

**MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING
JUNE 30, 2009**

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

The Special Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Highland was called to order at 6:01 p.m. by Chairman Haller in the Donahue Council Chambers, 27215 Base Line, Highland, California.

Present: Commissioners Randall Hamerly, Trang Huynh, Milton Sparks, Michael Stoffel, Vice Chairman John Gamboa and Chairman Richard Haller

Absent: Commissioner Michael Willhite

Staff Present: John Jaquess, Community Development Director
Ernie Wong, City Engineer (arrived at 6:06 p.m.)
Lawrence Mainez, City Planner
Bruce Meikle, Senior Planner
Linda McKeough, Administrative Assistant III

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Haller.

2.0 COMMUNITY INPUT

Chairman Haller explained to the audience action taken by City Council, the former Design Review Board Members are now a part of the Commission and then welcomed them to their new positions, as Commissioners of the Planning Commission.

3.0 PUBLIC HEARING

3.1 Specific Plan Applications submitted for the "Greenspot Village & Marketplace Specific Plan" - The Specific Plan encompasses an approximate 104-acre Site and proposes a maximum of 769,600 square feet of Retail / Office Space and a maximum of 800 Multi-family Residential Units along with recreational uses and open space. Applications submitted, including:

- 1) Review of the Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH 2008031058) for the Greenspot Village & Marketplace Specific Plan Projects, including the Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program, and Public / Agency Comments (ENV 009-003);

6-30-09.PC

- 2) General Plan Amendment Application (GPA 009-002) to designate a portion of the Site Planned Development (PD), and amend the General Plan Circulation and the Land Use Elements;
- 3) Specific Plan Review Application (SPR 006-001), for the “Greenspot Village & Marketplace Specific Plan” to be adopted by Ordinance and inclusive of a Rezoning of the Site to “Greenspot Village & Marketplace Specific Plan” “SPR 006-001”;
- 4) Design Review Application (DRB 009-003), Site Plans for Planning Area 1, “Highland Marketplace”, of the Greenspot Village & Marketplace Specific Plan, and;
- 5) Design Review Application (DRB 009-004), Site Plans for Planning Area 2, “Residential Villages”, of the Greenspot Village & Marketplace Specific Plan.

The property is an approximate 104-acre triangular shaped Site located at the northeast corner of the State Route 210 Freeway and Greenspot Road. The Site is generally bordered by Greenspot Road on the south, State Route 210 on the west, City and Bledsoe Creeks on the northwest, Eucalyptus Avenue on the north, Boulder Avenue on the northeast, and Webster Street on the east. Representatives: John Snell with Greenspot Village & Marketplace, LLC and Jeff Lochner with Vestar Highland GV, LLC.

(This item was continued from the Planning Commission’s May 21, 2009, Special Public Hearing)

Chairman Haller explained this is a continued Public Hearing, then introduced the item and called for Staff’s presentation.

(Note: City Engineer Wong arrived at 6:06 p.m.)

Senior Planner Meikle gave the presentation from the Staff Report, which included, but not limited to the following: 1) provided background information for the benefit of the newest Commissioners; 2) introduced the Applicants’ Representatives from Mission Development and how a second Specific Plan was submitted last December for the consideration at the May 21, 2009, Special

6-30-09.PC

Meeting; 3) the Applicants had several Open Houses for the community to view their proposed Project and had two (2) Joint Study Sessions with the Design Review Board, Planning Commission and City Council, etc.; 4) explained about the comments received to date from Agencies; 5) Staff is continuing to work with the Consultant and Applicants regarding the environmental review and response to comments; 6) Staff is also working with the Consultant with overriding considerations and are still outstanding and will be bringing them forward to the Commission at a future Meeting. Senior Planner Meikle explained how Staff would take the Commission's comments on the environmental document, but primarily wants the Commission's comments on the Specific Plan and the two (2) Site Plans for Scenarios 1 and 2 on Planning Area1 (PA1) and Planning Area 2 (PA2). He further explained the Project is design related Plans including the Building Elevations, Lighting, Landscaping, etc. will be brought back to the Commission at a later date for consideration. For tonight, the Commission will be looking at the Entitlement of the property and reiterated the Commission will have an opportunity at a later date to review the Project design. He also explained for the new Commissioners what the Applicants are proposing in Planning Areas 1, 2, but the design concept for Planning Area 3 is conceptual. He also explained the two (2) Scenarios proposed for the Project. Senior Planner Meikle explained Staff's recommendation to the Commission is to hear the Applicant's Report, provide comments and continue the Hearing to a future unspecified date and that Staff will renote and readvertise the future Hearing date and then concluded his presentation.

Chairman Haller asked if the Commission had questions of Staff.

A question was asked by a Commissioner regarding the Commission's focus on tonight's Meeting regarding the Site Plan and at what level of details does Staff want of the Project that is before the Commission.

Staff explained they want the Commission's comments on Site Plans A and B for Planning Areas 1 and 2; the Project's overall Site circulation; the proposed mix of uses; and; the Table of proposed uses in the Specific Plan. Staff also identified the issues in the Draft EIR – climate changes, air quality, noise, transportation / traffic and agriculture.

Chairman Haller explained this is a continued Public Hearing and invited the Applicants' Representative to give a presentation.

