

**MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
May 18, 2021 – 6:00 P.M.**

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Highland was called to order at 6:02 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 Jarrod Miller
 Commissioner Jessica Sutorus

Staff Present: Lawrence Mainez, Community Development Director
 Kim Stater, Assistant Community Development Director
 Salvador Quintanilla, Associate Planner
 Carlos Zamano, City Engineer
 Matt Bennett, Assistant Public Works Director
 Matt Wirz, Building Official
 Camille Goritz, Administrative Assistant III
 Scott Rice, Landscape Architect

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Hamerly.

COMMUNITY INPUT (ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA)

None

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Minutes from the May 4, 2021 Regular Meeting.

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

PUBLIC HEARING

2. Specific Plan Revision (SPR) No. 06-01A is an amendment to the Greenspot Village & Marketplace Specific Plan (SPR No. 06-001) to adjust the boundaries of Planning Area No. 1 (Highland Marketplace) and the boundaries area of Planning Area No. 2 (Residential Village), eliminate the Village Paseo from Scenario No. 1 and eliminate the requirement of private open space for studio units; Design Review Application (DRA) No. 20-012 for the construction of approximately 85,316 square feet of commercial uses (Greenspot Crossings) and a 200 attached residential unit complex with a 6,214 square-foot clubhouse; Conditional Use Permit (CUP) No. 20-006 (ABC License) for the establishment of three (3) off-sale alcohol licenses (ABC Type 20 and 21) and five (5)

on-sale alcohol licenses (ABC Type 41 and 47) for a commercial retail center; Conditional Use Permit (CUP) No. 20-007 for the construction of gas station with eight fuel pumps, convenience store, and carwash; Tentative Parcel Map No. (TPM) No. 20-002 to increase the number of parcels from four (4) parcels to eight (8) parcels; and Accessory Sign Review (ASR) No. 20-013 (Sign Program) to establish a Sign Program, excluding freeway sign heights and locations, for the commercial and residential development within the Greenspot Village & Marketplace Specific Plan (GVMSP).
(Continued from May 4, 2021)

Chair Hamerly opened the public hearing.

Associate Planner Quintanilla presented the Staff Report.

Commissioner Miller asked how much is the square footage of the paseo that is being removed? Have we considered any opportunity to incorporate pervious pavement to address the offsets from having little disperse treatment through the removal of the paseo?

Tom Robinson, Applicant stated we started working with the City of Highland in 2007. The paseo was first designed in 2005 which was a different time and since then the city-built storm drains in the street and that is where the water is drained now. We currently have 17% of landscaping on the site, and a normal developer would have about 10% percent. In 2007 regarding the paseo, looking back would have been a nightmare with the homeless population if it were built. We do not need it for water quality. We put a lot of thought and landscaping in for this apartment complex. We went through three different architects because they were not listening to our requests. Our mission was to design a project where we would want to live at.

Commissioner Miller suggested to look at Citrus Plaza and East Valley Water District Headquarters landscaping for great examples regarding the project. I see a potential for us to lose some value of treatment by taking that portion of the paseo out and hope we can mitigate that by making use of further opportunities on the site.

Tom Robinson replied that is a great point.

Chair Hamerly stated one of the coprimary targets of the paseo is to link the respective communities within the Greenspot Village and Marketplace when choosing to make the residential component on the western end a gated community, how are we creating that linkage that was predominantly addressed in the Specific Plan?

Tom Robinson stated when I first looked at this plan, I sat with staff Ernie Wong and Bruce Meikle and allowed only one traffic signal on Greenspot Road, and we knew it would never work. Linking all the projects together was a good concept back in 2007, but the project failed. It was a completely different time. We have agreed to link our project with the east next door. There will be a connection point, but the connection will be mostly on Greenspot Road, and you are going to have to traverse through. It is not what

was dreamed up in 2007. That project and even the paseo is dead, and if we want to go back to that we are going to be sitting here for 15 more years. I want the connectivity. We have put a Condition in here which we will connect to the project directly to the east.

Chair Hamerly stated there are multiple shallow points where it seems like it would be logical to put a gate there, but I think it would be a missed opportunity if there was not at least a potential linkage. That way people will have access to go to the shops or restaurants.

Tom Robinson replied I agree with you. We want our apartments on the east wall to have areas where you could go through our site to the other side. We do not know what the site next door is going to do, but we do have linkage for vehicle traffic behind the gas station from the apartments that you can go through.

Chair Hamerly stated I saw that; however, I did not see the opportunities for creating gateways from the residential components of your development to the residential components to the east development. I think that would be an opportunity for an additional gateway theme.

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated answering to Commissioner Miller's question, the size of the paseo is 0.6 acres.

Commissioner Miller asked is that the amount being proposed to be removed?

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated yes.

Commissioner Amaya thanked TREH Partners. Was there any thought on bringing in a large retail company such as Target?

Tom Robinson stated we have had conversations with Target throughout the years, we will not give up on any retailer, but we are looking to add value to the community. We developed the first Chick-fil-A, Cracker Barrel, and A ground-up Lowes in California. We developed the first Sprouts in Inland Empire. We look for those type of tenants that will add value. We need quality housing to acquire quality retailers. The way we have designed this project and all the amenities is a market rate project. We have some smaller units, and it might put some people in the marketplace that may not want to rent a 1,200 square foot apartment for \$1,800 or \$2,400. It will not be affordable to everyone, but it will bring more marketplace to the area.

Vice Chair Thomas asked if there was a separate area that was planned for the smaller units on the site?

Tom Robinson stated it is the building furthest to the south and closest to the gas station.

Commissioner Amaya asked is that enough distance from a gas station to residential area?

Tom Robinson replied yes, it is.

Vice Chair Thomas asked how many parking spaces are tenants allowed based off square footage of their house? Do the studios count as a one bedroom or are those excluded?

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated the studio have a different count. The studio requires one cover parking space, which are carports.

Vice Chair Thomas stated I appreciate the apartments and having different options of variability for an affordable option for others. I appreciate the connection that Chair Hamerly mentioned regarding connecting the residential project. This is important for our walkability. Greenspot Road is an extremely busy road; therefore, it would be convenient for people to walk to the commercial complex. I look forward to that.

Commissioner Miller asked do we know the timing between completing the extension to City Creek and completion to this project?

