

**MINUTES  
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING  
MARCH 5, 2013**

**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       Richard Haller  
  John Gamboa  
  Milton Sparks  
  Michael Stoffel

Absent:       Commissioner Michael Willhite

Staff Present: John Jaquess, Community Development Director  
                  Ernie Wong, City Engineer / Public Works Director  
                  Jim Godfredsen, Project Manager  
                  Lawrence Mainez, City Planner  
                  Linda McKeough, Administrative Assistant III

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Hamerly.

**2.0 COMMUNITY INPUT**

There was none.

**3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR**

**3.1 Minutes of February 19, 2013, Regular Meeting.**

**A Motion** was made by Commissioner Gamboa and seconded by Commissioner Stoffel to approve the Minutes of February 19, 2013, Regular Meeting, as submitted.

Motion carried on a 5 – 0 vote with the abstention of Commissioner Haller and Commissioner Willhite absent.

Commissioner Gamboa thanked the Commission for adjourning the Commission Meeting in his father’s memory and Chairman Hamerly said the Commission was glad to be able to do that.

03-05-13PC

#### 4.0 OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

#### 5.0 NEW BUSINESS

Note: Prior to the Meeting, Staff distributed a copy of the proposed Revised Planning Conditions of Approval (COAs) for DRA 012-007 and a larger copy of the proposed Photometric Plan for Item 5.1 for the Commission's consideration.

- 5.1 Design Review Application (DRA 012-007) for a new East Valley Water District (EVWD) Administrative Office Building and Corporate Yard ("Campus") on a 24.7 acre site which includes 28,300 square feet of Administrative Office and Operations Yard which include a 5,803 square foot Operations Building; and approximately 11.6 acres of native vegetation and an existing citrus grove will remain in its natural setting and will be incorporated in the long-term use of the Site, as well as a Demonstration Garden to illustrate water conservation. The Project is located on Greenspot Road (south side – one quarter mile east of Santa Paula Road)(APNs: 0297-051-17 & 18). Representative: Richard Gndt, Balfour Beatty Construction (East Valley Water District Representative).

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

City Planner Mainez distributed a Sample and Materials Board to the Commission and then gave the presentation from the Staff Report and PowerPoint presentation and explained the historical background and the proposed Project design, inclusive of Site access, public and employee parking, trail components and Demonstration Garden. With regards to the Demonstration Garden area, City Planner Mainez read into the record, the following: "The intent of the Demonstration Garden is to provide patrons of the East Valley Water District, homeowners and community leaders, drought tolerant landscaping techniques and water conservation irrigation practices. It is anticipated that the pallet or plant material indigenous and are proven performers with the East Valley Water District Service Area." City Planner Mainez continued with his presentation indicating that there a lot of plants, signage and irrigation techniques that will be seen at the Demonstration Garden. He further explained the fence / wall design, materials and locations, landscaping, Exterior Elevations and the Applicant's requests to the Commission. He explained the Revised Proposed Planning COAs in that the revisions are fairly minor and the purpose is to clarify the intent of some of those COAs and that there is the proposed Floor Plan on display for the Commission's review. He indicated that the Applicant's Representatives are in the audience and would be introduced for any questions the Commission may have and then concluded his presentation.

03-05-13PC

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

A question was asked by City Planner Mainez if the Commission had any questions.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding the process of beginning at the Staff Report and working through in order of the document's Plans; Plot Plan, Grading, Conceptual Landscaping, Photometric, Elevations and Materials. He then asked if the Commission had any questions / comments on the overall Site Plan.

A question was asked by Commissioner Haller regarding with the high speed travel way on Greenspot Road, and that the East Valley Water District (EVWD) will have maintenance equipment that is slow and exiting the road, what is the concept of the proposed turning lanes on the Site. City Engineer Wong responded that safe access to the Facility was one of the earliest considerations of the Site design and then explained how the Project will widen the south side of Greenspot Road going east and will provide an eastbound, exclusive right turn pocket into the easterly access driveway. For the westbound traffic, the Project will also provide some pavement widening along the north side of Greenspot Road that would be wide enough to allow a left turn pocket into the westerly access driveway. In addition, he indicated that Staff feels that both customer and maintenance vehicles that would have safe access to the Site.