6-30-09.PC

Mr. Glen Elssmann, of Mission Development, 308 West State Street, Suite 3D, Redlands, California, who is the Applicant, addressed the Commission. He stated Staff has spent an extensive amount of time on this Project, with field trips, workshops, and processing the Specific Plan document and the various Plans for the Project. He then started to provide an historical background to the Commission and introduced other Members of the team; John Snell of Mission Development, Jack Sellman and Sarafin Brahms of Architects Orange. Mr. Elssmann explained Residential uses are planned for PA2 and Retail uses for PA1. Mission Development assembled the land while the Regency Project, Lowe's, the Golf Driving Range Walmart Project and the Greenspot Road Master Plan were being developed and then came up with concepts and goals for the Project. Mr. Elssmann further explained how approximately two and one-half to three (2½ - 3) years ago, the Project was proposed with less retail space and a variety of residential uses. How the Town Center concept was incorporated with a Main Street design that comes in from Greenspot Road, and provided examples like Market Night, Farmer's Market, Street Fairs, as areas for Restaurants, gathering places, etc. A landscaped Paseo would provide a link to local Schools, Regional Trail Connection, etc. and the storm water / runoff may also be controlled using the Paseo. Mr. Elssmann stated the Paseo will be a pleasant landscaped place with a walkable Trail. There will also be a Public Park along the Paseo. The Paseo would also be a link between PA2 and PA3. On earlier versions, PA3 was blank, but now there is a Conceptual Plan for PA3 with professional office space and hotel(s) for the community. Mr. Elssmann stated there is little professional office space located in Highland, there is a Park / Plaza proposed in PA3, and explained the potential for theater uses and could revisit that use in the future. There will be tall palm trees running north / south direction in the middle of the Project. Mr. Elssmann said the commercial uses (the Salon, Liquor Store, etc.) located on Webster are not a part of the Project, but are included within the boundaries of the Specific Plan. He indicated the Project is a horizontal mixed-use project. Mr. Elssmann stated in response to the Commissioner's question regarding circulation and pedestrian use, their Landscape Architect can review the pedestrian flow from Greenspot Road to the Retail and Community uses, etc. A Trail would also go along Boulder Avenue and connect with the Paseo. Mr. Elssmann further indicated the Major Anchor has a dedicated pedestrian walkway from the front entrance to Greenspot Road and concluded his presentation with the overall picture of the proposed Project and waiting for feedback from the Commission.

Chairman Haller asked if the Commission had any questions of the Applicant.

6-30-09.PC

A question was asked by a Commissioner if the Applicant anticipates phasing PA1 and PA2. Ms. Elssmann responded and explained the Main Boulevard (Access "C") entrance is on the east side of Main Street (Access "A") and will be in the First Phase. The customers to the Major Anchor and the residents in PA2 will come in on the Main Boulevard in Phase 1. Then the other commercial, uses will follow and then spread out on both sides of the Project. A comment was made by a Commissioner how the Citrus Plaza is not pedestrian friendly and users typically drive from one Anchor Store or pedestrian area to the next. Mr. Elssmann responded the largest parking field will be located in front of the Major Anchor Store and around the Main Street area, and the walkways and pedestrian areas will be significant with enhanced pavement, shading, signage, etc. A comment was made how the backs of the Buildings do not look nice. Mr. Elssmann responded the back of the Retail Buildings will be landscaped areas with loading docks being screened. There will be landscaping along the back of the Buildings and will be a stepped down on the north side with more landscaping. He then asked about a larger buffer along the Buildings or enhance the Paseo. When the Paseo gets landscaped with 24" to 36" box trees, it will appear solid and will serve as a screen between the Residential and Retail Areas. He further explained the landscaping will provide substantial screening in a few years and enhance the varied architecture.

A comment was made by a Commissioner that it is exciting to see the word, "Village" in the Project's name and then asked what would be located in front of the Retail space in addition to the driveway and walkway and asked if there could be additional benches in front of the Major Anchor. Mr. Elssmann responded affirmatively and there would be arbors located in some places along the walkway, as well as planters, benches, and would have a lot of variety in texture, etc. and indicated that concept design would be expanded on at a future Commission Meeting with more substance and that design is also important to the Applicants.

A question was asked by a Commissioner regarding if the Main Street would be able to accommodate the people attending an outdoor event. Mr. Elssmann responded the space is approximately 500 feet and is a large space. If a space is too large, it becomes too impersonal. The Main Street space would be similar to the Victoria Gardens on Dos Logos and would have a "cafe feel" with lattice covers, signage, benches, etc. Mr. Elssmann reiterated it has to be scaled properly and people do not like empty streets. Mr. Jack Sellman, who is the Architect, can comment on that.

6-30-09.PC

A question was asked by a Commissioner if the outdoor restaurants would have patio seating and Mr. Elssmann responded there would be a combination of indoor and outdoor dining along the Main Street Corridor and that the Main Boulevard will be a private street leading to a gated community within the Residential Area. A question was asked by a Commissioner will traffic enforcement along the Main Boulevard be done by the Owner or the City. Mr. Elssmann responded there will be on-site security when built out. A suggestion was made by a Commissioner about possibly having outdoor summer movies in order to draw people to the area. Mr. Elssmann responded that area would be in the Plaza Garden located in PA3 on the east side of the Project or on a smaller scale in the Park.

A question was asked by Staff regarding delivery trucks and Mr. Elssmann responded the delivery trucks would travel down the Main Street entrance and go behind the Buildings.

Chairman Haller asked if anyone would like to speak on the item. Hearing none, Chairman Haller asked for Mr. Elssmann to continue. Highland Police Chief Ron Cochran stated for On-site Citations would be for handicap parking violations, but not moving violations.

Chairman Haller asked if the Commission had any further questions for Chief Cochran.

