

MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
August 3, 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 6:00 p.m. by Chair Hamerly at the Donahue Council Chambers, 27215 Base Line, Highland, California.

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

Staff Present: Lawrence Mainez, Community Development Director
Kim Stater, Assistant Community Development Director
Ash Syed, Associate Planner
Matt Bennett, Assistant Public Works Director
Matt Wirz, Building Official
Camille Goritz, Administrative Assistant III
Scott Rice, City 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 July 20, 2021 Regular Meeting.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Sutorus, seconded by Commissioner Amaya, to approve the minutes, as amended. Motion carried, 5-0.

LEGISLATIVE ITEM

2. Development Code Interpretation (DCI-21-001) requesting to establish a Party Supply Store within a vacant Nonconforming Structure in the R-1 Single Family Residential Zone. (7755 & 7761 Sterling Avenue)

Community Development Director Mainez presented the staff report.

Chair Hamerly asked when was the property rezoned?

Community Development Director Mainez stated in 2006 during our comprehensive General Plan update process.

Commissioner Amaya asked if it is recommended that the building be used as a business office or storage?

Community Development Director Mainez stated yes, the letter that I sent them states that we are limiting the use to office and supply storage related to the existing auto repair.

Commissioner Amaya asked is that per the Highland Municipal Code?

Community Development Director Mainez stated yes, under the nonconforming ordinance my interpretation is that we protect what is there now. Given that there is an auto repair that has been there in the northernly building, I am allowing them to expand that into the southern part of that property.

Chair Hamerly asked how would that affect the nonconforming use ordinance 16.08.150?

Community Development Director Mainez stated that's a good question. They are not expanding the structure, so they are not violating the nonconforming ordinance. The party supply would not intensify it because now you are adding another use to that site that was not designed to take separate. It is up to the review of the Planning Department to make sure that there is enough parking, hours of operations, and not impacting the residents around it.

Chair Hamerly stated it was having to do with the intensity because it sounds like the recommendation in your letter was that this vacant building could be used with the existing nonconforming use. So, within section E, would that fall through the cracks or that you are allowing an existing non-conforming use to increase its own intensity?

Community Development Director stated technically they would be doing that if we looked at it from today's perspective, but I'm going back to look at what the property was initially designed for. Somewhere along the way an owner said, or the person renting said I do not need the whole property and it is too expensive, I need to reduce my square footage and that is how they ended up only on the north side.

Chair Hamerly stated 6-month vacancy for the purpose of this discussion would have to do with the primary business if it ceased operation for 6 months and use has been vacated for 180 days. It could no longer operate as legal nonconforming.

Community Development Director Mainez stated yes.

Commissioner Miller asked regarding the adjacent properties, what is the current land use?

Community Development Director Mainez stated this is on page 8 exhibit B, the light-yellow color is single family residential.

Hammuraby Mayorga, Applicant's wife translates on his behalf. The the only thing he want is that you allow him to open a business. The person that has the auto repair is older and has been there more than 20 years. We try to do something that

benefits him, and we can continue to keep the property because we have had 5 years trying to open.

Vice Chair Thomas asked what business have you tried opening within 5 years?

Applicants' wife stated the main business we tried to open was a tire shop. We worked with inspectors and as time passed more than a year later, they said you need to open a big door and something like that? They did not tell us before we started spending our money to construct a building that we could not open a new business.

Vice Chair Thomas asked is this for the Tentative Improvement (TI) permit?

Applicants' wife stated yes.

Vice Chair Thomas asked are you going to have jumpers?

Applicants' wife stated we will have jumpers, chairs, and tables

Vice Chair Thomas asked do you anticipate customers coming to purchase and pick up there or will it be strictly delivery?

Applicants' wife stated strictly delivery.

Vice Chair Thomas asked so this will be for storage then?

Applicants' wife stated yes for storage.

Chair Hamerly stated the most important thing that you need to understand on this is it is a legal nonconforming use, meaning what is there now legally can stay in operation. For any reason if the existing owner vacates the use, you will only have 6 months to reestablish that business, or the legal part of the nonconforming use goes away. The property owner is to make sure that there is a viable ongoing business that never ceases operation on that site. The most important considerations is making sure that existing use does not go away until you are ready to move in and assume operations of whatever business you are going to introduce. We must make a judgment based on what are you able to do legally on this property and can you maintain that business in perpetuity as long as that answer is yes.

