

MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
November 3, 2020

This meeting was conducted as a video conference meeting in a remote location. All votes during the meeting were conducted by roll call.

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 Community Development Director Mainez through video conference.

Present: Chair Randall Hamerly
 Vice Chair Chandra Thomas
 Commissioner Jarrod Miller
 Commissioner Jessica Sutorus

Absent: Commissioner Edward Amaya

Staff Present: Lawrence Mainez, Community Development Director
 Kim Stater, Assistant Community Development Director
 Ash Syed, Associate Planner
 Salvador Quintanilla, Associate Planner
 Matt Bennett, Assistant Public Works Director
 Matt Wirz, Building Official
 Camille Goritz, Administrative Assistant III

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Community Development Director Mainez

COMMUNITY INPUT (ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA)

None

REORGANIZATION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

1. Election of Chairman and Vice Chairman for 2020-2021.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Planning Commission conduct an election for Chairman and Vice Chairman for 2020-2021.

Community Development Director Mainez gave a brief review of the staff report and opened the floor for nominations.

Commissioner Sutorus nominated Commissioner Hamerly for Chair.

Community Development Director Mainez called for any other nominations. Hearing none, the floor for nominations was closed, and the vote was called for.

Commissioner Hamerly was appointed as Chair, 4-0, with Commissioner Amaya being absent.

Chair Hamerly opened the floor for nominations.

Commissioner Miller nominated Commissioner Thomas for Vice Chair. Hearing no other nominations, the floor for nominations was closed and the vote was called for.

Commissioner Thomas was appointed as Vice Chair, 4-0, with Commissioner Amaya being absent.

CONSENT CALENDAR

2. Minutes from the September 1, 2020 Regular Meeting.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Vice Chair Thomas, to approve the minutes to conclude the record, as submitted. Motion carried on a roll call vote, 4-0, with Commissioner Amaya being absent.

PUBLIC HEARING

3. Accessory Sign Review (ASR 20-005) to replace existing KFC and Taco Bell signage with new corporate signs and Design Review Application (DRA 20-007) to perform an exterior remodel including new paint, accent finishes, and new trash enclosure roof.

Chair Hamerly opened the public hearing.

Associate Planner Syed presented the staff report.

Vice Chair Thomas asked about the exhibit on the south elevation which shows the predominant color of the bright red. On the plans it is listed as an accent color, and with this image it does not look like an accent color. Are there any limitations?

Associate Planner Syed replied per our city design guidelines there is not any limits on what can be considered as primary versus accent colors.

Vice Chair Thomas asked if there would not be a limit on color types or shades within what we allow for City of Highland.

Associate Planner Syed stated not in the general area. Colors are typically are looked at with more discretion when they are in the Historic District, for example.

Commissioner Sutorus asked if the applicant would consider using less red on the south elevation.

John P, Applicant replied typically we have the red and white strips on that wall. I am not sure if that is something you might want to consider.

Chair Hamerly asked if the colors would be horizontal stripes.

John P replied vertical stripes.

Chair Hamerly asked how wide those would be.

John P replied probably about four feet wide.

Commissioner Sutorus asked if those stripes would be continuous from top of the ceiling down to the floor, or are we talking about the section where in between world famous to the right.

John P stated it is going to be from the top of the building all the way down.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater asked if applicant could describe to the Commission the original plans that were submitted to the City. The applicant is describing is a red and white stripe throughout the entire elevation which mimics their corporate branding that is on their product. The slide that we are showing right now is the Colonel Sanders figure with the red and white striping which is what we saw originally on the entire southern elevation, but with the four foot striping that the applicant is describing. Staff thought that might be a little much for that elevation, so they instead proposed the large amount of red on the south elevation. If the commission prefers the red and white striping or some alternative deviation from one of those two you could describe it to the applicant and see what he could do to modify it.

Vice Chair Thomas thought if we had to choose between the two, the striping would be less preferred. I feel the bright red was very catching. For me, it should not be used for the entire wall for the south elevation. I am very familiar with this location, and my only concern is to maybe break out that area. I do not think the red and white striped would be better. In this circumstance it is right next to some natural areas, and something that looks slightly a bit more natural would be better received by the community perhaps.