A comment was made by a Commissioner the proposed Project could be a popular site for young people for cruising and asked if there is an Ordinance to prevent / disallow for cruising and if not, asked the Police Chief to think about it. Chief Cochran responded he had provided his comments to Staff. Then Chairman Haller explained to the Commission the Police comments were in the Staff Report. He then asked if the Commission had any further questions of Chief Cochran. Hearing none, he then asked for Mr. Elssmann to respond. Mr. Elssmann stated how it is good that Highland has contracted with San Bernardino County Sheriff Department and they have provided enforcement in locations like Ontario Mills and will be integrated into the operations of the Project.

Chairman Haller stated there are a number of issues that have already been identified and asked if there were any new issues at this point. Staff responded how Staff wants the Commission's comments on the Specific Plan and the Site Plans and the majority of the landscaping, architecture, etc. would be reviewed at a future Hearing of the Commission.

6-30-09.PC

A question was asked by a Commissioner regarding the Main Street Concept and why is that feature pushed back to Phase 2 of the Project. Mr. Elssmann responded it is because of the dynamics in the Retail Market and Major and Minor Anchors have to be built first before the smaller Users will agree to come to the Site. He further explained it is similar to the chicken / egg theory and had attended the ICSC in Las Vegas and how retailers are having a hard time and the need to the Major Anchors first to attract the other Users. The question was asked again by a Commissioner why in Phase 2 and Mr. Elssmann responded if the Retail Market has sufficient demand, it could be included in Phase 1, but reiterated that it is driven by the Market. Mr. Elssmann further indicated it might be built as a single Phase, but does not want to build space that is not filled and wants sustainability within the Project. With Phase 1, with the first block of Tenants would be located in the middle of the Site and some located at the Main Street entrance and also wants to build a strong Main Boulevard. A comment was made by a Commissioner about the feasibility of creating a dual Main Street in order to create balance and symmetry. The Commissioner also asked about the one-story scenario and the concept to create a second-story with professional offices over retail space. The Commissioner stated it would aid the Applicant with Tenants and the ability to get more Users on the Site. Mr. Elssmann deferred the question to his Architect.

Mr. Jack Sellman, of Architects Orange, 144 North Orange Street, of Orange, California, who is the Applicant's Architect, addressed the Commission. He stated he has been design projects for thirty (30) years and loves two-story volumes, but they are the first offices to die and last to come back, and are typically used by attorneys, and as Class "B" offices. There might be some usage there, but reiterated they are last to lease and first to vacate. Mr. Elssmann asked about a two-story building with restaurants. Mr. Sellman responded a two-story building with a restaurant will not work, unless it's the same restaurant (that uses both stories). A comment was made by a Commissioner about being a concept, it is to create a pleasant outdoor areas and if a two-story restaurant, or if a landscaped plaza, it would be a standalone building. Mr. Sellman responded with forty feet (40') of pavement located on the west side, there will be plants / landscaping and a food court will be used is a buffered area. He further indicated that a space can be made too big and focused on this and will know at the next presentation and then provided examples with a Mexican Restaurant, fountain, etc. that is located within twenty (20) miles of the City for the Commission to go see. He explained the Riverside Plaza and designed the Main Street there and has a theater and explained that design to the Commission and would be the same Plaza scale to the proposed

6-30-09.PC

Project regards to walking, food, etc, and would be about the same design. Mr. Elssmann added if the Commission has specific examples, please give them to Staff so Staff can provide them to us. A comment was made by a Commissioner the most successful two-story buildings have canopies, increased visibility, signage, etc. Mr. Sellman responded he is open to look at it. A question was asked by a Commissioner if the Specific Plan allowed for second-stories and Staff responded affirmatively. Mr. Sellman added having a one-story then a two-story can provide a variety of Roof Elevations. A Commissioner stated he wants the Project have a strong architectural presence.

A question was asked by a Commissioner if there is office space in PA1 and if allowed in the Specific Plan and Staff responded that shouldn't be an issue and Mr. Elssmann added that is acceptable. Staff then read on Page 64 of the Specific Plan under offices that they are allowed by Right-of-Zone in PA1 and PA3.

The Commission requested Staff to summarize the traffic mitigation.

City Engineer Wong summarized the traffic mitigation to the Commission. He explained the Study is an extensive / comprehensive Traffic Study and the Project analyzed forty-four (44) intersections and how many trips the Project would generate. The Analysis has been done to verify whether any of the forty-four (44) intersections will be operating at a minimum Level of Service D, and if the Level of Service falls to E or F, then the Mitigation Measures will have to do provided by either physical improvements or for the Applicant to pay their fair share for the City to do the improvement work in the future. With regards to Greenspot Road, there are several locations where the Project impact is non-mitigatable and is part of the overriding consideration. With regards to the COAs, the Project is required to do physical improvement if the impacted location is within one-quarter (1/4) mile of the Project, and if and farther than that, the Applicant is required to pay their fair share. He added the physical improvements on Greenspot Road would be limited between the east end of the Project and the Freeway southbound ramps. A question was asked by a Commissioner regarding the timing of the Mitigation Measures. Staff responded it has to do with phasing of the Project. The physical improvements along Greenspot Road are required with development of PA1 or PA2. Staff met with the Applicant this afternoon and wants to discuss more on revisions of the COAs. The northbound and southbound off- and on-ramps were discussed and are

