

1 CITY OF MORENO VALLEY  
2 PLANNING COMMISSION  
3 REGULAR MEETING  
4 CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER – 14177 FREDERICK STREET  
5

6 Thursday March 12<sup>th</sup>, 2015, 7:00 PM

7  
8 CALL TO ORDER

9  
10 ROLL CALL

11  
12 Excused Absence: Chair Sims

13  
14 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

15  
16 APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

17  
18 VICE CHAIR LOWELL – Would anyone like to motion to approve the Agenda for  
19 tonight’s meeting?

20  
21 COMMISSIONER BAKER – I’ll move to accept the Agenda as presented.

22  
23 COMMISSIONER BARNES – Second

24  
25 VICE CHAIR LOWELL – Can we get a vote?

26  
27 COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA – Yes

28  
29 COMMISSIONER BAKER – Yes

30  
31 COMMISSIONER BARNES - Yes

32  
33 COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ – Yes

34  
35 VICE CHAIR LOWELL – Yes

36  
37 VICE CHAIR LOWELL – Okay that brings us to the public comments portion of  
38 the meeting. At this time... this is the time for any member of the public to  
39 address us on any matter which is not listed on the Agenda and which is within  
40 the subject matter of the jurisdiction of the Commission.

41  
42 PLANNING OFFICIAL SANDZIMIER – Vice Chair Lowell, may I? The approval  
43 of the minutes would be the first item. I apologize.

44  
45 VICE CHAIR LOWELL – Ah, I see, my mistake.

1 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2  
3 **January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2015**

4  
5 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Right, let me back up. The first item on our Agenda is  
6 the approval of the minutes for the meeting of January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2015. Would anyone  
7 like to motion to approve the minutes?

8  
9 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – I'll so move

10  
11 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Second

12  
13 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – And can we ask for a vote?

14  
15 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – Yes

16  
17 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Yes

18  
19 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Yes

20  
21 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Yes

22  
23 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Yes

24  
25 **PUBLIC ADVISED OF THE PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED IN THE**  
26 **MEETING** *(On display in the rear of the room)*

27  
28 **COMMENTS BY ANY MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC ON ANY MATTER WHICH**  
29 **IS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA AND WHICH IS WITHIN THE SUBJECT**  
30 **MATTER JURISDICTION OF THE COMMISSION**

31  
32 *Upon request, this agenda will be made available in appropriate alternative*  
33 *formats to persons with disabilities, in compliance with the Americans with*  
34 *Disabilities Act of 1990. Any person with a disability who requires a modification*  
35 *or accommodation in order to participate in a meeting should direct such request*  
36 *to Mark Sambito, ADA Coordinator, at 951-413-3120 at least 48 hours before the*  
37 *meeting. The 48 hour notification will enable the City to make reasonable*  
38 *arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.*

39  
40 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Now that brings us to the public comments portion of  
41 the Agenda. This is the portion of the meeting where comments by any member  
42 of the public on any matter which is not listed on the Agenda and which is within  
43 the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission. A little caveat... Upon request,  
44 this agenda will be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons  
45 with disabilities, in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.  
46 Any person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in

1 order to participate in a meeting should direct such a request to Mark Sambito,  
2 ADA Coordinator, at 951-413-3120 at least 48 hours before the meeting. The 48  
3 hour notification will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure  
4 accessibility to this meeting. Do we have any requests for the Public Speakers?

5  
6 **GRACE ESPINO-SALCEDO** – We do have one Speaker. That’s Tom Jerele Jr.  
7 I’m sorry that’s Tom Jerele Sr.

8  
9 **SPEAKER JERELE** – Tom Jerele Sr. speaking on behalf of myself.  
10 Commissioner Lowell, Commissioners and members of Staff and the public.  
11 Thank you for giving me enough time and I’m fine I don’t need any special  
12 accommodations. Gives me a chance to stretch my back a little bit, but I simply  
13 wanted to acknowledge and am pleased that the City Council has extended the  
14 terms; that are given new terms to the incumbent Planning Commissioners and  
15 I’ve enjoyed the work I’ve seen take place in the past and I think Councilman  
16 Giba said it quite well and I’m paraphrasing a bit, but it amounted to if it ain’t  
17 broke, don’t fix it, so it’s working pretty good and so I just want to wish you a  
18 good tour of duty in the future here and that’s it. Thank you.

19  
20 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you Tom. Grace, are there any other Public  
21 Speakers?

22  
23 **GRACE ESPINO-SALCEDO** – We have no other speakers.

24  
25 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, well at this time that closes the public speaker  
26 portion of the meeting. Thank you.

27  
28 **NON-PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

29 *None*

30  
31 **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

- 32  
33 1. Case Description: [PA13-0063 Plot Plan](#)  
34 [P13-130 Environmental Impact Report \(EIR\)](#)  
35 Applicant: Kearny Real Estate Company  
36 Owner: Kearny Real Estate Company  
37 Representative: Jason Rosin, Kearny Real Estate Company  
38 Location: 17300 Perris Boulevard (NEC of Perris Boulevard  
39 and Modular Way).  
40 Proposal: A Plot Plan for the construction of a 1,109,378  
41 square foot warehouse building on 50.68 net  
42 acres with the demolition of the existing  
43 warehouse facility. The project site is in the  
44 Moreno Valley Industrial Area Specific Plan  
45 208. Approval of this project will require the  
46 Review and certification of an EIR.

1 Case Planner: Claudia Manrique

2  
3 **Recommendation:**

4  
5 **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2015-03 and Resolution No. 2015-04 and  
6 thereby:

- 7 1. **CERTIFY** that Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR), P13-130, for  
8 the Modular Logistics Center on file with the Community & Economic  
9 Development Department, has been completed in compliance with the  
10 California Environmental Quality Act, the Planning Commission  
11 reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR,  
12 and the Final EIR reflects the City's independent judgment and  
13 analysis as provided for in Planning Commission Resolution 2015-03.
- 14 2. **ADOPT** the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations  
15 regarding the Final EIR for the Modular Logistics Center, attached  
16 hereto as Exhibit A to Resolution 2015-03.
- 17 3. **APPROVE** the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Final EIR for the  
18 proposed Modular Logistics Center, attached hereto as Exhibit B to  
19 the Resolution 2015-03.
- 20 4. **APPROVE** PA13-0063 Plot Plan, subject to the attached Conditions of  
21 Approval included as Exhibit A to Resolution 2015-04.

22  
23 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Now we need to go to the first item that we are  
24 discussing tonight which is the Kearny Real Estate Company; PA13-0063 and I  
25 believe Claudia is the Case Planner on this one or is it; I'm sorry.