City Engineer Zamano stated we are working with United States Fish and Wildlife (USFW) services to approve the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) that was prepared for that location. The HCP has been approved, now we are waiting on the next steps to proceed. We are currently in the process of getting the design finalized. Once that is complete and we have the permits in place we can move forward. We would like to construct those improvements prior to November's timeframe.

Commissioner Sutorus asked has there been plans on constructing covered parking solar onsite?

Tom Robinson stated we have not decided yet on the overhang and if we are going to put solar there or not. There will be Electric Vehicle (EV) chargers throughout the projects.

Commissioner Sutorus stated great, it is a beautifully designed project.

Vice Chair Thomas asked for more of an explanation regarding the Alcohol Beverage Control (ABC) license.

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated each census track has certain amount of license they allow which is based on population. For this census track it allows three alcohol licenses for on and off sale. Now, you may receive additional licenses or ABC will allow licenses as long as the City can make a public convenience and necessity finding.

Vice Chair Thomas stated if we approve the project now, will this go forward or City Council for approval?

Associate Planner Quintanilla replied this will go to City Council for final approval, however whatever the sign program is, the tenants will follow the guidelines listed.

Chair Hamerly stated the freeway signs are being excluded because there must be a flag test.

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated that is correct.

Chair Hamerly stated we would have to pull the conceptual sign plan from the Design Review Application (DRA) portion of approval that they are seeking tonight.

Tom Robinson stated we could not match up with our flag test with our sign company this evening. In my opinion, the signs in the Specific Plan are supposed to be 90 feet and the sign across the street is about 84 feet.

Commissioner Miller stated we have many gas stations and car washes in Highland. What value do you think having an additional gas station and car wash associated with this project will have for this city?

Tom Robinson stated I think it would be a great impact. It is going to be very convenient being right off the freeway for people getting ice before going up to the mountains. Chevron sells a tremendous amount of ice. For example, people would stop and fill up their ice chest when they are traveling up the hill and when they come back down the hill, they fill their ice chest again. It is catering to the freeway traffic.

Vice Chair Thomas asked do we have any other project approved with the electronic signs like this that is being proposed tonight?

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated we had looked at one for San Manuel on Boulder Avenue and Highland Avenue that was not constructed.

Commissioner Amaya asked from the freeway are there two monument signs being proposed?

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated correct.

Tom Robinson stated there is two conditions that we want to discuss tonight. Item number 37 in the Engineering Conditions. We have an issue with the way it is worded. There is federal and state law that has to do with drainage issues, and we are willing to take on any drainage that comes across our neighbor's property onto ours that they cannot handle post development. We are not willing to give a blanket easement across the property for drainage it must be more specific. It states Planning Area 1 and 2 easterly adjoining properties for drainage. This needs to be more specific which staff agreed to work with us over the next couple days. The ownership to the east of it should not have a right taken away from them and for me to be able to put a utility on their property anywhere I want. That is basically what it states. If they need a utility across my property or if I need a utility across their property than we need to negotiate. I cannot have them going under my building or coming in my shopping center anytime tearing up the easement which that specific Engineering Condition does not address. I have told Staff I do not want my neighbor to have this requirement on them nor I want it on me.

There are no limitations or insurance. They can come on my property anytime and I can go on theirs anytime and that is the issue we have. Another issue we have is Planning Condition number 75 and 76 which has to do with an additional \$550,000 for a fire truck and employee. We do not see where that is fair for us. We currently have an agreement with San Manuel ourselves, however they can cancel it and the City has an agreement also. The fire truck issue came about years ago when the overall Specific Plan was, and the developer was negotiating for a development agreement and this is how this transpired. There is sales, property, use, and gas tax that are coming in. It is not our responsibility as an individual as a small developer or a Specific Plan to buy something for the entire City that they are going to utilize. \$6,874,000 is how much we are paying the City of Highland in Development Impact Fees (DIF). Apart of those 12 items that go into the DIF, two specific items go for equipment and fire. We cannot go forward with this project spending \$550,000 when the City has the power to keep those agreements in place. I would like to point out that we are not in agreement with that either. Staff is great to work with, everyone is very friendly, we are comfortable here and we are glad to be in Highland. We want to build this project and we want to see the projects to the east happen. Sometimes projects do fail and for whatever reason we still want to see a success here. We believe by building high quality projects will help in the future. I am excited about REXCO too. We would like to have that consideration to take out Planning Conditions 75, 76 and Engineering Condition 37. We will continue to work with staff to amend that.

Chair Hamerly clarified that type of issue is one of the reasons why the Planning Commission is not the final determiner of those type of issues because they are financial, and the City Council makes those determinations. We might be able to make a recommendation to consider it, but we would not be able to make a recommendation to strike that.

Community Development Director Mainez stated that is correct. Purely financial the agreement with San Manuel was approved by City Council; therefore, we should defer this to City Council.

Chair Hamerly opened the public hearing.

Glenn Elssmann, Public Speaker stated I have a handout I would like to pass to Staff and Planning Commissioners. Congratulations to Tom and Ed it has been a long journey working on this project and it is exciting to see the vibrancy and the opportunity for both the commercial and residential. Our project failed because we were denied on the condition Mr. Robinson brought up. The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) never addressed this need for an added person for a ladder truck. Unfortunately, we cannot come to resolution, we had a 532-unit three story garden apartment with over 43% open space so sadly that did not happen. We survived the great recession and as mentioned we are excited REXCO is graded and TREH Partners is coming forth. We are preparing to move forward with some exciting plans, the market, and retailers are coming up, however we are left with uncertainty. I am trying to obtain clarification on some key

