

**MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
MARCH 1, 2011**

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Highland was called to order at 6:02p.m. by Chairman Hamerly in the Donahue Council Chambers, 27215 Base Line, Highland, California.

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

Absent: Commissioner Richard Haller (Note: arrived at 6:12pm)

Staff Present: John Jaquess, Community Development Director
Lawrence Mainez, City Planner
Bruce Meikle, Senior Planner
Linda McKeough, Administrative Assistant III

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Member Lorei.

2.0 COMMUNITY INPUT

There was none.

3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

There were no Items.

4.0 PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

03-01-11.PC

5.0 LEGISLATIVE

- 5.1 Design Review 010-006, review of an Alternative Design for a Gas Canopy for the Chevron Project. The Project will be built on Pad 1 at the Highland Crossroads Project located on the south side of Greenspot Road approximately 1,300 feet east of the 210 Freeway (APN: 1201-341-22). Representative: Highland Fuels, LLC – Applicant; Patrick Fiedler, (Fiedlergroup) - Representative This Item was continued from the Planning Commission’s February 15, 2011, Meeting.

Chairman Hamerly identified the Item and called for Staff’s presentation.

Senior Planner Meikle gave the presentation from the Staff Report and Powerpoint presentation. He explained the Applicant’s proposed revised Project’s design details for the Gas Canopy Plans and proposed Cornice treatment to the Commission, and that the Applicant and his Representatives are in the audience and then concluded his presentation.

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

Discussion ensued between the Commission and Staff regarding there was no color pallet / color scheme for the proposed Canopy for the Project and the Applicant had not provided one for the Commission to review. A picture of a Chevron Canopy located in Corona was provided, but was not for the proposed Project, and the Applicant had not brought one with him.

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

Mr. Patrick Fiedler, of Fiedlergroup, 23222 West Third Street, Los Angeles, California, who is the Applicant, addressed the Commission. He stated that he is anxious to get the Project underway and tie in the architecture with the Canopy and to give it more dimension. He explained how the tile mansard / gable roof would limit the solar panels and exposure and how the Cornice treatment has been scaled down in proportion to the Canopy and the colors / materials are similar to the Building and will have stone veneer on the eight (8) columns and go up approximately ten feet (10’) on the columns and stucco above that will also match the Building and the Cornice will match the stucco. The Fascia portion is similar and the bullnose is a white section and the blue is recessed back approximately six inches (6”). There is a white eave element along the Fascia

03-01-11.PC

and on top of the Cornice that will give additional dimension and indicated that it is not a flat Canopy. He further explained there are twenty-six (26) solar tubes located in the Sale Area / Employee Area and that there are no solar panels on the Extra Mile Building.

Discussion ensued between the Commission, Mr. Fiedler and Staff regarding the location / illumination of the LED lighting. A suggestion was made about if the Canopy had a Cornice treatment, just scaled down and with the white and blue colors and on top of the columns have crown molding and would look good and asked if the Applicant could incorporate that design and the Applicant was amenable to that.

A comment was made by a Commissioner how he had researched Chevron Stations with a Canopy design and found one in Napa that had a mansard façade and printed a copy of his results. Mr. Fiedler responded that the newer Stations have a Canopy and that the Extra Mile Building portion is elevated and kept the Chevron low key and so when people drive by, the Extra Mile Building is the focal point of the Project and not the Canopy.

Discussion ensued between the Commission and Mr. Fiedler regarding the design and number of proposed Fuel Lanes and Dispensers and the Napa canopy copy. Mr. Fiedler reiterated the Canopy is proportionate structure and is not the focal point and that the Extra Mile Building is.

(Note: Commissioner Haller arrived at 6:12pm)

Discussion ensued between the Commission and Mr. Fiedler regarding the projection i.e. two inches (2") for the reveal, four inches (4") for the arch and then extends goes out seven inches to eight inches (7" – 8"). Mr. Fiedler responded the Cornice is seven inches (7") from the Fascia. Further details of the Canopy Cornice were discussed.