Hammuraby Mayorga, Applicant stated it says 6 months, you want to open business when everything is closed it makes no sense.

Chair Hamerly stated that part does not matter at this point because the business is still there and it is in operation, so it's legal.

Hammuraby Mayorga stated when I brought that property it had two buildings and only one has an address. I waited for 2 years to get one address.

Vice Chair Thomas asked what is the status of the TI permit?

Community Development Director Mainez stated the TI permit was withdrawn on September 30th, 2019. The applicant withdrew the application because he was

frustrated with the process. I have been in communication with our staff on this issue which might be the frustration of the the applicant of not talking to me. I wrote letter because I felt putting in writing would help align my thoughts and my interpretation of the code.

Vice Chair Thomas asked is there a way that a condition can be made where the customers are not coming to the property? Does that still meet your requirement for storage?

Community Development Director Mainez stated if you are comfortable with that, but again, it is changing the use from what it was originally approved for under the county automotive kind of uses. I will have to honor the Planning Commission's direction and make findings to support it.

Commissioner Amaya stated my concern is the letter. Unless you are a City Planner, it is hard to understand. Did you already buy inventory?

Hammuraby Mayorga stated yes, tables and parts.

Chair Hamerly stated for the sake of making everything legal this building is going to be cleaned up and used as storage. The city is not going to come in and inspect inventory and ask if this is a tire or a bounce house?

Community Development Director Mainez stated yes, we do go out for inspection.

Commissioner Sutorus stated in order to run the business, you do need vehicles to take the jumpers drop off at the site which might be a challenge if you do not.

Chair Hamerly stated there is already vehicles parked on the side if it is an automotive repair. What is the difference between a tow truck and panel?

Commissioner Sutorus stated the automotive is still there, correct? That is still an active business currently.

Community Development Director Mainez stated correct. Are you interested in working with them on the warehousing of the party supply, no retail?

Chair Hamerly stated yes, any retail component just looking at the layout of the site, I do not see how they could do anything except have maybe one or two employee parking spots with the existing configuration. There could not be any retail component and have the site even come close to working. If the site were consolidated there is a little bit of opportunity for parking in the middle but not a lot. I think for the intensity of use I would have to say the impact on the neighborhood, a party rental would probably be less impactful than an auto repair zone.

Community Development Director Mainez stated you are not supposed to have outside storage whatsoever.

Chair Hamerly stated I am wondering what the sticking point was on trying to consolidate to one address. I do not know what the rationale is.

Community Development Director Mainez stated we get that a lot when there is number of different detached structures on a commercial or industrial property. Edison wanted a separate address there.

Vice Chair Thomas asked what is your plan for the outdoor portion of the site? Were you planning on just having the business indoors?

Applicants' wife stated not outside.

A MOTION was made by Chair Hamerly, seconded by Vice Chair Thomas that the Planning Commission finds in favor of the applicant. That the proposed use would not be an increase in intensity of use and would be an appropriate use for this legal nonconforming site. This item will come back with the findings, and be continued to our next Planning Commission meeting, August 17, 2021. Motion carried, 5-0.

PUBLIC HEARING

3. A Public Hearing to Consider the Appeal of Administrative Citation No. 15051 issued for the discharge of fireworks in violation of Chapter 8.58 of Title 8, of the Highland Municipal Code, at the property located at 7453 Victoria Avenue, Highland, California. Cited: Miguel Abendano (APP-21-002)

Chair Hamerly opened the public hearing.

Community Development Director Mainez presented the staff report.

Chair Hamerly closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Amaya, seconded by Commissioner Sutorus, to uphold Administrative Citation No. 15051 and adopt Appeal Board Resolution No. 2021-013. Motion carried, 5-0.

RESOLUTION 2021-013

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION/APPEALS BOARD OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, DECLARING THAT A VIOLATION OF HMC 8.58.020(A) OCCURRED ON THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 7453 VICTORIA AVE, HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, ON JUNE 8, 2021, THEREBY UPHOLDING ADMINISTRATIVE CITATION NO. 15051 AND ORDERING THE APPELLANT TO PAY THE CITATION FEE IN ACCORDANCE WITH HMC 8.58.060(B).

