, when it is clear in the law that is said you cannot use density as a factor in approving these administratively over the counter. Usually these types JADUs, Planning Commission is not supposed to look at. It is staff level approval only. Keep in mind that if you were to approve this project tonight without JADUs under the current state law, the new residents would be able to come to the counter and submit their plans. We look at the parking impacts and anticipate the unique living arrangement.

Chair Hamerly asked do either of the resolutions need to make the findings and or provisions for one invalidates the other?

Community Development Director Mainez stated the condition is written in such a way, where that option will not be acceptable until we get buy off from the state.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated the City Attorney has reviewed all the documents and ensured what Community Development Director Mainez has stated is correct.

Chair Hamerly stated there was a clear contingency clause in both Option A and B for the Conditions of Approval, however I did not see anything equivalent in the way the resolution was worded to where one becomes invalid should the other get a determination from HCD.

Community Development Director Mainez stated we set it up, so the entitlement is Option A or Option B and so there is not any findings except that strong stern condition. We did not separate the findings that way.

Chair Hamerly stated the recital A1 states it, but essentially, we are being asked to approve a dual slate of resolutions here.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated it is strictly noted in the conditions. The City Attorney did concur that this is the appropriate language; the dual resolutions instead of a single resolution with both options.

Chair Hamerly stated I do not dispute the dual resolution is the way to go, it is more a clerical understanding that I need about what does this do to us because obviously we cannot adopt both resolutions.

Community Development Director Mainez stated that is a good question. We should probably explore that with our City Attorney to make sure we have it right. Planning Commissioner can adopt both, there are two separate conditions.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated on page 87, which is Option A, stated based on the findings of fact and conclusions the Planning Commission approves Design Review Application to construct Option A. We can add additional language that we can work on drafting while the Commission continues to talk. We can modify No. 7.

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated I want to thank staff, particularly Associate Planner Tafolla for her hard work to get this all these different moving pieces to make sense. With me tonight, I have our partners, architect, landscape architect and our civil engineer to answer any detailed questions. There will be a few points in the conditions that we want to respond and get addressed. We have been working on how to create a mixed-use community that meets all the goals and objectives that the community and the Specific Plan has had. We were before you a couple of years ago when the world was very different and was able to address the three story, ladder truck issue and that brought forth our original plan. Unfortunately, interest rates went up and the capital markets plummeted. Clearly there is a for sale shortage in Southern California and we saw an opportunity to produce a plan that would meet the density. So that unlocked not just the multifamily apartment option, also for sale option for residential and some of it was detached and the attached. We are excited that the rest of the Specific Plan has come together. It is easy now to see how this would be a great place to live. It is

going to be a really a great, great community as well as being able to go to the new stores and shops that are coming up. So, we are really excited about looking forward to moving it forward and are prepared to answer questions and yes, we will come specifically on some of the different conditions. Thank you.

Chair Hamerly asked are you in agreement with the Conditions of Approval?

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated we do have several conditions that we need to address. The latest one will actually require that we are being asked to do something that was not a part of the plans allowing TREH to open up the gate for common ingress and egress.

Community Development Director Mainez stated that this is going to be a long discussion, so I would like to invite the public first to speak before we get into the Conditions of Approval.

Public Speaker Elizabeth stated I live at 7712 Calhoun Road, I did send a letter in with six items, but I did not see in your list of letters. The first concern I have is on the design for the block wall. Originally, we had an 8 foot wall, but now it is showing a 6 foot wall again. The other concern is where the sports courts are, that is a road currently at the end of Calhoun Road. The water from Calhoun and Eucalyptus all flows down that direction. If you notice at the end of Calhoun Road, the furthest south property, it appears that they are taking part of our road which for egress and regress we need part of that to pull into the driveway like we have for 50 years. That green slatted area is going to have water flow issues too.

Chair Hamerly asked is part of your access presently going past the property boundary?

Public Speaker Lynda Schubert stated yes because they marked the property line. In reality, the other side of the street is for pulling in and out. The other issue is the trash trucks getting in and out, it needs to be wide enough for them to maneuver. My other concern was the sufficient parking for the Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and the windows facing northbound. I am asking for the 8 foot wall. Personally, I do not think 10 feet is enough room to have a patio, it should be 12 feet.

Chair Hamerly asked the public speaker mentioned access to Calhoun Road, I noticed on the sport court there is a gate that goes through there?

