

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
October 1, 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
	Commissioner	Craig Graves
	Commissioner	Jarrold Miller
	Commissioner	Nicole McCance

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

Staff Present: Lawrence Mainez, Community Development Director
Kim Stater, Assistant Community Development Director
Angela Tafolla, Associate Planner
Travis Trejo, 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 20, 2024 Regular Meeting.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Miller and seconded by Commissioner Graves to approve the minutes as amended. Motion carried, 4-0, with Vice Chair Thomas being absent.

2. Minutes from the September 3, 2024 Regular Meeting.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Miller and seconded by Commissioner McCance to approve the minutes as submitted. Motion carried, 4-0, with Vice Chair Thomas being absent.

3. Minutes from the September 17, 2024 Regular Meeting.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Miller and seconded by Commissioner McCance to approve the minutes as submitted. Motion carried, 4-0, with Vice Chair Thomas being absent.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

4. Continuation of a Public Hearing for 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. Additionally, it includes Tentative Tract Map No. 24-001 (TTM-24-001/TR 20698) for the subdivision of three (3) parcels to create seven (7) new parcels across 25 acres for the purpose of finance and conveyance. Continued from September 17, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting. (Location: Vacant area of approximately 25 acres located on the north side of Greenspot Road between the SR 210 and Boulder) (Applicant: Mission Communities & Mossa Investments)

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Miller and seconded by Commissioner Graves to continue the Public Hearing to October 15, 2024. Motion carried, 4-0, with Vice Chair Thomas being absent.

5. Design Review Application (DRA 24-006) for the development of 94 detached single-family homes, community exercise stations, picnic areas and community trails within Phase 4 of the "Mediterra" Planned Residential Development. (Location: Approximately eleven (11) acres at the northeast corner of Greenspot Road and Mediterra Parkway) (Applicant: Greenspot Corridor LLC)

Assistant Planner Trejo presented the staff report.

Commissioner Miller stated regarding the recent fires and closing of Greenspot Road to debris flows, has there been additional requirements?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated on the last page of the Engineering Conditions is the drainage design criteria that has not changed. It is predetermined and evaluated that this area is subject to the flows that came down from the hillside beyond our Arnott's property. There are no further studies being requested, however lessons learned of what the debris flows were, and they were contained to the roadway. It was a healthy design criteria that was applied in the beginning.

Commissioner Miller asked what insurance is there that the staff is asking for the Conditions of Approval?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated the original evaluation was completed with a former Flood Control plan designer Engineer that established the runoff mitigation plan as well as these design criteria. There are some other concerns that are being addressed along the hillside for debris removal and those are in the Conditions of Approval.

Commissioner Miller stated I am going to refer this concern to page 96 of the staff report. I am familiar with document SP 100, and I believe if we got into the details of that, we would find that a bulking factor of 50% is recommended and applied. I do not think 50% is adequate here. I have lot of training in fire hydrology and have assisted multiple track developments

with addressing debris flows from fires and if we looked at some of those conditions such as bulking factor of three is probably more representative. I had a recent conversation with Michael Pham, Chief of Flood Control, not regarding this project, but about debris analysis for a project in Wrightwood. He was not even recommending any San Bernardino County Flood Control District criteria for quantifying debris. He was recommending use of Army Core or LA Counties methodology. I do not think it is adequate to quantify the potential debris that we risk over the next 5 to 10 years at this development.

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated there has been a conservative safety factor applied to this which is 50%. That is the rule that we are currently designing on Plunge Creek, which is a larger watershed and is under review and in consideration of Michael Pham with Flood Control, and it is the higher conservative approach and is being applied here in a smaller watershed. So, the factor that you are talking about is not applicable at this location.

Chair Hamerly asked are any of these Conditions of Approval being retroactively applied to the other planning areas or these are strictly isolated to just PA 4?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated for this conversation tonight it is only PA 4.

Chair Hamerly stated of all the planning areas within this entire subdivision, PA4 is probably the lowest risk because debris would have to come through a lot of other future houses to get to PA 4. PA 2 and 3 would be at the direct line of fire at the foot of the slope areas that are most vulnerable.

Commissioner Miller asked PA 4 is actually directly adjacent to debris flow that just occurred within the past week and Greenspot Road had to be closed down.

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated that is correct, it is at the eastern location. It did over top into the roadway and we do have concerns and that is why we are approaching the downstream with the partners, San Bernardino Valley Water District and East Valley Water District to make the proper connections on the south side so that we can see the flows discharge downstream from that culvert.

Chair Hamerly asked in future analysis of debris flow would then the perimeter masonry walls of a development give a higher debris retention factor as opposed to just being a free board wall?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated on PA 3 they might have some debris coming from the north of the wall. The wall is not developed as a flood wall.