Discussion ensued between the Commission and Mr. Fiedler regarding the downspout design that is inside the structural columns and routed underground to a yard drain that will have a treatment elements inside to treat the runoff before it flows to the underground storage.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any questions of the Applicant. Hearing none, he then asked if anyone would like to speak on the item. Hearing none, he then closed the Public Hearing and opened the floor for discussion amongst the Commissioners.

03-01-11.PC

The following are comments made by the Commissioners: 1) the proposed revisions are significantly better than what was previously proposed, but not as good as it could be, but think it is a significant improvement; 2) a Commissioner still does not care for the Cornice treatment and did like the rendering in the picture and putting a mansard on the whole Canopy is too huge; 3) the way that the Cornice looks on the rendering in the picture looks a lot better than it does on the Cornice on ours and is hard to see since it is not a live shot, but when you look at the live shot, there is so much bigger difference; 4) in Corona, the columns are fairly insignificant and while in Highland, they are more massive and with the added stonework and with the added treatment at the top of the columns will add more presence to the Project and we seem to be getting more “bang for the buck”; 5) people will see that and knowing that they are getting a good product and the Applicant had made some improvements; 6) still need to “tweak” the proposed Cornice detail and whether or not to have it project more; 7) not knowing what the Cornice treatment colors are, the Commissioner would like a darker color.

Discussion ensued between the Commission and Staff regarding the displayed Color Elevations on the Powerpoint presentation.

The following are further comments made by the Commissioners regarding the Cornice treatment: 1) like the picture better and the contrast color makes the Cornice more substantial; 2) the Cornice treatment could remain the same with the Building as long as there was a different color band; 3) the proposed colors would be white on white with the Cornice details; 4) there was a hesitancy to flip the color pallet on the Canopy and couldn't see it with the white on white Cornice detail and would not read very well; 5) the roof section is tile and likes the pillars, but the Canopy is what the people in Highland don't care for and still has a concern; 6) not knowing what the color contrast is and the dimensional size, is unable to support it today, unless it is modified somewhat; 7) the lighting issue is a dramatic improvement over Valero, but is basically, the same colors with very little contrast; 8) the proposed white Cornice with a bigger white area along and above the Chevron, and wants to support the solar panel concept, but the hip roof wipes out the area for the solar panels, and; 9) the Cornice and solar panels are okay, but with the off-white color with the white Canopy, is unable to support it.

Discussion ensued between the Commission, Mr. Fiedler and Staff regarding the proposed Stone / Color Pallets from the previous Meeting were then displayed and discussed. Mr. Fiedler explained how both the Cornice and Eave treatment on the Canopy are the same color and will have a shadow effect because the Cornice itself will project forward seven inches (7") then will have the Eave treatment and then will drop down to the blue treatment.

03-01-11.PC

A question was asked by a Commissioner that both the Eave and Cornice are the same color and Mr. Fiedler responded affirmatively.

A question was asked by a Commissioner what color would be more of a color contrast and Mr. Fiedler responded and looking at the picture that was provided to the Commission that had the darker relief and is attractive and is not opposed to that at all to modify the bolding for consistency.

The following are comments made by the Commissioners: 1) the color in the picture looks nice and is something the Commission would like to see in that area; 2) the Cornice has a greater projection than what the Commission was anticipating and which will add color along with the different profile and will tie in with the Building; 3) the feasibility to possibly altering the Building with the Cornice lighting; 4) the Commission is not wanting to delay the Project; 5) traffic on Greenspot is heavy and would make the Project highly visible; 6) have the color as well as the profile sticking out a bit further would go a long way towards sprucing up the Canopy, and; 7) the Cornice detail is a bit understated.