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated Edison is going to require a gate, and they require full travel with a 35 foot easement uninterrupted. The community will be gated and there is no vehicular access north on Calhoun Road. We just have to have that gate for Edison.

Applicant's Representative Bob Stewart stated the design does have to accommodate to pick up that water, so with the constrain with Edison that water will be picked up at the at the end of Calhoun Road would go across the Edison easement and then it once it reaches our private street that is where it will be collected.

Applicant Glenn Elssmann asked Associate Planner Tafolla if staff had copies addressing the plan A.

Associate Planner Tafolla stated on the presentation are the plans we have received last week.

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated where it stated utility easement on the upper left quadrant, the unit to the right is shown as a three story and that was modified as a two story home.

Associate Planner Tafolla stated there is a unit mix plan for Option A and B.

Chair Hamerly asked ok, so it is your belief that you have adequately addressed these changes to the homeowners by the development and that they are comfortable with the increased setbacks and the stepping back of the taller elements?

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated yes.

Public Speaker Ali stated I am on 28145 Eucalyptus Avenue. Applicant Glenn Elssmann did have a very nice open line of communication with us, which we appreciate. My main concern was our privacy was going to get overtaken. We are going to have constant views, and I will not be able to bathe properly. I would request the Planning Commission if it is possible to have higher walls. The higher the better is for us. We have been living there for almost 20 years now and invading privacy is going to be a huge thing. New residents put in cameras, and they are facing old residents and watch them 24 hours a day and I will not be able to stop. So, more trees, taller brick wall would be even better. I understand 8 foot walls are the minimum. There is no guarantee with the trees. 10 years ago, we had the Japanese Bark Beetle wipe out majority of our trees. What do I do if I do Japanese Bark Beetle returns, and these trees are gone and now they have full access to my yard? We have to look out for ourselves in the future. Just put yourself in my shoes, what do you have left, where is your privacy that you have had for so long with your family? I can rely on a wall.

Chair Hamerly stated there isn't any practical solution for a wall that where we would even be able to build a free standing 30 foot tall wall that's going to block the windows. That just wouldn't work in earthquake country obviously. The best solution that I can produce is there is a redundancy, and they have agreed to landscape on the south side of the barrier.

Public Speaker Samon stated he owns the house at 7747 Eucalyptus Avenue and Applicant Glenn Elssmann has had multiple meetings with us. Today's the first time I am hearing about this court in the back, I always thought that was just the entrance and exit to Edison and Fire Department. That access opens right into my house, and I am thinking once that gate even opens, I have no access to my backyard.

Chair Hamerly stated it is rarely going to open at all. It is allowing Edison access if something does happen that they need access to.

Public Speaker Samon stated I am on septic. They have tried to collaborate with me, and he has gone to the water company and offered to do a stub out, but they declined that. So, at this point three stories looking into my parking lot of property because I cannot do anything with it. I understand I am in a new site Specific Plan, and I was never notified that I was in that plan. We have lived there since 2002. I disagree with the three story homes.

Chair Hamerly asked how deep is your property?

Public Speaker Samon stated roughly 150 feet.

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated in the original packet there were some three story homes on that section, and they had a deeper setback, but we replaced those to accommodate the concern of the three story. The two-story has a bigger footprint, so it has a smaller setback. I will show the Planning Commission the new plans for Option A. Now, instead of the three story with a deeper setback, are two story homes with a shorter setback.

Associate Planner Tafolla stated staff did not receive this revision that is currently being presented.

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated we apologize. These are revisions that have been ongoing.

Chair Hamerly asked if these are all two story homes with 12-14 feet?

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated yes.

Chair Hamerly stated the plot we are looking at right now has five units, first tandem has 23 foot setback and the second is a two story unit of 12 foot setback.

Chair Hamerly asked how would we condition landscape buffers for an unknown exhibit or is that something we make as a directive, and it is picked up in plan check? How do we allocate potential landscaping that would occur off site that would be an allowance for the northern property owners?

Community Development Director Mainez stated the off site is a civil issue and is a good idea. I just do not know how to condition; we have never done that. It sounds like the developer is doing the right thing about being neighborly.

Chair Hamerly asked what are those unit numbers? There is two different units that are in that block of five buildings.

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated plan one are the three story, plan two and three are the two story homes.

