

**MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 5, 2012**

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Highland was called to order at 6:00p.m. by Chairman Hamerly, in the Donahue Council Chambers, 27215 Base Line, Highland, California.

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

Absent: Commissioner Michael Stoffel (Note: arrived at 6:02p.m.)

Staff Present: John Jaquess, Community Development Director
 Ernie Wong, City Engineer / Public Works Director
 Jeff Veik, Battalion Fire Chief
 Jim Rissmiller, Administrative Analyst
 Jim Godfredsen, Project Manager
 Lawrence Mainez, City Planner
 Sean Kelleher, Assistant Planner
 Scott Rice, City's Landscape Architect
 Linda McKeough, Administrative Assistant III

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Hamerly.

2.0 REORGANIZATION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

2.1 Reorganization of the Planning Commission and election of Chairman and Vice Chairman for 2012 - 2013.

Chairman Hamerly identified the Item and then he turned the Meeting over to Community Development Director Jaquess who explained the Election process and opened the nominations for Chairman.

Commissioner Haller nominated Commissioner Hamerly for Chairman and Commissioner Gamboa seconded the nomination of Commissioner Hamerly.

06-05-12.PC

Community Development Director Jaquess asked if there were any other nominations for Chairman. There being no further nominations, it was affirmed to close the nominations and by acclamation elect Commissioner Hamerly for Chairman.

Commissioner Hamerly was elected as Chairman of the Commission.

Community Development Director Jaquess turned the Meeting over to Chairman Hamerly.

Chairman Hamerly then opened the nominations for Vice Chairman.

Commissioner Gamboa nominated Commissioner Huynh for Vice Chairman and Commissioner Haller seconded the nomination of Commissioner Huynh.

Chairman Hamerly asked if there were any further nominations for Vice Chairman. There being no further nominations, it was affirmed to close the nominations for Vice Chairman.

(Note: Commissioner Stoffel arrived at 6:02p.m.)

A Motion to elect Commissioner Huynh as Vice Chairman unanimously passed on a 7 – 0 vote.

Commissioner Huynh was elected as Vice Chairman of the Commission.

3.0 COMMUNITY INPUT

There was none.

4.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

4.1 Minutes of May 15, 2012, Regular Meeting.

A Motion was made by Commissioner Gamboa and seconded by Vice Chairman Huynh to approve the Minutes of May 15, 2012, Regular Meeting, as submitted.

Motion carried on a 6 – 0 – 1 vote with the abstention of Commissioner Haller.

06-05-12.PC

5.0 OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

6.0 NEW BUSINESS

Note: Prior to the Meeting Staff distributed an additional Public Comment Statement that was received for Item 6.1. In addition, a revised proposed Engineering Condition of Approval (COA) No. 23 was also distributed to the Commission for consideration.

- 6.1 A request to amend Conditional Use Permit (CUP-007-014) for a Planned Development Document to allow for the construction of a 73,779 square foot Building including sixty-eight (68) Assisted Living Units and sixteen (16) Memory Care Units "BrightWater". Additionally the Applicant is requesting Approval of Design Review Application (DRA-012-004) for the design of the proposed Building and improvements. The approximate 5.2-acre Site is located on the south side of Base Line approximately four hundred feet (400') west of Church Street. (Assessor Parcel Number: 1201-251-12.) Representatives: Greg Elmore, Lenity Group

Chairman Hamerly identified the Item and asked for Staff's presentation.

Assistant Planner Kelleher gave the presentation from the Staff Report and PowerPoint presentation and explained the distributed materials and proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Amendments, the Design Review Application's (DRA) Project design and layout, historical background and the Applicant's requests to the Commission. He added the Materials Board is in front of Chairman Hamerly for the Commission's review. He further explained some of the Conditions of Approval for shade over the parking lot and landscaping. Regarding the analysis on the block wall along the easterly / westerly property lines and existing fencing and how the Applicant has requested not installing a block wall along the easterly property line and then maintaining a block wall along the westerly property line adjacent to the seven (7) most northerly properties where the property is maintained on a more level basis and from there, the property slopes downward. There are three (3) properties that are encircling the Project currently that have existing block walls and the Applicant would install a northerly block wall from there, south and maintain the existing fencing which is new vinyl fencing and the three (3) block walls and that is the Applicant's proposal and if the Commission desired that, then that would potentially amend Planning COA No. 54. In addition, City Engineer Wong is here to answer any questions and indicated that the Applicant and his Representative are in the audience for any questions the Commission may have and then concluded his presentation.

06-05-12.PC

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any questions of Staff.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the Engineering COAs regarding submittal of a Landscape Median Plan and if that would be deferred for approval and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded that it would come back to the Commission for further consideration and is not a part of this Application.

A question was asked by Commissioner Gamboa regarding how the generators are shown on the Site Plan are located on the west side of the Refuse Enclosure, but with all of the other Plans, the generators are shown on the east side. Assistant Planner Kelleher responded that the Grading Plan is not modified and is noted on his Plans the generators are located on the east side and the Plans will be modified in the plan check process.

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

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh regarding the Conceptual Plan if the air conditioning / heating equipment is located inside in the attics of the Building and not wanting to see something on the roof of the Building later on and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded there are COAs requiring the screening of ground / roof mounted equipment in place and Staff will work with the Applicant along with the City's Landscape Architect during the plan check process to ensure the lighting is screened and Staff does not anticipate any roof-mounted equipment based on the proposed roof design.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any further questions of Staff. Hearing none, he then opened the Public Hearing and asked if the Applicant would like to make a presentation.