Commissioner Miller asked I thought the Conditions of Approval actually specified that the perimeter walls were supposed to be designed for Flood Control.

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated not for PA 4. PA 4 will be developed before PA 3 constructing a portion of a flood wall and protection.

Commissioner Miller stated at a minimum that eastern boundary condition, where we have already seen evidence of debris flows, should be designed as a flood wall.

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated you are speaking about a flood wall at that location, which was not a part of the design plan, but you are speaking about the easternly boundary?

Commissioner Miller stated yes.

Community Development Director Mainez stated where it refers to the Flood Control document SP 100, can we add or as determined by the City Engineer?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett asked is this Condition No. 47 A? Yes.

Chair Hamerly stated I would like to add some kind of language identifying that particular lot, just so that it does not slip through the cracks during plan check. That is the most vulnerable corner if nothing happens for several years after the development.

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated yes, we can add it specific to that lot in the easternly boundary so we can be considerate of any concern of this project.

Applicant Camille Bahri presented the PowerPoint presentation.

Chair Hamerly opened the public hearing.

Commissioner Miller stated regarding the zero lot line, I was thinking about a situation where a property owner wants to paint his house and for whatever reason he is not getting along with his next door neighbor, but yet he needs to be able to get access to that adjacent home to be able to paint his home. How does something like that get resolved?

Applicant Camille Bahri stated we have an easement on the lot to benefit the next door neighbor, so if they do not get along they still have access to it.

Chair Hamerly stated within the detailed plotting that you have done, that represents not only the lot sizes but the different plan models, was there any plot where you actually accounted for the locations of the second floor windows?

Applicant Camille Bahri stated I did the plotting and will consider it.

Chair Hamerly stated if I am plotting plan 2 against the reverse image of Plan 3, and it is a primary suite to primary suite, those tended to have the windows on the side, and there was a very high propensity to have those windows directly facing each other. There are some bedrooms that only have side exposure, they don't have exposure to the front or the rear of the house, and so you do want to have adequate light and ventilation into a bedroom, however if you only have one window into your bedroom, you don't want to have to permanently keep your windows shut or shaded because right there is the neighbor's bedroom.

Applicant Camille Bahri stated yes, I understand that. I will keep that into consideration.

Chair Hamerly stated given the density and the tightness of the lots and the project is over parked, I would encourage staff to work with the applicant anytime we can have a pocket park

or expand the common areas and reduce parking on either side. That is an opportunity to break up what could be a highly repetitive streetscape. My biggest concern of the project is the driveways by and large tend to be on the same side of the house on almost every single lot that is on the south side. If there are opportunities to do a flip and shift the driveway more towards the center of the lot to create more separation between the driveways so that they are not 600 hundred feet long every 20 feet on center. It is going to look very repetitive if you have a 20 foot driveway and then the next 20 feet over another driveway and tree. If you can make sure to break up that rhythm. Also, there is a condition that said, the second story that fronts Greenspot Road should have enhanced architecture. We can create a second condition that stated for the internal street that those units with a side exposure would also have enhanced architecture. Regarding lot C, there is a pocket park that does a very nice job of counteracting the monotony that is on the south side. If you wanted to eliminate a couple of those parking spaces to expand the public feature.

Chair Hamerly stated moving onto plan 1 floor plans and elevations. On page 28, the 2nd floor, the laundry is tight and a feature that you may want to consider is the window that is on the south side of the second floor popped out two feet to give you a deeper porch. It would double the amount of storage space in that laundry room.

Applicant Camille Bahri stated we will consider that.

Chair Hamerly announced a short recess at 8:52 p.m. The meeting resumed at 9:00 p.m.

Chair Hamerly stated on page 33, I have a suggestion on the colored elevations from the front elevation, there is the veneer that defines the two sides of the garage. It would be nice to mirror that on the column that is flanking the front door. On Plan 2, on the second floor there are two windows that are showing that stairwell. One recommendation to get light into that hallway on the 2nd floor would be to shift that window so it is centered on the stairway as it is coming off the hallway. On Plan 2, the Tuscan left elevation front facade, the post that is by the covered entry wrap that in veneer and the other option was running the veneer down that wall till it hits the inside corner at the front door, so the entire length of the walkway has a similar treatment.

Applicant Camille Bahri asked so wrapping it to where the front column is?

Chair Hamerly stated yes.

Applicant Camille Bahri stated that it is likely where the gas line would be, and we wanted to leave enough space between that sidewalk and the wall of the garage. I agree with you, otherwise it is going to take away from treating the veneer treatment on the column itself.

Chair Hamerly stated it would make more sense to shift that window that is in the entry down a little bit and put your utilities on that blank wall instead of having your gas meter that is going to stick out about 18 inches.