Chair Hamerly concurred with the notion of striping would be more glaring when you are looking at it. There is a very logical point where there is a step in the parapet elevation and that looks like there could be an opportune location to create a color break or material break if that is the preference of the client. One of the concerns I have about stripes is we are painting stucco which is very difficult to get a clean line when you are applying paint to a naturally rough surface.

Vice Chair Thomas stated I think it is great that KFC and Taco Bell to be improving their structure. I really like the design side of Taco Bell, I just think the red could be limited a little bit to break it up. If the applicant would consider that. The signs look great and more modern and will appeal to today's generation.

Chair Hamerly stated on the exterior elements view on the north elevation the horizontal element where the Taco Bell is located there is an inside corner at the delivery window. I was wondering why the horizontal element stopped at the end of the wall and did not terminate into an inside corner since my understanding is that the horizontal slats would be mounted to the surface of the existing wall. That would give a cleaner transition between the material.

John P replied that this is the typical size for the Taco Bell signage, but I do see your point. Typically, there is a return for that one, so it is not going to look unfinished. The pop out for the drive thru is very close so I do not see any issue to extend over to the drive thru pop out.

Chair Hamerly stated it would read better. It is a diagonal approach to the property so that entire corner from the north and west is the street frontage when you are south bound on Boulder. Dressing up that corner would greatly enhance the project. On the west elevation we have the boral cultured stone veneer at the northwest corner comes down right in the middle of the door. This is the west façade and if weather is coming in, the weather is coming from the west and south. Is it possible to add an awning over that doorway to give it a little bit of protection because that is the most exposed façade on that building?

John P replied good idea, note taken to add an awning.

Chair Hamerly stated for context I was thinking just a simple horizontal plane like you have over the pickup window and that would be mounted directly over the door. This would soften the transition between the stone and doorway. On the tower it looks like there is a wood fascia and on the revised elevation it does not look like there is transition between the fascia and the face of the tower. Is the material changing on the fascia?

John P replied that I need to check my notes. We are probably planning to keep what we have there.

Chair Hamerly suggested to wrap the fascia with the standing seam material and continue it down. This would give you a cleaner more contemporary cap, because it does look like you are trying to make it a contemporary structure. On the western elevation it looks like the large window that is at the base of that tower is being removed, is that correct?

John P replied what would that be the concern for that window?

Chair Hamerly stated the bottom of the tower has a recess and there is a large, fixed window in there. Is that being eliminated or is it just not showing up on the elevations?

John P replied we are planning to remove the window.

Chair Hamerly stated in the process of the south façade underneath the large KFC is an existing window. There is a reveal around that window that ties into the old Taco Bell theme with mission style arch trim. It would be a nice opportunity to get rid of that to make the tower have a fresher look. Color P41 it is showing as an accent color, and I did not find that on the plan.

John P replied is it on the elevation or on the schedule?

Chair Hamerly stated it is on the schedule on the color swatches, however I could not find it on the notes and want to make sure I was not missing anything obvious.

Vice Chair Thomas stated I like the new logos and how they are presented.

Chair Hamerly stated on the west elevation the logo that has the bell and Taco Bell do not align on the façade horizontally. I was wondering if that has something to do with the logo and the way it is presented as opposed to being the two are centered.

John P replied each signage is aligned at the bottom. If you prefer the signs to be centered than that is not an issue.

Chair Hamerly stated I did not know if there was a corporate standard. My comment was about the alignment of the logo on the west façade on the tower with the large KFC logo on the south side of the tower did not align vertically. Again, you are approaching northbound on Boulder and you will see both signs in one view.

John P replied we could probably alter the angle to have a better symmetry.

Chair Hamerly stated the handling of the red accent color on the south façade. Is there any conscience or suggestion where we could give staff a directive and working with the applicant on that issue? Is it safe to say that we concur that the stripes would not be an acceptable alternative?

Vice Chair Thomas stated yes, I think that would be prudent for the architects to work with city staff to see about possible changes for the color scheme on the south elevation. The stripes would not be preferred, and some changes can be considered by the applicant.

Chair Hamerly asked when you said modify the color pallet, are you talking about the quantity or the color itself?

Vice Chair Thomas replied I am talking about the color as far as the total quantity on the south elevation wall. I would prefer it to be more of an accent red. I would estimate 85% of the bright red color which I love the color, however it would be helpful if it were less than that total amount. I would leave that to the discretion of the architect who is doing this.