Mr. Greg Elmore, of the Lenity Group, 471 High Street SE, Suite 10, Salem, Oregon, who is the Applicant's Representative, addressed the Commission. He distributed a Color Brochure to the Commission and how he has had several meetings with Assistant Planner Kelleher and understands the majority of the COAs and does not have any problems with them and indicated on their Site Plan, how the generator will be moved and will screen it. There are a couple of rooftop mechanical units that are located inside the Building so they don't have to face the inside slope and will not face the Building's exterior. He has looked at the neighbor's comments on the wall along the west side of the property and agreed with that COA. With regards to the COA along on the east side of the property, there have been discussions between the Applicant and the easterly

06-05-12.PC

property owner and how the easterly property owner wants a wall, but also wanting to keep as much vegetation as possible. A lot of the vegetation is also located on the Applicant's property and that the Applicant is trying to eliminate that wall so the neighbor can keep his vegetation and the Applicant and neighbor are trying to work out a compromise, out there at this point. Currently, there is a small existing retaining wall located there and is set away from the property line in order for the neighbor to keep his vegetation as best as possible and that is why the Applicant is trying to eliminate the easterly wall. With regards with the Median requirements, Mr. Elmore requested to leave open to work out with Engineering to come up with a safe solution for the residents / visitors of their Facility, as well as people traveling on Base Line. He does not have any objections that something needs to be located there and understands the Policies, but wants it safe for everyone. He did have some concerns with the traffic speed going up / down Base Line. He then explained the proposed Median design to the Commission and that it still needs to be reconfigured. Mr. Elmore explained that he is open for any questions the Commission may have and that the Applicant's Engineer and Financial Representative are also in the audience.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any questions of the Applicant / Representative.

A question was asked by Commissioner Haller regarding the easterly driveway and asked for further explanation regarding the Median.

Mr. Bud Thatcher, of Thatcher Engineering and Associates, 1461 Ford Street, Suite 105, Redlands, California, who is the Applicant's Engineer, addressed the Commission. He explained the COA for the Median goes across the property's frontage and stops short west of the easterly driveway and then would allow a person turn either left or right out of the easterly driveway. He was concerned if it gets too close to the driveway, it is too sharp of a turn out onto Base Line and he requested enough flexibility to work with Staff in order to push the nose of the driveway further west and would then allow a person come out of the driveway and possibly have an acceleration lane located in the Median and be able to enter into the westbound traffic. With the COA's language, it says, "to the east driveway" and that he reiterated that he is requesting to allow a little more flexibility and is willing to work with Staff to make it a safe exit out of the driveway, but he agrees with the COA. Commissioner Haller then thanked Mr. Thatcher.

06-05-12.PC

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Huynh regarding the six (6) handicap parking spaces for this particular use doesn't seem to be enough and Mr. Elmore responded that he has done quite a few of these projects and that six (6) is a good number for the Facility and that he does not have a problem with marking other spaces to be handicap spaces, but the spaces located in front are for visitors and the distant spaces will be whether they are for handicap or not, all of the spaces will be accessible size large enough to hold them and he does not think that he has a problem reviewing it, but never had run into a situation where there has been too few of handicap spaces and with this population / unit count, he reiterated that six (6) handicap spaces is a good number.

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Huynh that the Applicant has met the Code requirements, but he wanted to ask the question if there is a need or use for additional handicap spaces and Mr. Elmore responded that is a good question and it has come up in the past and based on the past Facilities that he has worked on, he reiterated that six (6) handicap spaces is a good number with four (4) located at the Main Entrance and two (2) at the other Entrance. Vice Chairman Huynh then thanked Mr. Elmore.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the Applicant is not proposing to mark handicap accessible parking spaces in addition to the six (6) spaces and Mr. Elmore responded in terms of the population and if there is a need for more of them, then they have done that in the past where they have come back in and marked a few and that is why there are 68 parking spaces, as opposed to 53 that are required and is good to have a few extra spaces if it is called for and is needed, it is not a problem to stripe a few more handicap spaces. Chairman Hamerly responded that the Applicant would lose one (1) out of three (3) spaces if the Applicant did the additional striping and Mr. Elmore said that is correct.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any further questions of the Applicant / Representative or Staff. Hearing none, he then asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on the Item.

Mr. Bart Groninger, 7357 Marigold Avenue, Highland, California, who is a resident, addressed the Commission. He thanked the Commission and his concerns was with the initial information and now he wanted clarification with the westerly wall located on Marigold Avenue and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded that is correct. Mr. Groninger asked about the location of the vinyl fencing and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded and displayed on the PowerPoint the locations of the existing vinyl fencing at the bottom of the hill (Base Line) and the existing three (3) block walls' location and what appears to be the original Tract fencing. Chairman Hamerly interjected and that is what is proposed to install a block wall. Mr. Groninger said behind his fence there is an

06-05-12.PC

easement and asked if the block wall is to be built on the Facility's side of the easement or on other side of the easement and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded the block wall would be installed on the property line between the two (2) property owners and based on the City's documentation, the easement was never formally recorded when the Tract was built. Mr. Groninger asked what Facilities fall under a Care Facility Zone and Community Development Director Jaquess responded the property is a Residentially Zoned Use for Single Family Homes and a Care Facility is permitted through a CUP process and if the Applicant proposes a different use other than a Care Facility, then the Applicant would have to return and amend the CUP. Mr. Groninger commented this type of Care Facility is supposed to house Alzheimer care and Elder care is the only business that can occupy that Facility, otherwise, there would need to be a new request and Community Development Director Jaquess responded if the Commission approves it tonight, that is correct. Mr. Groninger stated then a halfway house or a rehab center and Community Development Director Jaquess interjected that would not be permitted and Mr. Groninger said okay. Chairman Hamerly added for clarification that this is a modification to a previous approval for the CUP so it's not a brand new approval and that it is a modification to the mix that has already been approved for the Site. Mr. Groninger then thanked the Commission.

Mr. Damon Muldoon, 7333 Marigold Avenue, Highland, California, who is a resident, addressed the Commission. He also had concerns with the block wall, as well as with the lighting. Assistant Planner Kelleher responded there is a Photometric Plan that has been submitted by the Applicant and that the Applicant is in compliance with the Low Level Lighting Standards. The Applicant was proposing fifteen (15) or so tall mounted light standards, as shown on the PowerPoint. However, they are under a COA to remove those lighting standards and will be replaced with bollard lighting that is approximately three feet to four feet (3' – 4') in height and that would be the only lighting that would be on the Facility. Mr. Muldoon asked if there is landscaping along the block wall and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded affirmatively and that the Applicant has submitted the Landscape Plan and it has been reviewed.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly regarding the northern portion of the Landscape Plan that if the northern edge of the block wall will have trees and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded affirmatively and also explained that there will also be shrubs and groundcover.