26  
27 **PLANNING OFFICIAL SANDZIMIER** – Claudia Manrique is the Case Planner on  
28 this one, however I want to bring to the Commission's attention this evening that  
29 on Monday of this week the applicant had made a formal request that the  
30 Planning Commission continue the public hearing on this item to the meeting of  
31 April 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2015. There is a letter attached and it is on your dais this evening that  
32 explains why. Simply they have received some additional comments. They did  
33 not say who those comments had come from, but they need some additional time  
34 to consider the comments and prepare an appropriate response and they  
35 respectfully request that we continue the item to April 23<sup>rd</sup>. Staff has considered  
36 the request and we have no objection to the continuance, however I do want to  
37 point out to the Commission that the meeting was public noticed as a public  
38 hearing this evening, so if there was any member of the public that was here who  
39 wished to speak, the Commission may want to ask for that. The two options you  
40 have are one, to open the public hearing and take the public testimony and then  
41 continue the meeting in an open fashion to the meeting of the 23<sup>rd</sup> if you are  
42 inclined to continue it or the other option is to take deliberations to take a motion  
43 to see if you can continue the meeting to April 23<sup>rd</sup> without accepting public  
44 comments and then you can just direct the audience they will have the  
45 opportunity to make their public comments on the 23<sup>rd</sup>. Those are your two  
46 options.

1 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, in an effort to make sure that nobody travelled all  
2 this way to our meeting and not have a chance to speak, are there any speaker  
3 slips for this item?  
4  
5 **GRACE ESPINO-SALCEDO** – I have not received any Speaker Slips.  
6  
7 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Alright since we don't have any Speaker Slips, I think it  
8 would be a better move to not open the public comment at this time and can we  
9 get a motion to continue this item to the April 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting.  
10  
11 **PLANNING OFFICIAL SANDZIMIER** – That was the request.  
12  
13 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I move that we continue this item to the  
14 April 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting.  
15  
16 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Do we have a second?  
17  
18 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – I'll second that  
19  
20 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Can we get a vote? Can we get a roll call vote?  
21  
22 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – Yes  
23  
24 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Yes  
25  
26 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Yes  
27  
28 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Yes  
29  
30 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Yes  
31  
32 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – And with that motion I do believe the item has been  
33 continued. Do we need to say anything else on this matter Mr. Sandzimier?  
34  
35 **PLANNING OFFICIAL SANDZIMIER** – No we do not. The next meeting will be  
36 on April 23<sup>rd</sup> because the meeting was continued to a date certain. The public  
37 notice that has been published for this meeting still holds, so it'll be fine. Thank  
38 you.  
39  
40 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

1           2. Case Description:     [PA14-0042 Plot Plan](#)  
2                                    [PA14-0043 General Plan Amendment](#)  
3                                    [PA14-0044 Zone Change](#)  
4           Applicant:            Latco Enterprises  
5           Owner:                 Jim Kimmel  
6           Representative:      Pacific Development Solutions Group  
7           Location:             Southeast corner of Eucalyptus Avenue and  
8                                    Edgemont Street  
9           Proposal:             General Plan Amendment from Commercial (C) to  
10                                  Residential 20 (R20) and Zone Change from  
11                                  Community Commercial (CC) to Residential 20  
12                                  (R20) for development of a Plot Plan for a 112  
13                                  Unit apartment project on 6.63 acres. The project  
14                                  Proposes 14 two-story buildings with a mix of 1  
15                                  And 2 bedroom units and with covered parking to  
16                                  include carports and garages.

17  
18 **Recommendation:**

19  
20           **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2015-06 and thereby **RECOMMEND** that the  
21           City Council:  
22           1.     **ADOPT** a Mitigated Negative Declaration for General Plan  
23                    Amendment application PA14-0043, pursuant to the California  
24                    Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines; and,  
25           2.     **APPROVE** General Plan Amendment application PA14-0043  
26                    based on the findings contained in this resolution, and as shown on  
27                    the attachment included as Exhibit A.

28  
29 **Recommendation:**

30  
31           **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2015-07 and thereby **RECOMMEND** that the  
32           City Council:  
33           1.     **ADOPT** a Mitigated Negative Declaration for Zone Change  
34                    application PA14-044, pursuant to the California Environmental  
35                    Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines; and,  
36           2.     **APPROVE** Zone Change application PA14-044 based on the  
37                    findings contained in this resolution, and as shown on the  
38                    attachment included as Exhibit A.

39  
40 **Recommendation:**

41  
42           **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2015-07 and thereby **RECOMMEND** that the  
43           City Council:  
44           1.     **ADOPT** a Mitigated Negative Declaration for Plot Plan Application  
45                    PA14-0042, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act  
46                    (CEQA) Guidelines; and,

1           **2. APPROVE** Plot Plan application PA14-0042 based on the findings  
2 contained in this resolution, and subject to the attached conditions  
3 of approval included as Exhibit A.  
4

5 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – So now the next item on the Agenda is the public  
6 hearing for a Plot Plan, General Plan Amendment, Zone Change and Mitigated  
7 Negative Declaration filed by Latco Enterprises. Is there a Staff Report on this  
8 item?  
9

10 **PLANNING OFFICIAL SANDZIMIER** – There is a Staff Report this evening. Jeff  
11 Bradshaw, Associate Planner will make the presentation.  
12

13 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you  
14

15 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Mr. Vice Chair, before we get started, I had a  
16 discussion with the City Attorney and one of the property owners and another  
17 individual are a client of the firm that employs me, so after discussion, I have  
18 decided that it would be best that I recuse myself from this evening's  
19 proceedings.  
20

21 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Just give him a chance to exit.  
22 Okay, Mr. Bradshaw.  
23

24 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER BRADSHAW** – Thank you. Good evening Vice Chair  
25 Lowell and members of the Planning Commission. As described in the Agenda,  
26 the item before you this evening is a request from Latco Enterprises and includes  
27 three applications for the development of a project identified as the Edgemont  
28 Apartments Project. The applications would include a request for a General Plan  
29 Amendment, request for a Zone Change and a Plot Plan for the development of  
30 a 112 unit apartment project located on the 6.63 acres at the southeast corner of  
31 Eucalyptus Avenue and Edgemont Street. I'll just provide a little bit of  
32 background on the project site. This is a site that was used historically for  
33 agricultural purposes up to about 1967. From 1967 forward it has remained as a  
34 vacant undeveloped corner with the activity there limited to weed abatement.  
35 This is a mostly flat property. There are no outcroppings or stream beds or other  
36 features of this type on the site. It is important to note I think that the project at  
37 this location is within the boundaries of the Edgemont Community Services  
38 District which provides sewer and lighting services for arterial streets and also  
39 within the boundaries of the Box Springs Mutual Water Company, which provides  
40 water to this area. The City did receive will serve letters from both these utilities  
41 indicating their ability to provide both sewer and water services to the project and  
42 additionally a fire flow letter was provided for the project indicating that Box  
43 Springs Mutual was able to satisfy the City's fire flow requirements. That  
44 document was reviewed and found satisfactory by our City's Fire Prevention  
45 Bureau.

1 When you look at the project location, it is surrounded by established uses that  
2 include single family homes to the north on the opposite side of Eucalyptus.  
3 There are scattered homes to the west and the south. There is a mobile home  
4 park immediately to the east. To the north on the other side of Eucalyptus there  
5 is also is Edgemont Elementary School and an office building.

