

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
September 20, 2022 – 6:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Highland was called to order at 6:05 p.m. by Chair Hamerly at the Donahue Council Chambers, 27215 Base Line, Highland, California.

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

Absent:	Vice Chair	Chandra Thomas
---------	------------	----------------

Staff Present:	Lawrence Mainez, Community Development Director
	Kim Stater, Assistant Community Development Director
	Ash Syed, Associate Planner
	Matt Bennett, Assistant Public Works Director
	Matt Wirz, Building Official
	Shannon Wisniewski, Administrative Assistant III
	Scott Rice, City Landscape Architect

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Hamerly.

COMMUNITY INPUT (ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA)

None.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Minutes from the September 6, 2022 Regular Meeting.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Sutorus, to approve the minutes as amended. Motion carried, 3-1-1, with Commissioner Amaya being absent and Vice Chair Thomas being absent.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. A One-Year Extension of Time (EXT 22-002) for Conditional Use Permit (CUP 17-003) and Design Review Application (DRA 18-005) to accommodate a 33,775 square foot expansion of an existing self-storage facility.

Chair Hamerly recused himself from this agenda item because he previously rented a storage unit in this facility.

Associate Planner Syed presented the staff report.

Commissioner Amaya asked if this was the last Extension of Time (EOT) they can apply for?

Associate Planner Syed stated no, eligible for one more EOT.

Commissioner Amaya asked are the delays due to the permitting or does it take time to construct?

Associate Planner Syed stated it takes time to construct and find a tenant.

Applicant Aysar Helo stated the reason it was delayed is because of the parcel map which took forever to complete, and we just had it recorded 2 months ago and prior to that we were not able to do anything.

Commissioner Miller asked when will you be able to progress forward on the project?

Aysar Helo stated we are working with the city staff right now.

Commissioner Miller asked do you think this extension will be adequate enough to meet your needs?

Aysar Helo stated that he might need one more extension.

Commissioner Miller opened the public hearing.

Commissioner Miller closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Amaya, seconded by Sutorus, to adopt Resolution No. 2022-030 approving a one (1) year Extension of Time (EXT-22-002), subject to the Conditions of Approval and Findings of Fact. Motion carried, 3-0-1, with Chair Hamerly abstaining and Vice Chair Thomas being absent.

RESOLUTION NO. 2022-030

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND APPROVING A ONE (1) EXTENSION OF TIME (EXT 22-002) FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP 17-003) AND DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION (DRA 18-005), TO ACCOMMODATE A 33,775 SQUARE FOOT EXPANSION OF AN EXISTING SELF-STORAGE FACILITY LOCATED AT 28031 AND 28099 GREENSPOT ROAD, HIGHLAND CA 92346.

3. Conditional Use Permit (CUP 22-003) to permit the development of a 90,532 square foot warehouse and associated improvements, Design Review Application (DRA 22-008) for the Site Plan, Building Elevations, Grading Plan and Conceptual Landscape Plan, Tentative Parcel Map (TPM 22-009) to combine four (4) parcels into one (1), and Variance (VAR 22-003) allowing the warehouse building to exceed the maximum building height permitted in the Business Park Zone by fourteen (14) feet.

Associate Planner Syed presented the staff report.

Commissioner Amaya stated I drove to the site and there is a chain link fence around the entire lot off 6th Street, will there be demolition on all four parcels?

Associate Planner Syed stated yes, all four parcels.

Commissioner Miller asked are all the surrounding areas designated as Industrial/Business Park (BP) for the existing General Plan?

Associate Planner Syed stated yes, to the north, south, and east are all BP which are considered as legal nonconforming residences and to the west across Grape Street is zoned for R1 single family.

Chair Hamerly asked is that only the area that is north of that arrow? (Pointing to the PowerPoint presented) My understanding was BP went down to 6th Street along the corridor.

Associate Planner Syed stated on page 301 it states the zoning designations for that area, the entire western side of Grape Street is zoned for R1 single family.

Chair Hamerly stated regarding the issue of the Variance on page 147 of the staff report for the findings of fact, item 6E, just a point of clarification the basis for the starting point of the calculation that establishes the 43 feet was based on the volume needed to successfully build a warehouse. The way the response is written states the granting of the variance for an additional 14 feet of building height will increase the overall cubic volume of the building. That doesn't read correctly, the roof is basically level, it is the parapet that is increasing another six feet. The variance to establish an 8-foot height increase was necessary for the minimum performance standards needed for the warehouse, but the additional 6 feet for the parapet wasn't based on a volume requirement. My concern is the response is addressing the overall height of 14 feet instead of the 43 feet.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated we can modify the findings.