Chair Hamerly asked has your plan mix changed? I am referring to pages 60 and 61. Are they mini town homes or regular town homes?

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated yes, those are the two story homes for the clusters in Option A. All north side in Option A is considered cluster with Junior Accessory Dwelling Units (JADUs). The south side has the townhomes.

Chair Hamerly stated I am looking at AB 308 plans. These are the longer clusters.

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated the clusters are detached and the clusters are plans A 3. They are detached, so they have no connection.

Chair Hamerly stated regarding the site plan, pickleball is a fairly noisy sport and how we get sound mitigation and screening on the sport court?

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated I do not think it is going to be feasible to mitigate sound.

Chair Hamerly stated if we need a 10 foot screen to keep the balls from flying over the fence to the north, so if we had in the continuation of an 8 foot wall that gives us a little bit of sound mitigation and visually screen that.

Applicant Glenn Elssmann asked which side?

Chair Hamerly stated primarily to the north because I do not think it is as much of a factor going to the west. How do we mitigate sound from the pickleball court?

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated that wall continues north. At some point we will have to make it a gate.

Chair Hamerly asked does that gate have to be the full 36 feet wide or it has to have 18 foot clear for access?

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated I do not know what the minimum width for the clearance is. We can put mesh up for the balls, but I do not know what to do with the sound.

Associate Planner Tafolla asked is it possible to do something similar to the East Valley Water District fence that is removeable?

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated yes, we can do a perforated mesh on the gate.

Chair Hamerly stated on page 37, that is the tentative track map which is not the final one we have an additional map that was provided to us this evening. Now, we will go through the elevations for scheme A, on the colonial style is the front elevation is nicely done, the mass is beautifully broken up. On the right elevation, I am reading siding, flanking the front door and it looks like it transitions right at the corner to smooth stucco. Am I misreading the plan or is the stucco wrapping and going past the front door and the siding is only wrapping around the garage?

Applicant's Architect Victor Gonzalez stated that is a brick veneer. It does stop at the corner.

Chair Hamerly asked any thoughts to putting an eyebrow or an awning roof element over the sliding door that is exiting from the first floor?

Applicant's Architect Victor Gonzalez stated yes.

Chair Hamerly stated on the north side of Lot B, we have the orange units on the south side of lot B we have the cross hatched pink or red with the orange units as well, but the ones specifically the ones on the corner have a three side exposure. Location specifically, we have exposures to streets I would like to see a wraparound architecture that is more representative of the front facade.

Applicant's Architect Victor Gonzalez stated we can have enhanced elevations at those locations.

Chair Hamerly went over the elevations on Craftsman and Colonial style. There are missing elevations and floor plans on the club house. We are requesting that this comes back to the Planning Commission with the 4 missing elevations at a future date.

Chair Hamerly announced taking a recess at 9:21 p.m. Resumed the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

Chair Hamerly stated for Option B, site plan on page 67, the primary differential between Options A and B is going to be found in the northeast corner. Any comments on Option B site plan A1.0? We have the common space exhibit, L6, the northern edge on either side was the screening. We have that wall and the vegetated screen, but again giving a screening to the upper levels on Option B. Moving on to the character elevations, the Spanish Colonial, a concern is the rear elevation where there are eight garage doors all in a row. I do not know whether we want to look at color options for defining those units within a defined color palette, but any options you can produce to break that up would be greatly appreciated. On the plotting plan, page 78 is dated 7/16/24 for Plan B, is that current?

Applicant's Architect Victor Gonzalez stated yes, that is the current plan.

Chair Hamerly stated we can go over the Conditions of Approval.

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated regarding the Planning Condition No. 11, the improvements along Boulder Avenue. It has to do with the timing of the Boulder Avenue frontage and preliminary perimeter landscaping. We need the West side to be completely relieved of this condition. We need condition No. 11 to only apply to the east side where we can build, however not get our final occupancies until we get Edison's approval for modifying any of the easement area for improvement purposes. We need to link their approval versus the occupancy approvals because we do not know how long it is going to receive the approval.

Chair Hamerly stated Edison's primary concern is structures within their easement, but they typically do not halt on things like asphalt, curb, and gutter.

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated also, as it relates to the central amenity, we can link that to the 40th or 50th occupancy of the west side. The west side gets constructed first and the central amenity will be under construction or finishing the first several phases. So, we do not mind putting a number of the occupancies on the West side to have the central amenity completed.