Chairman Hamerly then asked if there was anyone else in the audience who would like to speak on the item. Hearing none, he left the Public Hearing open and then opened the floor for discussion amongst the Commissioners. He then asked the Commission if there was anything that needed to address the CUP first. Hearing none, he then asked about items needed to address the DRA on the Site Plan.

06-05-12.PC

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding the Site Plan, there is a retention basin located on the southern edge of the property and was concerned with the lack of landscaping between the parking area and the Building's edge. The angled driveway that has the Refuse Enclosure and then asked why the driveway was cut short and the feasibility of enlarging the private court yard and installing more landscaping and Mr. Elmore responded that area is an outdoor area. Chairman Hamerly responded the driveway is at a 45 degree angle and why not have the radius softer like how it is on the eastern side of the property in order to allow additional landscaping or a larger courtyard since that is the only outdoor facility that has a nice view to the south. Mr. Elmore responded that he didn't know, but that it might have something to do with grading and is also for a secondary entrance and trying to create an area in order to landscape behind the Refuse Area and if desiring a larger radius, he is unsure how the Trash Enclosure would fit, but can look into that. Chairman Hamerly indicated that Trash Enclosure can be relocated an additional fifteen feet to twenty feet (15' – 20') to the north to align with the curve that is located on the eastern edge of the Site and Mr. Elmore said okay.

Another question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the walkway that surrounds the basin is at the top of the slope and Mr. Elmore responded that is not going to be an accessible walkway, but will have maintenance ability to get into the walkway, but this will probably be a large, green open space / swale and that the Facility's residents will not use that walkway and explained the area and. Chairman Hamerly responded okay, then it does not have a steep slope on it and Mr. Elmore said no.

(Note: Commissioner Stoffel left the Chambers at 6:30p.m.)

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly regarding the lack of tree cover along the eastern property line and if the Applicant was viewing the tree cover on the property located to the east as being the existing screen and how the Applicant was going to use / preserve that with the alternate wall design and Mr. Elmore responded there is dense vegetation along the easterly property line and against the curb is a retaining wall and that the Applicant is trying to save as much as the neighbor's vegetation as he is asking the Applicant to save. Mr. Elmore further explained how the slope is heavily vegetated and is spilling onto the Applicant's property line. Once the vegetation is cut back and the Applicant sees what he has, he is not opposed to adding trees and if that is something that the Applicant wants to see, will add landscaping to that, as well.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly regarding the location of the added tree cover and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded the added tree cover would be located over the parking stalls themselves.

06-05-12.PC

Chairman Hamerly asked the Commission if there were any further questions regarding the Site Plan.

(Note: Commissioner Stoffel returned at 6:33p.m.)

Mr. Bud Thatcher addressed the Commission regarding the expanding the outside area is part of the Memory Care Facility and softening of the driveway curve radius in that the proposed driveway needs to be that size even if there was more room. The design was driven around the size of the court yard that the Applicant wanted and is a grading operational thing. Even if the curve was softened, there will be more landscaping on that side of the driveway, but will not enlarge the courtyard. In addition in trying to keep that angle, Mr. Thatcher is trying to minimize the amount fill and is about three feet (3') in the air on that driveway and the more radius there is, there is a one foot (1') of contour for every half cross-sectional width of the roadway and at the half-width out, will drop off one foot (1') farther sitting out over the hill and he then explained the soft transition around the Trash Enclosure. Mr. Thatcher stated that he preferred to leave the angle as is because of grading issues.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly since there isn't any parking right there, what would be the downside of providing more of a slope across the length of the curve and that he thought it was more of a four percent to six percent (4% - 6%) maximum slope and Mr. Thatcher responded that the Trash Enclosure is at three percent (3%) and is configured with the slope at 3:1 and if at 4:1, it encroaches over and he stated that he preferred to leave with the alignment. Chairman Hamerly responded that he is trying to get additional vegetation around the entire perimeter of the Building and he thought that seemed to be an easy solution in order to soften the Facade. Mr. Thatcher then thanked the Commission.

A question was asked by Commissioner Haller if the Applicant would comment on the water quality basin and slope stability and Project Manager Godfredsen responded about the modified Engineering COA No. 23 that was previously distributed and explained the modification with the slope stability. Commissioner Haller responded that he was concerned with slope stabilization / saturation / slough off.

Another question was asked by Commissioner Haller regarding if this is a percolation basin and will drain down or drain laterally and saturate the slope and Project Manager Godfredsen responded affirmatively and that is why for the added concrete barriers and that he can also discuss further with the Soils Engineer if the Commission desired and Commissioner Haller responded for him to consult with the Technical Engineer to ensure good slope stability for years to come and Project Manager Godfredsen responded that he would.

06-05-12.PC

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if Staff would foresee in lining the bottom of the basin as an additional measure or wanting the percolation and Project Manager Godfredsen responded the basin is an infiltration basin.

Another question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if an eight foot (8') deep barrier would mitigate that to the satisfaction of Staff and Project Manager Godfredsen responded to the satisfaction of Staff and that Staff will ask the Developer's Technical Engineer to get on it and Chairman Hamerly said okay and Commissioner Haller then thanked Project Manager Godfredsen.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding the Building Elevations regarding the long East / West Façades in that he is disappointed with lack of relief with the long East / West Façades and that the Applicant needs to have differentiation of the different areas of the Building. There are a couple of Tower Elements; couple of gables that there are long interrupted long runs of windows that appear that they have no trim or anything around them and if the Applicant had any alternatives to break up the Facades, especially the East / West Facades horizontally. Mr. Elmore responded for the Commission to look at the Color Brochure that was distributed earlier on the fourth from the last page of the Brochure. He explained that there is a considerable slope on Base Line with the design layout of breaking up the Buildings with the single-story Building, then a two-story Building, then again back down with a single-story Building and how the articulation in the architecture breaks up the long Building nicely and will have stucco along certain areas, with stucco trim pieces around the windows and does not know what else to offer, at this point.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly how he is seeing the relief perspectives for the first time and that the window treatment is fairly shallow and needs to have architectural elements the Applicant would consider adding to that i.e. awnings, trellis feature or something to break it up and indicated from the details that have been given, these look like fairly commercial, very thin mullioned window units that does not have a lot of architectural detail to them so that means that the Building itself will have to articulate those openings and realizes that it is the nature of the Facility, but that he wants something to break that up with either some vertical elements that are more pronounced or differentiation of materials between the first and second floor in order to soften the Facility. Mr. Elmore responded that on some of the Facilities similar to this Facility in the past, have installed wood trellis that is four feet (4') deep set on two (2) posts and that is eight feet to twelve feet (8' – 12') wide and span over two (2) window base and indicated that those kind of details are achievable and that he would talk with the property owner. With the West Façade he would prefer not to have awnings and because of it being a maintenance issue and not wanting to deal with and he preferred wooden trellis that he could look at and some sort of a detail that would match the Covered Drop Off the details in front of the Building with an open timber-type trellis.