points. We have another underlying objective which is the high density overlay to satisfy the Housing Element 5 of the City's approved Housing Element. If you calculate the math, we are concerned that the unintended consequences that there will be inconsistencies that we are going to be left with. It makes it hard to plan and go forward. We are not suggesting that REXCO and TREH Partners intended to have that ambiguity caused nor Staff, but we have a reality that we are trying to deal with. The Specific Plan allows up to 800 residential units and in this scenario being described there would be 200 that REXCO has and 200 that TREH Partners has, and what remaining is 400. The problem is that we have 25 acres in Planning Area 2 which is also covered by the high density overlay and by rights we have a minimum 200 units per acre. In the Specific Plan we must have a minimum of 20-30 units per acre. My math states $25 \times 20 = 500$ which 400 is remaining and we cannot do less than 500 units. Another element that we are concerned about is the high-density overlay covers an area greater than Planning Area 2, it spills down into Planning Area 3 which is about 12 acres and a portion of our retail. The objective of the last Housing Element cycle was to have 650 units. Apart of the Specific Plan amendment is these types of amendments. The way we see the map is that TREH Partners may have 100-120 units that would go into the high density overlay which then would leave 500-550 units that we would have by right. Add 200 of TREH's and REXCO's and that will leave us 950 units, however the Specific Plan only allows up to 800 units, so we have this inconsistently. The unintended consequences are the exhibits that show the tables, and the densities need to have language that says if these criteria met the density can come down. The Specific Plan allows a variety of housing types, but because of this conflict between the Specific Plan, count, and the high density overlay we are literally in handcuffs. Again, we do not think this is an intended consequence. Our recommendation in our letter is to have findings that would allow as an example because REXCO reduced a percentage of 170,000 square feet of the commercial space that was on the Planning Area 3. We are saying the analysis of the traffic impacts could allow that balloon to stay the same, however allow for an increase offset of the number of units, so we do not have this inconsistency. In conclusion, allow the cap to be raised because in essence we believe the other projects unintendedly are dictating and necessitating a raise of a cap. I am assuming the freeway signage was going to have other property owners beside the TREH Partners, but I did not look into the details. I appreciate Mr. Robinson bringing up the issue on the reciprocal easement. Thank you for your time Commissioners.

Chair Hamerly stated if the Specific Plan essentially creating the overlay and ground rules for development of the entire property along north of Greenspot Road, it seems that the vehicle is amending the Specific Plan. Did you have specific language that you were wanting to insert as a Specific Plan amendment as part of your future application?

Glenn Elssmann stated we are saying is that other applications have boxed us in and have caused inconsistency. Their revision should address that, so we have clarity.

Chair Hamerly replied I understand that, but as part of their application they are proposing certain things to amend the Specific Plan which is under consideration this

evening. If the Specific Plan needs to be amended to make your component work, wouldn't that be something you would propose as part as your development?

Glenn Elssmann stated if the project is approved tonight, we are left with a total inconsistency. What we decide to do in terms of what we are going to propose with housing types and variations is a future issue.

Chair Hamerly stated I understand. We really cannot make a decision about a future unfiled development that may or may not be impacted by the application that has been filed tonight because it is not on the agenda.

Glenn Elssmann stated however, you have guidelines that now they do not work. The guidelines fail with the approval tonight and we cannot develop per the Specific Plan. The unintended impact to us is if we go through a review project, I need to make sure my impact to my neighbors is addressed. Even though they did not cover the Specific Plan identically in our area their tables cover our land. The high-density overlay covers our land, so it seems logical that would be addressed in other people's application. As we apply people are going to look at our impacts on the surrounding neighbors and communities. We have suggested prior to this meeting to be addressed in this revision, otherwise we are left with a gap and a void of clarity.

Chair Hamerly asked what would be the Specific mechanism for achieving that?

Glenn Elssmann stated one is to change the table that has the minimum density on Planning Area 2 to allow it to be up 30 units per acre. For Planning Area 3 to be up to 40 units per acre. That would by default say, you do not have to have all your land at 20 units per acre because we are going to run out of units. I am asking staff to change table to up to 30 on Planning Area 2 and 3. Secondly, there is findings that say because REXO and TREH Partners reduced commercial, and there is a finding that the cap can be raised.

Chair Hamerly asked what type of mechanisms do we have for findings? Has staff had an opportunity to consider this or the developer who is before us this evening had an opportunity to consider this as well?

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated yes, we have met numerous times with Mr. Elssmann and his team. We have received his comments and questions for consideration. The application that is before you this evening is an application from TREH Partners for the items that are presented by Associate Planner Quintanilla and the team. We do not think it is the appropriate time to consider additional adjustments to the Specific Plan. We feel others have mentioned that is a future application whether we are raising or lowering overall caps. There are implications to doing that, we do not feel that is TREH Partners request nor an appropriate time to the modify other portions of the Specific Plan.

Chair Hamerly stated it was more a point of order because it does make me a bit nervous to have future projects that are impacted both this and REXCO. I understand

that however, the same token we have the public noticing and being able to address issues adequately. Staff need time to prepare, and Planning Commissioners need time to be able to study the relevant tables and potential ramifications to those changes. First thing to come to mind is having some sort of analysis of traffic data to say what will be the offsets. Yes, we greatly reduce the commercial that is to reduce vehicle trips per day, but we are increasing the residential component which could increase numbers of trips per day. It would have more of an impact in terms of square footage.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater replied we are in full agreement and again, not the request you have before you to do that. The Specific Plan is a zoning document, so it is saying within these 105 acres we expect certain square footage of commercial, a certain number of units. It is somewhat flexible within the plan itself between Planning Area 2 and 3. As Mr. Elssmann mentioned we have 800 units which is the cap in the Specific Plan. REXCO is in Planning Area 3 and had a bubble of 100-300 units. When REXCO went for the recommendation for approval the question was, is the development plan in compliance with the Specific Plan? It permitted with the development with 200 units which was their request. At the time, the plans stated 25-40 units an acre, REXCO said we cannot get that; however, we can get 18 acres. They asked for an amendment to the plan that stated at 18 units per acre we can built 200 units and capture 200 of those units within our 100-300 bubble. So, next is the TREH Partners development and they are asking for 200 units in Planning Area 2 which they are asking for a modification of that boundary. They are not asking a reduction in the commercial, because they think within the plan itself, they could get that synergy and commercial square footage. They are asking for a modification of the boundaries so they could bring the residential down partially into Planning Area 1. The number of units they are asking for was considered within the EIR and supplemental EIR and we did consider that, and we feel the project is in compliance without additional review at this time. Now, if we were to modify tables that states we are going to increase the cap to a number and at this time we do not know what that number would be. That additional work has not been done. What are the Environmental implications of going from 800, 950, to 1,000? Again, this is not TREH Partners application. We are looking at the zoning document to say, does this comply? We prepared our findings and recommend approval.