Chair Hamerly stated regarding Plan 3, on the second floor of the Santa Barbara option, the loft is enormous. It is either a great spot for a balcony or another option would be create a master bathroom.

Chair Hamerly asked regarding the landscape plan and the DG exercise path along Greenspot Road, the exhibit that showed during the presentation that showed a lot of trees that you said you bootlegged in there, yes?

Applicant Camille Bahri stated yes.

Chair Hamerly stated on the landscape plan detail 1.2, the enlargement for lot C would be the parking areas that Mr. Bhari mentioned in his presentation, so if two-three of those parking spaces went away makes a nicer pocket park right at the main intersection coming into PA 4.

Assistant Planner Trejo stated staff will make a note of that.

Chair Hamerly stated going through the Planning Conditions of Approval one specific to item 13 stated interior residential lots must feature two trees on site, corner residential lots must feature three trees. I think the corner lots is an easy solution. Where do you see those two trees? Are they in a row?

Applicant Camille Bahri stated there is only room for one tree to grow maturely about 25 feet 30 feet. I am also concerned while observing people yanking out their front yard trees and I counted maybe 60% of people taking out trees. I think if you overdo it, it will get in people's way.

Chair Hamerly stated I like the landscape condition No. 30; however, we can modify it to stated one specimen and one ornamental or one large tree form shrub. The intent is to have more tree form in that front streetscape.

City Landscape Architect Rice stated Condition No. 13 just needs some wordsmithing to be a little bit more specific and then it should be fine. As depicted on the screen that is what we are asking for, which is a prominent street tree that is appropriately sized. The species is not something that will be overgrown. The second tree is an accent tree.

Chair Hamerly stated when you have a long exposure to keep the three primary trees in the condition, however I am fine with the first sentence of Condition No. 13.

Applicant Camille Bahri stated I would like to speak about Planning Condition No. 27.

Assistant Planner Trejo stated regarding Planning Condition No. 27 stated landscaping and planting areas should be used to screen and buffer edge areas and parking areas from public view. All parking areas shall be screened by earth bounding and or screening shrubs at 30 inch max to screening parked cars from public view as seen from frontages or right of way areas.

Applicant Camille Bahri stated I do not think this condition applies. I want to make sure that we are not agreeing to something we cannot implement.

Chair Hamerly stated Conditions of Approvals that have been modified are Planning Department Nos. 9, 13, 16 B, 35, and Engineering Conditions No. 47 A.

Chair Hamerly closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner McCance and seconded by Chair Hamerly to adopt Resolution 2024-022, approving Design Review Application (DRA 24-006) including the Site Plan, Conceptual Landscape Plan, and Building Elevations related to the development of Planning Area 4 of the Mediterra Planned Development, subject to the Conditions of Approval as modified and Findings of Fact. Motion carried, 4-0-1, with Vice Chair Thomas being absent and Commissioner Miller voting no.

Commissioner Miller stated I voted no because my concerns are related to safety. The conditions surrounding this development warrant different criteria than what are being cited in the Conditions of Approval. Additionally, the Applicant's Engineer used to be business partners with CSAC who is also the reviewer. There is a conflict of interest.

RESOLUTION NO. 2024-022

A RESOLUTION OF PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND TO APPROVE DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION (DRA 24-006) FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF 94 SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES, COMMUNITY EXERCISE STATIONS AND PICNIC AREAS AND COMMUNITY TRAILS WITHIN PHASE 4 OF THE MEDITERRA PLANNED DEVELOPMENT LOCATED ON APPROXIMATELY 11 ACRES AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF GREENSPOT ROAD AND MEDITERRA PARKWAY (APN: 0297-051-27)

6. Selection of street names for Tentative Tract Map No. 18893 located within Planning Area 4 of the Mediterra Planned Development. (Location: Located on the north side of Greenspot Road, east of Avienda Ramblas, and south of Mediterra Planning Area 3. Owner: Greenspot Corridor LLC)

Assistant Planner Trejo presented the staff report. The spelling would be Carrer, not Carrero.

Chair Hamerly opened the public hearing.

Applicant Camille Bahri presented his presentation.

Chair Hamerly stated if you would like to stay within the Spanish vernacular go Calle or Via.

Applicant Camille Bahri stated Via in Italian means street, I am not sure what it means in Spanish. I am comfortable with replacing Carrer with Via.

Chair Hamerly closed the public hearing.

Chair Hamerly stated Carrer changes from Carrer to Via, the second names stay the same.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner McCance and seconded by Commissioner Miller to approve the proposed street names for Tentative Tract Map No. 18893 as modified. Motion carried, 4-0 with Vice Chair Thomas being absent.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next Planning Commission Regular Meeting is scheduled October 1, 2024.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Hamerly declared the meeting adjourned at 10:21 p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Camille Duarte, Administrative Assistant III

Randall Hamerly, Chair