06-05-12.PC

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the Applicant is going for a Craftsman look and how the color palette is going in that direction and Mr. Elmore responded there are some Craftsman Elements, but more like a Southwestern Desert theme.

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Huynh that he agreed with Chairman Hamerly's comments for the Applicant to look at trellis / awning elements and the proposed Facility is plain and has an school / institutional look is boring to look at and the Applicant needs to dress up the Facility, especially the West Facade. The Facility is being called a residential design and the Facility needs more residential architectural features and Mr. Elmore responded okay.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that the Facility is in a single family residential area and needs to maintain a residential scale / detail in order to soften the Facility. The Site is a narrow and deep Site and will mitigate the concerns of the Building mass. Detail / scale of the Main Entry Portico, soften the Facades along the East / West Façade and encouraged for the Applicant to look at trellis elements, introduce some corbels or outriggers at the gable ends because it is within that architectural character style. Maybe expanding the use of stone at a couple of the areas as a base element where a person stepped down through to the slope and that would give the Applicant that mass / anchor that some of the taller elements and that it would also break up the vertical element and there are a lot of different ways the Applicant could look at this and encouraged the Applicant to get together with his Design Team and start to look at ways to soften it and bring the scale down. Mr. Elmore responded sure and appreciated the constructive criticism and with the step downs. The Elevations don't do as much justice as even the perspectives that the Applicant has. There are a lot of retaining walls that step down and this Building has several steps that occur as you go through the Facility. A lot of the Elevations will be broken up by the retaining walls and the railings and with the perspectives. Mr. Elmore does not have any issues with looking at some of the architectural features so the scale can be brought down and he then thanked the Commission.

Chairman Hamerly asked the Commission if there were any further questions on the Exterior Elevations and that the Public Hearing is still open.

A question was asked by Commissioner Stoffel if there was a fireplace in the front and Mr. Elmore responded affirmatively.

Ms. Jan Martin, resides on Patterson Court, Highland, California, who is a resident, addressed the Commission. She said that her back yard is going to run along side of the Project. She asked who will maintain the hillside that is all weeds right now all the time or is it going to stay that way and Chairman Hamerly

06-05-12.PC

responded that it will have to be fully landscaped. Ms. Martin responded how she had moved here two (2) years ago and if I had known this Facility was going to be built right outside my back yard, I would have never bought my house. She was concerned and said that we are asking for a lot of trouble with trucks and traffic circulation on Base Line.

Chairman Hamerly asked if anyone else would like to speak on the item. Hearing none, he then closed the Public Hearing and opened the floor for discussion amongst the Commissioners.

A question was asked by Commissioner Haller regarding Engineering COA No. 14 regarding the Median in order to allow flexibility for the Applicant. City Engineer Wong responded that Staff would recommend to leave the proposed COA as is and that the Applicant is asking for design consideration for the Median and will be considered at the Final Engineering Stage and Staff is not recommending that Staff is making any commitments to change to the COA. Commissioner Haller then thanked City Engineer Wong.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if there is no specific hard location for the eastern most extremity of the Median and City Engineer Wong responded that the current COA requires the Median will be built on the west side of the easterly driveway up to Marigold Drive and then he explained the Applicant's Median design request to the Commission and indicated that Staff is concerned with the details and cannot commit at this time. Assistant Planner Kelleher added that the Median design and landscaping will be back to the Commission for further consideration.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if a Traffic Analysis or Line-of-Sight Study would be available when the Project returns to the Commission for consideration and City Engineer Wong responded affirmatively.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding the process of the Commission's action on the First Motion amending the CUP and then the Commendation take action with a Second Motion on the DRA if the Commission wants to see additional information come back on the Building Elevations and Community Development Director Jaquess said sure and Assistant Planner Kelleher added that Staff will work with the Applicant regarding the trellis and Chairman Hamerly responded that he would like to see them.

A comment was made by Community Development Director Jaquess that Staff felt comfortable with the Commission having two (2) separate Motions and Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission was in concurrence and the Commission responded affirmatively.

06-05-12.PC

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

A Motion was made by Commissioner Haller and seconded by Vice Chairman Huynh that the Planning Commission Approve Resolution No. 12-008 amending Conditional Use Permit (CUP 007-014) for a Planned Development Document and with the amended Engineering COA No. 23, as distributed by Staff.

Discussion ensued between the Commission, Mr. Thatcher and Staff.

A question was asked by Assistant Planner Kelleher regarding clarification / addressing Planning COA on the easterly wall if the Commission is acceptable with Staff's recommendation for the seven (7) parcels or so located to the north of the existing block walls and then remove Planning COA No. 54 which is located on Page 24 of the Staff Report and if so, Staff has added revised recommended language for the Commission to consider.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly how the Applicant is continuing to work with the property owner to the east in order to preserve the vegetation and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded on Planning COA No. 54, as it stands today, the Applicant is required to construct a block wall and recommended by removing the easterly block wall, strike out "easterly decorative block wall" and in terms of the westerly wall, include clarification westerly property lines inclusive of the six (6) or seven (7) most northern parcels and that Staff will also include the Assessor Parcel Numbers of said parcels.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly then strike the word, "easterly" on COA No. 54 and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded then strike the word, "easterly" and include "westerly property lines inclusive of the six (6) most northern most parcels and will include the Assessor Parcel Numbers" and Chairman Hamerly reiterated Assistant Planner Kelleher's recommendation to the Commission.