Another question was asked by Commissioner Haller regarding if there was a Fuel Modification Plan submitted since the proposed Project borders a fire / open space areas and is part of the Fire Department's review. City Planner Mainez responded that Fire Marshall was not in attendance, but said no, in that it is not in a Fire Overlay Zone Area and Ms. Meier added that Greenspot Road is the Fire Overlay Boundary. City Planner Mainez added that the COAs will be reviewed and will be conveyed to the City's Fire Marshall regarding a Fuel Modification Plan and the landscaping. Community Development Director Jaquess added there will be additional water brought to the Property and will have fire hydrants for fire suppression.

A question was asked by Commissioner Haller if EVWD Facility would be LEED Certified, and if not, what potential conditions might be included in the Site Plan i.e. the use of porous pavement, etc.

Mr. Roger Clarke, of Ruhnau Ruhnau Clarke Architects, 3775 Tenth Street, Riverside, California, who is the Applicant's Architect Representative, addressed the Commission. He stated this afternoon, that he had sent over to the City a response to the concern in that the EVWD is not seeking the formal LEED

03-05-13PC

Certification for the Project, at this time. But there are a number of energy conservation and LEED elements are part of the Project i.e., low water use, infiltration and how managing water onsite both in quality and quantity, daylighting throughout the Facility, high energy efficient HVAC systems, dual glazing, additional insulation, energy management systems, low emitting materials. etc. lighting, and City Staff has that available for the Commission and reiterated there is not going to be a formal submittal for LEED Certification.

A comment was made by Commissioner Haller that there needs to be good examples in Highland in a way to do those kind of things and is interested in Site specific things i.e. the use porous pavement and for EVWD to use that as an example and then thanked Mr. Clarke.

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Huynh on Page 4 of the Staff Report regarding the number of parking spaces how the Code requires 156 and the Applicant is proposing 249. He then asked about the proposed Floor Plan with the proposed Board Room with a capacity of 75 – 80 and how there is 75 parking spaces for visitors / employee parking and provided an example if there was a controversial topic / issue and would fill the Board Room up to capacity to be heard by the EVWD Board Members and would fill the Board Room up to capacity, where would the other parking be located at for that particular meeting and would EVWD open up the other parking area located on the east of the Site for the additional parking. Mr. Clarke responded that the Applicant anticipated that and that Staff would relocate their vehicles from the main parking lot out front and into the auxiliary parking lots for the overflow if there would be a controversial topic. Vice Chairman Huynh asked if there would be parking on Greenspot Road and Mr. Clarke responded no and that is partly the reason why there are so many numbers of parking spaces.

Another question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh on Page 5 of the Staff Report at the bottom of the Page regarding a COA establishing a public trail easement prior to the Certificate of Occupancy and if the Applicant could explain the process if the Demonstration Garden is intended to connect with the public trail in the future. City Planner Mainez responded that is correct and that there is no formal public trail that connects to the Site and that is something that the City will be working on and how the City is a partner with the Plan B with the Upper Santa Ana River Habitat Conservation Plan located in the Santa Ana River Wash Area, and as part of that Plan, there are trails. The trails that are shown to be connected to the Demonstration Garden are somewhat connected to the Santa Ana River Wash Area Trail System and is the reason why that City Staff asked EVWD for the establishment of a public trail easement for a public trail access in the future.

03-05-13PC

Another question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh regarding if the Demonstration Garden is open to the public and Mr. Clarke responded that is correct.

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh how the Demonstration Garden is tucked behind the Building and was concerned that not too many people would know that the Demonstration Garden is available for the public to see and if there is a Signage Program proposed. He noticed that there will be a monument sign adjacent to the street and if the Sign Program will return to the Commission for review and if the Demonstration Garden is part of the Signage. City Planner Mainez responded affirmatively that the Sign Program would return to the Commission for review and that the Demonstration Garden Signage would be a part of the proposed Sign Program. Mr. Clarke added that the Applicant did not submit all of the renderings, but they are on full display at the EVWD's lobby that shows the proposed Demonstration Garden, electronic signage, and the water feature entry into the Garden Area. Vice Chairman Huynh then thanked Mr. Clarke.

