

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

5 **Thursday, August 27th, 2015, 7:00 PM**

6
7
8 **CALL TO ORDER**
9

10 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Good evening ladies and gentleman. I would like to call the
11 August 27th, 2015 Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission to order. The
12 time is currently 7:05 PM. Grace, may we have rollcall please?
13

14
15 **ROLL CALL**
16

17 Commissioners Present:
18 Commissioner Ramirez
19 Commissioner Korzec
20 Alternate Commissioner Nickel
21 Commissioner Van Natta
22 Commissioner Baker
23 Commissioner Barnes
24 Alternate Commissioner Gonzalez
25 Chair Lowell
26

27 Staff Present:
28 Rick Sandzimier, Planning Official
29 Paul Early, Assistant City Attorney
30 Grace Espino-Salcedo, Clerk
31 Gabriel Diaz, Case Planner
32 Julia Descoteaux, Case Planner
33 Michael Lloyd, Traffic Engineer
34

35
36 **GRACE ESPINO-SALCEDO** – Vice Chair Sims is excused absent today.
37

38 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Correct. So, because we have an excused absence, we are
39 seating alternate Commissioner Lori Nickel to fill his seat and she is already at
40 the dais. I would like to ask Commissioner Nickel to lead us in the Pledge of
41 Allegiance please.
42

43
44 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

1 **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

2
3 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you. Would anyone like to motion to approve the
4 Agenda for tonight’s meeting?

5
6 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I move to approve the Agenda for tonight’s
7 meeting.

8
9 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – I’ll second.

10
11 **CHAIR LOWELL** – We have a motion by Commissioner Van Natta and a
12 second by Commissioner Baker, and I don’t know that we can vote on that. I
13 don’t have the voting option, so let’s just do a rollcall vote please.

14
15 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – Yes.

16
17 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Yes.

18
19 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Yes.

20
21 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Yes.

22
23 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Yes.

24
25 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Yes.

26
27 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yes. So tonight’s Agenda passes 7-0 thankfully.

28
29
30 Opposed – 0

31
32
33 **Motion carries 7 – 0**

34
35
36 **CONSENT CALENDAR**

37
38 *All matters listed under Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and all*
39 *will be enacted by one rollcall vote. There will be no discussion of these items*
40 *unless Members of the Planning Commission request specific items be removed*
41 *from the Consent Calendar for separate action.*

42
43 **CHAIR LOWELL** – There is no Consent Calendar.

44
45 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1 None

2

3 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I don't believe we have any approval of Minutes, so we're
4 moving on to the Public Comments portion of the meeting tonight.

5

6

7 **PUBLIC COMMENTS PROCEDURE**

8

9 *Any person wishing to address the Commission on any matter, either under*
10 *Public Comments section of the Agenda or scheduled items or public hearings,*
11 *must fill out a "Request to Speak" form available at the door and towards the side*
12 *and rear of the room. The completed form must be submitted to the Secretary*
13 *prior to the Agenda item being called by the Chairperson. In speaking to the*
14 *Commission, member of the public may be limited to three minutes per person,*
15 *except for the applicant for entitlement. The Commission may establish an*
16 *overall time limit for comments on a particular Agenda item. Members of the*
17 *public must direct their questions to the Chairperson of the Commission and not*
18 *to other members of the Commission, the applicant, the Staff, or the audience.*
19 *Additionally, there is an ADA Disclaimer: Upon request this Agenda will be made*
20 *available in appropriate alternate formats to persons with disabilities in*
21 *compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Any person with a*
22 *disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in*
23 *the meeting should direct such a request to Guy Pagan, our ADA Coordinator.*
24 *His phone number is (951) 413-3120. Please make your request at least 48*
25 *hours before the meeting. The 48 hour notification will enable the City to make*
26 *reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to the meeting.*

27

28

29 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Moving on to the Non-Public Hearing Items, which I don't
30 believe we have any tonight. That moves us on to the Public Comments portion
31 of the Agenda. This is the portion where any member can speak to the
32 Commission on any item not on the Agenda. Do we have any Public Comment
33 Speaker Request forms?

34

35 **GRACE ESPINO-SALCEDO** – We have six speakers signed in today.

36

37 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Wow, we do. Okay, so the first up would be Tom Jerele
38 followed by Thomas Jerele, Sr. I have two Jerele's in here.

39

40 **GRACE ESPINO-SALCEDO** – Our first speaker would be Thomas Hines.

41

42 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, so we'll have Tom Jerele first and then Thomas Hines
43 second.

44

45 **SPEAKER TOM JERELE** – Tom Jerele, Sr. I'm speaking on behalf of myself
46 and on this case behalf of the Sundance Center where I've spent a little bit of

1 time. My boss was out here today and got to sit in on the mayor's address to the
2 state of the city and was very impressed with all the good things happening in
3 Moreno Valley, so he asked me to share some kind words. Chairman Lowell,
4 Commissioners, Staff and the public: Simply the main reason I'm here tonight is
5 to thank the Commission and the Staff for some very well conducted hearings on
6 the WLC. It's no secret what a challenge that project was, you know, from many
7 sides. However, the way the Commission handled it, the setup, and especially
8 the courtesy to the speakers on all sides. I really liked that. The courtesy of
9 taking a whole night to hear many, many speakers. It was all good. And, like I
10 said, it was a very well conducted set of hearings. I'm not thanking you so much
11 for your voting though. I was in favor of approval of the project. But, like I said,
12 the way the whole meeting was conducted, especially for one of this magnitude.
13 I have a full respect for all sides. I even concede that Commissioner Korzec,
14 your comment about wall-to-wall warehouses, was accurate. It's something I
15 took into consideration and it was why I was a little late coming to the party
16 because I had to deal with that mentally. But it's something that when I look at it
17 in the long view and what may be practical at this time, you know, I wanted to
18 support the project. And I especially want to give some thanks to Mark Gross for
19 an excellent Staff Report. I know many people, Mr. Sandzimier, had sat through
20 two long hearings on this and was a great go-to guy and got a lot of pointed
21 questions but gave some very clear and direct information and the other
22 consultants. It was really, really well done, so those are my comments. I thank
23 you for taking time to hear me.
24