Chair Hamerly opened the public hearing.

Applicant Kevin Rice declined to present a presentation.

Chair Hamerly asked any comments on the site plan?

Commissioner Amaya asked is that wall on west of Grape Street 10 feet?

Associate Planner Syed stated the Applicants architect stated that there is no fence on the west side.

Chair Hamerly stated immediately to the west of the office portion of the building the southwest corner looks like there's a switch back ramp that goes up there. I guess it's a design issue, however I was wondering if there were alternatives that were considered as opposed to having three switchbacks filling in the space between the street right of way and the edge of building at that location?

Representative Kevin Alcantra stated that is why we placed it there, we did not want to place it on our site to take up too much parking space because we are already requesting a variance. If we could take out another four parking spots to put that ramp on site, we're comfortable with the amount of parking to be sufficient.

Chair Hamerly stated I was looking for alternative paths through there. If we went farther to the north, came up and then ran it along the building or offset from the building it would make more sense, it just seems like a shame that you're spending so much architectural capital at that corner to really dress it up and make it nice.

Chair Hamerly stated on the next item there was a pad that is right in front of the west gate separating the parking and the truck bay. I'm reading that as a transformer pad, and if that is ground mounted equipment it will need to be screened. Planning's Condition of Approval number 14 states that any ground mounted equipment must be completely screened. please make a note of that. There is very tall structure which is over 30 feet, and you are going to need extended firefighting equipment to battle any fire here. My understanding that there would be a minimum of a 15-foot set back required, you have the 26-foot fire access all the way around the perimeter, which is great, but my understanding is they don't want the fire truck too close to the structure. The first project Patriot Partners submitted was the maximum height was calculated from the low point on the building perimeter. On this project it looks like it was calculated from adjacent grade, so we had a 3.5-to-4-foot depression in the truck bay, but that was not the reference elevation that was used for determining max height. I'm fine calculating it that way, but as a matter of record, the first one was calculated from the low point in the truck bay when the variance was processed. That would push us to about a 46.5 at the truck bay to our parapet height, but the 49-foot max height at the southwest corner is correct because that is established from adjacent grade.

Assistant Community Development Director Stater stated that's correct.

Commissioner Miller stated I was looking at the U channel along the south side and there is an overflow for the site that looks like it's planned to spill into that offsite channel. Based on the plan it looks like there is opportunity for that that U channel running along the south side to spill into the site. I want to make sure that the channel that is along the south side has adequate capacity for that offsite flow, and we provide some type of high point.

Representative Ryan, Civil Engineer stated yes, you are right. In our drainage report, we will address that and make sure we have the right size to collect the water and the overflow going to that U channel is for emergency use.

Chair Hamerly stated on both sections BB and CC, referencing the U channel one is showing that channel along Section B as being 5 feet wide, and it's 3 1/2 feet wide at the southern property line. That's out of a 10-foot planter, and some of the largest specimen trees on site are showing up at the center line. Is there any potential that planting is going to disrupt or potentially damage your U channel?

Representative Ryan stated we will look into it, right now we are estimating U channel size.

Chair Hamerly stated two suggestions would be a serious root barrier device to protect your channel. The second would modify the channel profile to have a consistent volume but make it a little bit narrower and deeper if that works.

Representative Ryan stated we can always have a deeper U channel.

Chair Hamerly stated moving onto building elevations, on the material palette for the building elevations the glass wall makes it look like there's a 2 tone glazing or is that just artistic?

Kevin Alcantra stated it is just artistic.

Chair Hamerly stated since that's artistic, the lines that are non-horizontal that are showing in the glazing. Are those actual muntin's or is that part of the rendering?

Kevin Alcantra stated that is part of the rendering.

Chair Hamerly stated moving on the landscape plans. Noted in the staff report that staff did pick up on the taller columnar trees along the streetscape, I concur with that, especially given that the building is so tall, so close to the street, and it is a narrow street. Are there plan to widen Grape Street at the build out of the BP area?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated Grape Street will be widened. It is going to be widened center line to curb face at 26 feet wide from the northern boundary of this development all the way south to 6th Street. The construction all the way south along 6th Street to Victoria Avenue.

Chair Hamerly asked what is the composition within the right of way at 26 feet? Is a portion of that in parkway or is it all in paving?

Assistant Public Works Director Bennett stated the section I have is 30 feet within right of way for the roadway at 26 feet, plus curb, gutter, a portion of the sidewalk and then we're requiring an additional help. Basically, within the right of way it is 30 feet and plus PUE and sidewalk easement back of that. No portion of the landscaping will be within the right of way, it will be within a portion of the PUE sidewalk easement.