Chair Hamerly asked so the vehicle for doing a future Specific Plan amendment to address density and Planning Area 2 and 3 be a supplemental EIR or would it be to study traffic impacts?

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated we would consult to determine the exact answer to that question. It is something we would look at with our California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) consultant and our City Attorney to determine exactly what that is because it has rolling consequences when we move that.

Chair Hamerly stated you can immediately rule out that it is not going to affect endangered species because you are developing the same number of square feet of dirt, same thing with historic resources. There would be things for consideration, which

states that would be a targeted impact by changing the density of the residential component. Noise factor would also be something to consider because the residential has a lower noise threshold. I am not comfortable taking up issues like this on the fly.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater replied right, and again, we have met with Mr. Elssmann and absolutely understand his concern. We have talked in length about a proposal that is in draft form at this time. We have spoken about the Housing Element and as you are aware the City is moving into its sixth round. Some of the earlier discussion when we approved the Specific Plan it was the City attempting to have our Housing Element certified by placing the high density overlay on this project which we worked with Mr. Elssmann. He was very helpful to the City in determining what part of the project should be subject to this high-density overlay. It was the 20-30 units to the acre which in part of this project and REXCO is not even in the high density overlay but is adjacent to it. There is a lot of pieces at play, we of course are always going to want credit for any medium and high-density units that build in the City. We will continue to work with the State and Housing Element to make sure that the City receives credit for and the Planning Commissioners receiving credit for approving and building these projects. It is our responsibility to make sure that all the densities are provided in our community and they are accounted for. As we go into the sixth round, we are not going to ignore TREH Partner's, REXCO, and future projects by Mr. Elssmann to state have we met the intent that high density overlay. Do we move forward in the future with all 52 acres that were a part of the high-density overlay? What does that look like and what are the programs? This is an opportunity for us to keep the lines of communication open with all the developers within the Specific Plan, to say what is best for the future for the City and the densities that are provided here? We are a few months premature for that and we hope to be certified in October 2021 and send something to the State by September 2021.

Chair Hamerly stated the first item is the Tentative Tract Map (TTM) which is dividing the four parcels into eight. I do not see a boundary that goes around the efficiency units that are at the southernmost edge and it does not show that it is a part of lot eight. It looks like they are included in lot one.

Tom Robinson stated all the apartment units are within one parcel.

Chair Hamerly stated so they are in lot eight?

Tom Robinson stated yes.

Chair Hamerly stated there is bold line that cuts right between the club house and that block of units.

Tom Robinson stated that block of units is within the apartments as one parcel.

Chair Hamerly replied so, that is not a property line that I am looking at?

Tom Robinson stated that should not be a property line.

Commissioner Amaya asked the emergency exit between Pad 2 and 3 was still a plan to do that?

Tom Robinson stated yes.

Chair Hamerly stated the sport courts that are at the extreme north end. They have very limited visibility for many of the units. What are potential solutions for security in that area since it is only a six-foot wall. It is by the wash, and it is an attractive target from the northside for graffiti, but it is also an attractive target to jump over to play basketball. This is supposed to be a gated community, and it is a security issue. Did you have any thoughts or resolutions for that?

Tom Robinson stated yes, we put placed it at the end of the property because of noise and we want it to be used. We are going to put cameras out there. If there is ever an issue where it is not being properly used, we will take the basketball hoops down. I do not think the pickleball will be an issue. We have active management and if we need a bigger wall, I am happy to put an eight-foot wall up.

Chair Hamerly stated I would like to suggest putting an eight-foot wall there and modify that one exhibit in the landscape plan for the fence and wall plan. The west of Shop 1 that is sandwiched between the onramp to the 210, that is a long blank space and there is no way to exit out if there are any issues that develop. There is no visible exposure along there, the first window there is on the southside of Pad 4. The recommendation is a reasonable barrier at the property line between the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) right of way to keep pedestrians from getting into that area and that it is well lighted.

Tom Robinson stated yes, we will have that well-lit.

Chair Hamerly stated concerns regarding looking at the site circulation at the south end of the property. We have four conflicting travel patterns where we are entering the queue for Shop 1. Someone like Chick-fil-A or In-N-Out that queue is going to lock those vehicles in, and they are never going get out until the dinner rush is over.

Tom Robinson stated it is a good point. We are building a Chick-fil-A in Yucaipa and it has 43 stacking and a double drive-thru. That specific tenant going in that location which I cannot disclose is not a drive-thru, it is a pickup window.

Chair Hamerly stated if it is a pickup drive-thru it seems there would be more of a sit down, plaza dining option. So much of that Pad has been taken up with drive-thru's. Would there be an option maybe eliminate the parking spaces to the north to create a pass-through drive lane for pick up and delivery. The entire south end, east, or west would be a nice isolated outdoor dining area.

Tom Robinson stated every tenant is unique in what they are looking for. I believe in Pad 3, they want two exclusive pickup slots in front, and it is a quick serve restaurant, but they need the drive thru because of COVID-19 and the way the market is going. They want less patio than more patio.

Chair Hamerly asked if there was a queuing analysis was done for the gas station? We have a lot of pumps, and then we have what I am interpreting as the entrance to the pumps.

Tom Robinson stated the purveyor of the gas station will be able to control the fuel trucks somewhat. It is not 100% accurate, but they are not delivering in peak times. We did look at the queuing analysis and the truck routes.

Chair Hamerly asked would this convert to rapid charge for an EV station?

Tom Robinson stated yes.

Chair Hamerly asked why the planter areas are not widening to ensure those walkways to run parallel including the jogs with that arterial? That would make it safer and clearly defined if they did follow the right of way through there. Those walkways run from the south end residential component to the car wash, and they parallel the four lanes that are running east and west. There are multiple jogs, and some of those walkways stop at the main arterial, but they do not align and do not parallel the traffic flow which means they are going in and out of the planter areas.

Tom Robinson stated I think the drive isles are not all sequential either, it must be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant.

Chair Hamerly stated if those are cross hatched and showing accessible paths of travel that you do want to have those as protected, and it seems easy to widen those planters. You are not increasing or decreasing the parking spaces, you are shifting that walkway to make a straight, unbroken line instead of having jogs and offsets.

Tom Robinson stated if we can widen those without losing parking, I will do that.