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa regarding the parking in front of the Administrative Office Building in that there are no proposed pervious pavers located in the parking stalls, or no swales to direct the water. On the Operations side of the parking lot, there are no swales between the parking stalls to direct water and appears to be all concrete and there is no indication of the direction of the water flows.

Mr. Ron Sklepko, of Parsons Brinkerhoff, 451 East Vanderbilt Way, Suite 200, San Bernardino, California, who is the Applicant's Civil Engineer Representative, addressed the Commission. He asked the Commission look on Page 2 of the Grading Plan and pointed out areas of porous concrete moved from the front row of parking stalls to all of the center parking stalls. The driveby aisles will still be asphalt pavement, and within that area, there will be porous landscape detention areas so each one of the planters is designed to receive and infiltrate water. If it fills up to capacity, there will be drain inlet and will take the water into a pipeline. There are those features in the front parking lot and should have been designated on the Plan and added that there will be added porous pavement parking stalls located at the south end of the Maintenance Yard and the south side of the parking lot and is considered high value areas where the water runoff from the asphalt will be able to pass over that and be infiltrated. There are additional porous landscaped detention basins located in the north portion of the Maintenance Yard and when they fail, the water runoff will spill out and will be picked up by the drain inlets and the pipeline system. All of the offsite drainage for the Yard is directed into a new basin and will receive all of the storm water runoff and will store it to approximately four feet (4') deep and then percolate / infiltrate.

03-05-13PC

Another comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa the pervious pavers appeared to be shown only on the front of the Building. Mr. Sklepko responded that is a differentiation on the Grading Plan and indicated that it is hard to read, but is Note 4 listed on the Grading Plan and that it's in all of the other areas which he had pointed out to the Commission.

A question was asked by Commissioner Stoffel regarding chain link fencing and thought that chain link fencing was prohibited in a commercial area. City Planner Mainez responded that is a design issue for the Commission, and usually for commercial properties, it is unallowed, but there is not a prohibition against chain link fencing. Community Development Director Jaquess added the only type of fencing prohibited is barbwire fencing. Commissioner Stoffel indicated that he was concerned there was no chain link fencing with new construction and it seemed like that would be a lot of chain link fencing and there is nothing on the other side. When one is driving, all the person would see is chain link fencing. With regards to the citrus trees, he was unable to differentiate them on the Map and how they looked the same. Chairman Hamerly stated that the citrus trees are off the Map and the grove that they are talking about is located on the northwest corner, but there are some dwarf citrus trees in a couple areas onsite.

Mr. Scott Wilson, of Wilson Associates, 11262 Warmington Street, Riverside, California, who is the Applicant's Landscape Architect Representative, addressed the Commission. He stated there are citrus trees located along the fire lane by the patio by the west end of the Building along with a water element and then explained their locations.

Another question was asked by Commissioner Stoffel that the citrus trees are not on the Administrative Building side and Mr. Wilson responded there will be a water feature located in that area to show historically how the groves were watered over the years.

A question was asked by Commissioner Stoffel if the chain link fencing and if the landscaping is going to be sufficient to make it beautiful and Mr. Wilson responded that the chain link fencing starts down a slope where a person is unable to view it and then as it loops around back of the Site, that is out in "the wilderness". Commissioner Stoffel said how the Applicant is constructing this beautiful site and then have chain link fencing. Mr. Wilson responded that the chain link fencing will be vinyl coated and offered that vines could be installed on the fencing and then it will "disappear", especially if one is traveling at high speed. Commissioner Stoffel then thanked Mr. Wilson.

A question was asked by Commissioner Sparks regarding how high is the decorative historic stone wall and Mr. Clarke responded that it's approximately five feet to six feet (5' – 6') high.

03-05-13PC

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding that on the Site Plan, it states that the wall is an historical decorative wall and then on the Landscape Plan, it states that there will be vines on the historic masonry wall. Why cover the historical masonry wall with vines and then asked will there be other elements introduced on the Site for some of the water features. Mr. Clarke responded in terms of the vines located on the historical masonry wall would be located intermittently and see the stone. He indicated over by the Board Room, and on the west side of the Site, there is a water feature that will demonstrate / recreate how water gets transported to Southern California and explained the design to the Commission.