A question was asked by Commissioner Haller for clarification, what is there right now in terms of fencing on the east side and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded and explained the historical background of the original Tract boundary fencing to the Commission.

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa when he went to look at the property Site, it looks like chain link fencing with foliage overgrown on it.

06-05-12.PC

A question was asked by Commissioner Haller if the fencing was the full length of the property and Assistant Planner Kelleher explained the location on the displayed PowerPoint and Commissioner Haller responded this is a little different with not having a fence around the Project property. Chairman Hamerly responded apparently, there is going to be a retaining wall for a portion of it and then having a fence on top of the retaining wall for safety and Assistant Planner Kelleher explained about the existing retaining wall.

A comment was made by Commissioner Haller that it is only two feet to two and one-half feet (2' – 2'6") and Chairman Hamerly said right and Commissioner Haller added that he is supportive with the concept, but wants to ensure with the easterly property line and that it appears that there will be a section that will have no fencing at all and is unhappy with that.

A question was asked by Commissioner Gamboa about what is located from Base Line to the edge of the retaining wall and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded there is existing chain link fencing with overgrown vegetation on it.

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa from the point of the chain link fencing to the south there is nothing and asked if block wall would be installed there and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded nothing has been proposed.

A question was asked by Commissioner Stoffel there is nothing above the newer home Tract down there that there is nothing and Chairman Hamerly responded passed the south edge and Assistant Planner Kelleher displayed the location on the PowerPoint where the proposed wall is located and explained the Applicant's request to the Commission.

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa that he is not concerned with the westerly edge, but he is concerned with the easterly side and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded on the rest of the property, there is no other fencing proposed by the Applicant.

Mr. Thatcher distributed photographs to the Commission showing the dense foliage on the chain link fencing.

A question was asked by Commissioner Haller does the chain link fencing runs the full length and Mr. Thatcher responded affirmatively and how it is a huge privacy screen.

A question was asked by Commissioner Gamboa of the end of the foliage down to the southern tip of the filtration area will be wide open and was displayed on the PowerPoint and he thought that a block wall would be added from the edge of the vegetation to the southerly tip and if there is no fencing passed the foliage,

06-05-12.PC

that area will be wide open and Chairman Hamerly responded with Planning COA No. 54 that it would run the length of the east / west property lines.

A comment was made by Commissioner Stoffel how that area curves down there along the eastern end and Chairman Hamerly responded there should at least be a fence and Vice Chairman Huynh responded affirmatively, that there should be some type of fencing. Chairman Hamerly said if we just say fencing, then it does leave it up to the Applicant's discretion. Commissioner Haller responded that maybe it should have fencing and suggested wrought iron fencing and Chairman Hamerly suggested could also be vinyl or chain link fencing. It implies that there is fencing there, but if there is another COA that he is not recalling. Assistant Planner Kelleher responded the fencing comment that the Commission is noting there, as if the Applicant is install fencing along the southern parking lot and the Mitigation Measure and he then explained how the Planning COA was initially written was for a block wall along the easterly property line from Base Line all the way up to the toe of slope and from both on the easterly and westerly sides and along the southern property line, and if the Applicant so desired to install fencing, then that fencing would be view type fencing and there was no action requirement for the Applicant to do fencing along the southerly property line.

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa that he agrees with no block wall fencing with foliage because it is big enough that no one can get through it, but from the foliage down to the southern tip, need to install either wrought iron or a block wall and need to put that in the COA now and not come back at a certain time.

A question was asked by Commissioner Stoffel what happens then to the easterly property owner decides if some day he cleans up all that foliage and in the future he sells his property and there is only a chain link fence there and Commissioner Haller concurred and then asked what about to the south and Commissioner Gamboa responded that there would be with wrought iron fencing from the foliage area down to the southern tip and Chairman Hamerly added view type fencing. Commissioner Gamboa added with that future property owner to the east, and then it would be up to the property owner to change the fencing. A question was asked by Commissioner Stoffel where would the fence actually go and placing a fence up mid-hill and Assistant Planner Kelleher added the fencing would be on the property line and installed at the top of the slope.

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa so along the southerly tip, there is block wall behind the houses and then from the edge of the foliage to the block wall and suggested to add wrought iron fencing to the southern tip for the Establishment.

06-05-12.PC

A question was asked by Commissioner Stoffel what does the Applicant think and Mr. Thatcher responded that the Project is not a fenced project and that it was not their intention to gate or fence this Project and it is not fenced in front across the frontage and it is an open 24 hour Facility. There is no fence of any kind on the slope on the south end and was going to be open and no fencing on the east / southeast corner where the neighbor's fence stops and we were going to leave that open. It is not a secured Site, and have no intentions of trying to create a secure Site with a fence around the property, but to leave the Site open and Commissioner Gamboa said that he is talking about the block wall on the westerly side.

Mr. Thatcher responded that he believes that the block wall on the west side that makes sense, because residential homes backing up and there is older fencing and is a mismatch of fencing. It makes sense to continue the block wall for the six (6) parcels on the west side and on the east side, it is different. He then explained the landscaping to the Commission and the retaining wall design and then suggested / requested a modification to the COA to require the Applicant to extend the block wall on the west side behind the six (6) lots and do nothing on the east or south side. Chairman Hamerly responded that is why deleting and modifying Planning COA No. 54 that it and will accommodate the property owner to the east in order to preserve the vegetation. Commissioner Gamboa added that he is not trying to make the Facility a secured Site, but ensure a division between the properties, unless there is not a problem with the property owner on the east side, then that's fine.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that it seems to be that the easterly property owner and the Applicant seemed to be willing to have some kind of a fence up. If the property was to be enclosed, then it would be between the property owners and Commissioner Gamboa responded that he is used to enclosing properties and not wanting to have the Application come back and Chairman Hamerly said how both property owners don't want it.