Chair Hamerly stated what caught my eye was the enhanced paving pattern that is at the signalized intersection. It is critical for the accessibility and for pedestrians traveling east/west along there to have a clearly defined pedestrian path that goes through enhanced paving patterns. I see the swell that runs through there, but if somebody is vision impaired and they are walking with a cane there needs to be clues where they can stay within the accessible path of travel.

Tom Robinson stated yes, and we have the grooves. I think that might be on the civil plan, but we are required to do that.

Chair Hamerly stated is there anything done to enhance the landscape?

Tom Robinson stated we try stay within the Specific Plan and same pattern throughout.

Chair Hamerly stated I liked the outside dining area where you have Shop 1. What caught my eye was immediately adjacent to that outside dining area, and it is showing as an open canopy and it has a 90-foot-tall monument sign that is electronic. That might be something that would ruin the mood for outdoor dining. My suggestion is adding a bigger canopy of trees or add a canvas screen, so you do not see the sign hovering over you.

Tom Robinson stated okay.

Chair Hamerly stated the plaza area that is on the south side of Major 1 and 2, I am reading that is four little trees which are the crepe myrtles and that is going to be the southern edge of that building. I am assuming those are going to be tall which means it is going to be reflecting heat and if we could put additional shade there. I recommend introducing awnings to create the shade or a landscape canopy there.

Tom Robinson stated okay, we will see if we can get something in there.

Commissioner Sutorus stated along the ridge where is above the brick tile, I want to confirm that is going to be stone and not styrofoam covered stucco?

Tom Robinson replied all the front is real stone.

Associate Planner Quintanilla showed the Commissioners the color boards and material for the residential and commercial property.

Chair Hamerly stated since we are going for the Spanish Craftsman style, the gables and corbels would be prominently featured in most of your higher elements.

Tom Robinson stated I think the south elevation is facing in the patio area.

Chair Hamerly stated yes, that one is the south plaza that has the tiny corbels, so the opposite side of that would be the north.

Tom Robinson stated correct and that has a trellis coming off it.

Chair Hamerly stated the south plaza elevation as the patio area that we needed something to screen because that is where the big monument sign was, which is the big dining area right there.

Chair Hamerly stated I know it is Spanish Craftsman and it is going contemporary, but if you look at the side profile of that it looks like a flat plant on. Whether is it foam or polyvinyl chloride (PVC) but looks like it is one board thickness and it sticks out. I am wondering if there was a way to dress that up a little bit.

Ed Horovitz, Applicant stated when he first drew those with those number of corbels on the east elevation it seemed like it would be too much. It was an architectural comment where he thought it was an excessive amount of corbels coming across and then adding the signage seemed too busy.

Vice Chair Thomas stated we still have a large area in the center where we have abundance of area for signage. If it is going to be a corner statement, I recommend enhancing that because the sign will not be mounted in the corner. Just those pairs, I recommend doing something to dress that up if we are going for Craftsman, it usually accentuates the craftsmanship and it has more flare to it.

Ed Horovitz stated yes, we will look into that.

Chair Hamerly stated on the west elevation on page 201, that is the facade for the cueing for the drive-thru, and it looks like we have done a good job breaking that up with arches and green walls. Approximately what is the depth of the arches and the recesses along there?

Ed Horovitz stated between 18 and 24 inches. It will be in the construction document.

Chair Hamerly asked what is the material on the brown boarder that is going around each of those arches?

Ed Horovitz replied it was supposed to be recessed.

Chair Hamerly asked so it is an intermediate step?

Ed Horovitz replied yes, sir.

Chair Hamerly asked would that be a trim element out of the stone or a stucco element?

Ed Horovitz stated it is intended to be a stucco element, and it would show up on the construction document for review.

Chair Hamerly stated on the landscape plan does not have any planting area around any of those perimeters and typically the masonry enclosures we like to see vines growing on that. It does not look like there is much opportunity on the east or north side. Where there will be a possibility to get some vine pockets in there?

Tom Robinson stated I think there were two areas that did not. We were going to put vines on there.

Chair Hamerly suggested if we could make similar detailing architecturally to articulate between the post beam connection to pull in the same detailing you have for the trellis elements out in the plaza. It would tie it in all together to ensure it does not look dramatically different from the architecture that is going on. That shows on the east elevation and there is a little bit of an accent band and a step in the fascia of those.

Tom Robinson stated okay.

Commissioner Miller asked did we have an availability of a purple pipe in this area to tie to for recycled water?

Tom Robinson stated I was onsite a few days ago and they were pulling a big purple pipe up the street on Greenspot Road, so hopefully.

Chait Hamerly asked if the west/northern most wall is not being used a debris wall.

Tom Robinson stated correct.

Commissioner Miller stated if possible, we would like to avoid using any of the metal underground facilities. I know we have some options that are galvanized and supposedly do not leach, but over the long term there is some evidence that we do get some leaching of metal.

Ed Horovitz stated they will not be a metal, it will be Polyvinyl Chloride (PVC) and some will be concrete. I agree with you, we did not use any metal in the Lowe's center, and we do not do it in any other centers.

Chair Hamerly called a brief recess at 8:45 p.m.

Chair Hamerly called the meeting back to order at 8:55 p.m.

Commissioner Amaya asked if the buildings B, C, and D are the three-story building?

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated correct.

Commissioner Amaya stated I know that triggered the issue with the fire ladder.

Tom Robinson stated you can either make the units smaller or go wider and lose area, so you have that conundrum. It affects the quality of the project. Not all the buildings are three story, but also you must have the density that is required by the Specific Plan. The fire issue started with someone agreeing with something and it went to development agreement and there was no going back once it was on the table. It has negatively affected the Golden Triangle for a while. In 2010 I wrote a letter the City Council and City Manager stating this is going the wrong way, businesses are going to end up going to Mountain Grove Plaza in Redlands. We need to get this started. We bought property across the street from Mountain Grove Plaza, and we developed the Amazon building. Originally it was going to be retail, but there was not enough retail at the time.

Chair Hamerly stated majority of those retail clients want to see more population.

Tom Robinson stated the project needs to start and we want to ensure quality for the community.

Chair Hamerly stated regarding the parking space it does not look like there is T-space to back out and make a three-point turn. You are looking at an 11-foot stall in the garage. I know we are locked into the footprint of the buildings, but there is anyway to squeeze another six inches out of those, because 10.3 is about tight as you can get.