4. Design Review Application (DRA 21-007) for the analysis of a site plan, building elevations, rough grading plan, conceptual landscape plan, and model home complex regarding the construction of a 149 single-family home community, a public park, public trails, a private common area, a private community pool, and recreation center within Phases 1 & 2 of the Mediterra Planned Development. (APN Nos: 0297-021-25, 0297-021-26, 0297-021-27 & 0297-021-28)

Commissioner Miller abstained from item No. 4 based on a conflict.

Associate Planner Syed presented the staff report.

Chair Hamerly opened the public hearing.

Commissioner Sutorus asked did staff provide an example of what type of shade structure the city wanted approved?

Associate Planner Syed stated it could either be a solid one or lattice.

Chair Hamerly stated since there is pretty extensive trelliswork or shade structure within the pool area that fronts immediately to the lawn. Why wouldn't staff suggest that a tree would soften that a little bit?

Associate Planner Syed stated a tree could provide shade. Since this is a new development by the time those trees have grown and can provide shade it will be years before that will happen. For the initial stages of the project, it will be very difficult for residents to use those common areas and those picnic tables in the heat without immediate shade.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated the features provided currently in our parks and for gathering with our climate really seemed to be an amenity that is appreciated by the park patrons currently.

Chair Hamerly stated I agree, it is like a sundial. I was suggesting trees for the picnic area because the same holds true for play areas, so the kids don't overheat. I did not see a shade structure plan for the play area. If we are going to swap one for the other, protect the kids where the activity is the highest and put it over the play area and then leave the natural amenities over the picnic area. You can put in a 48-inch tree there and that is going to grow quickly.

Commissioner Amaya asked is the street Paseo Ramblas perpendicular to Avenida Ramblas?

Associate Planner Syed stated Paseo Ramblas runs along Avenida Ramblas. It's on one side of the street, it is like a parkway.

Chair Hamerly asked is the infrastructure going for the streetscape specifically the paved areas, curb, gutter, and sidewalks? Are they anticipating that it is going to go in at one time for both phase and 1 and 2 concurrently?

Associate Planner Syed stated no, phase 1 and 2 will be developed concurrently.

Chair Hamerly asked will they have access to the main street coming in the Mediterra Parkway?

Associate Planner Syed stated yes.

Chair Hamerly stated the streetscape that was shown in section C was the park adjacent section of Avenida Ramblas, that portion of the parkway had a double parkway on both sides of the street. If you look at the streetscape section in Exhibit 9-10 that was the

original intent because that is the core of the entire development. I noticed they went back to the single line of trees with the curb adjacent sidewalk right by the park.

Associate Planner Syed asked is this by Santana?

Chair Hamerly stated yes, and that one section right through there was originally supposed to be a double parkway. There were going to be multiple crossing points. I would encourage them to go back to that plan and that exhibit cross section C in the specific plan document.

Chair Hamerly asked why the landscape theme for the Greenspot Road streetscape was not extended to that side of the property?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated it is to blend in with the natural landscape. As far as the water quality basin as described was a tubular steel fencing around it, so that it doesn't appear to be a basin is then attempting to come back as a natural landscaping.

Chair Hamerly stated the landscape features that are around the perimeter of the basin I was envisioning rather just have a bare metal fence there. At least we have some vines or some plants that replicate some of the landscaping that's present in East Valley Water District, streetscape landscaping. It is highly visible and at three plus acres it is going to be very visible on the inside of that corner, so you will see down into the basin. We do not want it to look like just a bunch of dead weeds out there that are in the wash right now.

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated ok, just to point out as you mentioned there is not any current plans for a sidewalk on the southerly side west of Water Conservation District land that will be maintained natural.

Chair Hamerly asked is that west or east?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated west.

Chair Hamerly ok, so this is conservation land. Where does the East Valley Water District land stop?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated the East Valley Water District property is probably 400 feet east of this eastern boundary of the basin. There is still an underlying property that could be developed in some other fashion.

City Landscape Architect Scott Rice stated we can work with the applicant and their landscape architect to develop a palette that would be complementary to the northside, but also considers the natural plantings. On the southside you are really touching that environmentally sensitive area and there are species that would work well.

Chair Hamerly stated I was mainly interested in the drive by presentation of that area because that is a prominent curve right there. If we could introduce street trees at a reasonable spacing and at least some perimeter to mask off the wrought iron fence so we do not have a 6-foot-tall barrier.