Chair Hamerly asked where is that break line of what you are considering east and west C of O for purposes of phasing this for Edison?

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated we would like to be able to construct on the east side. This would be the 200th occupancy we would have before this was completed.

Chair Hamerly stated anything that is adjacent to that Edison easement all the way through the project would be vulnerable in terms of what you are describing.

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated we could make it so the units adjacent to it cannot be occupied until that has done, that would work.

Community Development Director Mainez stated staff put forward conditions that we thought were reasonable and obviously the Applicant has the opportunity to review these conditions, and there was not enough time. It is a large project, there is a lot of conditions. We have to break this up in these parts. We want the clubhouse to be constructed as a marketing tool for the first occupant. If that's not reasonable staff need to figure out what is reasonable. Traditionally it is not good practice to sit here and negotiate every condition.

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated the clubhouse that is not as critical. The Paseo becomes critical because it is going to be hard to construct these homes and have the Paseo operational. So, when these units are done the Paseo needs to be done. Otherwise, if we build the Paseo and all those amenities, there is no room to physically construct and get the equipment around us.

Community Development Director Mainez stated I do not want to debate how we are going to conclude; what is clear is we need to sit down with the developer and go over it.

Chair Hamerly stated let us go over conditions and give us the numbers of all the conditions that you object to or have alternative recommendations for.

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated planning condition No. 25, that has to do with the time frame related to the HCD ruling, we would like to have it so that if we don't get the answer within 90 days, we can proceed with Option B. Planning condition No.10 and No. 21 that has to do with phasing, so it coordinates with our planning areas. Also, planning condition No. 11.

Chair Hamerly stated if staff it not prepared to negotiate in the public hearing. Do we continue this to a date certain since the Conditions of Approval are basically the core of the Conditional Use Permit?

Community Development Director Mainez stated we will get some response from the Applicant as well, but there is another item that was presented by TREH Partners in a letter. I would like to continue that dialogue between TREH Partners and the Applicant tonight in hopes that they can come to terms on a good solution to give them what they are asking in their letter. We have to do a date specific.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated September 3, 2024 would be the next meeting.

Applicant Glenn Elssmann stated we can do the date certain, September 3, 2024.

Chair Hamerly closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Chair Hamerly and seconded by Vice Chair Thomas to continue the meeting until September 3, 2024. Motion carried, 4-0-1 with Commissioner McCance abstaining.

Commissioner McCance returned to the Council Chambers.

4. Conditional Use Permit (CUP 23-010) for the development of a 79-unit small lot single family community; Design Review Application (DRA 24-003) for the related Site Plan, Building Elevations, Landscaping and Grading Plan; General Plan Amendment (GPA 24-001) and Zone Change (ZC 24-001) from Low Density/Single-Family Residential (LD/R-1) to Planned Development (PD), and Tentative Tract Map No. 20693 (TTM 24-001) to subdivide of 3 parcels into 79 single family lots and common areas. (Location: 7394 Central Avenue) (Owner: Coffee Family Trust)

Assistant Planner Martinez presented the staff report.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated I have three additional clarifying items for you based on what you have seen in front of you. Design Review Application (DRA 24-003) is a single page during duplication of the agenda. We omitted one of the pages of engineering conditions, so it is between page 181 and 182, engineering conditions 25-30. There is a discussion about how there is not a lot of detailing on the park amenities, staff had recommended that come back to you at a future date, however the Applicant would prefer to have a concept approved at this level. In front of you is an 11x17 color plan.

Commissioner Miller stated there is a looks like an existing storm drain system that runs along the boundary of the project. The existing site looks to discharge to some combination alleyway road and drains west. Do we know if that existing storm drain system is capable of handling the additional flows being introduced at this location?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated that storm drain that goes westerly on Crest Street does pick up Central Avenue and the east side of Central Avenue from housing development Jeffrey Court. There is a catch basin on both sides, but it was anticipated designed storm drain system for the drainage easterly to west, and south at Central Avenue.

Commissioner Miller stated it looks like we will probably be introducing flow a little bit earlier to that storm drain. As a part of the process of the drainage report, would the city be requesting analysis of that existing line to verify capacity?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated we have had the study completed.