6  
7 The General Plan designation for this area is primarily Residential Office, with  
8 some commercial designated land to the west at the intersection of Eucalyptus  
9 and Valley Springs and again to the east at the intersection of Day and  
10 Eucalyptus. The zoning for the area is complimentary to that. It is primarily  
11 Office Commercial along Eucalyptus Avenue along with Commercial zoning at  
12 the same intersections at Valley Springs and Eucalyptus and again at Day and  
13 Eucalyptus. The zoning to the south includes single family homes that are in  
14 zones that are R10 and R15, which are both multi-family zones, so we have  
15 some pre-existing non-conforming uses that surround the site and again with the  
16 school site across the street that has a public zone or public use.

17  
18 Additionally just to provide some background about the project site. There was a  
19 mini-storage facility approved by the City Council at this location in April of 2009.  
20 The approval of the mini-storage as the use required Councils approval of a  
21 General Plan Amendment and a Zone Change at this location, so in 2009 the  
22 General Plan was changed from Residential Office to Commercial and the zone  
23 was changed from Office Commercial to Community Commercial and that  
24 change allowed for the more intense use to take place and would have allowed  
25 for the development of the mini-storage facility. In speaking with the owner of the  
26 property, that particular use has never come on line and was not developed due  
27 to changing market conditions and the demand for mini-storage which has  
28 diminished through the years and so the change presented to you this evening is  
29 a reflection really of changing demand and land use patterns for this area. Again  
30 the project includes a request for a change in land use at this site.

31  
32 The applicant is requesting a General Plan Amendment to change the  
33 designation to Residential 20 and a corresponding zone change to R24 for this  
34 location. The proposed change would then establish a multi-family designation  
35 for this site, which would be compatible with those surrounding residential uses  
36 to the south and to the east. The loss of commercial land use at this location  
37 would eliminate the potential for commercial development at this site, however in  
38 reviewing the proposed land use change, consideration was given to the amount  
39 of existing commercial located within close proximity at the intersections of Valley  
40 Springs and Day Street with Eucalyptus. I think it is also important to note that  
41 under the prior approval, the intent was to allow for commercial development that  
42 would be a passive use if you will; a mini-storage use across from an Elementary  
43 School, I believe at the time was considered to be an acceptable type of  
44 commercial use across from there.

45



1 It is Staff's feeling that in this case, with the proposed change to multi-family  
2 residential we can establish a land use across from the Elementary School that is  
3 a more compatible use than the unknowns of an intense commercial use at this  
4 location. The Traffic Engineering Division required a Traffic Impact Study for the  
5 project. The intent of that was to address the potential increase in traffic that  
6 would result if this project is approved. Based on the results of that study, there  
7 were no acceptable levels of service or other negative impacts to the City's  
8 circulation system identified.

9  
10 The Plot Plan proposed for this project would result in the development of 14  
11 two-story buildings that would allow for a total of 112 apartment units that would  
12 include a mix of 56 one bedroom and 56 two bedroom units. The site would be  
13 secured with decorative perimeter fencing and walls. It would be a gated facility.  
14 Amenities with the project would include a pool, a rec center, private open space,  
15 carport parking and some single car garages for the residents of the community.  
16 In the review of the project, the City coordinated with outside agencies that  
17 included the Moreno Valley Unified School District, the Pechanga Cultural  
18 Resources representing the Temecula Band of the San Jacinto Mission Indians  
19 and the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission and out of that  
20 coordinated review we were able to address concerns raised by some of those  
21 agencies and then include conditions of approval on the project that would help  
22 address potential impacts to both cultural resources and also ensure that this  
23 project is compatible with the March Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan that is  
24 the responsibility of the Airport Land Use Commission to oversee. As an  
25 extension of that, the City has satisfied or coordinated rather with Pechanga  
26 Cultural Resources in a manner that is in compliance with the SB18 consultation  
27 process.

28  
29 With regards to the environmental for the project, an Initial Study Mitigated  
30 Negative Declaration was prepared for the project to assess potential impacts on  
31 the environment and based on the findings presented in that Initial Study, Staff  
32 has made the determination that the proposed project will not have a significant  
33 effect on the environment with the implementation of mitigation and there are  
34 mitigation measures proposed for this project that would reduce impacts under  
35 the categories of hazard, noise and traffic and there is a Mitigation Monitoring  
36 Program that has been prepared for this project and that is included as  
37 Attachment 6 in the Staff Report for reference. Those same measures are also  
38 referenced in the conditions of approval and so we have two ways to ensure  
39 compliance with those mitigation measures. Based on the results of this study...  
40 excuse me, the mitigated negative declaration; again there is no evidence that  
41 the project would result in significant impacts on public health or be materially  
42 injurious to surrounding properties and it is Staff's recommendation that Mitigated  
43 Negative Declaration be adopted for this project. Noticing efforts for this project  
44 were in compliance with the requirements of our code. We did publish a notice of  
45 this item in the newspaper on February 20<sup>th</sup> to satisfy our 20 day noticing  
46 requirement. Additionally notices were sent to property owners within 300 feet of

1 the site and that was done on February 26<sup>th</sup>, along with the posting of a notice on  
2 the site.

3  
4 In response to the notices I did receive two phone calls from area residents. Out  
5 of that conversation I didn't come away with any stated concerns about the  
6 project, but just a request to better understand what the notice was about and  
7 then additionally this afternoon there was an email submitted from a resident  
8 stating concerns with the proposed land use changes and also questions about  
9 the Box Springs Mutual Water Company; there should be a copy of that email  
10 provided to you for your consideration. That should be on dais there. And finally,  
11 there are some additional materials that were provided to you in the way of a  
12 memorandum, which addressed recommended changes to the conditions of  
13 approval, so after the Staff Report was circulated we had a chance to speak with  
14 the applicant with some concerns they about some of the conditions of approval  
15 and so before you this evening is a memo from the Special Districts Division with  
16 the recommendation to revise condition SD1.

17  
18 Since the project is located within the Edgemont Community Services District, it  
19 would not be subject to the City's zone C tax for arterial street lighting and so the  
20 recommendation is to correct that condition and not require an assessment of  
21 them that is not appropriate. There is a memo from the Fire Prevention Bureau  
22 with a recommendation to delete what would be item 1 of the fire conditions. The  
23 deletion of this item is recommended since the installation of fire sprinklers is not  
24 a requirement and I believe you should have a complete set of the revised fire  
25 conditions attached to that memo for reference and finally recommended revision  
26 to conditions from the Land Development Division and they are proposing  
27 changes to conditions LD10, LD22, LD29, LD32, LD33, LD43 and LD53 and I  
28 can come back to those if you like for reference. Attached to the memo from  
29 Land Development is a copy of a new final set of conditions of approval from  
30 Land Development as well as a strike out underline version of the conditions that  
31 would allow you to see where those changes were made. The intent of the  
32 conditions is to bring this project; to ensure compliance of this project with water  
33 quality and storm water requirements that are appropriate for an apartment  
34 project. The conditions as issued were prepared in a manner that is more  
35 appropriate for a condominium project where you would have common areas and  
36 the need for a Homeowners Association and with this being an apartment  
37 project, those conditions weren't necessary or appropriate and Land  
38 Development has revised the conditions to bring them into compliance with the  
39 type of project that it is.