City Landscape Architect Scott Rice stated I would recommend using the landscape frontage for East Valley Water District facility as an inspiration for the look as opposed to just mimicking the northside of the street.

Chair Hamerly stated the south edge of Greenspot Road would keep that corridor consistent.

Chair Hamerly stated regarding the big plot plan, I think the main issue that staff brought up in their report sounds like it has been addressed with breaking up the six consecutive two-story units with the single story which should soften that. I think that is especially important because that is the longest stretch of lots that front directly to Greenspot Road.

Commissioner Amaya asked are those the model homes?

Chair Hamerly stated the western 3 are the model homes. On the original site plan there was a roundabout shown coming in off the main parkway, but there was another that was directly adjacent to the park to have everyone to slow down.

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated the design feature that has been provided at that intersection are the bulb-outs. That intersection was going to see additional pedestrian traffic and the intent of these bulb-outs was to allow the pedestrians to have a position at the intersection visible shorter crossing. The only roundabout that remains is the first one coming in through the track off Avenida Ramblas in Mediterra Parkway.

Chair Hamerly asked do you think that is as effective as traffic calming as a roundabout that is an actual diversion?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated it is probably not as effective, it is a location, and the footprint is smaller. Regarding the park the traffic is still dominant on Avenida Ramblas, but the roundabout is not always the easiest for pedestrians as well.

Chair Hamerly stated we are taking away from some of the aesthetic benefits in the core of the project. If I had to pick and choose between which one would be more attractive or appealing right around the park, I think would take the parkway over the roundabout. Something needs to be done because that is the core of the project.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated this was a concession that was made with the redesign when we established Street B as a main entrance and moved that Mediterra Parkway over.

Chair Hamerly stated it makes sense with the realignment of the main entry, but that is still the core of the project, regardless of where the main point of entry is. The park is the core of the project and to take two major aesthetic hits, we're taking out the roundabout and you are narrowing the parkway.

Chair Hamerly stated in the Conditions of Approval there are several issues that are addressed. The most significant ones are the entry statements that are not detailed in landscape exhibits. Those are mentioned as being approved by Community Development Director. There is one of two ways we can go on, that we can either use

the exhibits that are in the specific plan and use those as the guiding documents. Given the discussions that we have already had, I'm a little nervous to make that concession. The Mediterra Parkway and Street B, those main entry statements at a minimum, and those two points should have been included in the landscape exhibits because those are the statement features of the entire development. I would like to propose that we change those Conditions of Approval numbers 17 and 19 on page 37 of the staff report. I do concur with item 18. The configuration of the pool notice that it did a mirror image and it got substantially smaller. If that is the only pool in the community and it has high traffic, I think a pool deck would be better. It does not look like the area is immediately adjacent just to the south and west of that shade structure is in a lawn area or a highly used area for play. Why is the pool area reduced in size for what looks to be shrubs and ground cover? I do not mind the orientation of the pool, but I encourage them to explore the additional shade structure and expanding the pool deck area, so we have a bit more circulation space.

Alyssa Bottinelli, Applicant stated yes, what we are presenting here is in line with the specific plan, but it is still in concept. As we work through our construction documents, we will wholeheartedly consider all considerations and as we work those again those construction documents will have more of the final design.

Chair Hamerly stated given the types of vehicles that frequently parked on Street L you see a lot of offloading of off-road vehicles, so you have trailers and trucks, and that street does not look like it has much capacity for community parking. Is there any thought to expanding that fire buffer zone to include dirt area to park off the street for larger vehicles like towing trailers?

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated we would have to look at the grade at that location.

Chair Hamerly stated that street would not accommodate because since it is a street that is going to be accessing all those homes that are right there. You put a couple of trucks with trailers, and it is going to get congested in a hurry right there.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated I know we talked to Camille Barhi about that in the early development stages. The resolution was on street parking at street L, and it will have access to the trail itself. I do not see people parking too much further up. Perhaps when we bring back condition 17 and 19 for Planning Commission approval, we can look at an alternative parking area.

Chair Hamerly stated yes it needs to be a real trailhead with substantial parking, not just kind of parallel parking on the street.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated that was some of the considerations in our conversations with the applicant about amenities at the park and they were very conscientious and added certain things that we had asked for. They are going need some shade, water, and places to park so we are trying to accommodate that within this narrow portion of the of the development.

