

**MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
FEBRUARY 18, 2014**

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 John Gamboa
 Commissioners Richard Haller
 Trang Huynh
 Milton Sparks

Absent: Commissioner Michael Stoffel (Note: arrived at 6:03p.m.)
 Commissioner Mark Rush

Staff Present:Lawrence Mainez, Community Development Director
 Kim Stater, City Planner
 Megan Irwin, Senior 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 4, 2014, Regular Meeting.

A Motion was made by Commissioner Haller and seconded by Vice Chairman Gamboa to approve the Minutes of February 4, 2014, Regular Meeting, as submitted.

Motion carried on a 3 – 0 vote with the abstentions of Commissioner Huynh and Chairman Hamerly and Commissioners Rush and Stoffel absent.

02-18-14.PC

4.0 OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

5.0 NEW BUSINESS

- 5.1 Accessory Sign Review (ASR 014-003) – Sign Application for a new proposed seven foot tall by eighteen feet wide (7' X 18') Monument Sign for the East Valley Water District (EVWD) Administrative Offices and Corporation Yard located at 31111 Greenspot Road.

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

(Note: Commissioner Michael Stoffel arrived at 6:03p.m.)

Community Development Director Mainez gave the presentation from the Staff Report and PowerPoint presentation and explained the historical background and that EVWD is now open for business at their new location, and the proposed Project's materials and design to the Commission. He further explained that at the next City Council Meeting, the Council will consider and take action on an Encroachment Permit to allow the Sign to be located in the City's Right-of-Way and that the Right-of-Way should have been closer to the Street Improvement, but Staff opted not to vacate that area. He then concluded his presentation and would answer any questions the Commission may have. It was noted that no one representing EVWD was in the audience.

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

A question was asked by Commissioner Stoffel if EVWD had already built the Monument Sign without approvals and Community Development Director Mainez said no, the Monument Sign has not been built, but the location of the Monument Sign was conceptually approved by the Commission a long time ago, and is a Right-of-Way issue.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the Right-of-Way issue is located in the deceleration turn lane and would it make the Right-of-Way more onto the EVWD's property. Community Development Director Mainez responded that the Property Line is located far back from the street where the "S" curve is located and that is where some street improvements were constructed and gave EVWD more land and was never vacated after the fact.

02-18-14.PC

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that at one point, there was a discussion during the Site Plan review regarding the deceleration lane in that who was going to maintain that swale of the land and Community Development Director Mainez said Chairman Hamerly is right and that with those facilities, there is still a lot of land out there.

A question was asked by Commissioner Haller if deliveries for the Corporation Yard were going to go through the Main Entrance and if the Commission it going to expect to review a Second Sign for the driveway further east. Community Development Director Mainez responded the Main Entrance will be used for the public and for deliveries such as mail, FedEx, UPS, etc. and that the Second Easterly Entrance is separate and will be utilized for storage equipment and employees.

Another question was asked by Commission Haller if the Commission will be reviewing a Sign Program and Community Development Director Mainez responded that this is for one (1) Sign and there will not be a Sign Program and indicated that the EVWD has not completed with the Demonstration Garden and was unsure if that is something the Commission would like to see, but he believed that EVWD would be more in charge of, but this is all of the Signage the Commission will have to review.

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Gamboa that he doesn't want to see a Sign pop up later in the future without review / permits by EVWD and Community Development Director Mainez said absolutely.

Another question was asked by Vice Chairman Gamboa why the Monument Sign is not internally lit and Community Development Director Mainez responded that it was a design option that the EVWD wanted these types of materials to reflect the Building and would be more unique with a shadowing effect at night, rather than the commercial standard retail lighting. Chairman Hamerly added that the coppertone color is an earthy color and is appropriate for the Building.

A concern was raised by Vice Chairman Gamboa regarding vandalism and sufficient lighting. Community Development Director Mainez responded that there are lots of security cameras installed not only on the parking standards, but also in other areas that are not in so conspicuous locations.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding as a formality, the Commission usually wants to see some sort of an identifier by placing the City Logo somewhere on the Monument Sign that has commercial venues. He knows that it is a Public Utility Facility and then asked if that is something that excuses EVWD from a typical Sign Standard or do you want to have a Marker stating that

EVWD is still in the City of Highland and to have the City Logo on the Marker and that it is usually on the body of the Sign and on the Sign base and if that would be a separate element that would be below the Sign's base block. Community Development Director Mainez responded if that is the desire of the Commission, that Staff could take that as a directive that there is enough room to place the City's Logo on the right side's offset of the Monument Sign. Vice Chairman Gamboa added that it is good to identify that the EVWD is located in the City of Highland.