Chair Hamerly stated in the staff report condition No. 14 addressed the recreational facility and it has to do with California Public Resources Code. Is there another condition that addressed that facility? It was on page 176.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated it is on page 175, staff removed some conditions that messed up the numbering.

Applicant's Representative Peter Carlson stated I am representing the applicant team, DMSG. I am happy to be here and present this project to you. We put together slides just to show you this park area that we had worked on and thought that might be helpful for you in your consideration of the project. We been working with staff on the design of the park and staff had had requested an amenity package and we had talked about whether that was a half-court basketball or a tot lot. We drew this concept plan with a combination of open turf as well as tot lot for two different age groups. There is still a shade structure for seating and barbecue and the tot lot would have shade over them. There is a gazebo kind of a shade structure over the play equipment allowing for greater use of the play equipment especially when it gets hot and during the summer months. There are a couple conditions that I think we have resolved completely. One of them was the was coming back to the Planning Commission on the on the park area. The other conditions had to do with some engineering issues. That referenced ten additional feet along Central Avenue and I think we had talked about that being actually part of the right of way. Our plans show a curb adjacent sidewalk as opposed to a meandering sidewalk. There is a condition that talks about a meandering sidewalk along Central Avenue and our recommendation would be a curb adjacent sidewalk with about four and a half feet of landscaping within the right of way. Otherwise, we accept all of the conditions and look forward bringing this project to City of Highland. There are two conditions, one is No. 33 on page 182 and condition No.14 which is on page 180. Condition No. 14 references a 6 foot meandering sidewalk and condition No. 33 stated a 10 foot wide minimum landscape easement across Central Avenue frontage in addition to the required street right of way. We are dedicating additional right of way and improving the half section of Central Avenue which is currently not improved. I think what the concept is that we have we have 11 feet between face of curb and the edge right of way, and that area that would include the sidewalk as well as landscaping.

Chair Hamerly stated condition No. 33 is 10.5 half feet from back of curb to the face of the development wall, which is also the rear yard wall.

Applicant's Representative Peter Carlson stated correct.

Chair Hamerly stated maybe you can answer item 34 references the required off site property interests. Are you aware of what those are?

Applicant's Representative Peter Carlson stated there are no offsite acquisitions, which is necessary.

Chair Hamerly stated I did not see any, that is why I am asking you.

Applicant's Representative Peter Carlson stated I was not too worried about that condition where we are all self-contained. We do have the secondary access that is off of Central Avenue, however there is no off site acquisition that is required. Regarding the drainage question with the basin, basically the way the system's been designed is that drain that goes into Crest Street is part of the master plan of drainage through San Bernardino County. We looked at the planned queues going into that drainage system, our detention basin detains run off from the developed condition to match the design cues going into that system that was in the master plan. We had very good infiltration rates in the basin, and we are satisfying our water quality requirements through infiltration.

Public Speaker Karen Harnick stated I am speaking for the Harnick Family Trust. We wonder what direction the City of Highland is taking, and it is high density, so I have that one right. It looks like 2/3 of the plans are to be 4 bedroom houses and if 2/3 of the houses are 4 bedrooms, which is 52 houses with two people in each bedroom that is possibility of nine people in each house. So, 9×52 is 468 people, plus the other third of the plans being 3 bedroom, would be 27 houses with the possibility of seven people in each house. 7×27 is 189 people, plus the 468 means possibility of 657 people living there. Possibly. How many of these people will be drivers and needing to go to work, school or somewhere at the same time every morning and all returning home at the same time about every evening. Even if you cut that in half, the rest of your children are not of driving age yet. That is possibly over 300 cars trying to get in and out twice a day at about the same time. All this traffic will pour out through one entrance and exit onto Central Avenue creating everyday congestion like we have never known. It looks like there might be a possibility of another entry and exit on the west side of the Coffee Trust Property, which is Bruce Street, and it does dead end to the back of the Coffee Trust Property. There is a possibility of losing two of the proposed houses to open up Bruce Street to a second entrance and exit. This could help relieve the congestion and Bruce Street leads over to the Cunningham Park. The proposed emergency exit also enters onto Central Avenue, the same street that is already overcrowded. There are other possible emergency exits, but they exit onto private property. You can't have an emergency exit there, although the road does end there of the newly the proposed properties. There is no emergency exit off Crest Street. I am looking at the legend on the first diagram in the staff report, not the new diagram that was provided for tonight, 3/4 of an inch and is 60 feet. I guessed that the proposed park in this proposal will be something like 60 x 60 feet. Is that a big enough area to entertain all the kids or adults? What does the proposed development add to this community other than money, high density housing, high density population, and congestion. I think that this proposal will overburden our community, and I think too value our property. We as a family do not want any part of high density housing, this is where our families have grown up. From six houses to 9.5 houses per acre is a huge increase and it is just too big of a stretch. Also, there are nine extra parking places for the Junior Accessory Dwelling Units (JADUs) and that is not a lot. I think that what it is going to cause is a lot of visitors and family members who are visiting the new homes are going to be parking out on Central Avenue and when you pull out, you will not be able to see because all the cars will be parking out there. So, it is going to cause a lot of street parking. I hope I am wrong, but you for listening to me tonight.