Chair Hamerly stated typically there is two remedies. One we could take an action on the design review portion of this application this evening and issue a directive to staff. If the changes are dramatic and the commission feels it is warranted, then we ask the applicant to bring back the exhibits for additional review.

Vice Chair Thomas stated I would recommend that the applicant work with city staff to have a change here and would like to see it coming back before moving forward with this.

Commissioner Miller and Commissioner Sutorus concurred with Vice Chair Thomas.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated we have one resolution with findings for both signs and elevations. We must modify the resolution to approve a portion of the project separating out the signs. It might be beneficial to continue the item and bring it back all together so they could be approved at one time. Or if it will take the applicant sometime to modify the elevations, we can bring back the resolution for approval for the sign portion and remove the elevations until the applicant is ready.

Chair Hamerly stated the main reason that if we were to continue it is usually continued to a date certain. For the applicant, how quickly could they make the modifications suggested and get this back to us for review?

John P replied we could turn the presentation within two to three days. In addition to the south elevation you mentioned the transition where the parapet is lower that is where I am thinking we could stop the red accent on the right-hand side.

Associate Planner Syed replied that December 1st would be the soonest we could bring this item back.

Chair Hamerly asked the applicant if December 1st an acceptable date?

John P replied if it possible if we could make a decision tonight. If I make the red accent wall smaller in terms of quantity, and that is acceptable to you all then I can do that.

Chair Hamerly asked Vice Chair Thomas if limiting the red accent from the eastern corner to the step in the parapet be enough of a reduction in the accent color.

Vice Chair Thomas asked if it would be replaced with the white?

Chair Hamerly replied correct.

Vice Chair Thomas stated I am just one person on the commission, but for me its hard to say that for sure that would do the trick for a color break or not without being able to visualize it.

Commissioner Miller stated I do not have any further comments. I am fine with pulling it back to the step and would be willing to accept that.

Commissioner Sutorus asked what color is the roof? Right now, it looks like it is a different material, but it is currently red tile. Is that going to be white?

John P replied he needs to clarify, but one of the options is a grey metallic or white color.

Chair Hamerly stated I think a dark grey would be more appropriate as a cap that would tie in and relate to the base. Commissioner Sutorus, we were talking about the south façade and in your opinion would it be acceptable to stop the accent color at the vertical offset in the parapet?

Commissioner Sutorus stated in my mind when I first saw this, I thought a different material would be a better accent to match the material that is on the roof. It is difficult for me to visualize.

Chair Hamerly stated the red would continue across the entire plane of the wall but would stop. There would be a vertical break going from the white base color to the red accent color that would line up.

Commissioner Sutorus asked if everything else to the right of that is now going to be a solid white?

Chair Hamerly apologized that it is everything to the left of that line would be white and everything to the right towards the east would remain the red.

Commissioner Sutorus stated that it is difficult to make that decision without seeing it in a design.

Chair Hamerly stated the applicant is requesting that we make a decision and take an action tonight, if possible.

Vice Chair Thomas stated that I hate to have the applicant come back with another drawing, is there another solution that could be added? I feel like adding the white behind the logo that is there would make it look better.

John P replied yes, where we have made by hand is going to be white to the parapet.

Vice Chair Thomas asked if it is possible to consider any one of the colors that are on the other side?

Chair Hamerly replied that would be cross branding because they are trying to create a solid transition between the Taco Bell color pallet and the KFC side of the building. The solution is not to necessarily alter the color pallet for each of the franchises, but how do we mitigate the brightness by limiting the amount of the accent color. One option might be to suggest we have a reveal that runs horizontally through the entire façade on the south. The horizontal band that is just above the awnings bisect the red. Below that horizontal reveal that runs through the middle of that south façade, if all of that was red and all above it was white is a suggestion.

Vice Chair Thomas replied that is an excellent idea.

Community Development Director Mainez asked if you can see the mockup now with the white on the right-hand side. It does give the appearance of a stripped box, obviously the stripes are extremely wide. Perhaps on the very far corner on the right-hand side staff could reduce the white a little bit.

Associate Planner Syed stated maybe moving the made by hand scripture logo over to this area.