A question was asked by Commissioner Haller if that would be confusing that the public might take the EVWD is part of the City. Chairman Hamerly responded that no one thinks as Lowe's is and added that the City Logo is usually required on Monument Signs. Community Development Director Mainez there would be some additional opportunities with the new development across the street and could maybe capture that City image from that side and could ask EVWD. He then said that it appears to be a mixed consensus whether or not to add the City Logo and then requested Chairman Hamerly to poll the Commissioners whether or not to add the City Logo to the Monument Sign.

Chairman Hamerly polled the Commission regarding whether or not to add the City Logo to the Monument Sign. The following is the result of comments on the poll: Commissioner Huynh: Yes, in that it is a nice feature if EVWD went along with it; Commissioner Haller said that he is okay with it, and indicated that it is bad that someone from EVWD was not present tonight; Commissioner Sparks said yes; Commissioner Stoffel said maybe and Vice Chairman Gamboa said yes, as long as it is not overwhelming and that EVWD is okay with it. Community Development Director Mainez said that he believed that EVWD has a Board Meeting tonight there at the Building and had an official public opening earlier today.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any further questions of Staff. Hearing none, he then opened the Public Hearing and asked if anyone representing the EVWD or anyone else in the audience would like to speak on the Item. Hearing none, he closed the Public Hearing and then opened the floor for further discussion amongst the Commissioners. There being no further questions of Staff, or discussion amongst the Commissioners, Chairman Hamerly then called for the question.

A Motion was made by Vice Chairman Gamboa and seconded by Commissioner Huynh to approve the proposed Monument Sign, with the addition of the City Logo, subject to the Conditions of Approval and adopt the Findings of Fact.

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

02-18-14.PC

5.2 Municipal Code Amendment (MCA 013-007) - An Ordinance of the City of Highland amending Chapter 5.12 (Home Occupations) and Chapter 16.44 (Specific Development Standards) to establish development regulations for Cottage Food Operations which will allow small food businesses to operate out of a private residence.

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

Senior Planner Irwin gave the presentation from the Staff Report and PowerPoint presentation and explained the historical background, and the proposed Code revisions and requirements to the Commission. She then concluded her presentation and gave Staff's recommendation that the Planning Commission approve the proposed Resolution to the Code Amendment and then forward the Amendment with the Commission's action to City Council. She indicated that a Representative from the San Bernardino County Health Department is in the audience and would be available to answer any questions the Commission may have.

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

A question was by Commissioner Stoffel how would someone control the proposed hours of operation between 7:00am to 8:00pm in the kitchen between the person's business and the person's time to cook for the family or is that for someone coming / going. Senior Planner Irwin responded that it is more for the people coming / going, but the person would be unable to prepare / cook food outside of those hours for business and stated that it is not prohibited by the State.

Another question was asked by Commissioner Stoffel how did Staff come up with the time between 7:00am to 8:00pm. Senior Planner Irwin responded when she contacted other Cities, that was the general parameters that it would be acceptable for deliveries for increased traffic and when the person is cooking for the business during those hours. She further explained as part of the Application for a Business License the Applicant has to sign and acknowledge that they have read the Conditions and comply with Code requirements. If the City does receive a complaint, the City has a right to go out and ensure that the Applicant is complying with the Ordinance. Commissioner Stoffel said that he did not want some neighbor to complain that the person is cooking past 8:30p.m. and that the person is cooking for their family and "to tie someone's hands" from doing business recommended that the Code be more specific regarding the limitation on hours. City Planner Stater said that the hours of operation could be more specific with regards to vehicular traffic or pedestrian traffic. Community Development Director Mainez added regarding the hours of operation of the use

02-18-14.PC

and provided scenarios with regards to restricting sales of beer / wine and not wanting the person to cook late at night. Hopefully, won't get into the argument if that person was cooking for that event / client, or cooking for their family.