25 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you Mr. Jerele. Up next is Thomas Hines I believe.
26

27 **SPEAKER THOMAS HINES** – Thank you very much. I really appreciate how
28 this Committee stood tall during all the torment that went on in the city, and I
29 really do appreciate the 5-1 vote that you guys came up with. It was almost
30 unanimous. And, after listening to our City Councilmen speak, I thought we were
31 going to have a unanimous vote from them also it appeared because of the way
32 they had changed their song I guess trying to sound like they were in the middle.
33 But, anyway, I have been....the next stage of this project is the environmental
34 lawsuits. And we have been told in the paper that the Jurupa Valley Center for
35 Community Action and Environmental Justice was going to be leading one of
36 those charges. I happen to know who they are. I know Penny Newman. She's a
37 nice lady, but she is an environmentalist who funds her activities by shaking
38 down businesses so that she can get money to pay for her staff and the things
39 that she does so that she can sue other businesses. The more she sues, the
40 more money she gets, the more businesses she can sue in the future. Now, I
41 was familiar with the Lake Matthews Conservancy and how they shook down my
42 previous boss at the Dos Lagos project, and we ultimately had to pay them \$1
43 million to endow all of their lawsuits in the future against other businesses. I
44 hope, any my belief is, that I have seen the World Logistics Center and the
45 gentleman in charge of that and he doesn't take to blackmail very well. Mike
46 Greos tried to blackmail him and another gentleman, his associate, was also in

1 on that blackmail. And he has a pretty good spine, and he just doesn't take to
2 that type of blackmailing. But, in order to get his project through, he may have to.
3 But, if he does, then there will be more lawsuits paid by the money that would be
4 put forth. Deep pockets: This is a tactic that was brought forth by Jesse Jackson
5 who uses it for racial lawsuits, such as what he did for the Texaco thing. And, as
6 soon as Texaco paid the money, Jesse Jackson and all of his protestors went
7 away. Thank you for standing tall.

8
9 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you Mr. Hines. Up next is Rafael Brugueras.

10
11 **SPEAKER RAFAEL BRUGUERAS** – Good evening. What a great pleasure it is
12 to stand before you again. On behalf of the City, the thousands of men and
13 women and myself, we say thank you very, very much to you seven and the Staff
14 for standing tall, for doing your homework, for turning all boulders (not just little
15 rocks but boulders) to make sure that the project was safe and beneficial for the
16 City of Moreno Valley because that was very important. Again, today's ceremony
17 was great. And we got to learn that not only is the World Logistics Center is part
18 of Moreno Valley, but we have others. It's not just one basket with all the eggs.
19 There's many things in that basket that creates Moreno Valley, so we just don't
20 rely on one big project. We have other projects that we unite together to hold our
21 city together. I'm deeply grateful for that. I want to talk about warehouses
22 because many of our parents, grandparents and great grandparents started out
23 at a warehouse or a factory to get us where we are at today. You're here
24 because they worked hard to get you to go through school, to be well educated,
25 and to be in the position that you're in. I didn't do that when I was growing up in
26 Harlem. I chose a different route, but I thank my mother who kept me together
27 and taught me to work very, very hard. I started at \$1.85 an hour when I first
28 worked, and I ended with \$25.00 an hour in 2009, and I worked for Ralph's Food
29 for Less for 25 years. I'm deeply grateful for my union who fought for me to get
30 pay raises every year, even if it was only \$0.15, but it was a pay raise. It would
31 be nice to get the whole thing, but I had to share that with my fellow workers, so
32 \$0.15 is \$0.15. But what I want to say because she inspired me to talk about my
33 job because, without it, I wouldn't have what I have today. So I want to share
34 with you the future because warehouses do pay well, very well. In 2006, I made
35 \$62,000. In 2007, I made another \$62,000. In 2008, I made \$49,000. May last
36 year, I made \$80,000 working for Ralph's Food for Less. So dreams can come
37 to warehouses. Not everybody has to have a college degree to work hard. So, if
38 you have a college degree, work hard. Work from the bottom and work your way
39 up and use that degree to go into management. Thank you so much.

40
41 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Up next is Robert Harris followed by
42 Chris Baca.

43
44 **SPEAKER ROBERT HARRIS** – Commissioners and Staff: I would just like to
45 thank you all for your hard work and your diligence evaluating the World Logistics
46 Center. The years that the Staff took that were involved in creating the EIR

1 (40,000 pages) and the consultants obviously that you used. And, together, you
2 guys have made history for Moreno Valley and you've helped to make a better
3 future for our City. Thank you very much.

4
5 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Chris Baca please. I saw him.
6 Where did he go? Last call for Chris Baca. Okay, we can sit tight for a second. I
7 think he might have changed his mind. Okay, I appreciate it. Thank you. Chris
8 Baca didn't show up, so that concludes the Public Comments portion of this
9 meeting.

10
11
12 **NON-PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

13
14 None

15
16
17 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Moving on to the Non-Public Hearing Items, which I believe I
18 called out of place a minute ago. I don't believe we have any Non-Public Hearing
19 Items. So we are going to go on to the Public Hearing Items. So the first item is
20 P14-072 an Amended Conditional Use Permit. The owner is Time Warner, and
21 the Case Planner is Gabriel Diaz. Do we happen to have a Staff Report for this
22 item?