A Motion was made by Commissioner Haller to amend his Motion and Vice Chairman Huynh amended his second to approve CUP 007-014 to include the modified Planning COA No. 54, as read by Staff.

Motion unanimously passed on a 7 – 0 vote.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that he would like to see more information on the Building Elevations, or if the Commission wishes and feel comfortable in taking his comments and take as Directives and Staff work with the Applicant, he will let the Commission dictate this and reiterated how the

06-05-12.PC

Commission feel about re-reviewing the Building Elevations or does the Commission trust Staff to resolve the issues with the Applicant. Commissioner Willhite responded to trust Staff and Commissioner Haller added that's fine. Community Development Director Jaquess added that Staff is comfortable with taking the Commission's trust, as long as Staff knows what the Commission wants to happen. If the Commission's focus is on the trellis design, etc. he believed that Staff understands and Chairman Hamerly responded that the trellis is one strategy and there were several ideas given in order to break up along horizontal unarticulated windows, change the materials, have more decoration and gables, try to pull out some of the Craftsman influence, whatever is felt is to be appropriate. Community Development Director Jaquess responded that he understands that, but wants to ensure the Commission's trust is not misplaced because Staff does not understand exactly what the Commission wants.

A question was asked by Commissioner Gamboa if Staff understands that and both City Planner Mainez and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded affirmatively.

Chairman Hamerly then stated that the Commission will let Staff take that as Directive(s) as it dictates and work with the Applicant and then called for the question of the DRA Application.

A Motion was made by Commissioner Haller and seconded by Commission Gamboa Approving Design Review Application (DRA-012-004) including Site Plan, Preliminary Grading Plan, Tree Survey, Typical Building Elevations, Planting Plan (Conceptual Landscape Plan), and Photometric Plan subject to the Conditions of Approval, as modified with the following:

Planning COA

- ~~54. (NS) The Applicant shall be required to construct a decorative block perimeter wall along the length of the easterly and westerly property lines. Any fencing along the southerly top of slope shall be view type fencing, as approved by the Planning Commission.~~
54. (NS) The Applicant shall be required to construct a decorative block perimeter wall along the property line of Assessor Parcel Numbers: 1201-211-01; 1201-211-02; 1201-211-03; 1201-211-12; 1201-211-05 and 1201-211-06. Any fencing along the southerly top of slope shall be view type fencing, as approved by the Planning Commission.

06-05-12.PC

Engineering COA

23. Install Site design BMP's including, but not limited to, draining roof drains directly to landscaped areas, draining landscaped areas directly to the infiltration basin via a private underground drainage system, and vegetated swales in landscaped areas. Install an infiltration basin to comply with treatment control BMP requirements. Construct an eight foot (8') deep concrete barrier along the southerly and westerly perimeter of the basin to prevent potential damage to the adjacent slope during periods of heavy rain due to flows caused by burrowing animals and seepage from the water in the basin infiltrating into the adjacent soil. Alternate Site design and treatment control BMPs which are equally effect may be submitted for review and approval by the City Engineer.

and Findings of Fact.

Motion unanimously passed on a 7 – 0 vote.

(Note: Assistant Planner Kelleher left the Chambers at 7:12pm)

- 6.2 Amendments to the City's Land Use and Development Code Amending the City's Official Zoning Map to incorporate a new Special District called "Civic Center Zoning District" (CC) within the Town Center Policy Area (ZCO-012-01), and Amending the City Land Use and Development Code (Title 16) adopting new Civic Center Zoning District Development Standards (MCA 012-001) all in accordance with the City's 2006 General Plan Land Use and Community Design Elements (Chapters 2 and 10). Concurrent Approval includes Design Review Application (DRA 011-008) for the City's New Fire Station No. 1 (First Phase) which includes a 16,107 square foot four (4) Bay Fire Station Facility, 1,152 square foot detached Storage Building, and twenty-five (25) Standard Parking Stalls, and fifteen (15) Secured Parking Lot Facility for City vehicles, and approximately 37,000 square feet of landscaping / open space. The Project is located at 27215 Base Line (City Hall) and 27177 Base Line (westerly and contiguous to the Highland City Hall Facility – previously the Highland Branch Library and Post Office) (APNs: 1192-421-01, 1192-421-02, 1192-421-03 1192-421-08, 1192-421-12, 1192-421-39) Representatives: Joseph A. Hughes, City Manager and GV Salts, Architect (STK Architects, Inc.)

Chairman Hamerly identified the Item and asked for Staff's presentation.

City Planner Mainez gave a brief overview from the Staff Report and indicated that the Applicant and the Applicant's Representative are in the audience and introduced other City Staff members in the audience. He gave a brief historical

06-05-12.PC

background to the Commission inclusive of the City now not having RDA funds, liquidation of assets, and the City Council directed Staff by Rezoning the six (6) parcels around City Hall to be called a Civic Center Zone and explained how it would help the City acquire a favorable and reasonable appraisal for Civic Center uses and added how City Attorney Craig Steele commented and inserted the phrase, "this was for the benefit of the public". He then gave Staff's recommendations to the Commission which would then become the Commission's recommendation to the City Council. He added that the property includes five (5) parcels and not six (6) like it is stated in the Staff Report and that the southern part of that area was inadvertently added which should not have been and should remain residential and will make that correction before this goes to City Council. Community Development Director Jaquess added that the parcel is the 0.05 acre parcel and will drop off and is the last APN with 1192-421-12.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the Commission had any questions of Staff for the proposed Zone Change. Hearing none, he called for further Staff presentation.

Mr. GV Salts, Architect, of STK Architects, 42095 Zevo Drive, Temecula, California, who is the City's Representative, addressed the Commission. He gave the presentation from the Staff Report and PowerPoint presentation, inclusive of a historical background of the Project and Historical Elevations of Fire Stations, as well as detailed Building Elevations and layout design, colors and materials to be used, Street Elevations on Base Line, landscaping, parking areas, etc. He explained the detailed perspectives to the Commission and indicated the Project would have a historical design look, but with having modern conveniences.