A question was by Commissioner Stoffel if there was any input from the people / public and knows people in the business and they cook late at night and that he knows of "the Cinnamon Roll Lady". Community Development Director Mainez responded Staff did not want a 24 hour business and that this is something that Staff could start off with and might be modified over time and what did Commissioner Stoffel suggest. In addition, Community Development Director Mainez added that there had been one (1) gentleman that had attended a City Council Meeting when this Item was introduced as a Work Program Item and that he was supportive of it. City Planner Stater added that Staff had spoken with four (4) other communities plus San Bernardino County and none had indicated any concern with the hours of operation, but would be fairly easy to modify Section B.3.c. to modify the hours of operation to pedestrian and vehicular traffic shall now be... and Commissioner Stoffel interjected said as a businessperson, that he hates to put restrictions like that on people.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that it is understandable with sales during the day, but what if the person has a catering business and has an Evening Event and that the person is loading everything in order to prepare for that Event and might be problematic if the Event started at 8:00pm. If a person is doing direct sales, a person does not want to have vehicular traffic volume at 10:30pm, but not wanting to jeopardize their ability to provide a business in having food. Vice Chairman Gamboa responded on Page 13 of the Staff Report under B.3.e.i. regards to deliveries. City Planner Stater said then the question would then be regarding sales.

A question was by Commissioner Stoffel regarding to loading / delivering and gave a scenario if a client had an event on a Friday night at 10:00pm and the person had come home to clean up after that and a person does not want to make a lot of noise at night. Chairman Hamerly added with the provision with having no idling vehicle in order not to bother neighbors at 10:00pm.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any further questions of Staff. Hearing none, he then opened the Public Hearing and asked if Ms. Singh would like to address the Commission.

Ms. Sumedha Singh, Environmental Health Specialist of San Bernardino County, Department of Public Health, 6575 Haven Avenue, Suite 130, Rancho Cucamonga, California. She distributed her business card to the Commission

02-18-14.PC

and Staff and then addressed the Commission. Ms, Singh indicated a scenario with hours of operation from 8:00am to 8:00pm with regards to Rancho Cucamonga that some people do bake cookies at 2:00am at Christmas. Commissioner Stoffel said not cooking for the business, he wanted assurance the person would not have people at night lining up at the business for cinnamon rolls. Ms. Singh responded the person is not supposed to be preparing domestic food while preparing for the sale items.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly regarding some modifications done to the person's normal domestic kitchen to allow additional capacity. Ms. Singh responded that she hasn't seen that and how this is not like other domestic activities, i.e. laundry, cleaning, etc. and it is like a job – a person to clock in and clock out and how most have double ovens in their kitchens and not commercially-sized capacity ovens.

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

A comment was made by Commissioner Haller this is confusing on how the City is going to collect the information and what happens if a complaint is registered and needs to be addressed / clarified. Chairman Hamerly responded how would the business be monitored with the utilities and a complaint registered and would be "enforceable" would then become a public nuisance issue i.e. increasing or obstructing traffic, noise disturbances, light disturbances, etc. and need to put something in there to clarify a what constitutes a nuisance / disruption of the neighborhood as opposed to limiting the hours of the commercial enterprise and not the preparation of the food items.

Another comment was made by Commissioner Haller if the business is allowed in an apartment which is a lot more complicated than in a private residence because would still be parking and delivery issues, etc. Chairman Hamerly said that it would have to be with indirect sales and with no traffic circulation. Senior Planner Irwin added that if a Cottage Foods Operator is not the Homeowner, there would be a requirement of an authorization from the Apartment's Property Manager or Apartment's Property Owner who would be responsible for ensuring compliance. Chairman Hamerly said if the City is unable to restrict the Cottage Food Operator, could a Private Land Owner restrict the commercial activity for the Cottage Food Operator and if that is something that the Private Land Owner could get in trouble for. Commissioner Stoffel said no one has ever thought of that and that the restriction could be listed in the Rental Agreement.

City Planner Stater responded that is something Staff had not discussed before and would be a question for the City Attorney and ask him to address it at the City Council Meeting, or if the Commission desires, bring it back to the Commission for further consideration prior to being forward to City Council and