6-30-09.PC

required to have additional lanes. Also, the Applicant had indicated that the Project entrance at the traffic signal at Lowe's will be widen to provide an additional lane. Staff further explained the following to the Commission: 1) the Applicant's fair share; 2) restricted driveways with right in / right out access; 3) in Project entrances will be fully signalized; 4) Webster will have a right in / right out and left in movement; 5) Greenspot Road/ Boulder Avenue install another left turn lane going north, east and west; 6) striping of additional lanes as part of street widening; 7) the City Council committed to spend up to eleven (11) million dollars to improve Greenspot Road – widen the street, median, landscaping, storm drain, utility lines, etc. but funding is not sufficient; 8) the Project is Conditioned as a stand alone Project and not assuming the City Council will spend the \$11 million and the COA is a self-sufficient; 9) Staff had written the COA in that the Project will improve certain parts of Greenspot Road along the north side with traffic signal(s), curb / gutter median, storm drain, etc. and; 10) the Applicant has reviewed with the COAs and requests a meeting with Staff. A question was asked by a Commissioner if the identified Mitigation Measure was unacceptable with the Level of Service at the western most area and the access to the traffic signals within one hundred feet (100') or so. Staff responded during a Joint Study Session with the Planning Commission, Design Review Board, the City Council decided to add one (1) additional traffic signal to the Greenspot Road Master Plan. A comment was made by a Commissioner about the break in the Median with PA3 being obvious for that one and there are too little shops and two (2) traffic signals and then asked about what is going on with the south side of Greenspot Road. Staff responded Regency uses the access at the median break to LA Fitness. Mr. Elssmann stated there is a parking field located there. A comment was made by a Commissioner about a person would be willing to wait 45 seconds at the signal, rather than go through three (3) lanes of traffic. and Mr. Snell said exactly. A comment was made by a Commissioner that only three (3) cars were making a left hand turn on a green light. Mr. Elssmann responded about the timing for the traffic signal located in Redlands where the Walmart is located on Redlands Boulevard, California and New Jersey Streets and indicated his agreement with the concerns on the desired space for accessibility to diffuse the traffic at peak hours, but does not agree when the peak hours are off.

A question was asked by a Commissioner if Pads G and H are easier to get filled because of the driveway and Mr. Elssmann responded affirmatively and that is why he likes multiple accesses for the Site.

6-30-09.PC

A question was asked by a Commissioner if there is an optional way of getting to the proposed office space / hotel space in PA3 where it is signalized. Mr. Elssmann responded PA3 is conceptual and the proposed design could be realigned to face a traffic signal located at Greenspot Road or Boulder Avenue. At the Main Boulevard entrance, there is a turn pocket design there with signalization / movement at PA3. A suggestion was made by a Commissioner to use the traffic signal at the Main Boulevard (Access "C") entrance and rotate the Buildings in PA3 to face the toward that entrance. Mr. Snell responded they can play with the design. Staff added with the Main Boulevard, the parking just north of Pad J is unwise along that driveway and should be relocated or eliminated.

A question was asked by a Commissioner regarding the vehicle count and Staff responded a left turn pocket at 200 feet in length can accommodate eight (8) cars. The Boulder Avenue / Webster Street traffic signal will be relocated to access Greenspot Road and reiterated PA3 has no COAs because it is not a part of tonight's discussion. Staff further indicated there will be a traffic signal located on Boulder Avenue / Eucalyptus and then Staff concluded Staff's presentation. A question was asked by a Commissioner regarding Eucalyptus. Staff responded Eucalyptus would be widened and Calhoun widened then terminates at the Project boundary as an offset cul-de-sac.

Chairman Haller asked if the Commission had any further questions of Staff.

A question was asked by a Commissioner regarding what is the trigger mechanism for improvements on Greenspot Road. Staff responded Greenspot Road would be improved on the north side when either PA1 or PA2 develops. If the Residential Area is developed first, then the Parkway improvements along Boulder Avenue would also be done in front of PA2 and certain improvements on Webster would also be constructed.

A question was asked by a Commissioner regarding if additional Right-of-Way was needed on Boulder Avenue and in the interim what would be built / installed as a temporary solution with PA3. Staff responded there is sufficient street Right-of-Way along Boulder Avenue for the Community Trail with landscaping on both sides of the Trail. A comment was made by a Commissioner regarding pedestrian traffic coming up Boulder Avenue and going to the Paseo. Both Mr. Elssmann and Mr. Snell responded that would be temporarily at grade dirt and does not see to being a problem, but would keep the weeds off until PA3 is developed and is important not to stop the pedestrian flow of traffic.

6-30-09.PC

A question was asked by a Commissioner regarding the children residing near the Schools and Post Office. Mr. Elssmann responded there will be a traffic signal located on Boulder Avenue and Eucalyptus Avenue. A Commissioner added to have Staff look at that if it meets the minimum Standards. Concerns were raised by the Commission regarding the Boulder Avenue frontage along PA3. A suggestion was made by a Commissioner about closing the gap along Boulder Avenue and to finish off / complete the loop. Mr. Elssmann responded they would look at that and the crossing to the Schools.

A question was asked by a Commissioner regarding the timing of the ICO Project constructing the street improvements, or if ICO goes first, then the ICO Project would install the improvements. Staff added how Staff met with Mr. Elssmann and Mr. Snell and discussed the COAs and they are thinking about phasing the Project, however, Staff did not know about the phasing until recently and the COAs may be needed to be revised.

Chairman Haller asked the Commission if it had any other issues.