23
24
25 **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

- 26
27 1. Case: P14-072 Amended Conditional Use Permit
28
29 Applicant: Mansour Architecture Corporation
30
31 Owner: Time Warner Cable Pacific West, LLC.
32
33 Representative: Tony Mansour
34
35 Location: 24541 Fir Avenue
36
37 Case Planner: Gabriel Diaz
38
39 Council District: 1
40
41 Proposal: P14-072 Amended Conditional Use Permit
42

43
44 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

45
46 Recommend the Planning Commission:

- 1
2 1. **CERTIFY** that the proposed Time Warner Communications building addition
3 is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act
4 (CEQA), as a Class 1 Categorical Exemption, CEQA Guidelines, Section
5 15301 (e.2) for Additions to Existing Facilities; and
6
7 2. **APPROVE** Amended Conditional Use Permit P14-072 based on the findings
8 contained in Planning Commission Resolution 2015-23, subject to the
9 conditions of approval included as Exhibit A of the Resolution.

10
11 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – We do. Good evening, Chairman
12 Lowell. Gabriel Diaz, as you mentioned, will be giving the Staff presentation.
13

14 **CASE PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – Thank you. Chairman and Commissioners:
15 The project is located at 24541 Fir Avenue on the northeast corner of Indian and
16 Fir Street. You can see the aerial on Attachment 1. The zone is Specific Plan
17 204 Village Office/Residential. It allows for office and residential housing. It's
18 located within Council District 1. The owner is Time Warner Cable Pacific West,
19 LLC. The Applicant is Mansour Architecture. The Amended Conditional Use
20 Permit application will add 1498 square feet to an existing 1301 square foot
21 unmanned Time Warner Communications facility. The existing facility was
22 previously approved by the Planning Commission back on March 14th, 2002, this
23 is the facility you see in Attachment 1, as Conditional Use Permit No. PA01-0085.
24 So the proposed building addition consists of a new equipment room, new
25 battery room, and a new generator enclosure. The generator enclosure will not
26 have a roof above it. That's the elevations of existing and proposed. Let me get
27 you a Site Plan. Here's the Floor Plan of the proposal. The design of the Time
28 Warner facility will have a residential appearance to fit into the existing
29 neighborhood. The building will have cream-colored stucco walls and white trim
30 color around the windows, doors, and garage door. The roof is mansard and will
31 have an asphalt roof shingle in the brown wood color. The building height is 19
32 feet and 2 inches. The existing building is about 17 feet. The majority of the new
33 building addition is within the rear yard and side yard areas behind the existing
34 fence and will not encroach into the front yard or street side setbacks. The new
35 building addition will not have much effect on the existing mature landscaping.
36 Noise from the proposed generator and condenser units was a concern to the
37 Planning Department. The Applicant submitted an Acoustical Report that
38 indicated noise levels below the 60 dBA noise levels allowed under the Municipal
39 Code at the property lines. The adjacent properties to the project to the north,
40 east and west include single-family residences and are zoned Specific Plan 204
41 Village Office/Residential. Properties to the south and southwest are also single-
42 family residences and are zoned Specific Plan 204 Village Residential. The
43 project has been reviewed and meets or exceeds the Development Standards for
44 a communications facility in the Specific Plan 204 and is consistent and does not
45 conflict with the goals, objectives, policies, or programs of the general planner or
46 Municipal Code. Access to the property will be off Fir Avenue through an existing

1 driveway where service trucks are able to park. No additional driveways or
2 parking areas are required or being proposed. Public notification was sent to all
3 property owners of record within 300 feet of the project. The Public Hearing
4 Notice for this project was posted onsite and published in the local newspaper. I
5 do have one Public Comment to report. The owner just to the north of the
6 property had some concerns about the noise and maintenance of the existing
7 facility. I did explain the current project to him. I let him know that the generator
8 is being moved further south away from his property and closer to Fir Street and
9 will also be enclosed. There was a Noise Study that the Applicant submitted that
10 meets our current Noise Standards. He did seem fine with the new addition. He
11 did not seem to have any issues with the new proposal, but I did let him know
12 that he could call if the project was approved or if there are any existing issues
13 with noise or maintenance to the property. On the environmental part, Planning
14 Staff has reviewed the project and determined that this item will not have
15 significant effect on the environment and qualifies for an exemption under
16 provisions as a Class 1 Categorical Exemption under CEQA Guidelines Section
17 15301 (E2) Additions to Existing Facilities. Staff recommends the Planning
18 Commission certify that the proposed Time Warner Communications building
19 addition is exempt from the provisions of the California Quality Act as Class 1
20 Categorical Exemption CEQA Guideline Section 15301 (E2) for the additions to
21 the existing facility and approve Amended Conditional Use Permit P14-072
22 based on the findings contained in the Planning Commission Resolution 2015-23
23 subject to the conditions of approval included as Exhibit A of the Resolution.
24 This concludes Staff presentation. I believe we do have the Time Warner
25 representative here. Let me give you the elevations. Here's the cross section of
26 the inside and how things are hidden and there is the materials color board. The
27 Applicant also did provide some colored renderings and the real color board for
28 your review. Thank you.

29
30 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Does anybody have any questions
31 for Staff? I have a couple questions. On the materials board, is there any
32 particular reason why we are utilizing shingles as opposed to tile for the roofing
33 material?

34
35 **CASE PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – That's pretty consistent with the
36 neighborhood.

37
38 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay. Also, on the conditions, I didn't see anything about
39 fire sprinklers. Since they are building onto the building, do they have to bring
40 that current structure up to Code? Or is there a Code that this type of structure,
41 since it mimics residential but it's really a commercial or industrial facility, it
42 doesn't need sprinklers?