The Commission did not want to stop the Applicant's Project if the Applicant was proposing to redo the color pallet on the Building to introduce the concept at the Canopy for contrast would it be appropriate for the Commission review the colors again or would that delay the Project. Staff responded that Staff could bring back to the Commission with an alternative color option and a Commissioner added if the Applicant is redoing the Building color pallet to introduce contrast capability at the Cornice for the Canopy and asked what would be the color choice. Staff responded that the Commission could give a Directive to Staff regarding the color alternative for the Cornice for the Canopy. A Commissioner responded for Staff that he would not mind to keep the Cornice but with a different color band and will have Staff bring back the color pallet to the Commission for review and the color is not there for a dark accent. The color pallet for the Building have the Commission see again or direct Staff for color approval and Staff responded that is okay. Mr. Fiedler added he would go back to the Shopping Center's color pallet and how Lowe's portion has a dark cornice treatment and possibly integrate that into the Applicant's Buildings. A question was asked by a Commissioner if the Applicant changes the color pallet, will it affect the Project and Mr. Fiedler responded with regards to the Cornice treatment, he will make revisions and with the color portion it would not be a problem, and will get the color pallet back to Staff. The Commission reiterated that it does not want to hold up / delay the Applicant's Project.

The Commission also gave a Directive to Staff to make the cornice profile project twelve inches (12") tall, project out twelve inches (12") in order to add more definition.

03-01-11.PC

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

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Gamboa and seconded by Vice Chairman Huynh to:

1. Approve the Plans for the Gas Canopy for the Chevron Project (Design Review Application 010-006), subject to the Conditions of Approval, with the exception of the color pallet, and;
2. Adopt the Findings of Fact.

With the Directives to have Staff bring back the color pallet the Applicant proposes prior to color installation for the Commission's consideration and have profile of the Cornice project out more (12" high by 12" out) which can be reviewed by Staff.

Motion unanimously passed on a 7 – 0 vote.

- 5.2 The Applicant is requesting Amendments to Design Review Application-010-002 (DRA-010-002) for the Dairy Queen Fast Food Restaurant with Drive-thru Lane. The approximate 0.45 acre Site is located at the southwest corner of Base Line and Central Avenue (APN: 1192-341-06). Representative: Mr. Young Shin, Applicant

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

Senior Planner Meikle gave the presentation from the Staff Report and Powerpoint presentation. He explained the Applicant's proposed Amendments for the Project to the Commission and that the Applicant and his Representative are in the audience and then concluded his presentation.

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

Discussion ensued between the Commission and Staff regarding how the Commission previously approved the Dairy Queen Project and how the Dairy Queen Corporate Office was adamant for certain design details / items they would not change. Staff responded how Staff has relied on the Applicant and now Dairy Queen's Corporate Office is okay with the proposed Amendments.

03-01-11.PC

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

Mr. Bernie Mayer, Sitetech Engineering, 38248 Potato Canyon Drive, Oak Glen, California, who is the Applicant's Representative, addressed the Commission. He stated how Dairy Queen Corporate Office is now okay with the proposed Revisions and then explained the historical background to the Commission. After the Commission initially approved the Project, the Construction Drawings were prepared for Building Permits and then the Applicant had "sticker shock" when he came in with the costs. Dairy Queen understood the issues and got favorable contractors and was able to bring the price down and that Staff is still trying to work with Southern California Edison to reduce the Edison costs.

A question was asked by a Commissioner if there are more changes anticipated and Mr. Mayer responded he believed that this is it and how the issues were identified and reiterated that he does not anticipate any further changes. The Commissioner asked if the Landscaping Plans will "take a hit" and Mr. Mayer responded not at this time, there are no landscaping changes proposed.

The following are comments made by the Commissioners regarding proposed Amendment No. 1: 1) the Commissioner was concerned and felt like he was "handcuffed" with Dairy Queen when approving this Project and now, with the proposed Amendments, was taken aback with the changes that Dairy Queen could not change then and now they can; 2) another Commissioner felt the same way and now what is the band going to look like in that it will be not as shiny and propose it to be stucco, and; 3) a Commissioner was supportive of Amendment No. 1, but was also shared the surprise with the other Commissioner and how the Dairy Queen Corporate Office can now deviate from the Corporate standards. Mr. Mayer responded how the Applicant had gone back to the Corporate Office wanting a new Store in Highland and that was the only way it was going to happen and take it one step at a time and evaluate where the Applicant would be at with all of the costs.