02-18-14.PC

was unsure if Ms. Singh was familiar with this issue. Ms. Singh responded that she was unsure of the question and if it would be for a Class "A". Chairman Hamerly stated that it was a specific clause that if the Operator of the Business was not the Property Owner, the Operator would have to obtain permission from the Property Owner in order to have said business operating out of that particular Property. The Assembly Bill states that the City cannot refuse the person's right to operate a business out of a Private Residence and then asked if the Property Owner of that Residence could refuse to let someone operate a commercial enterprise out of the Property Owner's Residence. Ms. Singh responded that she has never dealt with that situation, but would say yes, that the Property Owner could refuse. City Planner Stater asked Ms. Singh if she has seen examples Cottage Food Industries based out of Apartments and Ms. Singh responded that she has never seen one in an Apartment in that some people feel that the Apartment's kitchen is too small. Community Development Director Mainez interjected there is legislation tied to the City of Highland's Land Use Regulations and doesn't believe that is something that has to do with the Property Owner's rights. The Property Owner has more strength than the City does and Staff can ask the City Attorney and take that as a comment from the Planning Commission and address that before being forwarded to City Council. There is also the Residential Rental Enhancement Program Ordinance that is a mechanism that the Code Enforcement Division utilizes and follows and explained that Program's process, and coordinates along with the San Bernardino County Public Health Department and its regulations. If the business is not located in Rental Agreement, it can be problematic, and would be based on neighbor complaints.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly regarding what represents hazardous food materials and provided examples with regards to Page 11, Second Paragraph on "Cottage Food Products" Definition of the Staff Report by adding the statement that, "Direct Sales include, but are not limited to" but there is "not a limited to" clause within Cottage Food Products and is not on a comprehensive list. Ms. Singh responded about how the foods need to be cooked and provided other examples to the Commission. and Ms. Singh responded that it is not permitted and there is a categorical list and if that item is not on the list, then it is prohibited and added that the ingredients need to be cooked into the products i.e. cakes, cookies, etc. but not ingredients like eggs, butter, raw fruit, vegetables, etc. Ms. Singh provided an example that cupcakes are acceptable, but not the buttercream frosting since the frosting has the butter ingredient, but it has not been cooked. She added that dried fruit is also acceptable. Another item that is not on the categorical list is beef jerky because it is a USDA thing which is a regulation from the State.

02-18-14.PC

A question was asked by Commissioner Sparks what about hot sauces and Ms. Singh responded that is an herbal blend and that mole is acceptable, but sauces do not fall on the categorical list and therefore, is not allowed.

Chairman Hamerly reiterated his question about whether or not it would be advisable to “include, but not limited to” phrase on Page 11 of the Staff Report, Second Paragraph, Direct Sales of Cottage Food Products Definition. Community Development Director Mainez responded “or as published by the San Bernardino County Health Department”. Chairman Hamerly said sure, as long as it references something more comprehensive so that it is not a “stand alone” if the item is not just cream, custard or meat, that it’s good. City Planner Stater said to add to the first sentence that, “it includes, but not limited to” and with the next Sentence specifically reference, “or as published by the San Bernardino County Health Department” and Chairman Hamerly said that would be fine.

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Gamboa regarding the hours of sales and City Planner Stater how about on Page 13 of the Staff Report under B.3.c. and suggested to place in the below Sales Section that specifically states Onsite Sales and make it B.3.d.iv and say that, “Onsite sales shall be limited to Monday through Sunday between the hours of 8:00am to 8:00pm”. Vice Chairman Gamboa said to place it there under the Onsite Sales Section and Commissioner Stoffel added that is a great idea.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if FedEx, UPS would be considered Third Party Delivery Services. Ms. Singh responded that the State and Cottage Foods Items are not allowed to be shipped via FedEx, UPS, Mail and be limited to State of California and indicated that is hard to control and San Bernardino County is not going to regulate that, at this time.

A comment was made by Commissioner Stoffel that the Post Office delivers mail on Saturday. City Planner Stater responded that this is complaint-based reaction and if there is a severe issue, it may be enforced. Chairman Hamerly added that it would seem to be more prudent to “water down” the regulations so that there would not be any unenforceable clauses and provided an example how people ship See’s candies around the Country during the Holiday Season and would not be distinguishable from a Cottage Food Operator and how enforceable this is and that it may be more trouble than it is worth to be codified in the Ordinance. City Planner Stater responded to learn from other communities where some of this was taken from and were also transferred from the City of Highland’s Home Occupation Standard Guidelines and have added to the Cottage Foods and if there are complaints, (the Code) may be modified in the future.

02-18-14.PC

A comment was made by Commissioner Huynh that there was a similar situation in Rancho Cucamonga with the 8:00a.m. to 5:00p.m. hours of operation and had a Staff Member count the number of UPS trucks for deliveries for that particular residence. He added that the City could also request a "Run Sheet" from UPS for that particular residence in question. He indicated this had happened when a complaint was registered and that there were lots of resources utilized in order for monitoring purposes and the person was caught in violation. City Planner Stater responded that there are Standard Revocation Guidelines within the Business License Chapter of the Municipal Code and explained the Revocation process to the Commission.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly regarding non-permitted food products and if maybe there are thirty (30) people / employees working in the garage on the food products is a clear violation. City Planner Stater responded that the Business License could be revoked and that any one (1) part of that, non-permitted food product, the number of people that are employed, the City will provide a Notice to the Cottage Food Operator who is responsible and then explained what would be revoked to the Commission. Community Development Director Mainez added that would also include the revocation of the Health Permit from San Bernardino County Health Department also has a Revocation process.