Commissioner Amaya asked if there are 380 parking spaces overall in the residential area?

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated correct.

Commissioner Amaya asked approximately how many guests parking spaces are onsite?

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated the applicant requires 142 guest parking spaces onsite.

Tom Robinson stated the other good thing about our project is we are directly adjacent to a shopping center parking lot, so we have 24 tenants in there too. We have extra parking there as well.

Chair Hamerly stated Condominium Owner's Association (COA) have a restriction on overnight parking, though. It might just be trucks, but I read something regarding the overnight parking even it is unhitched.

Tom Robinson stated yes it was only for trucks.

Chair Hamerly stated the parking unit ratio is 1.9.

Vice Chair Thomas stated I understand your comment regarding the fire truck not being fair for your development to pay an additional truck with ladder. I have no issue with who pays for it, however, that truck company with the engine is needed in this type of development for the City of Highland. My concern is what would happen with San Manuel having a full response with a fire in their area in this situation.

Tom Robinson stated my understanding is there is sister agreements with the neighboring cities. The City of Highland should already have a hook and ladder, and I believe they are looking for means for financing that, and I agree with it. To burden one project is not feasible and even the person here before wished it would have gone forward because the sales and property tax would here. The issue I have is over this \$550,000 amount, we cannot go forward with the project because of this. We are paying a lot of DIF.

Vice Chair Thomas stated DIF are divided for regular standard development and it is a tough burden for developer to pay. While we want the business and development in our city, it is challenging. Where the requirement came in was the third story building and it is requiring the ladder. I do know about the mutual aid agreements between cities, and it is a like for like situation. Without us having that type of truck with ladder company it is not a like for like situation. The first 24-hour period when another agency response there is no charge for local government. It is hard to put it on one developer.

Tom Robinson stated there will not be a project and that is the issue. What is the sacrifice there, not receiving \$6.7 million? There are specific items in there close to a million dollars for the fire department. My point with the City is I cannot control San Manuel; I have a lot less power to control them than the City.

Vice Chair Thomas stated the \$550,000 for a truck with that size of ladder is about half the price it would cost to buy that apparatus. On top of that, the cost of the fourth person required to operate that truck is challenging.

Tom Robinson stated I believe it is a City responsibility and I want to participate in that. We are participating across the street and are paying our property taxes. Everyone must remember; we are paying \$6.8 million to the City which will go away if we cannot agree with this and a huge amount is going directly to the fire department.

Vice Chair Thomas stated that is true. That is intended to serve the regular needs of a community. It is apart of the DIF and I am not sure if they considered the extra circumstances.

Tom Robinson stated I think the City needs it right now, they needed it two years ago. They will need it whether I built three or five story buildings.

Vice Chair Thomas stated it will be the City Council that is making that determination based off the condition.

Tom Robinson stated yes, we like participating in the City, we have never tried to get out of anything.

Vice Chair Thomas stated you are creating tax revenue in a beautiful area. We are thankful for that.

Tom Robinson replied thank you.

Chair Hamerly stated on both the floor plan and roof plan is showing six ground mounted condenser units. Given how tight everything is at the ground level, it is an opportunity to mount some equipment on the roof. It is mansard all around, so it would be easy to screen. The only downside is to find a way to access the roof to service it.

Ed Horovitz stated that was the issue to figuring out how to get access to the roof. These are smaller condensed units.

Chair Hamerly stated this is a smaller building too. When the building has the units on the ground it is an issue because it is taking a lot of critical real estate. It is worth exploring because there are opportunities for finding creative ways to access the roof, whether it is through an alcove or stairwell.

Ed Horovitz stated I am happy to look at this once we start construction documents. I prefer not to commit to them accessing the roof now because, we spent a lot of time with the architect and engineers.

Chair Hamerly stated if it is completely screened the way it is conditioned, it runs the risk of impacting air flow. If it is packed too close together than it will not develop the air flow it needs for those units to operate efficiently. If a hedge is around that area it will cause

weeds, debris, and leaves which could be sucked into the units. There should be a three-foot clearance.

Commissioner Sutorus stated I checked the code, and they are required to have solar on all the projects as of January 1, 2021. I do not think it would be a good idea to put a Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning system (HVAC) on a roof.

Chair Hamerly stated it is a big roof area and I do not know how it breaks down for each individual unit, but a single-family residence would be 125 square foot requirement.

Commissioner Sutorus stated two watts per square foot.

Ed Horovitz stated I am happy to look at it. I think it is a multi-layered issue and the reality is for the units to stay ground floor for servicing and maintenance. We spoke about concrete pads with rock around there.

Chair Hamerly stated the Specific Plan guidelines starting on page 137 does a nice job of summarizing the Spanish Colonial style. I suggest adding more flavor to the elevations. There is a lot of repetition going on.

Ed Horovitz stated I think it is a good idea to increase the module size.

Chair Hamerly suggested working with the way the windows are articulated. When there are three windows in a row I suggest putting in a wrought iron pot shelf as an accent. The design guidelines have nice descriptions on how to break up the form and what to do with the walls. It is important to view the end conditions of the buildings. The way the site lays out the circulation when you are driving through the development most of the elevations you are seeing are the ends of the buildings.

Ed Horovitz stated that is a good point. That is the circulation and what people see.

Tom Robinson stated every time the architect would add it, it would take a little away from what he was trying to accomplish with the simple and clean look of the building. The architect would add more, and it would not look right because it is not the style we were going for.

Chair Hamerly stated there are certain rules for vernaculars so unless the architect is going for Contemporary or Spanish revival I can understand where the Contemporary would be more minimalist, however there are rules. If you are going to call it Spanish, go with Spanish. If you are going to call it Mediterranean, add more timber.

Vice Chair Thomas stated from a non-architect perspective it does look plain. If I were going to be living in this area, I would want something more decorative.

Chair Hamerly asked if the multi-family buildings more a Mediterranean style?

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated it is a Monterey style.

Chair Hamerly stated the Monterey style has a muted color pallet. We are not utilizing insets and offsets for decks; I think the color is going to be important. There is not a lot of relief there especially the left- and right-hand sides of the elevation for breaking up the mass of a tall building. If we are not going with the massing, we must go with color and material.