A question was asked by a Commissioner how far out of line with the cost per square foot for this location and Mr. Mayer responded the Store here is twenty percent (20%) more costs on a square foot basis than others in Southern California and Dairy Queen should be comparable with other fast food restaurants such as Jack in the Box, McDonalds.

A question was asked by a Commissioner regarding the North Elevation that faux rock was proposed and now it seems as the rock has been crossed out and asked what is happening. Mr. Mayer responded that Elevation will be all rock on the entire face.

03-01-11.PC

The Commission was amenable to Amendment No. 1 and permitting stucco in place of the metal panels.

The following are comments made by the Commissioners regarding proposed Amendment No. 2: 1) what was the rock going to be replaced with what type of material; 2) would the replacement include the columns and wall. Mr. Mayer responded there appeared to be a miscommunication and the Applicant intended to leave the rock around the base of the columns but to replace the tile material located on the wall next to the Patio Area with stucco.

Discussion ensued regarding Item No. 7 on the tile and the tile's specific location(s) the Applicant is requesting to change from tile to stucco on the Patio wainscoting and how the stone around the entryway would remain as per the original approval. A comment was made by a Commissioner the Amendment is a minor downgrade and overall, would like to support the completion of the Project and will be a dramatic improvement of the corner and the Commission concurred and was supportive.

The Commission was amenable to Amendment No. 2 of changing the Patio wainscoting from tile to stucco.

The following are comments made by the Commissioners regarding proposed Amendment No. 3: 1) paint the Patio fence beige / brown in order to match the rock columns.

The Commission was amenable to Amendment No. 3 to change the wire fencing to tube steel fencing, but paint it beige.

The following are comments made by the Commissioners regarding proposed Amendment No. 4: 1) what would the proposed colors be or a differentiation between the color of the typical walkway leading up to the Restaurant versus up to the Patio or is the concrete going to be stained all the same color; 2) a concern was raised on how the color stain would wear. Mr. Mayer responded the Patio Area would have a stained concrete and the other flatwork around the Building would be natural color concrete. The stain color would be a Terra Cotta / Brown and after the concrete would be cured, the acid stain would then be applied.

The Commission was amenable to Amendment No. 4 allowing the use of stained concrete in the Patio Area.

The following are comments made by the Commissioners regarding proposed Amendment No. 5: 1) what kind of pattern and finish for the concrete. Mr. Mayer responded the concrete would have a cobblestone pattern and after the concrete was cured, a powder staining would be applied.

03-01-11.PC

A question was asked by a Commissioner what color for the cobblestone – grey or tan and Mr. Mayer responded he left that open and suggested maybe something distinctive or have the same coloring as the Patio Area or something in between. A Commissioner responded to color the cobblestone beige for contrast and have the stamped cobblestone and another Commissioner agreed.

The Commission was amenable to Amendment No. 5 allowing stamped and stained concrete at the Base Line entry.

Discussion ensued between the Commission Mr. Mayer and Staff regarding the Applicant's schedule of pulling Building Permits, how the Applicant has his Project to be considered by the City Council on March 22, 2011, regarding costs, and anticipates the duration for construction will take approximately four (4) months.

Chairman Hamerly asked if anyone would like to speak on the item. Seeing none, and there being no further questions of the Applicant or Staff, or discussion amongst the Commissioners, he closed the Public Hearing and then called for the question.

A MOTION was made by Vice Chairman Huynh and seconded by Commissioner Haller to:

1. Approve the Amendments to Design Review Application-010-002, including the Site Plan and Building Elevations, and;
2. Adopt the Findings of Fact.

Motion unanimously passed on a 7 – 0 vote.

6.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS

Community Development Director explained the Items tentatively scheduled for the March 15, 2011, Regular Meeting.

The Commission expressed its appreciation of receiving the e-mail updates from Staff on the various projects.

There were no further Announcements.

03-01-11.PC

7.0 ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chairman Hamerly declared the Meeting adjourned at 6:54p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Linda McKeough, Community
Development Administrative Assistant III

Randall Hamerly, Chairman
Planning Commission

03-01-11.PC