40  
41 **PLANNING OFFICIAL SANDZIMIER** – Could I add a clarification? It is not that  
42 the condition as a whole was not... it was the reference to the HOA; the  
43 Homeowners Association in there that was stricken.

44  
45 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER BRADSHAW** – With that, Staff would recommend to  
46 the Planning Commission that they recommend Council adoption of the Mitigated

1 Negative Declaration for the project and that the Council approve the proposed  
2 General Plan Amendment, Zone Change and Plot Plan applications as presented  
3 to you this evening. With that, that completes my presentation and I'd be happy  
4 to answer any questions for you. The applicant and his team are also here to be  
5 able to speak and answer questions.

6  
7 **CITY ATTORNEY EARLY** – And I just wanted to add a piece of legal tidbit here.  
8 Because this involves a General Plan Amendment, the California Government  
9 Code requires that the recommendation for approval be by a majority of the  
10 membership of the body, which in this case is four and since we have a quorum  
11 of four here, in order for this recommendation for approval to go on, it will require  
12 four affirmative votes.

13  
14 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – And that's the case even though we have six Planning  
15 Commissioners at the moment?

16  
17 **CITY ATTORNEY EARLY** – Yes, because the membership of the body is seven  
18 even though a seat is vacant at the moment.

19  
20 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you for your report Jeff. I appreciate it.

21  
22 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER BRADSHAW** – I tend to get nervous and not run the  
23 slides, but if there is anything in your packet that you wanted to see by way of the  
24 project plans, we are prepared to go through those slides if that is helpful.

25  
26 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – The architectural plans I was unable to pull up  
27 on my viewer here. It is not loading so I'd like to see those.

28  
29 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER BRADSHAW** – Is it the elevations that you are  
30 interested in or...

31  
32 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – The entire complex. That one right there.  
33 That's the one I wanted to look at. So then how many units are in each building  
34 then... four? There's 112 units in how many buildings?

35  
36 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER BRADSHAW** – 14 buildings.

37  
38 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – 14 buildings, okay. I really would like  
39 somebody to speak to this issue about the water; the Edgemont Water District  
40 because I kept hearing for years; we've been hearing that we can't fix the roads  
41 there, we can't fix... we can't redo this, we can't redo that because the water  
42 system is so bad and the water supply is so low and I could see approving a  
43 storage space there because it would be very little water use, but to put 112  
44 apartment units there, what has changed in the Edgemont Water District that we  
45 haven't heard about to all a sudden make there be plenty of water supply.

46

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL SANDZIMIER** – If I may through the Chair or Vice Chair,  
2 there are two water supply issues that need to be considered. One is the  
3 domestic water that is supplied to the units themselves and the development  
4 does meet that standard. The other one which is a little bit more difficult to  
5 satisfy, is the fire flow and the fire flow consideration I'd like to turn to our Fire  
6 Marshall Adria to address, but that is the one that has got most of the attention.

7  
8 **FIRE MARSHALL REINERTSON** – Yes, to respond to that issue as we all know,  
9 there has historically been water flow, particularly fire flow issues in the  
10 Edgemont area. There are a couple of things that happened with this particular  
11 property that allowed us to get the required fire flow. Just as information, fire flow  
12 is based on the type of occupancy you want to build, the size of it and the  
13 construction type and that gives us our minimums, so for this particular project  
14 we were looking for a minimum of 1500 gallons per minute and we received that  
15 from a registered engineer which was our requirement from that area. We had a  
16 professional engineer go out, witnessed by Fire Department staff to assure us  
17 that we were getting the fire flow that we needed. So for this particular parcel the  
18 fire flow on that edge of town if I may, is generally better than a lot of other areas  
19 over there first of all and then this particular parcel is in very close proximity to  
20 the pump house, which has quite a bit to do with it, as well as there is a stretch of  
21 brand new pipe directly from the pump house into this parcel, so those are some  
22 of the things that we looked at and requested of the applicant to supply the Fire  
23 Department to satisfy our concerns with the water out there.

24  
25 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – And then does that also address the water  
26 supply for the residents?

27  
28 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER BRADSHAW** – The potable water was also something  
29 that was documented through Box Springs Mutual Water.

30  
31 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – So basically this property is geographically desirable. It  
32 is right next to the pump station, so there is plenty of flow, plenty of pressure for  
33 fire flow and domestic use.

34  
35 **FIRE MARSHALL REINERTSON** – Yes. Of course we haven't looked at all of  
36 the parcels in Box Springs, but we have been taking them on a case by case  
37 basis as requests have come in, and so it varies widely across the district.

38  
39 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Historically as Commissioner Van Natta was saying;  
40 historically the water supply in this area has been less than desirable. The  
41 infrastructure is failing. It is really old. Is there any precedence to have this  
42 project examine the surrounding network of pipes along its frontage to possibly  
43 have them improve the pipes or is that more of a water district maintenance  
44 issue?

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL SANDZIMIER** – Well one of the advantages of the  
2 development going forward in discussions with Box Springs Mutual is that they  
3 get an infusion of cash when they develop a new project, so this project will  
4 actually provide additional money to them so they can start to improve their  
5 system. There is a lot of work that needs to be done in the area and so for  
6 purposes of this project, we evaluated it based on its ability to get the water it  
7 needs for this type of a development in the 112 unit apartment development. It  
8 can be done meeting both the potable domestic water and the fire flow.

9  
10 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay

11  
12 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – The fact that the water district is going to get  
13 more funds from this, is there any way to control whether or not they are actually  
14 going to use those funds to improve the infrastructure?

15  
16 **PLANNING OFFICIAL SANDZIMIER** – I don't believe... the City cannot compel  
17 them to use the money for what I think you are suggesting they do. It's at their  
18 discretion what they use their money for.

19  
20 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I think that's been part of the problem up to this  
21 point is that their discretionary use of the funds that become available to them is  
22 not always to the benefit of the recipients of their service. That was my concern  
23 and we're putting something else in there without any reassurance that there is  
24 going to be an improvement to the system.

25  
26 **PLANNING OFFICIAL SANDZIMIER** – Your comments are noted.

27  
28 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay. The other question that I had was to do  
29 with traffic flow and any planned improvements to the streets that would be  
30 taking the residents here to the main arterial streets for commuting.

31  
32 **PLANNING OFFICIAL SANDZIMIER** – I'd like to ask Michael Lloyd to answer  
33 that question.