Another question was asked by Chairman Hamerly regarding the Business License it would be based on the gross sales income of the Cottage Food Operator would make \$50,000, would the business cease to be a Cottage Food Operation and have to locate to a Storefront space. Senior Planner Irwin responded that it is not currently monitored through the Business License process. Ms. Singh added that it is based on the "honor system". City Planner Stater added that they file with the Board of Equalization for tax purposes and if there was a complaint, the City could request those records and Vice Chairman Gamboa said that the City then could revisit that. Chairman Hamerly said that he is trying to avoid a "nightmare in enforcement" in that there are provisions, but no feasible way of monitoring and reiterated about the process in which if the City receives a complaint, the Staffing to handle it and is problematic. Community Development Director Mainez said that the Highland Municipal Code is probably full of a lot of frivolous regulations that are difficult to enforce on a good day, but it has to be on a complaint-basis and explained with the priorities and the process, there needs to be some regulation consistent with the laws and that is what is being discussed tonight.

A comment was made by Commissioner Haller to revisit the "average utility bill consumption" and what does that mean and if Staff can come up with a better way or delete it. (It was noted this was on Page 16 of the Staff Report, Section

02-18-14.PC

11, 3.i.). City Planner Stater responded that it came from the Existing City Ordinance and is a Standard Home Occupation Provision and duplicated it here, and that it is not a necessary requirement for Food Cottage in particular and Staff could remove it. Chairman Hamerly said okay and Commissioner Stoffel added that is a good idea. Chairman Hamerly added that he would rather not have Staff spend the time auditing utility receipts and provided examples of existing residential kitchens along if someone wanted to “split” a gas line and the feasibility of obtaining a Permit from Building & Safety. Another example he used was with someone having a commercial-sized refrigerator(s) or with other appliances and that the meter is not sized for those types of units and might be at risk and unsafe condition in order for the person to expand on their own. Senior Planner Irwin asked if the Commission would like that to be removed from both the Home Occupation and Cottage Food Section. City Planner Stater responded that was discussed and that Building & Safety is part of the Business License Application and its process. Chairman Hamerly said he was talking about the removal of the Section with the customary utility usage and provided an example if a person has three (3) double ovens due to that person like to entertain 150 people at a time.

A comment was made by Commissioner Huynh that there is enough general language and “shall not be more than the Building Code Regulations” and people will do that and provided an example, otherwise that is only a reaction when something happens. City Planner Stater responded that is similar to language listed on Page 17 of the Staff Report on 3.i. and read, “The occupation shall not cause an extraordinary increase in the use or any one or more public utilities” or possibly add the word, “appliances”. Commissioner Haller said that it reads well and that he meant that he was referring to the average utility bill. City Planner Stater said then keep the First Sentence and delete the Second Sentence. Commissioner Haller said or described in a way in referring to what that is and City Planner Stater responded that Staff will work with the Building Official.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that it cannot exceed the rate capacity of utility of residences and provided another example of IM BTU that is rated with 350,000 could be a combustion problem. City Planner Stater reiterated that Staff will work with the Building Official for the appropriate language and modify that Section.

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

A question was asked by Ms. Singh if the person would only have to obtain a Business License Permit and/or a Home Occupation Permit. Senior Planner Irwin responded that the Home Occupation Permit is combined with the Business License. Ms. Singh said that the person would have to register with the City first and obtain approval then go to San Bernardino County to obtain the County’s

02-18-14.PC

Permit(s).

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Gamboa regarding the language for the Application processing and Senior Planner Irwin responded the language would be included on the actual Application. Community Development Director Mainez added the process is similar with other Retail Restaurants that the person would go to San Bernardino County first then to the City for Permits. Senior Planner Irwin added as long as the person goes to San Bernardino County with some proof documenting that the person has come to the City. Ms. Singh said it would be "pending" paperwork and provided an example with a Class "B" License and go out later and then asked if the person would receive final paperwork from the City and how the Cottage Foods Operations Application is finalized.

(Note: Vice Chairman Gamboa left the Chambers at 7:05pm)

A question was asked by Commissioner Huynh regarding if the Cottage Food Operator during the Holiday Season, if that person can sell outside of their home. Ms. Singh responded that what happened with them and said if the City allowed it. There are traffic and trash issues, but allowed it, and would not allow the person set up on the driveway. City Planner Stater said that the person came to the City in advance, the City could issue a Special Event Permit.