Another comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding the purpose of onsite water features is to demonstrate how water was transported in the Inland Empire, specifically, for the agricultural uses, is the Applicant trying to replicate the old irrigation channels in the stone design or would it be more engineered concrete. Mr. Clarke responded affirmatively that EVWD envisioned the stone design and added that photographs were taken in a citrus grove where there is an existing channels that is lined in stone.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly if the EVWD is tying in with the agricultural uses and the historic water distribution and plant materials, and then asked why would there be a hard barrier between the public areas of the Site and the citrus groves and/or the native areas and why there would not be a softer connection so that some of the water elements flow out into the groves and maybe branches out into a path where the public could go out into the grove where a person would not be completely walling in a compound. Mr. Clarke responded that it's with EVWD management and control of the Site and keeping the public within the Demonstration Garden area, as opposed to have the public wandering the entire Site, but he was unsure if a final decision had been made. There is nothing regarding a wall / fence that is along the property on the north side, so someone could still go into the grove, but would be on private property of the EVWD. Mr. Clarke added that is not made a feature and would be expensive to fence and enclose that grove area.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly regarding fencing around the Demonstration Garden and connect with the trail and Mr. Clarke responded that it connect with the upper orange groves or the southeast corner, but is not a part of this Project, at this time, and is a control issue. There is nothing to connect to the trail right now and that the trail connection has been discussed at multiple locations.

03-05-13PC

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly about trails that crisscross out in the Santa Ana River Wash Area and if there is wrought iron fencing installed around the Demonstration Garden, at some point, would it then be all or portions of it removed for trail access. Mr. Clarke responded there is fully accessible during the business working hours and then explained with the gate design and how gate would not open up to the Service / Maintenance Yard for public safety reasons.

Another comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding the public side of the Facility of the gate control location and Mr. Clarke responded and explained the gate locations to the Commission. Chairman Hamerly said that he did not see it on the east side or the northeast corner of the Building. With regards to perimeter fencing is located there and when it is windy, trash / debris will go against the fencing and asked about mitigation and maintaining the abatement of the trash / debris regarding the chain link fencing, wrought iron fencing both on the Yard side and the Demonstration Garden side.

Mr. Mike Maestas, who will be the Assistant General Manager of the East Valley Water District on March 18, 2013, addressed the Commission. He stated that it would be rectified by the EVWD Maintenance Staff and incorporate the abatement of the debris along / on the fences along with their duties and would not be left unattractive.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that there would be no plant materials or native plant materials located on the outside of the fencing even though the fence is not located on the property line in that there are no plans for having a slight buffer of native plant materials on the outside of the fence and possibly mitigate that and Mr. Maestas responded that he was not that familiar with the Project, but maybe one of the Applicant's Architects could answer that regarding mitigation. Mr. Wilson said that the eastern boundary has plantings from the property line into the fencing and also beyond inside the fencing and the Applicant will not landscape the 27+ acres of the Site.

Another comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding the remnant fencing located out in the Santa Ana River Wash Area that with the wind, debris is pinned against that fencing and is not abated. Mr. Wilson responded how there is a "ton of people" from Maintenance now that will be working there on the Site.

A comment was made by Commissioner Stoffel in that there is a ditch on the east side of the property's fence line and Mr. Wilson responded how that area goes / slopes downhill on the Site.

03-05-13PC

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding the Grading Plan and where the water goes from the parking lot's retention basin located on the south side of the property and asked about the water flow on the north side of Greenspot Road if it will be diverted into the retention basins between Greenspot Road and the property line. Mr. Sklepko responded that there are two (2) lines; there is an existing eighteen inch (18") culvert that does collect water from north of Greenspot Road and discharges it to the south side and that the Applicant is connecting to it and continuing it to the south property line.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the "dashed line" is the existing portion of the line that goes underneath Greenspot Road and Mr. Sklepko responded affirmatively.