34  
35 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – Good evening  
36 Commissioners. Michael Lloyd with Transportation Engineering. The project is  
37 conditioned to provide frontage improvements along Edgemont Street which  
38 would get them back to Eucalyptus. The improvements along Eucalyptus are at  
39 their ultimate location, so the curb is set. They'll be putting in I believe new  
40 sidewalk and we do have an existing pedestrian signal, so children can cross  
41 from the south side to the north side of Eucalyptus, but this project is conditioned  
42 to put in improvements along their Edgemont Street frontage, which will provide  
43 improvement up to Eucalyptus.

44  
45 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – And their main gated entrance is on  
46 Edgemont?

1 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – That is correct.

2  
3 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – And the other entrance is exits?

4  
5 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – The other is an  
6 emergency only and it's designed that way given its proximity to the pedestrian  
7 signal. The signal is not designed for vehicular access from what would be the  
8 side street or in this case the driveway, so if we were to desire access onto  
9 Eucalyptus that would require a traffic signal modification.

10  
11 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – So is the main entrance on Edgemont then the  
12 only entrance and access that the residents would be allowed to use?

13  
14 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – That is correct.

15  
16 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – There is not a secondary exit onto another  
17 street that they could use if for some reason that was blocked or there was heavy  
18 traffic there or no other exit?

19  
20 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – That's the way it's  
21 currently designed. If there were an emergency where the main gate was  
22 blocked, the emergency gate to Eucalyptus could be opened to allow residents in  
23 and out and the traffic signal along Eucalyptus for the pedestrians could be  
24 adjusted to be put on all way flash, so it is flashing red so that people could get in  
25 and out of the driveway safely.

26  
27 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** - And that would be opened by emergency  
28 personnel?

29  
30 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – That is correct.

31  
32 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Why is this project allowed to have only one primary  
33 source of access. Projects in the past we have seen conditions where they are  
34 required to have at least two entrances. Is it resident specific, meaning if you  
35 meet a certain criteria you have to have more than one entrance or is this just  
36 standard operating procedure.

37  
38 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – I can address it from a  
39 traffic standpoint. Usually what drives the number of access points is Fire, so I'll  
40 handle the traffic first and then I'll let fire speak if that's okay. With regards to the  
41 traffic, the Traffic Study indicated that there is enough capacity along Edgemont  
42 to handle all of the project traffic. The Traffic Study also looked at the  
43 intersection of Edgemont and Eucalyptus and found that with some re-striping in  
44 the building out, that this project will do along Edgemont. Again there will be  
45 enough capacity at that intersection during the peak hours to accommodate all  
46 the project traffic through that intersection. Just as a note, there have been other

1 projects and I apologize, I don't know the exact size and comparative type  
2 analysis, but there have been other projects constructed within the past ten years  
3 within the City and it comes to mind along Perris Boulevard apartment type  
4 projects where there was one resident or visitor type of entry with a secondary  
5 access being emergency only, so we're not setting a precedent here. It has been  
6 done before. I'm not aware of any operational issues at those locations where it  
7 has been done and if Fire wanted to address the number of locations that they  
8 require access at.

9  
10 **FIRE MARSHALL REINERTSON** – Yes, Fire also has access requirements, so  
11 those access requirements speak particularly to emergency response personnel,  
12 so they don't really have a whole lot to do with the residents other than the fact  
13 we like for our access points to be able to also evacuate, so in an instance like  
14 this we have the access points that we need, but we also have the capabilities to  
15 open the gates in cases of emergency evacuation of the residents as well, but  
16 there is nothing in our code that speaks to the number of access points for  
17 residents to utilize in or out of the property.

18  
19 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Well the reason that I ask is over the last several  
20 meetings we've had quite a few projects of this type, some a little bit larger in  
21 caliber and some a little bit smaller in caliber and each one of them have been  
22 conditioned to have two points of access for entry and exit for the residents  
23 above and beyond the fire access and if my memory serves me correctly, we got  
24 into a fairly heated discussion over one of the items recently where they only had  
25 one point of access and it was a big argument between the applicant and the City  
26 and the Planning Commission. This project seems to be fairly similar to that one  
27 and it only has one point of access. Granted there is a second fire access, but  
28 that was a big point of contention up here. They had a nice long discussion. Is  
29 there any reason why we have limited this to one ingress and egress for the  
30 residents?

31  
32 **PLANNING OFFICIAL SANDZIMIER** – If I can speak to the other projects that  
33 have come before you... There have been three projects that have a residential  
34 nature. The one that was most contentious with regard to a second point of  
35 access, this Commission did end up approving that project with a condition to  
36 assure the secondary emergency access point was going to be included, so it  
37 was not approved with simply one access. It was the same configuration as this  
38 one which has a main primary vehicular access and the second access is  
39 opened in emergency situations only. The third project which actually went  
40 before City Council for final consideration this week did have a main point of  
41 entrance. It was 121 unit development; one primary entrance; a secondary  
42 entrance and then an emergency access location, but all three of them were  
43 evaluated in accordance with our code requirements and were reviewed by Fire  
44 and by Traffic and that's our process and the recommended approval here this  
45 evening does show that the project as presented does meet our requirements.

1 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – I was just trying to ensure that we have continuity. I do  
2 have another question for Staff. On the revised Fire conditions, it says that attic  
3 fire sprinklers are not required. The Fire Chief recommends that the sprinklers  
4 designed for these units include appropriate upright sprinklers be installed in attic  
5 spaces based on previous experience with the unprotected attic space involved  
6 in a fire for protection of residents and property. Just for clarity, this does not  
7 exclude interior fire sprinklers within the building. This is above and beyond to  
8 add fire sprinklers within uninhabited attic space?  
9

10 **FIRE MARSHALL REINERTSON** – Yes exactly. The property because it is a  
11 multi-family dwelling is required to be protected with what we call a 13R system,  
12 which is for residential and in those residential systems they are not required to  
13 have attic sprinklers. It is a life safety system rather than a property protection  
14 system, so we had made that recommendation and I spoke about it with the  
15 applicant and we decided to remove the recommendation from the final Fire  
16 conditions after we had a conversation about it. So there will certainly still be  
17 residential fire sprinklers in the building, but it will be built strictly to the code and  
18 will not require additional protection above and beyond that.  
19

20 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – So this item is being removed. It's not being added?  
21

22 **FIRE MARSHALL REINERTSON** – Yes  
23

24 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – I was just trying to clarify. Thank you. Any other  
25 Commissioners have any comments for Staff?  
26

27 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Is there a traffic light then at Edgemont and  
28 Eucalyptus?  
29

30 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – Currently there is not and  
31 I'm not aware of any plans to install one there. By traffic light I'm assuming you  
32 mean a traffic signal?  
33

34 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – A signal, yes  
35

36 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – That's correct. There is  
37 not a traffic signal at that intersection currently and I'm not aware of any plans.  
38

39 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – What traffic control is there? Is there stop  
40 signs?  
41

42 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – That's correct. The side  
43 street; Edgemont has a stop sign.  
44

45 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – But Eucalyptus does not.  
46



1 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – That is correct

2  
3 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – So you're going to have a couple of hundred  
4 cars coming out to leave and no way of getting onto Eucalyptus if it is busy and  
5 you know nobody lets them in?