43
44 **CASE PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – I'm not too sure if the building will have
45 sprinklers or not. Maybe the Applicant can speak on that, but it will go through
46 the building process and everything will be built per Code.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

CHAIR LOWELL – Okay I was just curious because most of the time in the conditions of approval it says must have fire sprinklers, but I didn't read that in here so okay. I have a couple more questions, but I'll push them off until later. At this time, if there are no other questions for Staff, could we have the Applicant come up?

APPLICANT STEPHEN SLATER – Hello Chairman and Members of the Commission. My name is Stephen Slater. I'm here representing Time Warner Corporation. I wanted to just start off and say that, this project, we took a lot of time on this. We've worked closely with Richard and with Gabriel. We spent a lot of time going through the design. What we've really worked closely to do is to make it a better project, a better facility than it is today. It does have a residential look. There are things like a garage door, a portico for the entry. Those are all intentional to make it blend in a little bit more with the neighborhood. As far as the front of it and the landscaping area, it's going to be the same and the additions are on the back. And the most significant thing is the existing generator, which only is used in the event of a commercial power failure, is outside right now. So, by doing this, Time Warner is able to take the generator inside the building and that's just going to be a much better situation for the neighborhood. I do have representatives here from Time Warner and the project architect to answer any specific questions you might have. And, the Applicant, we're in concurrence with the Staff Report as submitted. Again, we have spent a lot of time working closely with the Planning Department, and we're in concurrence with the conditions as submitted. Thank you.

CHAIR LOWELL – I have a quick question for you. What triggered the modification of this building? Were you trying to expand the site for better or more utility or more usage or?

APPLICANT STEPHEN SLATER – It's generally...well part of the reason for the expansion is to bring the generator inside and then for future growth for equipment, for additional services that are being provided by Time Warner.

CHAIR LOWELL – I really like what's proposed. I really like the way it looks. I think this is a good example of what should be done throughout the City so.

APPLICANT STEPHEN SLATER – And it does have a specific fire suppression system within the building and the project architect is here if you have a particular question about that.

CHAIR LOWELL – Okay, I'll ask that in a moment.

APPLICANT STEPHEN SLATER – Okay.

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I appreciate it. Do we have any other questions for the
2 Applicant? Okay.

3
4 **APPLICANT STEPHEN SLATER** – Thank you.

5
6 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I think it is pretty simple also. Do we have any Speaker
7 Slips?

8
9 **GRACE ESPINO-SALCEDO** – We do not have any. Thank you.

10
11 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Oh, we have Tom Jerele. He sneaks in under the wire. You
12 can just come up to the podium and we'll get the green paper from you in a
13 minute. I guess I should formally open the Public Comments portion. It's open.

14
15 **SPEAKER TOM JERELE** – Thank you, Chairman Lowell. I didn't plan on
16 speaking but then I've spoken before about any type of communication device
17 not only in this area because I work close to it, but throughout the city,
18 communications are evolving so rapidly. I mean, we're going into a whole
19 different world and we have been for the last 10 years. And it's probably going to
20 continue to evolve, and they are vital. And we all know how we have a bad
21 earthquake and all of a sudden nothing works, so I'm all for anything that'll keep
22 our communications up and running. And it's a tasteful building. It's a nice
23 addition, but it's also an essential service. You know, it could save somebody's
24 life in an emergency situation. So, you know, I support it. We're actually
25 negotiating with Time Warner on an easement on our property to bring in
26 services, so that's not why I want to speak for it. It's just that we need good
27 communications, not only in this area but throughout the city. So that's all I
28 wanted to say. Thank you. I'll submit my slip and I'll save one for the next item.
29 Thank you.

30
31 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thanks Tom. Okay, with that, I don't see anymore Public
32 Comments. The Public Comments portion is now closed. Moving onto
33 Commissioner Discussion. Do we have any questions for Staff or the Applicant
34 or comments in general? Go for it.

35
36 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I'd like to make a motion.

37
38 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Oh, oh.

39
40 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Oh. Were you going to do that?

41
42 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – No. I wasn't going to do that. That's all you Meli.

43
44 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Go ahead and say something.
45

1 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – I was just going to say that it's a simple clean
2 project and a nice relief after the last time we had to vote.

3
4 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – I agree.

5
6 **CHAIR LOWELL** – But, before we get to the motion, I just had a couple quick
7 questions on the fire items.

8
9 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay.

10
11 **CHAIR LOWELL** – We're proposing to put batteries in the building. Is there any
12 spill contingency. I know from my personal experience, if you leave a battery in a
13 remote too long, it starts to corrode or leak fluid. A 1000-pound battery has quite
14 a potential for having a spill if something should break it or rupture it, especially if
15 it's a liquid battery.

16
17 **CASE PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – There are conditions from the Fire
18 Department on the containment of the different types of batteries.

19
20 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay. It just says it needs to get a battery permit. I was just
21 curious what those were?

22
23 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Unfortunately, our fire marshall
24 was not able to attend this evening. But I can attest that, as Mr. Diaz has
25 indicated, there are conditions in the project approval that require consideration
26 of that before they get the building permit. So, if it's important to the
27 Commission, we can bring that answer back.

28
29 **CHAIR LOWELL** – It's not that important. I was just curious.

30
31 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – I do have a request out to our
32 building official to see if he can give me any input, but I haven't heard back yet.

33
34 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay. I appreciate it. That was pretty much it. Would
35 anyone like to make a motion?

36
37 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Yes.

38
39 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, let's go vote. You can officially make your motion by
40 clicking the button.

41
42 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay. Click on the button that says mover,
43 huh? Okay. I move that the Planning Commission certify that the proposed
44 Time Warner Communications building addition is exempt from the provisions of
45 the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as a Class 1 Categorical
46 Exemption CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 (E2) for Additions to Existing

1 Facilities and approve Amended Conditional Use Permit P14-072 based on the
2 findings contained in the Planning Commission Resolution 2015-23 subject to the
3 conditions of approval included as Exhibit A of the Resolution.