A question was asked by a Commissioner regarding the housing options in PA2 and how the Site Plan is a placeholder and what about other housing options for PA3. Mr. Elssmann responded the Specific Plan addresses the community to the north of the Project and allows flexibility for PA2. The Specific Plan and Guidelines for PA2 were done first then they followed with the architecture / precise plan of design. While there is a variety of housing types; the precise plan of design was submitted with three-story multi-family units with an architectural style of either with Monterey, or Mission. He further stated the focus on single family residential (SFR) units are primarily related to existing units to the north of the proposed Project (PA2) and not incompatible. Mr. Elssmann further indicated they had debated whether or not to include the northerly existing community. The PA3 has the senior components, condominium components, and is unlikely to be SFRs. He then explained the Elevations for PA2 to the Commission. A comment was made by a Commissioner with regards to phasing and have the Applicant go back to small villages design and applying the small village concept. Mr. Elssmann responded and stated they had evaluated that and that the dynamics of the west end of the Project relate to the northerly existing neighborhood and would provide quality amenities, related to the Monterey and Mission design styles, or a mix of designs, but there is internal discussion happening. A comment was made by a Commissioner that the people residing in the northeast corner of PA2 will not want to go to the southwest corner in order for them to use the pool, recreation facilities, etc. There is one (1) Floor Plan

6-30-09.PC

with three (3) stories and would be hard pressed to identify individual Buildings. Mr. Sellman responded the villages can be created by the way of the architecture character, styles and color treatment. The Commissioner responded there is no diversity in the mass of Buildings. Mr. Sellman responded it maybe solved through the architecture with three (3) different styles, but with the same Floor Plan. The Commissioner responded there still is a lot of Building mass and is a challenge. Mr. Elssmann stated that it is helpful getting details back to him and then present the Elevations in an enhanced version. The Commissioner stated Spanish / Mediterranean Style and Plant / Fountain details. Mr. Elssmann responded the Applicant's Landscape Architect was unable to attend tonight's Meeting, but have already discussed this with him. Mr. Elssmann added to allow much landscape area in order to enhance the area and that there are lots of options to demonstrate and bring at the next Meeting.

A question was asked by a Commissioner if the Applicant proposed apartments or townhomes and Mr. Elssmann responded PA2 is multi-family units and PA3 townhomes are proposed and indicated that would be in the Final Phase. He further explained that they want the urban feel. The Commissioner stated on Page 108 of the Staff Report with COA 72.a. it states ten percent (10%) are required to be rented to Lower Income households and twenty-five percent (25%) rented to Low to Moderate Income households and reiterated are the units apartments or what. Mr. Elssmann responded the Project is in a Redevelopment Project Area and Staff recommends affordable units be available, which are Income restricted units. With regards to Low Income units, could be teachers, single persons, couples just starting out, etc. and discussion ensued between the Commission and Mr. Elssmann regarding the proposed ratio relative to the household units. Mr. Sellman added condominiums are high Standards and how the rent will be at the top of the market scale and then explained the design amenities to the Commission. Mr. Elssmann added there are management requirements and the multi-family units and would be strictly managed. Mr. Elssmann does not want to degrade the community and have problems with that. The units will be premier units and management enforced. A question was asked by a Commissioner if Mission Development is a management company and Mr. Elssmann responded either "we" do it, or hire a company that will. The Commissioner responded with a management company, look at what Staff can impose regarding having high quality standards and then added the Initial Specific Plan proposal, the Applicant had proposed condominiums, and now the Applicant is proposing apartments. Mr. Elssmann responded there is a variety of housing units and believed multi-family is underserved in the community. A

6-30-09.PC

Commissioner responded for the Applicant look at Redlands with all of the apartments located there. Mr. Sellman added there will be high quality rentals and management. The Commissioner responded the three (3) bedroom units are few in number and currently, with so many foreclosures, the three / four bedroom units may be needed more than the one / two bedroom units. Mr. Elssmann asked how many foreclosures are being made into rental units and some people would be renters by choice. A Commissioner responded the Arden / Guthrie area used to be a nice planned area, but now, is torn down. Mr. Elssmann responded how the Applicant has talked with Staff and ensured the City there is nothing underlying and there is protection if the Project fell apart and can be avoidable and stated he is supportive of those Measures. The Commissioner asked if the Applicant had discussed the proposed three-story Building with the Sheriff Department. Mr. Snell responded that the Applicant received a list of COAs from the Sheriff Department.

Questions were asked by Commissioners regarding carports, garage and open space parking and handicap units and Mr. Elssmann responded how the State mandates disabled requirements.

Mr. Sarafin Brahms, of Architects Orange, 144 North Orange Street, Orange, California, who is another of the Applicant's Architects, responded and addressed the Commission. He stated all ground floor units have to be handicap accessible, like public transportation, and that the second and third story units will not be handicap accessible because of stairs. Staff added the Applicant is continuing to work on significant variance from the Highland Municipal Code regarding enclosed parking in multi-family units. The Site Plan calls for twelve percent (12%) parking in an enclosed garage and the Municipal code requires enclosed parking for all multi-family units and reiterated twelve percent (12%) is a big variance. Staff had asked the Applicant to present substantiation to convince the City that twelve percent (12%) is okay and the City is pushing for thirty-seven percent (37%) in an enclosed garage. That would mean 378 vehicles in enclosed garages. This is a proposed compromise and is an incentive to beef up the amenities to create neighborhoods. The Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Agreement can include a concession to reduce enclosed garages as an incentive to and restrict a portion of the units for Moderate Income Households for the next fifty (50) years. The number of Low Income Housing Units is up to the City Council and the Table will be debatable. Mr. Elssmann responded this is a good opportunity for Mr. Sarafin Brahms to provide perspectives in other communities. Staff responded that is up to the Commission, there are safety issues, defensible issues, etc. and how there is some missing information.