Mr. Tony Finaldi, who is also a STK Representative, addressed the Commission. He displayed and explained the proposed Floor Plan with the PowerPoint presentation and had distributed the Materials Board to the Commission for review.

A question was asked by Commissioner Sparks if there were bicycle racks proposed and what about motorcycle parking space(s) and City Planner Mainez responded there is parking for four to five (4 – 5) bicycles, but no motorcycle parking, but will address motorcycle spaces.

Another question was asked by Commissioner Sparks if there will be a light indicating that when an emergency vehicle is exiting the building, besides the siren, in terms of traffic, is there some kind of light indicating to the traffic flow that there is an emergency vehicle is coming and Administrative Analyst Rissmiller responded how the Project had gone through the Public Safety Subcommittee and indicated that it would with the traffic signal located on Base Line that may not be needed currently at this time, but sometime in the future.

06-05-12.PC

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh about the fuel for the trucks and Administrative Analyst Rissmiller responded there is diesel fuel now at the new Police Station and if the Police Station is out / unavailable, the trucks would be able to obtain fuel at a local gas station and explained why there is no fueling station located at the proposed Fire Station.

Another question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh regarding the design of the Front Entrance if someone at 11:00p.m. could ring the doorbell and Fire Department Personnel would answer and Administrative Analyst Rissmiller responded affirmatively.

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh if there were electrical vehicle stations locations proposed and City Planner Mainez responded no. Mr. Finaldi added that the Project is a LEED Project and that there will be a bicycle rack and will having parking with low emission parking and will have to think about providing electrical vehicle stations. Vice Chairman Huynh responded to incorporate with the Project design now and is harder to add at a later date and Mr. Finaldi reiterated that they are thinking about that.

Another question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh if the parking in back is part of Phase 1 and Administrative Analyst Rissmiller responded that is correct and will be approximately fifteen (15) spaces and overflow parking design. Both Community Development Director Jaquess and Administrative Analyst Rissmiller said the parking would be for unsecured City vehicles.

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh provided a scenario if there is a monthly meeting with the Battalion Chief and he brings the Fire Truck, he was wondering if six (6) Fire Trucks would show up at the same time and was concerned with the parking and circulation of them. Administrative Analyst Rissmiller responded that the City owns a total of six (6) Fire Engines and that the Apparatus Bay will house five (5) of them inside because it is built to the length of a Ladder Truck (seventy-five feet [75']) and tried to consider fifteen (15) years in the future what would be needed at that time for the Facility. In addition, there will be additional parking in the back on gravel in Phase 2. Vice Chairman Huynh then thanked Administrative Analyst Rissmiller.

A question was asked by Commissioner Haller what is a hose ramp and Administrative Analyst Rissmiller responded it is a ramp that is approximately eight inches (8") off the ground and is angled up to fifty feet to sixty feet (50' - 60') in length to dry out the fire hoses after they are cleaned.

06-05-12.PC

Another question was asked by Commissioner Haller how the ratio was done for the female / male areas. Administrative Analysts Rissmiller responded there are potential needs and the number of emergency personnel staffing the emergency vehicles and was ensured that there are enough rooms with two (2) beds in each room to either split up or double people up as needed to meet those kinds of issues. Mr. Finaldi said the ratio is usually not more than half and half, but usually the ratio is 2/3 male and 1/3 female and Mr. Salts added that it is a 70 – 30 split. Commissioner Haller then thanked them.

A question was asked by Commissioner Gamboa regarding the Day Room Area and if there could be an exit to the Patio Area and recommended to have double doors installed for better access from the Day Room / Kitchen Area to the Patio Area and Mr. Salts responded that he could do that Administrative Analyst Rissmiller had already talked about installing double doors and added that the double doors is a legal exit, but a sliding door is not. Mr. Finaldi added Battalion Chief Veik also wants to add a set of double doors. Administrative Analyst Rissmiller added that Battalion Chief Veik he would prefer not to have a sliding glass door in order to avoid potential of a young child that may be there running into that and preferred a double set of doors.

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh regarding if there is a Building Code requirement for the Facility to be an Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and Administrative Analyst Rissmiller responded that the City could have three EOCs. The main one is located in the new Police Station and that the Training Area or Apparatus Area could also be used as an EOC. There is a Mobile Communication Center located outside and could be hooked up outside the Building for water / sewer /electrical to be self sufficient.

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa that the Architect did a very nice job and Mr. Salts said thank you.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly how the Project has incorporated the historic references within a more contemporary format and is articulated and was nicely presented. He then asked about if there will be an impact with the Base Line Corridor Landscape Plan with a break in the pattern of street trees, signage, kiosks, etc. Community Development Director Jaquess responded there will be no Median in front of the Fire Station and that the Base Line Landscaping Plan there will be street trees, but not located in the driveway. Chairman Hamerly asked there will be no street trees along the entire frontage of the parcel and City Planner Mainez said that is correct. Chairman Hamerly said that Base Line is the primary corridor for the City and Mr. Finaldi said that they can be added, but not with the driveway area and Mr. Salts interjected then that would impede the view for the safety of the Fire Engine.

06-05-12.PC

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly with the absence of Parkway space along the frontage of the property and if there would be a substantial streetscape break along the entire Civic Center street (Base Line) and what accommodations would be made on the opposite side of the street, or along the south side of Base Line and how enhance the Vision Statement and achieve the objectives on the Base Line Corridor. Community Development Director Jaquess responded the trees in front of the City Hall / Parkway that will be located in front of the commercial property, but behind the sidewalk. There are existing palm trees and shade trees, but they won't be in front of the Fire Station.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that he is concerned that there is a lack of landscaping. It is basically concrete, asphalt, Building, but no substance to soften it and creates a more pedestrian-friendly landscape. Mr. Finaldi responded that there are palm trees located there and the concept is street massing and the Project is a tall Building. Chairman Hamerly responded that is why that he brought that up and explained the Vision Statement and General Plan was to create a pedestrian-friendly pedestrian-scaled walking experiences to encourage pedestrian activity and Mr. Finaldi said that the scale of the Building breaks it up and then provided examples to the Commission.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly there is no argument with the architecture, and need to see where we go from here from a landscape standpoint because there isn't a lot of opportunity for landscaping because of it being such a functional space. Community Development Director Jaquess stated there is intense landscaping in front and there are existing five (5) palm trees and Mr. Salts added to also install natural boulders in front in order to dress up the area and there will be flag poles, lighting and fan palms.