4
5 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So we have a motion by Commissioner Van Natta, and it
6 looks like we have a second by Commissioner Barnes. I now opened up the
7 voting. Please vote. We are good to go. So, last call, does anyone want to
8 change their votes? Voting is now ending. The motion passes 7-0. I do want to
9 say that this is a great project. I love what’s being done. I think this is a good
10 example of what needs to be done throughout the City where you’re blending
11 something into the existing. If you drove by, you wouldn’t even realize it’s a Time
12 Warner facility so I really compliment Staff on this project. Thank you very much.
13 Is there a Staff wrap-up on this item?

14
15
16 **Motion carries 7 – 0**

17
18
19 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Yes there is. Thank you for the
20 compliments also. We did work very hard with this applicant, and I want to
21 commend the Applicant for taking the time to work with us. The action that you
22 did take this evening is appealable to the City Council. Any interested party has
23 15 days to file an appeal. That appeal would be filed through the Community
24 Development Department to the Director of Community Development and would
25 be agendized for a hearing before the City Council within 30 days if such an
26 appeal is filed.

27
28 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Moving onto the second item tonight,
29 which I believe is PA15-0002 which is a Plot Plan and P15-003 which is a
30 Revised Tentative Tract Map for Tentative Tract Map 35414. The Applicant is
31 Oak Parc Partners. The Case Planner is Julia Descoteaux.

32
33
34 2. Case: PA15-0002 Plot Plan
35 P15-003 Revised Tentative Tract Map 35414
36
37 Applicant: Oak Parc Partners, LLP
38 Paul Reim
39
40 Owner: Garry Brown, Trustee
41
42 Representative: Trip Hord Associates, Trip Hord
43
44 Location: SECONDARY Box Springs Road/Clark Street
45
46 Case Planner: Julia Descoteaux

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Council District: 2

Proposal: PA15-0002 Plot Plan and P15-003 Revised Tentative Tract Map 35414

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

That the Planning Commission **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2015-21 and thereby:

- 1. **APPROVE** an Addendum to the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration for PA15-0002 (Plot Plan) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 15164 (b) as only minor technical changes or additions are required to the prior Mitigated Negative Declaration approved November 26th, 2007 for PA07-0016/PA07-0017 (Tentative Tract Map 35414 and Plot Plan). None of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent negative declaration have occurred and thereby approve PA15-0002 subject to the attached conditions of approval included as Exhibit A and the Mitigation Measures included as Exhibit B of the Resolution; and
- 2. **APPROVE** PA15-0002 (Plot Plan) subject to the attached conditions of approval included as Exhibit A and the Mitigation Measures included as Exhibit B of the Resolution; and

That the Planning Commission **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2015-22 and thereby:

- 1. **APPROVE** an Addendum to the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration for P15-003 (Revised Tentative Tract Map 35414) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 15164 (b) as only minor technical changes or additions are required to the prior Mitigated Negative Declaration approved November 26th, 2007 for PA07-0016/PA07-0017 (Tentative Tract Map 35414 and Plot Plan). None of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent negative declaration have occurred and thereby P15-003 subject to the attached conditions of approval included as Exhibit A and the Mitigation Measures included as Exhibit B of the Resolution; and
- 2. **APPROVE** P15 -003 (Revised Tentative Tract Map 35414) subject to the attached conditions of approval included as Exhibit A and the Mitigation Measure included as Exhibit B of the Resolution

COMMISSIONER BARNES – Chairman Lowell.

CHAIR LOWELL – Yes, Sir.

1
2 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – I must recuse myself. My employer has a
3 professional relationship with the Applicant, so I will watch from the lobby.

4
5 **CHAIR LOWELL** – You’re officially recused. Thank you. With that said, I’d like
6 to call up alternate Commissioner Erlan Gonzalez. Just give us a moment while
7 Commissioner Gonzalez logs out and logs back in.

8
9 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – What’s the password?

10
11 **CHAIR LOWELL** – It’s super secret.

12
13 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – While he’s doing that, I will
14 introduce Julia Descoteaux is our planner on this. Julia has been involved
15 thoroughly on this project when it was before the Planning Commission and City
16 Council late last year so.

17
18 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I remember this project coming before us last year.

19
20 **CASE PLANNER JULIA DESCOTEAUX** – Good evening Planning
21 Commissioners. I’m Julia Descoteaux, Associate Planner. The item before you
22 is a Plot Plan PA15-0002 and a Revised Tentative Tract Map 35414, P15-003.
23 The Applicant is Oak Parc Partners, Paul Reim. The owner is Garry Brown and
24 the representative is Trip Hord Associates, Trip Hord. The project is located at
25 the southeast corner of Box Springs Road and Clark Street and it’s in Council
26 District 2. The item before you includes a Plot Plan for a 266 unit apartment
27 complex with amenities and a Revised Tentative Tract Map for condominium
28 purposes. The site includes four parcels, which will be consolidated into one
29 parcel of approximately 13 acres with the approval of the Revised Tentative Tract
30 Map. The Revised Tentative Tract Map is consistent with the prior-approved
31 Tentative Map with minor changes to the ingress and egress locations and minor
32 changes to the Plot Plan for the project. The site was operated as a commercial
33 desert nursery from approximately 1967 to the early 1980s and has been vacant
34 since that time, except for numerous unattended trees and shrubs and
35 vegetation. In addition, there is a telecommunications facility located on the
36 southeast portion of the site. In 2007, the site was approved for a 240 unit
37 complex, which included a Condominium Map, a General Plan Amendment, and
38 a Change of Zone changing the land use designation and the zoning from
39 Commercial to Residential 20. In October 2014, the land use and zoning was
40 changed to Residential 30 providing an increase in the density, which allows for
41 an increase in the number of dwelling units per acre. The surrounding area
42 includes existing residential and multifamily and single family both to the north
43 and commercial vacant property to the east and the west. There is an existing
44 residential unit to the east, which is legal nonconforming. And, to the south, is
45 State Highway 60. And, further south, is commercial land located in the City of
46 Riverside. The proposed Plot Plan includes 266 units and is compatible with the