6-30-09.PC

A Commissioner indicated that he had a personal discomfort with adding more Buildings like enclosed garages. There are safety issues, visibility, even with mature vegetation. There is no substitute for elbow room and by tripling the parking structures, but no one should have a big trek in order to get to their unit. A question was asked by a Commissioner if that would include guest parking. Staff responded the Commission could follow along by color on the color coded Map. A Commissioner stated the Applicant has to keep the hardscape shaded. Another Commissioner stated that in downtown San Diego, all the parking is underground tandem parking. Mr. Brahms responded the required number of parking garage / carport spaces will be fifty percent (50%) of the units within PA2. The placement of garages needs to be where they do not visually impact the Site. The multi-color Exhibit shows where garages and carports would be located. A Commissioner asked Mr. Brahms to provide an example. Mr. Brahms requested the Commission to look at the displayed Map. The carports are the ones with "X"s and dashed lines on them. The garages are the ones with the heavy lines and open stalls have no marks and that Building 10, for example, would have garages located there. Mr. Elssmann added every unit gets a garage or a covered parking space and is computed in the ratio. Mr. Elssmann further explained the carports are in blue, red and orange in color on the Map and the covered spaces are in grey in color on the Map and stated to expect a boundary of carports land garages along on the north edge of the Project. Mr. Brahms added at the back of the Project will be carports and garages. Mr. Elssmann stated with regards to the parking, asked the Commission to look at the Open Space Exhibit compared to the Garage Exhibit and indicated there is 360° of green around the units and how seventy-five percent (75%) meets or exceeds the current Standards. If more enclosed garages are required, that would block the garden feel that they think is a key element. In the City of Redlands Lawn and Tennis Apartments located on Brookside, that landscaping allows the buildings there to have a garden feel around them and is not full of enclosed garages. The Company, Architects Orange, has been around for forty-three (43) years and parking is a big issue and has designed hundreds of project. Mr. Sellman stated the Industry Standard is one (1) covered space per unit. Where do you put more garages and not take up open space and came up with this concept. With their history of what works, with parking is a bit higher with 1½ covered space for a 1 bed / 2 car; 2 bed / 2 –3 car, and one (1) guest parking for every six (6) units making this 84 guest parking spaces and basically, this is one (1) car per bedroom. If developers tell them do more than two (2) cars per bedroom, the space gets wasted. A Commissioner stated if parking is deficient, some people will use other areas for storage. Discussion ensued between the

6-30-09.PC

Commission, Mr. Elssmann, Mr. Sellman, Mr. Snell regarding the following: 1) management of the parking area; 2) there would be an increase of roof area; 3) use more space in order to build garages; 4) carport is double wood columns, with Spanish tiles and single sheer walls; 5) sounds like the Applicant wants to place / locate the garage units as far away as possible from the residential units. Mr. Elssmann responded about not wanting to mess up the open space area and Mr. Sellman added he could come up with a number. A Commissioner stated for the Applicant to provide shade / trees. Mr. Elssmann responded the Applicant has allocated various planters and will install substantial trees. Staff responded what the Applicant has presented tonight, Staff has not had a chance to discuss with them and the numbers will change. A Commissioner stated the garage with the apartment unit needs to be upscale and is a critical point with the Commission. Mr. Elssmann responded that is a valid point and the Architects Orange has a lot of experience.

A question was asked by a Commissioner what is the symbol for the trash enclosure on the Map.

(Note: City Engineer Wong left the Chambers at 8:30 p.m.)

Mr. Brahms responded and pointed out the proposed trash enclosures on the Plans to the Commission and indicated they are tandem rollout bins. Mr. Elssmann stated that a separate Exhibit could be prepared for the trash enclosures. A question was asked by a Commissioner if the trash enclosures are totally screened and Mr. Brahms responded that is correct with metal gates and screens. Staff added the design details will be provided at a later Meeting.

(Note: City Engineer Wong returned to the Chambers at 8:40 p.m.)

A question was asked by a Commissioner to Staff regarding the thirty-seven percent (37%) of covered parking spaces and Staff's intent. Staff responded about the City "setting the bar" with a higher standard for a two-car garage for each unit in the R-2 Zone, and in the R-2C Zone. Looking for more covered parking, more shade trees and want to meet the intent and City Council Policy regarding garages. A question was asked by a Commissioner is whatever the Commission may direct and take action upon for this Project, then the City Council will review and take action on the Project and Staff responded that is correct. A comment was made by a Commissioner about the Applicant installing

6-30-09.PC

lockable storage spaces in the carports, above the vehicle. Another Commissioner responded that he could see that when the storage space is in front of the car, but can also see the storage spaces being broken into. Mr. Snell responded it is clear they have to show the garage as a separate design exhibit. Mr. Elssmann added Staff is correct, this is the first multi-family project of this scale since the City's incorporation and do not want to be dismissive of the City's history and reasons for incorporating. Standards created a means of stopping chaos. Twenty (20) years has gone by and that good architectural design is being demonstrated all over California and need to show examples why and what Standards are. The Best Management Practices make a quality community. Then take into account with the Project being taken to two (2) phases. This is an exciting time with questions and comments from the Commission and the need to create more exhibits without destroying the beauty of the Project and appreciates this from the Commission.

A question was asked by a Commissioner about the number of garages, how did the City Council deal with that. Staff responded two (2) car enclosed garage / per unit.