Ed Horovitz stated we will look at that.

Chair Hamerly stated I know with the Monterey style gets into some of the landscaping, however if you did a free-standing grid, something like a bougainvillea that is regionally appropriate. Maybe putting in an eight- to ten-foot-tall self-supported lattice work or wire frame. It is common see bougainvillea and those plant materials around Mediterranean and Monterey style housing. Maybe there is an opportunity at the arch openings.

Commissioner Amaya asked if the Monterey style is specifically for the three-story buildings?

Chair Hamerly replied yes. The biggest issue for the Monterey style is the garages. We have 14-16 doors facing each other in a couple locations. We have color changes, but that is a brutally repetitive element that is right below where everybody is going to see. If we can dress that up it would go a long way, because it is a tough element on those elevations.

Commissioner Sutorus stated I like that the mailboxes are inside the buildings.

Chair Hamerly the front elevation of the club house is almost exactly what I was stating regarding the multi-family units. The entrance is articulated right, that is perfect Spanish revival. It has the trim element, and it would not be uncommon to see a setback there where the summer hand painted tiles are and the trim which is stone. Good job on the wall mounted lights.

Ed Horovitz stated okay.

Chair Hamerly stated along the eastern edge of the property, there is very little plant cover, and it has been noted many times. You have no control over what happens on the next property over. One way to maintain privacy or shade is to plant a few more trees along there.

Commissioner Sutorus suggested to remove the Mexican Fan Palm and to select a different species. It is very invasive and will destroy infrastructure.

Ed Horovitz stated happy to do that.

Chair Hamerly stated along the western face of the studio units seems like it will be the highest traffic area in and out of the residential community. You have your two gateway trees that are crepe myrtles which does not have a very tall canopy. There are also palm trees which do not have a lot of screening or buffer right there. It is completely exposed.

Tom Robinson stated we put a 6-foot split face wall right there to block some of it and we did not want anyone from the back units doing anything through the wrought iron fence.

Chair Hamerly asked if the red line is a wall?

Tom Robinson and Ed Horovitz replied it is.

Chair Hamerly stated I was reading it as a curb.

Commissioner Amaya asked regarding the kid zones, are there any playground structures?

Tom Robinson stated we have the pool and the dog park. There are areas, we have the basketball and pickle ball court available. We did not put any tot lots in the community, we did not think that was our market here.

Commissioner Amaya stated I saw the artificial turf which is good.

Chair Hamerly stated in the pool area was there any thought to how you would provide shade for a lot of those lounge chairs?

Tom Robinson stated we will probably have umbrellas. Two of the areas have shade structure.

Chair Hamerly stated I encourage the eight-foot wall around the sport court area especially along the wash edge.

Landscape Architect Rice stated the perimeter of the project has either a block wall or tubular steel fence except the dog park section. I am not concerned about the fence between the dog park and inside the complex, however between the dog park and outside of the complex the material is out of place.

Chair Hamerly stated are you talking about the southern edge of the dog park that is adjacent to the major tenant 2.

Landscape Architect Rice stated that is correct.

Chair Hamerly asked do you think the wrought iron feels out of place?

Landscape Architect Rice stated I believe it shows a chain link fence.

Commissioner Amaya stated it shows a vinyl chain link fence.

Chair Hamerly stated that is a deal breaker for a gateway. That is the public edge of the property. If it is going to be completely concealed with landscaping that is one thing, however if it were a vinyl chain link that would seem to be out of place.

Landscape Architect Rice stated yes, that was our concern.

Chair Hamerly asked is it your anticipation that the monument signs along Greenspot Road would match in fashion with the other developments on the north side?

Tom Robinson stated I think they should match.

Chair Hamerly asked are you using your own exhibits you already have or the exhibits that are in the Specific Plan?

Tom Robinson stated yes, we would use our exhibit we have.

Chair Hamerly stated the subsequent development would have to be using your sign program if there was to any consistencies along Greenspot Road north side.

Tom Robinson replied or tie it in with some element, yes.

Chair Hamerly stated it seemed like most of the verbiage in the sign program was to give latitude to the individual tenants so they can insert their insignia on the building, which is completely understood. Most of the language in the document states the tenant is going to propose their signage and the landlord has the right to refusal or approval. That takes it out of the design review process. I know most of it is building mounted signage, but when we have pedestrian-oriented blade signage there is an opportunity of the continuity across the spectrum of the entire Specific Plan area. The unifying element would need to be the architectural statement that the bracket makes.

Tom Robinson stated I understand that. Each project that comes forward is going to be a little different. There could be an element that is tied together, but I think everyone is going to be different. I do not think it is bad if they stay within the Specific Plan and do something a little different in each way.

Chair Hamerly stated some places have extensive menu boards and drive-thru's. If there is a way, we can screen that from Greenspot Road to protect the right of way and the presentation from the street.

Tom Robinson replied okay.

Chair Hamerly stated we are looking forward to the flag test for the monument signs.

Commissioner Sutorus asked is the gas station going to have the option for a digital sign?

Tom Robinson stated the gas prices will be digital, but the rest of the sign will not be digital.

Chair Hamerly stated some of the signage that was in the Specific Plan both relates to the Spanish Craftsman style of architecture, but I think it also articulates in the composition and relates well to the architecture of your site. It could be as simple as changing out the stone veneer. The design guidelines for signage is found on page 175-

180 in the Specific Plan, I encourage the sign company to take a few more clues from those exhibits in there, because these signs look a little bit on the generic side.

Vice Chair Thomas asked where will the City of Highland logo be on the large freeway signs?

Tom Robinson stated it is on the top of the sign.

Vice Chair Thomas stated I am concerned about the electronic sign, I am not against it, but I wonder how the residents will feel about that.

Commissioner Sutorus stated the new electronic sign at Mountain Grove in Redlands has grown on a lot of people that were concerned. It looks very nice.

Tom Robinson replied I was surprised with that as well.

Commissioner Sutorus stated it is efficient because the plaza does not have to constantly change out signs and it is better marketing for the businesses.

Commissioner Miller stated a general comment I receive from the community is we need a really good sit-down restaurant and I hope you get us a good tenant.

Tom Robinson stated we are trying.