Public Speaker stated I am Mark, and this is my dad, Ron. We live on Central Avenue, right next door to the property that they want to build the houses on. My dad's concern is safeness. He has equipment and backyard. We were all kids at one time. You see equipment you are going to climb the fence; you are going to go back there. Also, privacy. He has been there for 51 years; he has had that empty field next to him. Now they are going to put two-story houses, right? We are concerned the wall not being high enough for privacy. there. He has been there for 51 years and have had no problems. There's cars constantly in the street parking there, we get 50 cars and where my dad's property is, the sidewalk ends right at his property. The fence next door comes out about 8 feet. There is going to be more cars, more traffic, so if they can do something where you cannot park on Central Avenue. People are driving 70 miles an hour down Central Avenue, they need to put some speed bumps or something. I know they cannot for like the fire trucks, but it is crazy on that street. I moved in there when I was 13 years old. I have seen a lot of changes because of the traffic. There is a fence that sticks out by my dad's property, and you cannot see cars coming. When we pull out of my dad's

driveway, we creep out looking north because the you can't see. They need to do something about the traffic on that street and like she said there is going to be more traffic. There are going to be two-story houses right here and they are going to look right into his living room window. He sits in his chair because he has had a stroke, and he will not be able to see the mountains through his window. This is going to block his view. If we can get higher walls or trees and make it nice. It would help if there is another entrance or exit somewhere else, maybe on the backside that would help. He can see the casino from his backyard, all of that is going to be taken away from him. Thank you for listening.

Chair Hamerly asked the commissioners if they were in favor to continue the public hearing to another date or continue the meeting tonight.

Applicant's Representative Peter Carlson Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, we have all been here since 6:00 p.m. this evening. We have been very patient and with all due respect, the prior applicant was not as prepared as they should have been. It became more of a workshop than actually a public hearing. I do not think it is fair for us to receive the burden and the punishment of the prior applicant's inability to have architecture prepared for you and to change plans right at the last minute. We have worked very diligently to be prepared. We would like to continue through this public hearing so that we can move on to the City Council.

Planning Commissioners voted to continue the meeting.

Commissioner Miller asked if there was a traffic study on the developed to support the change?

Applicant's Representative Peter Carlson stated yes, there was a traffic analysis that was conducted. The traffic study is done based on the Institute of Traffic Engineers, which they conducted a trip generation rate per dwelling unit. This was done based off the latest 11th edition. It is 9.73 average daily trips per dwelling unit and multiply that by the 79 dwelling units, and that is the number of trips that are being generated by the proposed project. The traffic study looked at both the AM and PM peak hours. There are 55 trips in the morning, and 74 trips in the evening. Central Avenue and Base Line it is currently B in the morning and B in the PM. It stays as B in the morning, and it goes to C in the PM.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated this is on page 151.

Commissioner Miller asked was there any consideration given to adding an access point on Bruce Street?

Applicant's Representative Peter Carlson stated we looked at that initially and we had conversations with staff. This is a gated community and having a second entry gate is problematic from operation of the gates as well as turn around. We saw Bruce Street as being an exit only gate. The concern is that at the end of Bruce Street often times cars parked there and can block the gate. Staff really encouraged us to keep access off of Central Avenue and not create a condition where that gate could be blocked by somebody parking.

Chair Hamerly stated regarding the General Plan Amendment and Zone Change, on page 20. This stated proposed use would not impair the integrity or character of the district in which is to be established or located. In the response it assumed the fact that we are changing to Planned Development (PD), which does not address the established character of the neighborhood. What is the justification for the increased density? The Planned Development is the issue. We are changing from a Residential 1 (R1) to a PD.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater asked are you referring to B in the General Plan or B in the Conditional Use Permit (CUP)? What page?