6  
7 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – Well there are traffic  
8 signals upstream and downstream, so at the old 215 frontage road there is a  
9 traffic signal there and there is a traffic signal at Day Street as well, so when  
10 they...

11  
12 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – How far away are those?

13  
14 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – I believe it's a quarter mile  
15 if I'm not mistaken. Maybe less than a quarter mile in each direction and typically  
16 when we try to coordinate the signals so that green is given to Eucalyptus so you  
17 can progress along the roadway without stopping and then it turns red so that the  
18 cross street receives the green which would create gaps within the stream of  
19 traffic which would allow Edgemont to enter the traffic stream.

20  
21 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – And the improvements to Edgemont for the  
22 project, will they be extending those improvements all the way down to Dracaea?

23  
24 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – They are not conditioned  
25 to do that. They are required to put them in along their project frontage. There  
26 would be some transitions in the pavement to bring it back to its current width.

27  
28 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – How much difference is there going to be  
29 between the current street and the improved street?

30  
31 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – I believe they are  
32 conditioned to put in a 36 foot wide street and it is currently 24 feet wide, so we  
33 are going to have an additional 12 feet along the project frontage.

34  
35 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – So about a 50 percent increase in size?

36  
37 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – That's correct in its width.

38  
39 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other comments? Commissioner Ramirez?  
40 Commissioner Baker?

41  
42 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Not really; no

43  
44 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Van Natta?

45  
46 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – That's enough for now

1 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Well I think that concludes our general comments for  
2 Staff. I'd like at this time invite the applicant to come up and speak.

3  
4 **APPLICANT ALSTON** – Vice Chair Lowell and Commissioners, Wes Alston, PO  
5 Box 14679, Long Beach, California. For the applicant Latco, thanks a lot for your  
6 time tonight to come hear this project. As Jeff noted, this project has been  
7 owned by the seller for a long period of time. Latco is coming in to purchase the  
8 property and develop it. They are a family owned company. They design. They  
9 build. They manage and hold their properties and as Robert Sr. says, he really  
10 has no exit plan. So this is going to be a long term hold project for this family. I'd  
11 like to thank Jeff and staff for all their work. This has had just about one of  
12 everything you can possibly have as far as the review process and we've made it  
13 through it with recommendations from everybody. I'd like to address the water  
14 issue a little bit. As part of the mini-storage conditions, there was a requirement  
15 to put a 12 inch line that runs across the property from the south to the north and  
16 it ties into a 12 inch line that is out in Eucalyptus and one of the reasons was for  
17 fire flow and the second reason for that line was to provide circulation within the  
18 system itself, so there was some... it brought some depth to the project outside  
19 the project area and brought some resources into the project outside the project  
20 area that wouldn't have that increase of flow if it wasn't for that 12 inch line that  
21 the current property owner put in. Also part of that was to make sure there was  
22 emergency backup pump and make sure the current pump system is operating  
23 correctly. The actual fire flow at 20 psi for that line that runs across there is 3700  
24 gpm. The Fire Department has conditioned us for 1500 gpm and so there is  
25 plenty of reserves in that system for the surrounding community. Some of the  
26 project benefits and we've already hit on that already is there is 640 thousand  
27 dollars going to the water district. Hopefully they'll use that money with matching  
28 funds through grant programs to increase that amount of money into the district  
29 and help built out their infrastructure and about 400 thousand dollars is going to  
30 the Edgemont Community Sewers District. We accept all the conditions. We've  
31 reviewed them as they are amended. I know there was a question regarding the  
32 fire sprinklers. All these buildings are going to be fire sprinkled under 13R. Also  
33 there is one hour separation between the individual units that go up to the roof  
34 decking, so that is under the new code also, so with the full fire sprinklers down  
35 below which is a live safety system and the one hour separation all the way to  
36 bottom of the roofs, should give each individual unit plenty of protection from the  
37 other. So we do accept all the conditions as they have been amended and the  
38 entire team is here for any questions if you have any of those.

39  
40 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Do any of the Commissioners have any questions for  
41 the applicant?

42  
43 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Just clarification, so that separation goes  
44 up...it is going to be separating the attics so that the attic from one unit, from one  
45 apartment it cannot be accessed from the attic from another apartment.

1 **APPLICANT ALSTON** – That’s correct  
2  
3 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – So it will be completely blocked there?  
4  
5 **APPLICANT ALSTON** – That’s correct  
6  
7 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other questions?  
8  
9 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – If approved, when do you plan on breaking  
10 ground?  
11  
12 **APPLICANT ALSTON** – If you approve this tonight, the applicant will put at risk  
13 plans into the City, so probably within two months we should hope to be grading.  
14  
15 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – Thank you  
16  
17 **APPLICANT ALSTON** – We actually hoped to be grading right now but we got  
18 hung up on other issues with the Airport Land Use Commission.  
19  
20 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Would you consider this project more designed  
21 towards middle and lower income families or is it more designed to attract higher  
22 rents?  
23  
24 **APPLICANT ALSTON** – It is work force housing.  
25  
26 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Work force... uh huh  
27  
28 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other comments or questions? Okay at this time  
29 I’d like to open the public hearing. If anyone is interested in speaking at time, if  
30 haven’t already done so please forward your speaker card and pass it off to our  
31 secretary over here. Do we have any public speaking items or speaker slips?  
32  
33 **GRACE ESPINO-SALCEDO** – I do not have any.  
34  
35 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – We have a couple in the audience.  
36  
37 **PLANNING OFFICIAL SANDZIMIER** – If I could ask. The speaker has not filled  
38 out a card yet. If you could just fill it out after you speak and provide this for our  
39 record that would be great. I appreciate that.  
40  
41 **SPEAKER LEE** – Okay, I own the little property right next to where they are  
42 putting...  
43  
44 **PLANNING OFFICIAL SANDZIMIER** – Also if you could identify yourself. We  
45 record these meetings, so if you could identify yourself as well.  
46

1 **SPEAKER LEE** – My name is Bernicesteen Lee. I own the little house next door  
2 to the property and as far as I'm concerned I think it's a great idea. It would help  
3 the City. It would help the water company. It would help me you know and they  
4 have a lot of water flow at this end of the water district, because I own other  
5 property down around the corner where the water pressure is very low like 300  
6 gallons a minute and I just don't see anything wrong with it. It would definitely  
7 help Moreno Valley and if it comes to a case where they need another exit they  
8 can talk to me.

9  
10 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Which property is yours?

11  
12 **SPEAKER LEE** – 21825 Eucalyptus Avenue.

13  
14 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Are you the one just to the south of the property.

15  
16 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – The southeast corner

17  
18 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Perfect

19  
20 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER BRADSHAW** – It's the home that the apartment project  
21 wraps around, so it is the north east corner of project site.