Chair Hamerly stated it also mentions on note 5 that the beginning of that trail is going to be asphalt. How far up is the asphalt going?

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated the natural hillside trail.

City Landscape Architect Scott Rice stated considering the park exhibit part of the landscape pertaining to the shade this is an interesting site because the pool area is key for residents only, but the remainder of the park side is public. The shade within the pool area would not necessarily serve the park. I think that is one of the things that was driving the comment relating to shade for the park site. We had some discussion about the playground area itself, it has a large footprint. Overtime the amount of surfacing that is in the park site has a maintenance cost and replacement costs that if the surfacing is not really serving any play function it is just out there. We did not explore shade over the playground at this level.

Chair Hamerly stated some of those place structures are self-shading. I think it is important that there be some element of shade within the play area.

City Landscape Architect Scott Rice stated there would be some flexibility in the footprint of the play area if that would offset the costs of the shape.

Community Development Director Mainez stated there is a lot of comments and I suggest refining it for the comments and bring it back with the other and suggested conditions later.

Commissioner Sutorus stated I enjoyed your plan model that has the kind of mother/grandmother suite, that is very needed in our community.

Alyssa Bottinelli stated thank you for that. We do the multigenerational (multi-gen) plans and we have two of them at this community. We been building them throughout Southern California. They have done very well, and they really speak to the contemporary family living needs in America today. We are very excited to bring our multi-gen plans to the City of Highland.

Chair Hamerly stated regarding the shutter configurations, the shutters on the non front elevations are listed where they are visible note that it is typically only one window that has the shutters. Even though there are typically two cases in point would be planned 1A Santa Barbara, and that is drawing exhibit 1.4 in the packet. On the left elevation, the middle window has the two shutters, the one that is closest to the front does not have any. If they are going to be visible from the middle, that they would also be visible on the one that is closest to the entry. I would recommend adding another set of shutters that are closest to the front. In terms of the Santa Barbara style, I was wondering if there was some rationale for when it was decided to use the tile accent and where it was eliminated? It seems like everywhere that there is a single round top arch that had the tile accent would work in all of them. The one for plan 1A has three arches, so I think it'd be a bit overdone for that one. I would agree with your decision to eliminate the tile, but on some of the other ones where you only had a single arch, what was the rationale for not having tile for those arches?

Gary Cunningham Senior Architect for Applicant stated the front window on the left elevation is going to be the same between all. If you see the shutters to the center window, we placed it there because it is in the center wall plane. If you look to the right if I try to introduce the second window and with the return fence there is an opportunity of crowding it.

Dan Dugan Architect for the Applicant stated regarding the tiles our opinion was the same, but it would have a little too tight with that and, we do not want it to be redundant. We wanted to mix it up a little bit with the Santa Barbara style, so we get a good mixture of arches and front elevations that have the tiles and some that did not.

Chair Hamerly asked did it have more to do with color palette than it did with the specific style or the particular model?

Dan Dugan stated no, it is just a redundancy.

Chair Hamerly stated assuming there within the overall plotting plan that there would not be, let's just say three Santa Barbara styles in a row that they would be mixed up with the Italian in the Tuscan. How much risk do you think there would be if all the two-story plans that were Santa Barbara style had the tile accent just around the entry feature?

Gary Cunningham stated we can look at it with our colors that helps us go through with the color palettes and they also do the color elevation assignments per lot, per house and color plotting so it is something we can look.

Chair Hamerly stated in terms of the locations of the shutters there isn't trim around the arch so if that were the plainer Santa Barbara style you would expect that the window above that would have some sort of attention. Either that being shutters, wrought iron or planters. The shutters are at the larger window to the left, but that element looks a little bland for the main entry right in the heart of the elevation, so I was wondering if there's another layer of detail that is consistent?

Gary Cunningham stated the main element over the entry arch is a deep and recess. It gives a tower effect, so as you enter the arch entry that is your point of entry, and you have the tower element over the top of the shadow line. To the left or the shutters if I was to introduce another pair of shutters as you as an architect proportion of shutters are very important. European shutters usually are a single shutter and it's the size of the windows. If we try to apply it on a deep recess architecturally that is not typically acceptable and designing too narrow over shutter is usually how shutters are applied. We looked at where the shutters would work proportionately to the window and that's on the left side second floor. Can we look at some other additional material, absolutely?