Another question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the new line after it goes past the retention basins, that the new line will go through the parking area and Mr. Sklepko responded underneath the parking lot all the way to the south side where there is a existing natural drainage course that runs in an easterly / westerly direction and will discharge the water into there that is mimicking the existing drainage patterns in that it is a pass-through system. In terms of storm water quality, there is segregation of offsite flows from the onsite flows which the Applicant is obligated to treat.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly regarding the retention basins located between Greenspot Road and the property line are offsite, but there is a small series of retention basins that are indicated off of Greenspot Road and if the retention basins are filled to capacity, is the overflow directed south of Greenspot Road and if that is how the system works or is there no co-mingling of any water coming from the north side of Greenspot Road into the retention basins. Mr. Sklepko responded the existing culvert picking up water from north of Greenspot Road is diverted south to the natural drainage course. The basins running along Greenspot Road are designed to treat the runoff from the Greenspot Road pavement itself which is collecting the runoff from the south half of the street and is required by WQMP treatment of the runoff and will fill up the basins, infiltrates and in a large event, they will cascade in a east / west direction and then will go back into the flow line of the street and to continue to the west, as it does historically.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the secondary line is not being picked up and Mr. Sklepko responded no, there is no connection between the basins and the culvert line and then proceeded to explain the separate systems to the Commission.

Another question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the overflow / sheetflow back into the ditch on the side of Greenspot Road or is there another system that is parallel and is retaining water on the Site that either percolates or overflows, and if so, where does that water go. Mr. Sklepko responded the Greenspot Road Basins in that there are six (6) basins and how the roadway is falling at three percent (3%) grade from east to west so each basin is one following the other and is substantially lower in grade and outlet on the west end and back into the street flow line and will travel a couple of hundred yards to the west and exits Greenspot Road, as it naturally does right now, and proceeds to the west and that system is operating by itself. On the north side, the water will pass-through the Site to the south side. The basins to the south is processing the onsite water and one will overflow as a spillway and overflows into a series of natural basins, which manmade, but have been there for some time, to capture / infiltrate the water and will cascade one basin into another basin going to the west and added that the Site is unique and has a lot of onsite storage capacity and infiltration capacity and the Applicant is taking full advantage of those natural features.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding the Site water flows into the basins and then cascades over to the next and Mr. Sklepko responded affirmatively.

A question was asked by Commissioner Haller regarding the earthwork balance on how is it based on the preliminary grading and Mr. Sklepko based on the raw quantities, it is balanced and looking for some import to finish out the Site grading because of losses due to rock and soil compaction.

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Huynh regarding the outlook area on the east side if it is ADA access with the trail and on the west side, it appears to have steps until a person would go further northwest before getting trail access and wanted assurance that the trail on the east side is ADA accessible. Mr. Sklepko responded those are contours. There are some steps and have been careful to make it ADA accessible by having five percent (5%) or less grade and that the most easterly trail is ADA accessible. With ADA accessibility, people would have access to the majority of trails and that there are segments where there are steeper grades, but it does not restrict the people to the main elements of the Demonstration Garden. He then explained the locations on the westerly end coming from the north that has steeper grades that have physical steps.

Chairman Hamerly asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on this Item. Hearing none, he continued with review on the Applicant's Conceptual Landscape Plan.

A comment was made by Commissioner Haller that it is great to see a Demonstration Garden and that Highland needs good examples of installing drought tolerant plants and associated irrigation systems that go with them and is please to see the Garden included as part of the Project.

Chairman Hamerly agreed with Commissioner Haller's comments and added to take it a step further. He then explained how the Commission requested Lowe's to install a demonstration type of landscaping how these are native materials and that they are designed well to do in Highland and if Lowe's could stock some of the drought tolerant plant materials and gave an example of someone purchasing them since seeing the landscaping of the drought tolerant plant materials in the Lowe's parking lot area. He then asked if the Interpretative Demonstration Garden Signage indicating what the plants are and would it be possible if Lowe's stocked these materials for purchasing and there would be minimal irrigation. Chairman Hamerly if this is something that could be worked towards and have the Signage introduced onto the Plan. Mr. Clarke responded their Signage Program that the Applicant has initiated that is part of the Demonstration Garden and is to point out what the plant materials that are utilized, etc.

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Huynh regarding the Demonstration Garden in that this is a great potential for students to learn about the landscaping/Faculty and then asked where the employees would park if there were to be two to three (2 – 3) School buses of students touring the Facility and where would the School buses park. Mr. Clarke responded there are 63 employees parking for the Site and would be available and the School activities would be scheduled / arranged with the EVWD.