Chair Hamerly closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Sutorus, seconded by Commissioner Miller, to approve:

1. Adopt Resolution 2020-006 approving Accessory Sign Review (ASR 20-005) to replace existing KFC and Taco Bell signage with new corporate signs and Design Review Application (DRA 20-007) as modified to perform an exterior remodel including new paint, accent finishes, and new trash enclosure roof, subject to the Conditions of Approval and Findings of Fact.
2. Direct staff to file a Notice of Exemption with the County Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

Motion carried on a roll call vote, 4-0, with Commissioner Amaya being absent.

RESOLUTION NO. 2020 – 006

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING AN ACCESSORY SIGN REVIEW (ASR 20-005) TO REPLACE EXISTING KFC AND TACO BELL SIGNAGE WITH NEW CORPORATE SIGNS AND DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION (DRA 20-007) TO PERFORM AN EXTERIOR

REMODEL INCLUDING NEW PAINT, ACCENT FINISHES, AND NEW TRASH ENCLOSURE ROOF AT THE KFC / TACO BELL LOCATED AT 7347 BOULDER AVENUE. ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER: 1201-131-04.

4. Design Review Application (DRA) No. 19-008, a request to construct a 19,600 square-foot contractor's office and warehouse space and storage yard.

Chair Hamerly opened the public hearing.

Associate Planner Quintanilla presented the staff report.

Commissioner Miller asked if there was any coordination with Flood Control on this project in terms of understanding the flooding in city creek and how that water surface impacts the site and the proposed building.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater replied we did direct the applicant to speak with Flood Control and staff also coordinates with them. They had responded to us, there concerns were with the easement along the rear side and access to maintenance and cleaning of the channel.

Commissioner Miller stated the activities that will be occurring within the parking lot and outside of the structure, is that going to be limited to parking the vehicles or are there going to be actual construction activities that occur within the parking lot?

Dan Moore, Applicant replied we are an electrical contractor that will be an office and storage. We do not store much, there will be a lot of tools. We do not have products delivered to us.

Commissioner Miller asked if there will be any maintenance of any equipment occurring outdoors?

Dan Moore stated no, we do not do our own maintenance. We do not have anyone that stays in the warehouse.

Chair Hamerly clarified the resolution that is included in the staff report does mention that it is warehouse space and a storage yard. There any raw materials stored for any length of time behind the gate, is that correct?

Dan Moore replied that is correct, not much outdoor storage.

Chair Hamerly asked staff if there were any flood flow that did make its way on the project site, how would that impact the subsurface retention that is in the northwest corner.

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated if you are speaking to the capacity of the underground infiltration system it is designed for the water quality purposes. Ultimately the site will be designed to mitigate the development flows to the existing flows offsite. At the southwest corner you may see on the screen a current outlet drain that would discharge those flows subject to drainage to the property. I do not have an expectation that the offsite flood channel has an impact to this.

Chair Hamerly commented on the location of the fire hydrant. Has the fire department signed off on the turnaround?

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated the Fire Marshal did sign off on the plans.

Chair Hamerly stated the southeast corner is a utility room, but there is a doorway there. My understanding is that if you have a zero or near lot line that there is not supposed to have any openings within five feet. Is there an exception for utility rooms?

Building Official Wirz stated the prior Building Official wrote the conditions and he will review the issue.

Chair Hamerly stated the exterior elevations metal panels is painted. Is that a field applied paint or is it a factory pre finish panel?

Dan Moore replied correct. Those are factory painted.

Chair Hamerly stated concerns on the mechanical enclosure on the roof on the northside of the building. What I was proposing is the north end of that building would just do a miniature detail that compliments the treatment at the southwest corner. Enhance the parapet with the different accent color and the horizontal band to make a small enclosure that would hide the equipment which would balance that west elevation.

Dan Moore replied basically relocate it towards the north and tie it in with the awning.

Chair Hamerly replied exactly. Copy what is happening at the south edge of the building and do a miniature version at the north end of the building for the mechanical enclosure. Did anyone have comments on the landscape plan?

Commissioner Miller asked would the landscaping be sumped from adjacent grade?

Dan Moore stated I do not believe anything will be sumped from what I see.

Commissioner Miller stated with an underground system sedimentation is certainly a main concern. So, the landscaping will be at grade?

Dan Moore stated yes.

City Landscape Architect, Scott Rice stated the planter areas are above the asphalt level, but below the top of curb.

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated the WQMP could be conditionally accepted through the engineering department.