Chair Hamerly stated page 20 item B.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated page 20 B are the findings for the CUP. The resolution will be broken down into a number of resolutions that the City Council will consider as well as the ordinance for the Zone Change. It has to go in order and the environmental has to go first.

Chair Hamerly stated I did not see real rationale, if we are asking for a 55% increase, which is achievable solely because of the PD, what are we getting? It references some vague standards like superior design and amenities. Amenities could be anything but what are we getting for that sense of community that allows for increased density? These are all two-story residences within the neighborhood that is predominantly a single story neighborhood and that is when we start talking about context and neighborhood character.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated we can build on these findings and improve those before they go to City Council.

Chair Hamerly stated the Homeowner Association (HOA) does a lot towards improving the overall character and quality of the community. This project is a lot of density with minimal benefit. The park is 60 x 60 and for 79 homes, which is pushing maximum density.

Chair Hamerly stated I know we have different floor plans, and we have mirror image orientations, but along each respective segment of the street, all the driveways and plans are repetitive. The interval of the lot width, there is a driveway, a tree, and a pop out. Since the lots are so tight, if some were reversed or flipped it allows the driveways to be separated and it gives the apparent distance between front doors.

Applicant's Representative Peter Carlson stated we have talked about doing is taking some of those and reversing them, so the driveways are next to each other and there is a larger opening between the next set of driveways.

Chair Hamerly stated the elevation details are expended on the front facade and very little wraps around the side. In those instances, such as the two parcels that flank the main entry gate and the four parcels that are adjacent to the community park, if we could consider two or three sided architecture and have the front facade elements wrap around the side.

Chair Hamerly asked do they have fences here? (Pointing to the PowerPoint).

Applicant's Representative Peter Carlson asked do you have the fence plan that has the color pallet? it is hard to read without the color, but there are fences along here. (Pointing to the PowerPoint)

Chair Hamerly stated I completely missed that, I was reading it as side yard, community landscaping that was parkway for the street. Where is the fence?

Applicant's Representative Peter Carlson pointed to the PowerPoint.

Chair Hamerly stated I was reading that the yard was separated, and the fence spanned between all those houses.

Applicant's Representative Peter Carlson stated there is no fence, you are right.

Chair Hamerly stated the feature trees (Holly Oak) at the most prominent areas in the site, I have nothing against it, they are beautiful trees. The only concern is, it has 24 inch box and those are pretty slow growing trees. I recommend particularly at the main entry if we increase the size of that.

Applicant's Representative Peter Carlson stated yes. The irony is the smaller container size will make the plant grow faster.

Chair Hamerly stated I have a comment on the elevation, the Prairie style house, the eaves, and roof slopes are very consistent and one of the defining features of prairie style is broad eaves and very shallow hips. Would you consider flattening that roof out, and extending the eaves so it reads more as Prairie?

Representative's Architect Jeff Addison stated one of the challenges that we have the narrower homes like this is the forced air unit that is up in the attic. We have that challenge when you start shallowing up the roof pitch a little bit more, we can certainly look at it.

Vice Chair Thomas stated regarding the color palettes on page 247, I did not care for the colors on the Prairie style homes.

Chair Hamerly stated the brick and roof look similar to each other.

Representative's Architect Jeff Addison stated we could look at those materials and make sure the brick and roof colors are different.

Chair Hamerly asked what types of equipment are you thinking for the tot lots?

Applicant's Representative Peter Carlson stated there are different play equipment for different age groups. We are going to go through with those additional designs, work with staff, and make sure it is age appropriate. There are a combination of climbing equipment, slides, and swings that helps differentiate some of the older kids from some of the younger kids.

Vice Chair Thomas stated I am finishing a project right now at my job and it is a playground that is for all abilities children, so including some accessible features for those that have disabilities as well. Maybe it is something that you could consider.

Applicant's Representative Peter Carlson stated absolutely.

Vice Chair Thomas asked were you planning to use rubberized surface on the playground?

Applicant's Representative Peter Carlson yes, the rubberized surface does get integrated and other surfaces surrounding that.

Chair Hamerly stated regarding the Conditions of Approval, we are reviewing the community amenity, and we are striking condition No. 12, is that correct?