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh where would the School buses park and Chairman Hamerly added that the buses would have a "tight fit" through the visitor parking area would have to go to the large parking area for parking. Mr. Maestas responded if during the day, when there are large public groups visiting the Office Area that all of the employees would be required to park in the back / rear of the visitor's parking area to make it available and that is a standard (policy) with EVWD.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly about School bus access and Mr. Maestas responded that during the day, have the employees park towards the rear of the parking area and if larges buses, EVWD would allow the buses in the Service Yard side and would be monitored. Vice Chairman Huynh then thanked Mr. Maestas.

03-05-13PC

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding the Exterior Elevations of the Main Building is nicely done, but it cannot be said for the Operations Building in that it is more bland just by its very nature. On the employees' side if they would include an added landscape buffer between the fourth row of parking to the north of the Operations Building in order to give a little bit of screening to reduce the mass / scale of the Building since there are no windows or articulation on that facade. Mr. Clarke responded in referencing the Grading Plan, the Building is fifteen feet (15') below grade and will be already reducing the mass of it and there is then a six foot (6') high wall that runs along the street. A person will see very little of that Building, other than the Building's roof and on the Landscape Plan, there is landscaping along that wall and slope.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly if the steep down slope is occurring immediately behind the wall and by the time for the first parking lot row on the north end of the lot, the farther away the Building gets from the street, there is a greater opportunity to have the sight line look out into the Santa Ana River Wash Area and will see the roof and the landscaping is sparse on the employee's side if would be possible to widen out that planter or introduce some additional plant materials for screening purposes.

A question was asked by City Planner Mainez what about a planter and Chairman Hamerly responded about installing a landscape buffer between the Site line and the north façade of the Operations Building which would be approximately six (6) trees in the parking lot. A comment was made by City Planner Mainez that he is receiving a concurrence from the Applicant's team in the audience and landscaping can be done with trees / diamonds. Chairman Hamerly responded without having a very good sense of scale on the reduced Plan, original 1:30 ratio if three feet (3') wide, but if six feet (6') wide, would be able to install trees without having to compromise the parking spaces with diamonds and eluded not having a higher ratio of trees / parking stalls in that it would be nice to have more trees installed for shading purposes. Mr. Clarke responded that additional trees were not added because of the Applicant was designating that for solar canopies in the future for the parking area and is not within the budget currently. Chairman Hamerly then thanked Mr. Clarke.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any comments on the Photometric Plan. He then asked about the lighting types, is all the Site lighting be done with parking lot lighting and with bollards indicated or are there additional exterior-mounted lights on the Building itself. Mr. Clarke responded the lighting is up under the soffets...additional parking lot lights....

(Note: Staff had to replace the Podium microphone's battery while there was ongoing discussion.)

03-05-13PC

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that the parking lot lights and the walkway lights all showed up on the Photometric Plan, but he did not see anything...need new better lighting. City Planner Mainez responded the average range is between 1:1 footcandles; to 2:9 footcandles and explained McDonald's is 1:9 footcandles, Wendy's is 1:6 footcandles and Walgreens is 1:7 footcandles. City Planner Mainez added as projects have been approved, they have gotten a bit darker over time and indicated the Applicant's lighting is 2.9 footcandles and is designed for security and would have to be reviewed by the Police. He indicated that Staff was also concerned with the lighting design for the boundary is almost is -0- and if the Applicant could control the light to the developed Site and for security reasons, not eliminate the Building and EVDA is a vested goal and to illuminate / protect their equipment in the Corporate Yard.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly regarding reduction of the light infiltration around the Site's perimeter and that the vegetation is going to do a lot to that effect also. The opposite is also true in that it is a nice Building and then asked if there will be accent lighting for the Building at night to highlight the Structure and on the Operations side, provide additional security. Mr. Clarke responded affirmatively and along the covered overhang that runs along the edge of the Building, there is additional down lighting that comes from that. In addition, there will have a glow from the interior of the offices as they are lit up at night and will have lighting spill directly from the Building. With regards to the Elevations, there are a lot of windows for daylight, etc. and will be a nice environment in terms of the lighting levels in the evening / nighttime.

Another question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if there are also lighting fixtures on the Operations Building and Mr. Clarke responded affirmatively.