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated there is a conditionally approved water quality plan that has been reviewed to address the concerns. The self-contained landscape areas and the project will complete a final WQMP for the design of that project.

Chair Hamerly stated the Australian willow the entire front set back is 25 feet, and the concern is it can hit 30-35 feet canopy. That might be a maintenance issue, I know those trees can be trimmed to give them a certain shape so that might be an ongoing concern. They are going to be planted approximately 10-12 feet from façade of the building.

Scott Rice replied what we have encountered within Highland on development projects is that the Australian willows are not as vigorous as their full potential. The retail center south of Base Line and west of Boulder that has Australian willows over 10 years.

Chair Hamerly stated would the primary difference between a parking lot tree and parkway tree be the amount of arable soil that is underneath the canopy. If any tree that is planted in a parking lot is automatically is going to be stunted.

Scott Rice stated I agree. We have also seen these trees planted in residential applications where they have considerable amount of potential for the root growth.

Chair Hamerly stated the locust trees that are planted along the western property line is about 5-foot planter and it is next to a CMU wall. Is a simple root barrier going to be sufficient to protect that wall?

Scott Rice replied I do not believe we will have any issues. Several of the trees are behind the wall. Things behind the wall tend not get as frequent of maintenance. We can suggest another tree during plan check.

Chair Hamerly stated I do not have a concern with the tree just the location. Some of the properties of the tree in a narrow planter. I was just concerned with the size of the tree, but mainly if a bunch of little trees start popping out because it is sending out horizontal roots once they start it is almost impossible to get rid of them.

Scott Rice stated I do not know any products that reduce sucker growth.

Chair Hamerly stated I am just concerned about the ability to control the potential damage to the wall, but I do not have an alternative recommendation and I am fine with the tree.

Scott Rice replied we appreciate the detail feedback on the landscape plan. We will take a closer look during plan check.

Chair Hamerly stated on the planning condition of approval number 17, it looks like a standard condition for a typical warehouse project that is a shed style roof. I do not see opportunity for doing any interior drains within the metal pan of walls. I was wondering if it can be modified.

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated we can remove that. We do understand that it is the middle panel, and that type of condition will not work based on the construction.

Chair Hamerly stated so delete condition of approval number 17?

Associate Planner Quintanilla replied yes.

Chair Hamerly asked what is avigation easement?

Community Development Director Mainez stated this is a document that the airport requires of development where there is a potential for an accident to occur. What this does is protects the airport from any liability when it comes to noise.

Chair Hamerly closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Sutorus, seconded by Commissioner Miller, to approve:

1. Adopt Resolution 2020-007, Approving Design Review Application (DRA) No. 19-008, as amended for the construction of a 19,600 square-foot contractor's office and warehouse space and storage yard, subject to the Conditions of Approval as amended, and Findings of Fact.
 2. Direct Staff to file a Notice of Exemption with the County Clerk of the Board.
- Motion carried on a roll call vote, 4-0, with Commissioner Amaya being absent.

RESOLUTION NO. 2020 – 007

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION (DRA) NO. 19-008, TO CONSTRUCT A 19,600 SQUARE-FOOT CONTRACTOR'S OFFICE, WAREHOUSE SPACE AND STORAGE YARD IN A 1.45-ACRE SITE WITHIN THE INDUSTRIAL (I) ZONING DISTRICT LOCATED AT 27002 MAINES STREET, ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER: 1192-0611-011.

5. Conditional Use Permit (CUP) No. 20-002 is to establish a cocktail lounge with a State of California Alcohol Beverage Control (ABC) license, Type 48 (On-Sale General – Public Premises) for the sale and consumption of beer, wine, and distilled spirits and live entertainment.

Chair Hamerly opened the public hearing.

Associate Planner Quintanilla presented the staff report.

Vice Chair Thomas asked with the nature of how restaurants and eateries have changed this year due to COVID-19, is there any plan in the change for how this business is going operate?

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated right now what the city is doing is following the lead of the County and State as far as dining and alcoholic beverages. If they were to be a restaurant that opened today, they would be allowed outdoor dining. The dining area is inspected by the city's planning, fire, and building and safety divisions. They would apply it to ABC for catering permit, which is a minimal cost, but they provide temporary approvals for that outdoor consumption of alcoholic beverages. What you would be approving this evening is the use being in the interior use. Exterior use would fall under the State and County provisions at this time.