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated yes.

Chair Hamerly stated on Engineering Condition of Approval No.14, we had a discussion on the previous application, however this mentions the six foot wide, meandering sidewalk. The applicant stated they proposed a 4.5 foot wide sidewalk within the right of way. What is the standard for the sidewalk that is presently on Central Avenue?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated the curb adjacent sidewalk would be six foot wide and a meandering would be a 5 foot wide.

Chair Hamerly asked does the Engineering department concur with the 4.5 foot recommendation that the applicant had suggested?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated 6 foot curb adjacent sidewalk, 4.5 foot for landscaping.

Chair Hamerly stated if it is six foot curb adjacent then it would no longer be meandering, is that correct?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated that is correct.

Chair Hamerly stated ok we will strike meandering in condition No. 14.

Chair Hamerly stated Condition of Approval No. 33 would be modified.

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated yes, this would be modified and as approved by City Engineers, so we are probably going to see that planning looks at it and does not need the 10 foot landscape easement back of right of way.

Chair Hamerly asked any additional comments on this item? Conditions of Approval No. 4 and 5 as modified.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated just for clarification, it is best to drop that into the beginning of the recommendation because the Planning Commission only has one resolution. Staff is recommending the Planning Commission adopt the resolution recommending the City Council take the actions one through six and at the end you would state conditions as modified. I will note that on page 16 it is before General Plan Amendment, and it needs to strike City Council and change that to Planning Commission. On page 18 No. 5 zone change, change from City Council to Planning Commission. On page 22 I am going to strike LMD and replace that with funding mechanism acceptable to the city.

Community Development Director Mainez stated rule of order, generally the Chair does not make the motion.

Chair Hamerly closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Chair Hamerly and seconded by Vice Chair Thomas to adopt Resolution No. 2024 -021, recommending the City Council items one through six as modified.

1. Adopt a resolution approving Mitigated Negative Declaration (ENV 24-002) and direct Staff to File and Notice of Determination with San Bernardino County Clerk of the Board of Supervisors;
2. Adopt a resolution approving General Plan Amendment (GPA 24-001) to change the land use designation of the site from Low Density (LD) Residential to Planned Development (PD);
3. Introduce an ordinance approving Zone Change (ZC 24-001) to change the zoning designation of the site from Single-Family (R-1) Residential to Planned Development (PD);
4. Adopt a resolution approving Conditional Use Permit (CUP 23-010) for a 79-unit single family development and related improvements, subject to the Conditions of Approval and Findings of Fact;
5. Adopt a resolution approving Design Review Application (DRA 24-003) for the Site Plan, Building Elevations, Conceptual Grading Plan, and Conceptual Landscape Plan for the residential development, subject to the Conditions of Approval and Findings of Fact; and
6. Adopt a resolution approving Tentative Tract Map No. 20693 (TTM-24-001) for the subdivision of three (3) parcels into 79 single-family lots and common area, subject to Conditions of Approval and Findings of Fact. Motion carried, 5-0.

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 021

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP 23-010) TO ALLOW THE DEVELOPMENT OF A 79-UNIT SMALL LOT SINGLE-FAMILY COMMUNITY AND RELATED ENTITLEMENTS INCLUDING GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA 24-001) TO CHANGE THE LAND USE DESIGNATION FROM LOW DENSITY (LD) RESIDENTIAL TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (PD), ZONE CHANGE (ZC 24-001) TO CHANGE THE ZONE DISTRICT FROM SINGLE-FAMILY (R-1) RESIDENTIAL TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (PD), DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION (DRA 24-003) FOR THE RELATED SITE PLAN, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, LANDSCAPING AND GRADING PLAN, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 20693 (TTM 24-001) TO SUBDIVIDE OF 3 PARCELS INTO 79 SINGLE-FAMILY LOTS AND COMMON AREAS, AND ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION ON A 8.3 ACRE SITE LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF CENTRAL AVENUE, APPROXIMATELY 400 FEET SOUTH OF BASE LINE (APNS 1192-341-11, 1192-361-45, AND 1192-361-47).

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next Planning Commission Regular Meeting is scheduled September 3, 2024.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Hamerly declared the meeting adjourned at 12:01 a.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Camille Duarte, Administrative Assistant III

Randall Hamerly, Chair