There being no further comments on the Photometric Plan, Chairman Hamerly proceeded and asked if the Commission had any comments with the Exterior Elevations / Materials. He then requested the Applicant's Representative to explain the Stack Stone Exhibit. Mr. Clarke responded that the exterior Stack Stone is river rock / natural stone and there will be ledge stone inside the Building's lobby.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding the riverstone on the proposed chimneys and asked if the blend, "Summer Blend" does not look like stones located at their Facility and intend to be light in color, even when the stones are wet and asked if the "El Dorado Manufacture" makes a blend that is similar to the rocks out there in the Santa Ana River Wash Area so it would look like the Building grew organically and Mr. Clarke responded that a person can get all sorts of color combinations and can certainly look into that and try to color match that closer and Chairman Hamerly encouraged Mr. Clarke to do that since the Applicant's selection was a bit richer in color than what a person would find out there and Mr. Clarke said okay.

03-05-13PC

Another comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding the proposed Elevations, overall on the Administrative side is very attractive and on the pictures that the Applicant provided for the proposed Materials Exhibits are interesting kind of agricultural-looking buildings that are rustic and nice materials. With regards to the Operations Building, there is a need to soften it up a bit with a clear story and/or a nested gable approach similar to the Administrative Building and would have some natural ventilation if the Applicant would want to do some high clear story windows and have louvers up there so there would be a natural venturi effect that would help break up the Operations Building. Mr. Clarke responded that was not considered and is a budgetary issue and the utilitarian nature of what the Building is, but if there is budget available for that, he could talk with EVWD if that is something that they would like to look at.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if that was a Butler-style Building for the Operations Building and Mr. Clarke responded affirmatively that it is an enhanced Butler-style Building and then explained the design details to the Commission inclusive of the rafter tails, lighting elements, windows, etc.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding the rafter tails have been enhanced on the Operations Building Mr. Clarke responded that both Buildings have enhanced rafter tails.

Another comment was made by Chairman Hamerly and that he wants more of the architectural character in the Operations Building so it would tie in better with the Administrative Building.

Hearing no further comments on the Elevations, Chairman Hamerly proceeded for comments from the Commission regarding the Mitigation Measures Notices. There being no comments regarding the Mitigation Measures, he then asked if there is anyone in the audience who would like to speak on this Item. Hearing none, Chairman Hamerly then closed the Public Hearing and opened the floor for further discussion amongst the Commissioners.

Vice Chairman Huynh requested that Staff explain / summarize the Revised Planning COAs in which City Planner Mainez complied with the request.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding clarification with Revised Planning COA No. 11 with COA No. 36 relative to the small citrus trees located in the Demonstration Garden because some of the plant materials may not need artificial irrigation after they have been established and asked if COA No. 36 would be in conflict with COA No. 11a with getting planting materials stabilized or mature enough using natural precipitation and if so, then COA No. 36 be rephrased if there are any new non-native plant materials or need to make that distinction. City Planner Mainez said no, and that those are Standard COAs and

03-05-13PC

there will be a final Plan to be reviewed by the Applicant's and City's Landscape Architects with a vision of a demonstration and added there will be a lot of technical review for irrigation / plants to be conducted. Chairman Hamerly then asked then there is no internal conflict with COAs 11a and 36 and City Planner Mainez said that is correct.

A comment was made by Commissioner Haller that he expressed that the Proposal is an excellent proposal from EVWD and congratulates them on a good set of Plans and indicated that there have been four to five (4 – 5) concept for the Buildings, but is supportive of this Application and encouraged that it appeared that Staff and the Applicant's Representatives to have taken notes on some of the comments of the proposed Project i.e. river stone and the Operations Building and hopefully, the Applicant can work with Staff in order to "tweak" their design a bit to incorporate some of the ideas the Commission had and expressed his pleasure at the Proposal, Facility and Site design and Chairman Hamerly said so noted.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any further questions of the Applicant's Representatives, Staff, or discussion amongst the Commissioners, Hearing none, he then called for the question.