Commissioner Sutorus asked if there were any plans to update the sign with their new business name?

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated we could ask the applicant about that. We would assume they would do that.

Chair Hamerly stated the new restroom is being added for ADA compliance and the doorway that is shown on that restroom is not ADA compliant. There is not the 18 inch clear on the strike side of the door. Staff may want to look into reversing that door so there is clear space on the strike side of it for it to be ADA compliant.

Building Official Wirz replied I will make a note of it. You are correct, it is not compliant.

Community Development Director Mainez stated the building has been vacant for more than six months which is going to trigger compliance with the sign code so I would suggest that we require the applicant to upgrade their signs as part of the approval tonight.

Chair Hamerly stated the existing building mounted sign would have to be brought up to current compliance.

Community Development Director Mainez stated that is correct because it has been vacant for more than six months. It is a projection sign which is not permitted in our code. It either must be a wall mounted or a monument sign with landscaping. This is a great opportunity to upgrade that signage to current code.

Chair Hamerly asked if that would add to the planning conditions of approval item 24?

Associate Planner Quintanilla replied yes that can be added to item 24.

Chair Hamerly closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Thomas, seconded by Commissioner Miller, to approve as amended to adopt Resolution 2020-008, a Conditional Use Permit (CUP No. 20-002), to operate a cocktail lounge with a Type 48 (On-Sale General – Public Premises) ABC license for the sale and consumption of beer, wine, distilled spirits and establish live entertainment.

Motion carried on a roll call vote, 4-0, with Commissioner Amaya being absent.

RESOLUTION NO. 2020 – 008

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) NO. 20-002 FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN APPROXIMATE 1,294 SQUARE-FOOT COCKTAIL LOUNGE WITH A STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOL BEVERAGE CONTROL (ABC) TYPE 48 (ON-SALE GENERAL – PUBLIC PREMISES) LICENSE AND ESTABLISH LIVE ENTERTAINMENT (S & S COCKTAIL LOUNGE) IN AN EXISTING COMMERCIAL SHOPPING CENTER, LOCATED AT 26485 BASE LINE (APN NOS.: 1192-101-02 & -03)

6. Accessory Sign Review Application (ASR) No. 20-006 is a request to amend the 7-Eleven Sign Program previously approved by the Highland Planning Commission on August 21, 2018. The new proposal would increase the height and the overall sign area of two future monument signs which identify the gas station and future tenants along Greenspot Road and Boulder Avenue.

Chair Hamerly opened the public hearing.

Associate Planner Quintanilla presented the staff report.

Commissioner Sutorus stated there is landscape around the monument sign that is eleven feet, is there landscaping around that as well?

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated yes, there was an established landscape plan. Also, it has been reviewed by our landscape architect.

Commissioner Miller stated I have driven by that site regularly and I know it is typically required in the conditions that the project is supposed to meet the requirements NPDS and yet I have not seen any of the typical storm water being implemented on site.

Community Development Director Mainez stated we will note that and follow up with our team that is responsible to monitoring those issues.

Chair Hamerly asked what was the reasoning for moving the monument Sign B father to the north?

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated the reason for the sign movement to the north was to give more separation from the habitat sensitive area for the Kangaroo Rat.

Chair Hamerly stated the previous location of the sign did account for any impacts for the Kangaroo Rat habitat that was identified as the southeast corner of the property. The location father to the south is more visible and is a higher elevation. It does not need as extensive of base treatment. The previous location seems to be a better location.

Warner LeMenager with TNT Electric Sign Group stated this has been completely negotiated as to moving this sign for better visibility. We have moved the sign up in height so we will have a visible plane for pedestrian and automobile traffic.

Chair Hamerly asked are you saying the agreement to relocate the signs was negotiated with staff or the original location was what was approved with staff?

Warner LeMenager stated I am the manufacturer of this sign itself. We have been contracted by the other contractor to put these signs in. Whatever has transpired they have been giving the location that they want to put these signs in.

Chair Hamerly asked if this was a developer-initiated change to move the sign further to the north?

Warner LeMenager stated yes, they contracted us, and this is where the sign wanted to go. We went ahead and realized the one Sign B would not be visible at all, so we had to

proposed to the city to raise that so it would be a visibility level for traffic and pedestrians.