The following are comments made by the Commission: 1) with the current count, with garages or covered spaces, thirteen percent (13%) would be 108 spaces, and; 2) the Applicant is providing about ten percent (10%) of what City Council wants. A comment was made by a Commissioner on how the residents in the Arden / Guthrie area then parked on top of the garage rooftops. Mr. Sellman responded this is a Class A Project without two-car garages. Staff responded to not put the ultimate responsibility onto City Council, but will include the Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council. A question was asked by a Commissioner if the City Council is the final body for approving the Specific Plan and Staff responded the General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan and related Site Plans will be subject to City Council action. The architectural review, landscape details, signage, etc., the Commission will take action on, unless it is appealed. A Commissioner asked if the Specific Plan Standards would apply to the single family units to the north of PA2 and want to add a bedroom, garage, etc., does the style have to fall in the Spanish style or is not in compliance. Staff responded new additions or expansions on those properties would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis using the Specific Plan and the Municipal Code. Mr. Elssmann stated with the workshops, trips, etc. and has been up front with creating the best Project and trying to achieve this goal and the Commission's recommendations are important. This type of Project has not been done in the past in Highland and the Goals and Principles need to be followed and achieved.

6-30-09.PC

A comment was made by a Commissioner how the Applicant needs to do “thorough homework” and how the Council Chambers was packed with people not wanting apartments. A question was asked by a Commissioner they want to convert to in the future, then what. Staff responded there would have to be an amendment to the Specific Plan and Site Plan approval. Mr. Snell responded there are no different Standards for condominiums and doing condominium conversions would be difficult for compliance.

Chairman Haller asked the Commission if there are any other issues.

A question was asked by a Commissioner regarding the significant EIR impacts that were identified, but cannot be mitigated. Using the Freeway evaluation as an example, how the document was prepared in a vacuum and it should discuss if you establish retail / commercial locally so that people do not have to travel and shop in San Bernardino or Redlands and keeping people shopping in Highland reducing impacts from those trips. however, ultimately, the levels of traffic cannot be mitigated. Staff responded that it is recognized in the Climate Change and other Sections of the DEIR.

Discussion ensued between the Commission and Staff regarding the Traffic Study. Staff added that it does not generate additional trips, in that it is reducing the length of trips and how trips are still going on the Freeway. A comment was made by a Commissioner about the air quality and the trips per day, and the need for compliance with CEQA, AQMD, particulate matter, etc. Staff responded that is the argument with the Climate Change and Staff had that discussion with the Applicant. Staff responded Draft Overriding Considerations will be provided at the next Meeting. Staff added from a Traffic Study standpoint, the Project will generate traffic on roads and the Freeway for people living in the Project, going to work, internal trips, etc. With regards to the Freeway, there is a portion of the Freeway that will experience a twenty-three percent (23%) increase of traffic on the Freeway. Staff further explained to the Commission that the Project would partly cause unacceptable LOS at the 210 Freeway and San Bernardino Avenue interchange in the morning and afternoon peak hours. Staff stated it is the City Council’s Policy from the economic standpoint, not have new development to pay for Freeway widening. A Commissioner responded how the end result is with the General Plan and the Circulation Element at build out. The best use of properties within the City is addressed in the General Plan and no significant impact analysis on the City streets has been identified that cannot be mitigated.

6-30-09.PC

If the document is to defend the Project, the Commissioner would like to see more impact analysis in the document and make the language defensible. Staff agreed with the Commissioner that it would be better if all impacted locations can be mitigated, but there are situations where mitigations is not possible, and this would be legally addressed as Overriding Considerations. A question was asked by a Commissioner will it be included in the EIR or what and Staff responded a technical discussion of Mitigation Measures and Overriding Considerations, have been included in the EIR.

A question was asked by a Commissioner regarding parking spaces located at the west end of the Project and another Commissioner responded that is for employee parking.

A comment was made by a Commissioner there is no Arts Center or creativity shown where a person can park, to shop, dine, go to a Mini-outdoor Amphitheater, YWCA where children can go, etc. Mr. Sellman responded stores are an option and is listed in the CC&Rs that employees not park in front.

The following was summarized which included, but not limited to, by both the Commission and Staff: 1) PA1 and PA2 with the Multi-family areas and the Commercial components; 2) Staff proposes the Commission to take final action on the EIR at the next Meeting; 3) Staff proposes the Commission to take final action on the GPA from the Open Space Designation to Planned Development Designation at the next Meeting; 4) the Specific Plan text with regards to the number of issues; 5) the COAs do not comply with the Specific Plan and need to match; 6) parking reflected in the Specific Plan is substantially different than the Municipal Code; 7) can review chapter by chapter; 8) with regards to the Site Plan on PA1, parking alignment, public area, and phasing; 9) with regards to the Site Plan on PA2, the Commission wants to review alternative Site Plans; 10) not happy with the parking lot and with pedestrian maneuverability; 11) there are massive asphalt areas and does not want the Project to look like Lowe's; 12) the need for the Applicant to break up the asphalt; 13) wants fewer tree diamonds; 14) add trees, plants, trellis along the walkways for a design break up; 15) parking in the middle and going to the store with strollers is difficult; 16) Citrus Plaza in Redlands is not pedestrian friendly; 17) disappointed how the Project is currently planned out; 18) Staff will be looking at the parking lot for WQMP, landscaping, etc. prior to the Commission making a decision; 19) there are few parking spots, add more landscaping and be pedestrian friendly; 20) Staff indicated there is a potential that some Buildings might need to be moved or