Chair Hamerly read into the record page 383, item 23 of Planning Conditions. Up lighting might be appropriate there in a controlled environment. The appropriate signage for the residential community would have an up lighted sign that has surface mounted characters as opposed to having an acrylic sign that is internally illuminated. Given the diversity of location I think it would be appropriate to have more than one bike rack on site. If we can modify it to state bike racks. Does this condition apply to every site within this site or is it treating it as an entire project for the purposes of Conditional Use Permit (CUP)?

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated at the beginning of the conditions on page 379, it states residential and commercial conditions 1-46 apply to both residential and commercial. We have conditions that are strictly commercial that start with condition 45. When it talks about the bike rack, it is singular because it is referring to for example, building 1, 4, Pad 4.

Chair Hamerly asked on each Pad?

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated in this particular design review we are approving the site plan, we only have the elevations for the two.

Chair Hamerly stated the conditions of approval are not tied to design review they are in all in compassing for the CUP.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated they are only design review conditions.

Chair Hamerly asked these are design review conditions?

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated yes.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated the beginning is both residential and commercial then it breaks into commercial and then into residential.

Chair Hamerly asked all the conditions in the 396 series are all design review conditions. They are not CUP conditions?

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated correct.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated you have two CUP's, one for the gas station and the ABC licenses.

Chair Hamerly asked for item number 7, are pulling that for the flag test or are we amending this?

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated we have had a lot of discussion regarding this at the staff level. We conditioned the sign program, there is conditions of approval for the Accessory Sign Review (ASR) portion that says they shall come back provide that flag test to determine the height and location. It is in the plans, if it makes the Commissioners comfortable, we can add language into the plan itself.

Chair Hamerly asked the Commissioners if they feel appropriate keeping the sign program intact with a placeholder on the height and location or pull exhibits for the freeway-oriented signs as standalone element?

Planning Commissioners agreed for item number 7 to stay as is in the Staff Report.

Chair Hamerly closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Thomas, seconded by Commissioner Sutorus, to adopt Resolution 2021- 007, recommending to the City Council:

- 1) Find under Public Resources Code Section 21166 and the corresponding CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 that there are no substantial changes or new information of substantial importance that would trigger the preparation of a subsequent EIR and further finding that the project is exempt from further environmental review under Government Code Section 65457;
- 2) Introduce Ordinance No. ____, to Amend the Greenspot Village & Marketplace Specific Plan (SPR No. 06-01A), to adjust the boundaries of Planning Area No. 1 (Highland Marketplace) and the boundaries of Planning Area No. 2 (Residential Village), eliminate the Village Paseo from Scenario No. 1 and eliminate the requirement of private open space for studio units;

- 3) Adopt City Council Resolution No. 2021 – _____, to approve Design Review Application (DRA No. 20-012) for the construction of approximately 85,316 square feet of commercial uses (Greenspot Crossings) and a 200 attached residential unit complex with a 6,214 square-foot clubhouse, subject to the Conditions of Approval and Findings of Fact;
- 4) Adopt City Council Resolution No. 2021 – _____ for associated Alcohol Beverage Control licenses, to approve Conditional Use Permit (CUP No. 20-006) for the establishment of three (3) off-sale alcohol licenses (ABC Type 20 and 21) and five (5) on-sale alcohol licenses (ABC Type 41 and 47) for a commercial retail center, subject to the Conditions of Approval and Findings of Fact;
- 5) Adopt City Council Resolution No. 2021 – _____, to approve Conditional Use Permit (CUP No. 20-007) for the construction of gas station with eight fuel pumps, convenience store, and carwash, subject to the Conditions of Approval and Findings of Fact;
- 6) Adopt City Council Resolution No. 2021 – _____, to approve Tentative Parcel Map (TPM No. 20-002) to increase the number of parcels from four (4) parcels to eight (8) parcels, subject to the Conditions of Approval and Findings of Fact;
- 7) Adopt City Council Resolution No. 2021 – _____, to approve Accessory Sign Review (ASR No. 20-013) to establish a Sign Program for the commercial and residential development within apportion of the Greenspot Village & Marketplace Specific Plan, excluding freeway sign heights and locations, subject to the Conditions of Approval and Findings of Fact; and Directed Staff to continue to work with the Applicant to modify Engineering Condition No. 37 and Planning Condition Nos. 75 and 76 in advance of the City Council meeting.
Motion carried, 5-0.

RESOLUTION NO. 2021-007

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING THE CITY COUNCIL: 1) ADOPT AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE GREENSPOT VILLAGE & MARKETPLACE SPECIFIC PLAN (SPR NO. 06-01A); 2) APPROVE DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION (DRA NO. 20-012) TO CONSTRUCT APPROXIMATELY 78,491 SQUARE FEET OF COMMERCIAL USES IN PLANNING AREA NO. 1 AND 200 RESIDENTIAL UNITS IN PLANNING AREA NO. 2; 3) APPROVE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 20-006 TO ESTABLISH FIVE (5) ON-SALE AND THREE (3) OFF-SALE STATE OF CALIFORNIA ALCOHOL BEVERAGE CONTROL (ABC) LICENSES FOR THE COMMERCIAL COMPLEX; 4) APPROVE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP NO. 20-007) TO ESTABLISH A GAS STATION WITH CONVENIENCE STORE AND CAR WASH; 5) APPROVE TENTATIVE PARCEL

MAP (TPM NO. 20-002) INCREASING THE NUMBER OF PARCELS FROM FOUR TO EIGHT; 6) APPROVE ACCESSORY SIGN REVIEW APPLICATION (ASR NO. 20-013) TO ESTABLISHED A SIGN PROGRAM, EXCLUDING THE HEIGHT AND LOCATION OF THE FREEWAY SIGNS, AND 7) MAKING A DETERMINATION THAT THE PROJECT IS EXEMPT FROM FURTHER CEQA REVIEW UNDER CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15162, PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21666 AND GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65457 FOR A PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF GREENSPOT ROAD, EAST OF THE 210 FREEWAY (APN NOS. 1201-331-01, 1201-341-01, -08, and -09)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled June 1, 2021.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Hamerly declared the meeting adjourned at 10:38 p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Camille Goritz, Administrative Assistant III
Community Development Department

Randall Hamerly, Chair
Planning Commission