**A Motion** by Vice Chairman Huynh and seconded by Commissioner Haller that the Planning Commission approve the following for DRA 012-007:

1. Determined the Mitigated Negative Declaration certified by the Lead Agency (East Valley Water District – Notice of Determination dated February 27, 2013) is an adequate environmental document for the subject Project and direct Staff to file a Notice of Determination with the San Bernardino County Clerk of the Board and State Clearinghouse in accordance with CEQA Section 15096(i);
2. Approved the following Plans:
  - a. The Site Plan / Plot Plan;
  - b. The Grading and Drainage Plan;
  - c. The Conceptual Building and Design Elevation Plans;
  - d. The Photometric Plan;
  - e. The Conceptual Landscaping Plan;

03-05-13PC

- f. The Exterior Elevations and Material Sample Board, all subject to the Conditions of Approval, as amended with the following:

Planning COAs

- 11. The Applicant / Developer shall submit three (3) copies of a Final Landscape / Irrigation Plan along with appropriate fees, to the City Planning Division for plan check. Said Landscape Plan shall show the type, size, and location of landscaping materials and a date by which time the planting is expected to be completed. Said Landscape Plan shall be signed by a Landscape Architect and incorporate the following criteria:
  - a. All landscaping shall be provided with a permanently maintained irrigation system where natural and water-wise landscaping are not used.
  - b. Per Engineering requirements, the landscaping irrigation system within the Parkway Landscaping Area shall be plumbed separately from the onsite irrigation so in the event the City has to maintain the frontage landscaping, it can be irrigated without irrigating the entire Site. This irrigation system shall be designed and plumbed so a separate water meter for this irrigation system can be installed.
  - c. The plants selected and planting methods used shall be suitable for the soil and climatic conditions of the Site.
  - d. Landscape Plans shall indicate any proposed wall / fences. All walls shall be designed and constructed to incorporate design features such as tree planter wells, variable setback, split-face block, columns, or other special features to provide visual and physical relief along the wall face, as approved by the Planning Commission.
  - e. Within the developed area, one hundred percent (100%) of all soil shall be covered with either shrubs or ground cover or other material, as approved by the Planning Commission.

03-05-13PC

18. All permanent parking areas shall be paved and permanently maintained with asphalt, or concrete, or other material, as identified within the Water Quality Management Plan and approved by the Planning Commission and clearly delineated. The number of parking spaces, including disabled parking, shall comply with the requirements of the City's Municipal Code. A minimum of one hundred fifty-six (156) parking stalls is required onsite, or as adjusted by the Planning Commission.
  - a. Permanent parking spaces shall be not less than nine feet (9') wide, nor less than nineteen feet (19') deep, with adequate provisions for ingress and egress by a standard American passenger vehicle, except where compact car spaces have been authorized as follows:

Compact car parking spaces shall not be less than seven and one-half feet (7.5') wide, nor less than feet (15') long and shall be clearly marked and/or posted with signs stating "Compact Cars Only."
  - b. All parking areas shall be provided with nighttime security lighting. Lighting shall be shielded and directed to reflect away from neighboring properties. Lighting shall not exceed 0.2 foot candles of illumination beyond the property boundary, as approved by the Planning Commission.
  - c. The disabled parking spaces shall be properly signed and striped per the Americans with Disabilities Act.
  - d. Loading Zones shall be provided and properly striped and signed.
  - e. Provide additional trees adjacent to parking areas, as to provide heat relief to parked cars and to reduce the heat island effect as applicable.
36. Any new plantings shall be watered by an automatic irrigation system. Bubblers are recommended for any new citrus trees, while "hardlined" low volume drip irrigation is recommended for the remaining shrubs, perennials, and vines.
45. (NS) Any purchase of Site furniture such as benches and tables shall be made of 100% recycled content, or other percentage, as approved by the City's Public Services Division.

03-05-13PC

3. Approved the Design Review Findings of Fact; and;
4. Determined that the construction of East Valley Water District's new Administrative Office and Corporate Yard is consistent with the City's General Plan in accordance with Government Code Section 65401.

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

## **6.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Community Development Director Jaquess explained the Items that are tentatively scheduled for the Commission's Regular Meetings for March 19, 2013, and April 2, 2013, at 6:00pm.

There were no further announcements.

## **7.0 ADJOURN**

There being no further business, Chairman Hamerly declared the Meeting adjourned at 6:52p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

---

Linda McKeough, Community Development  
Administrative Assistant III

---

Randall Hamerly, Chairman  
Planning Commission

03-05-13PC