6-30-09.PC

reduced to accommodate necessary changes at the Access “C” driveway; 21) more pedestrian space is both positive and negative; 22) have the Applicant create a real parkway, with fountains, etc. and have real estate between the drive aisles; 23) a Commissioner concurs with having more landscaping around the parkway, similar to Victoria Gardens in that they also have music on the path, there are benches along the way and are nice features; 24) the Project is the gateway to the City; 25) there is no relief on the west side of the Buildings and will be “fried” by the sun; 26) have a crossing between Lowe’s and the Project located on Greenspot Road so the kids can go back and forth between the commercial projects; 27) with the parking count, have a strong push for pedestrians and make the Project a destination; 28) with the Commission now being a seven (7) member body, these are good comments and separate the Entitlements from the Design issues – in that the separation is difficult, the Design could be destroyed for the Applicant to move forward with the Entitlements; 29) wants the Project to provide a sense of place; 30) the Applicant’s thoughts are there, but is short on design. A question was asked by Mr. Elssmann if the Commission would support a lesser parking requirement with more landscaping. A Commissioner responded it depends on the type of use and provided an example with a restaurant versus a coffee shop and which would be a higher priority to pedestrian use. Mr. Elssmann requested clarification, whether if it is square footage, or Code. The Commission is focusing on pedestrian connection to store fronts. What the Commission has described will be done and has no issue with that, but he wants more specific ideas and also wants to be responsive to the Commission. A Commissioner responded with pedestrians, maneuvering, the Anchor Store access way, the need to break up the asphalt. A question was asked by a Commissioner about the feasibility of angle parking. Another Commissioner responded the Anchor Store would then be isolated, need to make it outstanding and to ensure pedestrians can get to their destination. A question was asked by Mr. Elssmann regarding about additions and the following comments / responses were made by the Commissioners: 1) there is the east / west pedestrian issue – park in one area and hot to get between lanes of traffic and pavement features; 2) an example was provided with if people shopped at Shop 9, and then wanting to get over to Shop 8, how to you get there without walking through the parking lot, and; 3) the feasibility of applying some type of delineations across the parking lot. Pedestrian access to the Anchor Store from Greenspot Road is next to Pad H. Mr. Sellman responded that he would take a look at it and that Main Street will have a different feeling.

6-30-09.PC

(Note: Commissioner Sparks and Vice Chairman Gamboa left the Chambers at 9:39 p.m.)

Mr. Elssmann added about having good feedback from the Commission on PA1 and asked if the Commission had any further comments / questions. A Commissioner responded with regards to the restaurant area, with screening, transitioning, etc. Then both the Commission and Mr. Elssmann looked on the Site Plan with the restaurants and talked about creating a continuation, parking lot design, etc.

(Note: Commissioner Sparks and Vice Chairman Gamboa returned to the Chambers at 9:41 p.m.)

Mr. Sellman said that he would look at the above comments from the Commission. A Commissioner talked about the “pocket park” on the Paseo, could be either a positive or negative space. Mr. Elssmann responded about how people are going to be in that location. The Commissioner responded with the Paseo design, parking lot design, pull the Shops 3 and Shop 4 Buildings back so the “pocket park” is more available to the Retail customers and their children. Mr. Sellman said that he would look at that also.

Mr. Elssmann asked the Commission if there were any other comments / questions on PA2 Site Plan other than relative to garages, architectural and design issues, etc. Mr. Sellman added this Project is a premiere project. A comment was made by a Commissioner regarding the three-story Building overlooking the single family residences on Eucalyptus / Calhoun. There is a twenty foot (20') setback to protect the integrity of the existing neighborhood. The landscaping on the north side at the east / west direction, use street tree landscape with a forty-eight inch (48”) box size. Mr. Elssmann responded will look at that spacing, maturity, canopy for the circulation element.

A comment was made by a Commissioner with the compromise with Staff on the number of garages, and the Applicant avoid narrow alleys and not create a ten foot (10') alleyway. In addition, create a larger, private patio and reiterated to avoid narrow alleyways. Mr. Elssmann responded and agreed with that. Staff suggested to the Commission how Staff is willing to work with the Applicant, but is not ready to specify a certain date for the next Hearing and the need to respond to the EIR comments and recommended the Commission direct Staff to return to the Commission when it is ready for consideration and not continue the Public Hearing to a date certain. Mr. Elssmann responded how about August. A

6-30-09.PC

Commissioner asked if Staff had enough feedback from the Commission and Staff responded affirmatively. A comment was made by a Commissioner about wanting people from Redlands and San Bernardino to come and shop in Highland. Another Commissioner responded how the food court at Citrus Plaza is packed. Mr. Elssmann responded how the 91 Freeway is not the same and people only want to go to the Tyler Mall. He then thanked the Commission.

There being no further questions of the Applicant or Staff, or discussion amongst the Commissioners, Chairman Haller then called for the question.

A Motion was made by Vice Chairman Gamboa and seconded by Commissioner Sparks to continue the Public Hearing to a date to be determined.

Motion carried on a 6 – 0 vote with Commissioner Willhite absent.

4.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS

Staff further explained what it tentatively scheduled for the July 7, 2009, Meeting, at 6:00 p.m. and Staff advised the Commission for them to retain their documents and Plans from tonight's Meeting for the Highland Village and Marketplace Specific Plan Project.

Staff explained regarding the July 4th Parade and invited the Commission to come out and enjoy the Parade.

5.0 ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chairman Haller declared the Meeting adjourned at 9:53p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Linda McKeough, Community
Development Administrative Assistant III

Richard Haller, Chairman
Planning Commission

6-30-09.PC