A question was asked by Commissioner Stoffel if the landscape area size is significant and Mr. Finaldi responded that there is fifty percent (50%) landscaping.

City Engineer Wong explained Engineering COA No. 12 on Page 101 of the Staff Report to the Commission regarding the existing walkway could be removed and put closer to the property line creating a landscape space between the curb / sidewalk and the proposed walkway would be eliminated so that the landscaping can be expanded for a larger landscaped area and will have more landscaping street trees, etc.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the Phased Project and there is a COA indicating if the Phased Project is not currently developed, that it must be landscaped and provided examples with In N Out Burgers, Chevron properties had installed grasses / meadow flowers in the interim. He then asked what about not having gravel located in the Phase 2 parking area and Administrative Analyst Rissmiller responded that area could be an auxiliary parking area.

06-05-12.PC

A question was asked by City Planner Mainez if trucks could park there at the same time and Administrative Analyst Rissmiller responded that he is hesitant to say that they could be and that other than the fifteen (15) or so City vehicles within the fenced in areas will have gravel with exception with the water quality basin.

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh regarding Tree Planting and High Risk Fuel Modification Education and if there could be a reserve area location where this could be installed with volunteers for students as an educational display and Administrative Analyst Rissmiller responded he could look into that and will work with Cal Fire regarding the Fuel Modification Education.

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Huynh regarding look at Frontier Building located at Rancho Cucamonga Valley Water District and combine Green Building and Fuel Modification Education would be great and Chairman Hamerly added that would also add additional LEED Points there as a garden facility. Mr. Finaldi responded that gravel is over impervious paving.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any further questions of the Applicant, his Representative or Staff. Hearing none, he then asked if there was anyone in the audience who would like to speak on the item.

Ms. Pat Coffee, 7394 Central Avenue, Highland, California, who is a resident, addressed the Commission. She asked about the Zoning Designation and RDA dissolution and if that would involve Special District Taxation and required Assessments. Are we going to be taxed for the Fire Station and its geographical location. Chairman Hamerly responded that the Zone Change Designation is for five (5) parcels. City Planner Mainez added there were two (2) separate Notices one for was Design Review and the other for the Zone Change. Community Development Director Jaquess added regarding the Special District issue, the City is creating a new Zoning Designation for the five (5) parcels and not a Special District for taxing purposes.

A question was asked by Ms. Coffee regarding what about the RDA funding for the Fire Station and Civic Center District and Community Development Director Jaquess responded that the only thing that is being planned right now is a new Fire Station and, at this time, RDA funding does not exist in order to build the Fire Station, and the Fire Station will be built when the City can find the funds to do that; possibly with Development Impact Fees, Grants, etc. Ms. Coffee then thanked everyone.

06-05-12.PC

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh regarding if there was RDA funding for the new Police Station and Community Development Director Jaquess responded largely funded under RDA funds, and there were some Grants and was not timely to do a Civic Center District at that time, but it is timely now because the City trying to set a focal point for the public ownership of land and makes the land Zoned just for those purposes..

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding consolidating a contiguous block and City Planner Mainez responded the Zoning for the Police Station was Public Quasi / Public.

A question was asked by Commissioner Stoffel regarding the building across the street from City Hall and being placed in a Landscape Maintenance District (LMD) and if the City would have to also pay money for the LMD and Community Development Director Jaquess responded that the City would have to maintain the property in front of City Hall and that the public dollars are waived right now Chairman Hamerly stated that Commissioner Stoffel's question was more about the Base Line Median with either they improve it or go in lieu of and Community Development Director Jaquess responded there is not a Median located in front of the proposed Fire Station and will not require maintenance there.

Chairman Hamerly asked if anyone else would like to speak on the item. Seeing none, and there being no further questions of the Applicant or his Representative, or Staff, or discussion amongst the Commissioners, he then closed the Public Hearing and called for the question and indicated the Commission would have two (2) recommendations.

A Motion was made by Commissioner Haller and seconded by Commissioner Stoffel that the Planning Commission approve Resolution No. 12-009 recommending the City Council approve the following:

1. Determine the Negative Declaration is the appropriate environmental document for the proposed Zoning Map Amendment, and Land Use and Development Code Amendments (ENV-012-006);
2. Introduce an Ordinance to Amend the City's Official Zoning Map to incorporate a new "Civic Center Zoning District" within the Town Center Policy Area (ZCO-012-001), and;
3. Introduce an Ordinance Amending the City's Land Use and Development Code (Title 16) to include new Civic Center Zoning District Development Standards (MCA-012-001).

Motion unanimously passed on a 7 – 0 vote.

06-05-12.PC

A Motion was made by Vice Chairman Huynh and seconded by Commissioner Sparks approve the following City's Design Review Application for the future Fire Station No. 1 Facility (DRA-011-008):

1. The Site Plan / Plot Plan;
2. The Conceptual Grading Plan;
3. The Preliminary Planting Plan;
4. The Exterior Elevations and Material Sample Board for the City's "New Fire Station No. 1", all subject to the Conditions of Approval;
5. Approve the Design Review Findings of Fact, and;
6. Determine that the construction of the City's new Fire Station No. 1 is consistent with the City's General Plan in accordance with Government Code Section 65401.

Motion unanimously passed on a 7 – 0 vote.

A comment was made by Commissioner Haller that he applauded the City for a LEED Certification on the Building and commended the Staff for having the vision to do so and good work on that.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that it is overall, a very nice Project and well done.

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa good job.

7.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS

Community Development Director Jaquess explained the Items tentatively scheduled for the Regular Meeting for June 19, 2012.

8.0 ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chairman Hamerly declared the Meeting adjourned at 8:07p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Linda McKeough, Community Development
Administrative Assistant III

Randall Hamerly, Chairman
Planning Commission

06-05-12.PC