1 Residential 30 Land Use and includes 19 buildings with one, two, and three
2 bedroom units. The site will include onsite leasing, a recreation building, a pool
3 and a spa, and a play area, which will be located adjacent to the recreation
4 building. Each three-story building includes 14 units designed to provide a Santa
5 Barbara Tuscan feel with several color schemes and building accents, which
6 includes wall projections, window treatments, tiles, shutters and wrought iron
7 elements, and clay tile roofs. Each unit will include the required private open
8 space of 100 square feet for the upper stories and 150 square feet for the ground
9 units. The main entrance will be off the newly designed Clark Street with two
10 additional driveways available with limited access. The Internal Circulation
11 System will provide convenient access for residents and emergency response
12 teams to all buildings and parking areas. Parking garages and uncovered
13 parking spaces are available for the residents, which exceed the City's
14 requirement with a total of 513 required and 521 provided. The Conceptual
15 Landscape Plan provides for a variety of plant material consistent with the City's
16 landscape requirements, which will also take into consideration the recent
17 drought conditions. The design will include trees, onsite trees, and the
18 integration of drought-tolerant plants; cacti-type plants incorporating the original
19 site use as a desert nursery into the design. Based on an initial study, it has
20 been determined that this project is consistent with the requirements for an
21 addendum to the previously-approved Mitigated Negative Declaration pursuant to
22 Section 15164 (b) of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines. None
23 of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the Guidelines that calls for a
24 preparation of a subsequent negative declaration have occurred. The initial
25 study evaluated the modification of the project, which includes the addition of 26
26 units and changes to the building layout circulation, landscape and walkway
27 design, and other minor changes to the Site Plan. Updated technical studies
28 were prepared and submitted to the City for review to compare the original
29 project to the modified project. Based on the analysis provided, only minor
30 technical changes are required to the previously-adopted Mitigated Negative
31 Declaration and the proposed project would not create impacts not analyzed with
32 the original project or create new impacts not previously considered with the
33 original project. The project was submitted in February 2015 with minor
34 modifications made to accommodate fire emergency ingress and egress to the
35 site. All requested modifications have been completed and meet both the City's
36 objectives, as well as the Applicant's. Notice was sent to all property owners
37 within 300 feet posted on the site and noticed in the local newspaper. To date, I
38 have received no phone calls or inquiries regarding the project. Staff
39 recommends that the Planning Commission approve Resolutions 2015-21 and
40 2015-22 and thereby approve an Addendum to the previously-approved
41 Mitigated Negative Declaration for PA15-002 Plot Plan and P15-003 pursuant to
42 the California Environmental Quality Act Section 15164 (b) as only minor
43 technical changes or additions are required to the prior Mitigated Negative
44 Declaration with the inclusion of the conditions of approval included as Exhibit A
45 and the Mitigation Measures included as Exhibit B of the Resolution. This

1 concludes my presentation. I'm available for any questions, as well as the
2 Applicant is here. Thank you.

3
4 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Do we have any questions for Staff?
5 I don't see anybody raising their hand, so let's move on. Can we have the
6 Applicant please?

7
8 **APPLICANT PAUL REIM** – Good evening Commissioners. Thank you for your
9 time. My name is Paul Reim, the Applicant, and I'd just like to touch on a few
10 things that Julia mentioned a little bit more about the project. Along with the
11 project, we're going to be finishing off a big hunk of Box Springs Road adding a
12 lane, bike lane, sidewalks. I think about 700 feet of Box Springs Road is going to
13 get finished off, so there won't be very much of Box Springs Road left when we're
14 done. In addition to that, we'll be upgrading the cabinet in the intersection at
15 Clark Street into a four-way intersection with turn lanes, so that will help that
16 intersection. The community will be a gated community; gated access to
17 residents only. As Julia mentioned, it is going to be done in a drought tolerant
18 landscape. We're going to have several hundred trees, I think, right Julia? I
19 think we counted almost 300 trees on the Tentative Conceptual Landscape Plan,
20 so we're going to be putting a lot of shade on the property. It'll have a leasing
21 office, a recreation center, a community room, a workout room. The concept in
22 the recreation area is trying to create several conversation areas to try and
23 create community within the community. The interiors are going to be completely
24 furnished with energy efficient appliances, full-size washer/dryers side-by-side
25 units in each unit, as well as LED lighting inside the units and the building is
26 complete with sprinklers. So, if there are any questions, I would be happy to
27 answer them.

28
29 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I appreciate it. Thank you. Do we have any questions for
30 the Applicant?

31
32 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – I do.

33
34 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Gonzalez.

35
36 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – I read in the Staff Report that there is an option
37 for it, in the future, to be a for rent product and maybe go to a condominium-type
38 development. Will that be determined by market forces or when is that decision
39 going to be made?

40
41 **APPLICANT PAUL REIM** – Yeah, really we have to go to a Tentative Tract
42 because there are four parcels, so we have to bring those four parcels into one
43 parcel so the future condominium conversion is kind of a residual of bringing in
44 the four parcels together into one as a Tentative Tract, yeah.

45
46 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – Thank you.

1
2 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other questions for the Applicant? Okay Commissioner
3 Ramirez.