A question was asked by Commissioner Haller regarding the clustering of Cottage Foods Operations and distances between them. Senior Planner Irwin responded the State does not regulate that but the City has the authority to Condition overconcentration and chose not to, but could add if the Commission desires. Chairman Hamerly said not wanting to create a conflict and the feasibility of density, but if the City could limit the Licenses for Cottage Foods Operations in the community.

(Note: Vice Chairman Gamboa returned at 7:07pm)

Community Development Director Mainez responded that Cottage Foods Operations are located within a Residential Zone District and the City is not taking away the right for them to enjoy the neighborhood residential use and if adding a distance requirement, may have an impact on them, with so many restrictions and the process for the person to go through. A suggestion was made by City Planner Stater that a provision could be added to allow the Community Development Director to waive that in the event to allow / grant privilege with distances and provided examples to the Commission.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if this would be direct sales and Community Development Director Mainez responded that is correct and that the person could advertise, using e-mail, social media ads, like for cupcakes, and

02-18-14.PC

commented would be more of a problem rather than a shop or a Farmer's Market. Ms. Singh added with San Bernardino County, the person's gross income would be over \$45,000 and would allow clustering.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly to have Staff provide the City Attorney with the Commission's comments for the Ordinance for his review. Ms. Singh added that she (San Bernardino County) has not had any complaints.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any further questions of Ms. Singh or of Staff. Hearing none, he then asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on the Item. Hearing none, he then closed the Public Hearing and there being no further questions of Ms. Singh, Staff, or discussion amongst the Commissioners, he then called for the question.

A Motion was made by Commissioner Haller and seconded by Vice Chairman Gamboa that the Planning Commission approve Resolution No. 14-003 recommending the City Council:

1. Adopt a Notice of Exemption and instruct Staff to file a Notice of Exemption with the County Clerk of the Board, and;
2. Introduce an Ordinance to amend Chapter 5.12 (Home Occupations), Chapter 16.06 (Definitions), Chapter 16.44 (Specific Development Standards) and Tables 16.16.030.A (Uses Permitted within Residential Districts) and 16.22.030.A (Uses Permitted within the Mixed Use District) of the Highland Municipal Code establishing development regulations for Cottage Food Operations.
3. Staff to consider Planning Commission items for consideration prior to forwarding to City Council.

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

6.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS

City Planner Stater explained there are Items tentatively scheduled for the Regular Meetings of March 4, 2014, and March 18, 2014.

Community Development Director Mainez explained that the Community Trails Day is scheduled for May 3, 2014, along with a Ribbon Cutting.

City Planner Stater explained that demolition will commence on the Old Post Office and Library adjacent to City Hall in two (2) weeks.

02-18-14.PC

Community Development Director Mainez explained that construction on the New Greenspot Road Bridge started today and should be completed in one (1) year.

Commissioner Huynh requested that the Commission be advised when the Highland Area Chamber of Commerce has its Project Update (State of the City Event) for the public, business people and if possible, with the next Budget year, have the City pay for the Commissioners to attend it. Vice Chairman Gamboa requested that the information regarding the Luncheon is forwarded to the Commission. Staff responded that it would.

Discussion ensued between the Commission and Staff regarding the status of the proposed Harmony Specific Plan Project and that Staff is waiting for the Fiscal Impact Analysis (FIA). The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is still being prepared by the Consultant for the Harmony Specific Plan, along with other documents that are being revised and City Staff is anticipating that the documents will be submitted to City Staff and go out for public review soon.

Discussion ensued between the Commission and Staff regarding the “For Sale” Sign located on the Mission Development property. Staff explained that is part of the Greenspot Village & Marketplace, but the property is future Planning Area III and is not a part of the current Planning Area I and Planning Area II Project.

Discussion ensued between the Commission and Staff regarding whether or not if the Representatives from the Harmony Specific Plan have contacted the Representatives of the Arnott property and Staff indicated that Staff was unsure of that relationship, but added that Mr. Camille Bahri has been working with Representatives of the Arnott property and appears there may be some ideas exchanging between them with entrances located at both Projects and the feasibility of scheduling a Workshop with the Commission and a General Plan Amendment.

7.0 ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chairman Hamerly declared the Meeting adjourned at 6:25p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Linda McKeough, Community Development
Administrative Assistant III

Randall Hamerly, Chairman
Planning Commission

02-18-14.PC