22  
23 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Gotcha. So you're right across from the crosswalk.

24  
25 **SPEAKER LEE** – Yes I'm right there. Thank you.

26  
27 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much.

28  
29 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Let me ask one question. You live there. Do you  
30 see any need for a signal there at Edgemont and Eucalyptus when we get that  
31 amount of traffic? I know that would be one more signal on that block we'd have.  
32 That's the only concern I've got is getting those people in and out of there at high  
33 peak times on Eucalyptus.

34  
35 **SPEAKER LEE** – Well I don't quite see it that way you know; maybe a flashing  
36 light or something, but the traffic at times in the morning but not every morning  
37 because I have to listen to it.

38  
39 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Do you have a lot of people dropping kids off at  
40 school across the street.

41  
42 **SPEAKER LEE** – Yes you do and they have a crosswalk there with a crossing  
43 guard and as I say again it would help the City of Moreno Valley.

44  
45 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Yes I agree with you fully there. Okay thank you.

46

1 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much.

2  
3 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Someone else has a hand up back there Vice  
4 Chair.

5  
6 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Do we have another speaker?

7  
8 **GRACE ESPINO-SALCEDO** – I do not have a slip for him; no.

9  
10 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Could you fill out a slip before you leave the meeting  
11 today and could you introduce yourself please?

12  
13 **SPEAKER MARKS** – My name is Ron Marks. I represent Box Springs Mutual  
14 Water Company and hadn't planned on saying anything tonight, but I heard the  
15 name so I'm here to address any questions you might have and answer one in  
16 particular with respect to the question of funding that we might receive from this  
17 project. We've organized an assessment for our shareholders and that goes into  
18 a separate fund. The money can only come out of that with the approval of the  
19 full board and any money that is received from projects would be the second  
20 stream for the income for this capital improvement fund would also go into that  
21 fund and wouldn't be released except for capital improvement purposes, so I  
22 think that answers the question that was raised previously. If you have any other  
23 questions about Box Springs I'd be glad to answer them.

24  
25 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** - I actually had a couple of questions for you. Since you  
26 are here it's an opportune time to discuss this with you. What is the water  
27 district's timeline for improving the infrastructure for the system as a whole  
28 because I know there are portions of the district that are...?

29  
30 **SPEAKER MARKS** – I anticipate with projects like this that there will kind of be a  
31 snowball effect. We received what was mentioned a large amount of money and  
32 if you just estimate the cost of expanding the system at a hundred dollars a foot,  
33 it will give you a pretty good estimate and we'll be able to put in a considerable  
34 amount of infrastructure with the money that we receive and so as far as our  
35 water quality, there's not a lot of... it's kind of a hobby of some people in the  
36 newspapers and other venues to basically diminish the quality of the company  
37 but the company produces a high standard water; gets high marks from the State  
38 in water quality and I think we have more than adequate flow and maybe for  
39 future projects right now and maybe for a 20 or 25 percent of the area, so you  
40 can anticipate maybe even more activity there as we expand the system. As far  
41 as the timeline that will just depend on the regenerative effect of these funds and  
42 how quickly we can get the work done.

43  
44 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – With the large influx of capital into your company, what  
45 would be the primary project that you'd work on... what would be the first project  
46 or first area of your infrastructure that you'd try to fix?

1 **SPEAKER MARKS** – We'd probably run another line down Edgemont. We  
2 already have a backbone system that amounts to the 12 inch line across  
3 Eucalyptus and down Day Street to Alessandro and right now that's the  
4 background that is place and anywhere along that line we anticipate adequate  
5 fire flow for most projects, so somebody asked what the big change was between  
6 the situation now and several years ago and part of it is the addition of a direct  
7 connection that backbone of a 12 inch line, so a 12 inch line can give you a lot of  
8 fire protection and we have as I said, we have what might be called our  
9 backbone in place right now for that fire flow, so right now I think we have the  
10 quality, we have the potential for expansion and I think that maybe at this rate  
11 with additional projects and additional income that would come from our  
12 connection fees, five years might be a 80 percent completion in five years.  
13 That's a guess, but I think it is a well-considered one.

14

15 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – What was your name sir?

16

17 **SPEAKER MARKS** – Marks... M A R K S. I'm the Acting President of Box  
18 Springs Mutual Water Company and am the Chairman of the Board.

19

20 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – That was going to be my next question was  
21 your position with the Board... Acting President and Chairman of the Board?

22

23 **SPEAKER MARKS** – That's correct

24

25 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Does anyone else have any  
26 questions for Ron? I don't believe we have any more Speaker Slips do we  
27 Grace?

28

29 **GRACE ESPINO- SALCEDO** – We do not

30

31 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Before I close the Public Hearing, would the Applicant  
32 like to respond to anything they heard here tonight? No, okay, then I'd like to  
33 close the Public Hearing at this time. Now it's time for us to discuss it. Would  
34 anybody like to say anything?

35

36 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I'll start. I was going to say my initial thought  
37 about this project was rather negative, especially given the problems I'd heard  
38 about the water district and I just have to say it was very helpful to have Mr.  
39 Marks here to give us direct information about how the funds would be applied  
40 and what go on there. The only other concern I have is about access to the  
41 property if there is only one entrance and exit and it can only go one way which is  
42 up to Eucalyptus because the road going down to Dracaea is not going to be  
43 completed, it is only going to be the 24 foot wide that is currently there, which last  
44 time I was on it I don't think it was in all that great a condition. That is a concern  
45 to me. The other thing is that crosswalk, even though there is going to be maybe  
46 a crossing guard there at the time that school is opening and closing for the day,

1 I've seen crosswalks that have been embellished with lights in the street that  
2 flash when somebody pushes a little button when they want to go across and just  
3 provides an additional level of safety for crossing the street at that point. Has that  
4 been considered as an option for that crosswalk?

5  
6 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – There are rules within the  
7 MUTCD which is our Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices established by  
8 the State on utilization of those in-ground lights and I apologize, I don't recall  
9 exactly the rules in place, but I don't think they are allowed at a signalized  
10 location and this is a signalized crosswalk, so if a person wishes...

11  
12 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Signalized...

13  
14 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – That's correct, so a  
15 person wishing to cross at that crosswalk pushes the push button, which then  
16 turns the signal red along Eucalyptus and it gives them a signal at the pedestrian  
17 signal that they can cross at that time.

18  
19 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Excuse me, I think... are we talking about the  
20 same crosswalk. I'm talking about the one that is in the middle of the street?

21  
22 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – That's correct.

23  
24 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – It is signalized?

25  
26 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – Yes it is.

27  
28 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – It stops traffic so pedestrians can walk

29  
30 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay, alright, I did not get that

31  
32 **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION ENGINEER LLOYD** – Okay, I apologize if I  
33 wasn't more clear.

34  
35 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay

36  
37 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – It's actually one of the nicer crosswalks in the City  
38 because it is signalized with crossing guards right in front of a school. It's a great  
39 addition to a school site, so I really appreciate that.