4
5 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – The entryway is off Box Springs Road?
6

7 **APPLICANT PAUL REIM** – Yes.
8

9 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – What is the distance from where the gate is
10 going to be to the actual street and is there any chance that could get congested
11 as vehicles are entering through there?
12

13 **APPLICANT PAUL REIM** – We went through that with Traffic, I think with Mike,
14 and I can't remember the exact distance but it's the required queueing distance.
15 It's 60 or 80 feet off Box Springs Road or something like that yeah. It's way back
16 into the property.
17

18 **CHAIR LOWELL** – That's going to be an entrance, not just an exit?
19

20 **APPLICANT PAUL REIM** – Correct. It will be secondary, yeah, but it's
21 residents only at that entrance. Public is only off Clark.
22

23 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you. Any other questions? That moves us onto the
24 Public Comments portion. Do we have any speakers? I believe we have Tom
25 Jerele. Tom Jerele, you're up Sir. I think we should just give you a permanent
26 seat over there, Tom.
27

28 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Yeah or a microphone.
29

30 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Just give you a microphone and you can sit down over there.
31

32 **SPEAKER TOM JERELE** – Tom Jerele, Sr. again. I'm speaking on behalf of
33 myself. Chairman Lowell, Commissioners, members of the Staff, and public
34 watching on TV or on the internet: Thank you for conducting this hearing. You
35 know, before I go onto my comments on the project, this hearing is a perfect
36 example of why we needed the alternate system for the Planning Commissioners
37 and I'm glad to see it coming together. So I just want to give some kudos to the
38 City as they took that system up. The Applicant and the public get the benefit of
39 a full Commission Hearing on a project, so I like that. I am here to support the
40 project. Number (1): It's zone compliant. Number (2): I've seen the man's other
41 projects and they appear to be first rate apartment complexes, and something
42 that I noted when I went through the mix that I wasn't aware of until tonight, I
43 really like the idea of the 57 three-bedroom units. You know, these interest rates
44 aren't going to last forever. I'd like to think that home values are going to go up
45 in time, which is a good thing overall, but that can displace a lot of young
46 couples. I was thinking as I was waiting to speak how before we bought our

1 house, my wife and we ultimately had two kids. We all piled into one little one-
2 bedroom apartment in Garden Grove. I mean, we didn't start out that way. But,
3 the kids came, and we were able to keep them in there and luckily we were able
4 to get a house but that housing went up dramatically. So this affords a quality
5 housing element in the City. These are people that shop in the city. We know
6 our commercial element is going to need the additional footprints. I like the idea
7 of opening up Box Springs because that is a big bottleneck right there. So, even
8 though it's going to add traffic, it's also going to do something substantial to
9 remedy it. So I want to endorse the project, and I pray you approve it. Thank
10 you.

11
12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. I don't see any other speakers. I'm
13 going to close the Public Comments portion. This moves us onto Commissioner
14 Discussion. Do we have any questions or comments? Commissioner Ramirez?

15
16 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – Well I just wanted to say I think it's a great
17 project once again. It's in an ideal location. It will also support the local
18 businesses that are there in the area, and I'm ready to vote this project through.

19
20 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Nickel?

21
22 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – My only concern about Clark Street, that's going to
23 be open to the public? Okay Foothill Baptist Church, and the only reason I'm
24 bringing it up is that I attended a Traffic Committee Meeting and there was
25 someone from the church there complaining about a lack of parking and that they
26 were wanting basically the City to grade them a lot to park. So I was just
27 concerned that the church may overflow on that street.

28
29 **CASE PLANNER JULIA DESCOTEAUX** – I'll let Public Works speak more to
30 the construction of the street, but it will be a public street and it will be open to
31 parking unless Transportation or Land Development determine that it wouldn't be
32 allowed to be parked on.

33
34 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – I'm worried it could turn into a nightmare like Saint
35 Christopher Lane with the congestion of the church traffic, so I don't know if Staff
36 can mitigate that for Sundays.

37
38 **CASE PLANNER JULIA DESCOTEAUX** – I can let Public Works talk to the
39 street improvements.

40
41 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Thank you.

42
43 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER MICHAEL LLOYD** – Good evening, Michael Lloyd with
44 the Public Works Department. With this approval and the improvements that this
45 project will make, there will be no initial connection between the church and Clark
46 Street. So I appreciate your concern, and it's certainly something we'll have to

1 look at. But, at least initially, there will be no connection between the church and
2 Clark Street. Obviously, as the church expands into the vacant lot and develops,
3 that's when we would look at any potential connections at that time.

4
5 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Okay, thank you.

6
7 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other questions or comments? Okay, I have a couple. I
8 remember this project coming before us last year. I see the Revised Tentative
9 Map in front of me, but I don't really understand what changed. I know you said
10 there were some minor changes, but was there anything worthy of note or was
11 this an essentially carbon copied plan that is just coming back for re-approval?

12
13 **CASE PLANNER JULIA DESCOTEAUX** – It's relatively similar. The only
14 difference would be the driveway on the western portion of the site was a little bit
15 different and Clark Street on the original project was a private street at that time,
16 so it's real minor.

17
18 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So what triggered this project having to come back in front of
19 us?

20
21 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Mr. Chairman, members of the
22 Planning Commission: The item that was before you last year was actually a
23 Change of Zone and a General Plan Amendment, which would allow for a higher
24 unit count. The unit count on this particular project is higher than the previous
25 project, so while the map is relatively consistent, the total number of units has
26 increased.

27
28 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Gotcha.

29
30 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – What is the total number of extra
31 units or additional units?

32
33 **CASE PLANNER JULIA DESCOTEAUX** – 26.

34
35 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Any other questions or comments?
36 Would somebody like to make a motion?

37
38 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Yes, I'm motioning again.

39
40 **CHAIR LOWELL** – There we go. Now you can motion.