Chair Hamerly stated thank you. Regarding the wall plan, since project on the northern boundary is abutting a bunch of existing non-conforming residential uses. Was there any thought given to making that an 8-foot walls since the typical separation between business and residential would be an 8-foot wall?

Associate Planner Syed stated I considered it, but I selected six. It's technically up to you.

We can go up to 10 according to the BP wall standards.

Chair Hamerly stated I understood the thinking because of the adjacency to residential properties because there will be the truck traffic which is mainly concentrated in the southeastern portion of the site, but just didn't understand the difference that has one side of six feet and then another side that is at 10 feet.

Associate Planner Syed started the 10 feet that was based on our discussion on the Cypress Street and Victoria Avenue site. The Conditions of Approval number 14 is being changed to 8 feet. On page 116, we are changing condition number 18 to specify 8 feet.

Chair Hamerly closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Chair Hamerly, seconded by Amaya, to:

1. Adopt Resolution No. 2022 - 031 approving Conditional Use Permit CUP-22-003 for the development of a 90,532 square foot warehouse and associated improvements, subject to the Conditions of Approval, and the Findings of Fact;
2. Adopt Resolution No. 2022- 032 approving Design Review Application (DRA 22-008) for the project's Site Plan, Building Elevations, Grading Plan and Conceptual Landscape Plan, subject to the Conditions of Approval, and the Findings of Fact;
3. Adopt Resolution No. 2022- 033 approving Tentative Parcel Map (TPM 22-009) to combine four (4) parcels into one (1), subject to the Conditions of Approval, and the Findings of Fact;
4. Adopt Resolution No. 2022 – 034 approving Variance (VAR 22-003) to allow the warehouse building to exceed the maximum building height permitted in the Business Park Zone by fourteen (14) feet; and
5. Adopt Resolution No. 2022- 035 certifying the associated Mitigated Negative Declaration (ENV 22-005), and direct staff to file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk of the Board. Motion carried, 4-0, with Vice Chair Thomas being absent.

RESOLUTION NO. 2022-031

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP 22-003) FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A 90,532 SQUARE FOOT WAREHOUSE AND ASSOCIATED IMPROVEMENTS ON THE EAST SIDE OF GRAPE STREET, APPROXIMATELY 200 FEET SOUTH OF CYPRESS STREET. RELATED ENTITLEMENTS INCLUDE DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION (DRA 22-008), VARIANCE (VAR 22-003) AND TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP (TPM 22-009).

RESOLUTION NO. 2022-032

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION (DRA 22-008) FOR THE SITE PLAN, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, ROUGH GRADING PLAN AND CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN PERTINING TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF A 90,532 SQUARE FOOT WAREHOUSE, LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF GRAPE STREET, APPROXIMATELY 200 FEET SOUTH OF CYPRESS STREET. RELATED ENTITLEMENTS INCLUDE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP 22-003), VARIANCE (VAR 22-003), AND TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP (TPM 22-009).

RESOLUTION NO. 2022-033

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (ENV 22-005) FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A 90,532 SQUARE

FOOT WAREHOUSE ON THE EAST SIDE OF GRAPE STREET, APPROXIMATELY 200 FEET SOUTH OF CYPRESS STREET. RELATED ENTITLEMENTS INCLUDE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP 22-003), DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION (DRA 22-008), TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP (TPM 22-009), AND VARIANCE (VAR 22-003).

RESOLUTION NO. 2022-034

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP (TPM 22-009) TO MERGE FOUR (4) EXISTING PARCELS INTO ONE (1) PARCEL IN ASSOCIATION WITH CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP 22-003), DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION (DRA 22-008), VARIANCE (VAR 22-003) TO DEVELOP A 90,532 SQUARE FOOT INDUSTRIAL WAREHOUSE, LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF VICTORIA AVENUE AND CYPRESS STREET.

RESOLUTION NO. 2022-035

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING VARIANCE (VAR 22-003) TO ALLOW AN INCREASE IN THE MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT IN THE BUSINESS PARK ZONE FROM 35 FEET TO 49 FEET IN ASSOCIATION WITH CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP 22-003), DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION (DRA 22-008), AND TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP (TPM 22-009) TO CONSTRUCT A 90,532 SQUARE FOOT WAREHOUSE, LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF GRAPE STREET, APPROXIMATELY 200 FEET SOUTH OF CYPRESS STREET.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled October 4, 2022.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Hamerly declared the meeting adjourned at 7:16 p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Camille Goritz, Administrative Assistant III
Community Development Department

Randall Hamerly, Chair
Planning Commission