40  
41 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I think basically my questions were  
42 reservations have pretty much been answered and I'm in favor of the project.

43  
44 **PLANNING OFFICIAL SANDZIMIER** – Mr. Chairman if I may. Mr. Bradshaw  
45 just dropped of a color board to Commissioner Ramirez. It is being passed  
46 around to you. I'm kind of excited about the project in the fact that the applicant

1 is ready to break ground if it does move forward. The project in this particular  
2 area could be a good catalyst. What we're trying to show here with the materials  
3 board is you can almost touch and feel and see what the buildings will start to  
4 look like if this project goes forward and so those are available in your report, but  
5 this is more real life. We just wanted to make sure you saw those before you  
6 acted on the project. Thank you.

7  
8 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – Well I think it's a great project. It is definitely  
9 going to bring improvements to the neighborhood. Concerns regarding the water  
10 flow have been addressed and I'm ready to vote for this project.

11  
12 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – I think this is a great project and like the other  
13 Commissioners say, it is going to be a big boost to that Edgemont and you know  
14 you've got to have revenue or people in the area to make it work, so this is a  
15 shot. We haven't... I think the last one we approved was that burger place that  
16 these people own down the street and we had some water pressure problems at  
17 the time we approved that, but we need to get some properties in there so that  
18 the water district can get some funds and revenue to move forward. I think it is a  
19 great idea and it fits well in that particular area, so I'm going to vote for it.

20  
21 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – I too had some reservations about only having one  
22 point of access to the site with a secondary emergency access, but I think that  
23 has been negated through our discussion today. I also like the fact that  
24 somebody is willing to put money and a nice looking project in a part of town that  
25 definitely needs a little bit of attention; a little bit of love. I really like this project  
26 and even making it better is that the fact that Robertson's Redi-Mix Plant around  
27 the corner has been moved so it's better fit for the area not having a large  
28 industrial look to it. It is going to attract some people in the neighborhood. I think  
29 this is a great project. At this time I'd like to ask for a motion.

30  
31 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I can make a motion. They can be combined.  
32 We don't have to do each recommendation separately do we?

33  
34 **CITY ATTORNEY EARLY** – I would recommend doing at least the General Plan  
35 resolution separately just because the voting requirements are different on that  
36 one, which would be the first of the three.

37  
38 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay. Then I move that we **APPROVE**  
39 Resolution No. 2015-06 and thereby **RECOMMEND** that the City Council;

- 40 1. **ADOPT** a Mitigated Negative Declaration for General Plan Amendment  
41 PA14-0043, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act  
42 Guidelines; and,
- 43 2. **APPROVE** General Plan Amendment application PA14-0043 based on  
44 the findings contained in this resolution and as shown on the attachment  
45 included as Exhibit A.



1 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Do we have a second?

2  
3 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – I’ll second that

4  
5 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Can we have a roll call vote please?

6  
7 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – Yes

8  
9 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Yes

10  
11 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Yes

12  
13 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Yes

14  
15 **GRACE ESPINO-SALCEDO** – And just a reminder that Commissioner Barnes is  
16 recused.

17  
18 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – And I also move that we **APPROVE** Resolution  
19 No. 2015-07 and thereby **RECOMMEND** that the City Council:

- 20 1. **ADOPT** a Mitigated Negative Declaration for Zone Change application  
21 PA14-0044 pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act  
22 Guidelines and;  
23 2. **APPROVE** Zone Change application PA14-0044 based on the findings  
24 contained in this resolution and as shown on the attachment included as  
25 Exhibit A and;

26  
27 **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2015-07 and thereby **RECOMMEND** that the  
28 City Council:

- 29  
30 1. **ADOPT** a Mitigated Negative Declaration for Plot Plan application PA14-  
31 0042 pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines and;  
32 2. **APPROVE** Plot Plan application PA14-0042 based on the findings  
33 contained in this resolution and subject to the attached conditions of  
34 approval included as Exhibit A.

35  
36 **CITY ATTORNEY EARLY** – Would that be as amended?

37  
38 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – As amended.

39  
40 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – I’ll second that

41  
42 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** - We have a motion and a second. Can we have a roll  
43 call vote please?

44  
45 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – Yes

46

1 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Yes

2  
3 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Yes

4  
5 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Yes

6  
7 **GRACE ESPINO-SALCEDO** – With Commissioner Barnes recused

8  
9  
10 **OTHER COMMISSION BUSINESS**

11  
12 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, that brings us to Other Business. Are there any  
13 other business items?

14  
15 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – We could invite our excused...

16  
17 **PLANNING OFFICIAL SANDZIMIER** – There are none.

18  
19 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – We should probably do a Staff wrap up maybe.

20  
21 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** - But we have someone who is excused for this  
22 item. He could come back in.

23  
24 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Is Mr. Barnes sitting in the lobby or did he leave for the  
25 day?

26  
27 **PLANNING OFFICIAL SANDZIMIER** – I believe he was leaving for the day. I  
28 don't think he is still here.

29  
30 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay then I guess he's not here. Sorry.

31  
32 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Do we need a Staff wrap up after that last item?

33  
34 **PLANNING OFFICIAL SANDZIMIER** – The Staff wrap up on that one is the item  
35 before you was a General Plan Amendment and a Zone Change and a Plot Plan.  
36 The General Plan Amendment and Zone Change; the approval authority rests  
37 with the City Council and because the Plot Plan cannot be moved forward  
38 without the approval of the General Plan Amendment and the Zone Change, that  
39 also will be acted on by the City Council, so the City Council will be the final  
40 arbiter decision making body on those three applications. The date for that  
41 hearing has not yet been set. The second meeting in April it will go to the City  
42 Council.

43  
44 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you. Do we have any other business items to  
45 discuss?

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL SANDZIMIER** – There are none

2  
3  
4 **STAFF COMMENTS**

5  
6 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, do we have any Staff comments?

7  
8 **PLANNING OFFICIAL SANDZIMIER** – The only Staff comment I'd like to make  
9 is if you hadn't had an opportunity yet to meet our new Director of Community &  
10 Economic Development, Mike Lee did start with us at the beginning of the month.  
11 He's been a warm addition to the Staff. I think Mr. Lowell was able to meet with  
12 him just before this meeting this evening, but if you do have the opportunity to  
13 meet with him, I've had a chance to tour the City with him. He's got some good  
14 ideas and good energy and I think it's a warm addition to our department. Thank  
15 you.

16  
17  
18 **PLANNING COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

19  
20 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Do we have any Commissioner Comments?

21  
22 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Good night

23  
24  
25 **ADJOURNMENT**

26  
27 **VICE CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, well I think that does it. That concludes our  
28 meeting. The meeting is adjourned to our next regular meeting on March 26<sup>th</sup>,  
29 2015.

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 \_\_\_\_\_  
37 Richard Sandzimier  
38 Planning Official  
39 Approved

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

40  
41  
42  
43  
44 \_\_\_\_\_  
45 Brian Lowell  
46 Vice Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date