41
42 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Now I can motion. Okay, I move we approve
43 an Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Mitigation Declaration for
44 PA15-0002 Plot Plan pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act CEQA
45 Section 15164 (b) as only minor technical changes or additions are required to
46 the prior Mitigated Negative Declaration approved November 26th, 2007 for

1 PA07-0016/PA07-0017 Tentative Tract Map 35414 and Plot Plan. None of the
2 conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent
3 negative declaration have occurred and thereby approve PA15-0002 subject to
4 the attached conditions of approval included as Exhibit A and the Mitigation
5 Measures included as Exhibit B of the Resolution; and approve PA15-0002 Plot
6 Plan subject to the attached conditions of approval included as Exhibit A and the
7 Mitigation Measures included as Exhibit B of the Resolution and that the
8 Planning Commission approve Resolution No. 2015-22 and thereby approve an
9 Addendum to the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration for P15-003
10 Revised Tentative Tract Map 35414 pursuant to the California Environmental
11 Quality Activity (CEQA) Section 15164 (b) as only minor technical changes or
12 additions are required to the prior Mitigated Negative Declaration approved
13 November 26th, 2007 for PA07-0016/PA07-0017 Tentative Tract Map 35414 and
14 Plot Plan. None of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for
15 preparation of a subsequent negative declaration have occurred and thereby
16 approve P15-003 subject to the attached conditions of approval included as
17 Exhibit A of the Mitigation Measures included as Exhibit B of the Resolution; and
18 approve P15-003 Revised Tentative Tract Map 35414 subject to the attached
19 conditions of approval included as Exhibit A and the Mitigation Measures
20 included as Exhibit B of the Resolution.

21
22 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Are you sure you got it all?

23
24 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I think so.

25
26 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So we have a motion by Commissioner Van Natta and we
27 have a second by Commissioner Korzec. Let's vote. We are waiting on
28 Commissioner Barnes, but he is absent because he recused himself, so we're
29 going to end the vote. Voting has ended. The motion passes 7-0. Do we have a
30 Staff wrap-up on this item?

31
32
33 **Motion carries 7 – 0**

34
35
36 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – We do. This is another item that
37 is appealable to the City Council. Any interested party that would be interested in
38 filing an appeal would file their appeal within 15 consecutive days of this action.
39 That appeal would be filed with the Community Development Director in the
40 Community Development Department. And, if such an appeal is filed, it would be
41 agendized for a City Council Hearing within 30 days.

42
43
44 **OTHER COMMISSION BUSINESS**

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. That moves us onto Other
2 Commission Business, which I do not believe we have any Other Business.

3
4
5 **STAFF COMMENTS**

6
7 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Do we have any Staff comments?

8
9 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – The only Staff Comments that I
10 have is I did miss the July meeting. It was fun to be back here. I also do
11 appreciate the efficiency of tonight’s meeting and the efficiency I heard at the
12 July 23rd meeting. My Staff is working very hard to put together good Staff
13 Reports, and I hope that’s one of the reasons that we’re able to get through these
14 things. I do appreciate the comments from the public as well tonight on the
15 efforts of our Staff. And so, with that, I’ll conclude.

16
17
18 **PLANNING COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

19
20 **CHAIR LOWELL** – That moves us onto Planning Commissioner Comments.
21 Does anybody have any comments?

22
23 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Our next meeting is?

24
25 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Our next meeting is....

26
27 **GRACE ESPINO-SALCEDO** – That would be Thursday, September 24th, 2015.

28
29 **CHAIR LOWELL** – September 24th, 2015, there we go.

30
31 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I just always like it when he says that. It’s kind
32 of...

33
34 **CHAIR LOWELL** – One of the questions I had last time, which I was hoping to
35 get some answers to, is I would like to have the members of the Commission
36 allowed the chance to tour some of the facilities we’ve approved in the past. For
37 instance, Aldi Foods. We have the Amazon facility, which I believe is JPA. But
38 we also have Proctor & Gamble. We have a lot of large warehouses coming into
39 our area, and because there are going to be more coming to us for approval or
40 suggestions, I’d kind of like to know better what we’re approving on the inside of
41 the building. We know what the outside of the building looks like, but the inside
42 of the building is kind of the important thing. So if we could kind of arrange that
43 and have maybe the City chaperone the events so we don’t have any Brown Act
44 violations or whatnot.

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – I'd be happy to do that. I will work
2 with our Economic Development Staff whose worked with a lot of the various
3 businesses out there and the property owners that are trying to market the
4 properties. I think that there would be good opportunity to include the
5 Commissioners, including the alternate Commissioners. I also wanted to
6 compliment the alternate Commissioners as Mr. Jerele had. I think it's working
7 really well.

8
9 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I think it's working very well also. And one of the facilities I
10 would really like to see is the Fisker facility, maybe get a free test drive or
11 something. I'd also like to comment that our alternate Commissioners did a great
12 job tonight. Thank you very much.

13
14 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – Thank you.

15
16 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other comments?

17
18 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Well I just wanted to say, when you're
19 including that list, I think it would be really nice since we just talked about an
20 enormous warehouse facility that we get to go into the largest one we have in
21 town which is the Skechers one and get an idea of what it's like with all the
22 robotics and everything in place.

23
24 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Make a nice fieldtrip out of it.

25
26 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Yeah, especially if lunch is included.

27
28 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – I'll see what we can do.

29
30
31 **ADJOURNMENT**

32
33 **CHAIR LOWELL** – With that said, this concludes our meeting. The next
34 meeting is adjourned until our next Regular Meeting, which is September 24th,
35 2015, at 7:00 PM. Thank you very much and have a good night.

36

1 **NEXT MEETING**

2 *Next Meeting: Planning Commission Regular Meeting, September 24th, 2015, at*
3 *7:00 PM, City of Moreno Valley, City Hall Council Chamber, 14177 Frederick*
4 *Street, Moreno Valley, CA 92553*

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16 _____
17 Richard J. Sandzimier
18 Planning Official
19 Approved

_____ Date

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30 _____
31 Brian R. Lowell
32 Chair

_____ Date