Chair Hamerly stated within the Santa Barbara style there are a couple of options for articulating a main entry. You have used the tile surround on the archway. Another would be using reveals where you are taking the plaster and you are stepping it back, whether it is a chamfer, a step, or series of steps. It seems like that might be a middle ground because it is kind of an all or nothing solution. For the arches that have no detail and it is just a simple roman arch, would that be an option to add a layer of detail that might complement your recessed window up above?

Gary Cunningham stated at the lower here is a wainscot material apply. There is a layer effect across the bottom, so that's about an inch and a half going across. We do not paint it a different color. We refer to that as candy striping. We want a color of the same material, and you will see it labeled in a black and white text. If you are asking for

another layer, a vertical layer that would be breaking this gable and coming down. That applying additional layer.

Chair Hamerly stated a simpler effect where you are chamfering the arch, might allow that dramatic window treatment to carry the day around the entry.

Gary Cunningham stated to accommodate your request as well as work within my client's budget I can reallocate this arch material to another plan and allow this to take over.

Chair Hamerly stated it is an option because one other feature that is on this one that I really find attractive is the decorative wall on the buttress. It is a nice detail, and you see a lot of that in the Santa Barbara style. I know lot more expensive to do, but anywhere we can introduce things like that around the entry, I think that almost reads more dramatically than tile a lot of times.

Gary Cunningham stated usually the buttress works well here versus trying to throw it here where it's impeding a garage driveway right.

Chair Hamerly stated yes, might have a trouble backing out of the garage that would not be workable.

Commissioner Sutorus asked are you going to have solar on their roofs?

Gary Cunningham stated in today's environment with building green solar is here to stay and there will be solar installed standard just to comply with California Energy Code. The problem is as a design professional I have the building code over here and at the state government it says you shall do this, but this specific plan was developed 10 years ago. Solar came into play about 12 years ago and we got around it because of the tentative tract maps however, we try to locate solar, so they are not on the front of the elevations.

Vice Chair Thomas asked how was the red brick wall chosen?

Alyssa Bottinelli asked are you referring to the ladera brick perimeter wall?

Vice Chair Thomas stated yes.

Alyssa Bottinelli stated it is a block wall, so it is not brick. The ladera red is more of a Mediterranean feel it is a bit of a higher end block wall, and it should add a little bit more of a higher end feel to the community.

Richard Krumwiede Landscape Architect for the project stated the ladera red wall is based on inspiration from Camille Barhi, the original owner. We have been with this project for almost 8 years through Camille. We want to stick with a Mediterranean theme with all the landscaping.

Chair Hamerly asked would that impact the color selection of some of the plant materials that are in the parkway to compliment the deeper jewel tone as opposed to get the contrast?

Richard Krumwiede stated I would say that the red is more like the roof tile red on the homes. They have a bit of a patina to it than a brilliant red. It is a called a Tuscan Red. Chair Hamerly closed public hearing.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater and Associate Planner Syed recommended modifications of the Conditions of Approval Numbers 17, 19, 21 and 22.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Amaya, seconded by Commissioner Sutorus, to adopt Resolution No. 2021 – 014 to:

- 1) Make a finding 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 subsequent environmental documents and further find that the project is exempt from additional environmental review under Government Code Section 65457; and
- 2) Approve Design Review Application (DRA 21-007), subject to the Conditions of Approval as modified numbers 17, 19, 21, and 22 and Findings of Fact. Motion carried 4-0-1.

RESOLUTION NO. 2021-014

A RESOLUTION OF PLANNING COMMISSION TO APPROVE DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION (DRA 21-007) FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF 149 SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES, A PUBLIC PARK, A PUBLIC TRAIL, A PRIVATE COMMON AREA, A PRIVATE COMMUNITY POOL, AND A RECREATION CENTER WITHIN PHASES 1 & 2 OF THE MEDITERRA PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (APN NO. 0297-021-25, 0297-021-26, 0297-021-27 & 0297-021-28).

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled August 17, 2021.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Hamerly declared the meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Camille Goritz, Administrative Assistant III
Community Development Department

Randall Hamerly, Chair
Planning Commission