Chair Hamerly replied given the grading onsite the location where it is being moved is lower than the location where it would have been, because the site lines were considered when we were reviewing the height of the signage. Now, they are increasing the sign by 70-75% because they are moving it to a location that is lower relative to the street elevation. I am trying to figure out why they are trying to move the sign.

Chair Hamerly stated the base color of 7-Eleven is the very light stucco and it seems like it would tie in more with the landscape surrounding the sign if the base feature of the sign instead of being a very light stucco color.

Associate Planner Quintanilla replied it would not be a problem.

Chair Hamerly stated it said the base or concrete would be needed to be painted a color to match the main color of the building façade. Instead of painting the light color it should be a deeper color that is going to compliment the color of the stone and tie in more with the landscape.

Warner LeMenager stated that I concurred, and it should match the building.

Vice Chair Thomas asked what would happen in a scenario like this where the commission feels the sign was better in the original position than what is being proposed.

Chair Hamerly stated you would deny the request.

Commissioner Sutorus stated my understanding was they were increasing the sign because of the line of sight and it sounds like there was a different location where it was better and it did not have to be so large and now it is moved.

Chair Hamerly stated yes, now the sign is located at the bottom of a 2-1 slope that is sloping down and away from the street. I agree that the applicant would want to have a visible sign, but the location where it was, was a higher elevation.

Commissioner Sutorus asked are we allowed to ask to see where that location was before? Why did the applicant move it?

Chair Hamerly stated they said it was improved visibility, but in order to get visibility you have to increase the height of the sign from 10 feet to 17 feet because it is farther down a slope.

Chair Hamerly stated the Planning Commission felt the proposed locations of the original sign program were acceptable, but we did have extensive discussions about the amount of landscaping. This is the eastern gateway when you are heading west bound on Greenspot. This is the introduction into the golden triangle for Highland. We were very concerned about the parking being pushed into that corner that the northern end of the property wanting to have a very strong landscape area around that corner. Placing the sign into that parkway landscape area is going to diminish the amount of landscaping due to the signage.

Vice Chair stated the advantage that they may think they are going to get is added visibility by inserting it there. I think perhaps they are trying to get advertisement on both sides of the street where those traveling towards the freeway. I do not like the idea of landscape area being diminished when this is clearly an opportunity to have an area of improvement. I am not in favor at this moment to diminish landscaping and changing the sign.

Chair Hamerly stated typically in sign programs even though we are approving it as a package there is a certain amount of latitude that is extended to the applicant. There is usually reference to what are the city standards for monument signs based on the size of street frontage.

Associate Planner Quintanilla stated based on the location and the requirement is up to 11 feet for that type of monument sign.

Community Development Director Mainez stated yes, that is correct. The code does give the Planning Commission a lot of discretion when it comes to modifying those standards.

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated in the picture you see the wall which is the southside of the driveway and the originally approved location. If the sign were at that location, you would not experience sight distance issues as the vehicle in the driveway would be looking for northbound traffic. They are not looking south for traffic to pick up, so their sight line is not disturbed.

Warner LeMenager asked if we would carry this over to the next meeting. I will go back to the customer and see if he is adamant about pursuing that 17-foot sign in that position.

Chair Hamerly asked when the next meeting will be held.

Associate Planner Quintanilla replied December 1, 2020.

Chair Hamerly closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Chair Hamerly, seconded by Commissioner Miller, to continue this item to December 1, 2020 regular Planning Commission meeting.
Motion carried on a roll call vote, 4-0, with Commissioner Amaya being absent.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Assistant Community Development Director Stater informed the Planning Commissioners that there is a meeting on November 17, 2020 in person at City Hall.

Community Development Director Mainez recognized the new Planning Commissioners on how they deliberated in tonight's meeting, a job well done. We look forward to working with you.

Chair Hamerly thanked the Planning Commissioners, excellent participation, and comments. Very impressive for your first meeting. With the change of Planning Commission between two of the Planning Commissioners that are no longer on the commission there was an extensive 30

years of experience and was wondering if the city has any plans doing a resolution or a thank you for John Gamboa's and Rich Haller's service.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated letters have been provided and there will be a recognition at City Council.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Hamerly declared the meeting adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Camille Goritz, Administrative Assistant III
Community Development Department

Randall Hamerly, Chair
Planning Commission