

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

5   **Thursday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 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                   October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2015 Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission to order. The  
12                   time is 7:03 PM. We do have two absentees up here. Commissioner Ramirez  
13                   has an excused absence and Commissioner Baker has an excused absence.  
14                   With that noted, could we have the rollcall please?  
15

16  
17                   **ROLL CALL**  
18

19                   Commissioners Present:

20                   Alternate Commissioner Nickel  
21                   Commissioner Korzec  
22                   Commissioner Van Natta  
23                   Alternate Commissioner Gonzalez  
24                   Commissioner Barnes  
25                   Vice Chair Sims  
26                   Chair Lowell  
27

28                   Staff Present:

29                   Rick Sandzimier, Planning Official  
30                   Paul Early, Assistant City Attorney  
31                   Grace Espino-Salcedo, Permit Technician  
32                   Jeff Bradshaw, Case Planner  
33                   Guy Pagan, Senior Engineer  
34

35  
36                   **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**  
37

38                   **CHAIR LOWELL** – Would anyone like to motion to approve the Agenda for  
39                   tonight’s meeting? Oh, I’m one step ahead. We need to have the Pledge of  
40                   Allegiance. Commissioner Gonzalez is going to lead us in the Pledge of  
41                   Allegiance tonight. Thank you.  
42

43  
44                   **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

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

**Approval of Agenda**

**CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you for that. Now, would anyone like to motion to approve tonight’s Agenda? Let’s see if we can do a vote on that. There we go. We have a motion by Vice Chair Sims and a second by Commissioner Van Natta. Let’s vote. We are waiting on Commissioner Korzec.

**COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – I keep pushing it.

**CHAIR LOWELL** – There we go. It passes unanimously, 7-0. Awesome. Ah, I crack me up.

Opposed – 0

**Motion carries 7 – 0**

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

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

**CHAIR LOWELL** – So that moves us onto our Consent Calendar of which we don’t have any.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**None**

**CHAIR LOWELL** – Next is approval of Minutes, which again we do not have any.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS PROCEDURE**

*Any person wishing to address the Commission on any matter, either under Public Comments section of the Agenda or scheduled items or public hearings, must fill out a “Request to Speak” form available at the door. The completed*

1 form must be submitted to the Secretary prior to the Agenda item being called by  
2 the Chairperson. In speaking to the Commission, member of the public may be  
3 limited to three minutes per person, except for the applicant for entitlement. The  
4 Commission may establish an overall time limit for comments on a particular  
5 Agenda item. Members of the public must direct their questions to the  
6 Chairperson of the Commission and not to other members of the Commission,  
7 the applicant, the Staff, or the audience. Additionally, there is an ADA note.  
8 Upon request, this Agenda will be made available in appropriate alternative  
9 formats to persons with disabilities in compliance with the Americans with  
10 Disabilities Act of 1990. Any person with a disability who requires a modification  
11 or accommodation in order to participate in a meeting should direct their request  
12 to Guy Pagan, our ADA Coordinator, at (951) 413-3120 at least 48 hours prior to  
13 the meeting. The 48-hour notification will enable the City to make reasonable  
14 arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

15  
16 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And now we’re onto the Public Comments portion of the  
17 meeting.

18  
19  
20 **NON-PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

21  
22 **None**

23  
24 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Moving on, we have Non-Public Hearing Items, which we do  
25 not have any.

26  
27  
28 **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

- 29  
30 1. Case: PA15-0009 (Conditional Use Permit)  
31 Applicant: Verizon Wireless  
32 Owner: Shinder Kaur and Parmjit Singh  
33 Representative: SAC Wireless (Dail Richard)  
34 Location: 14058 Redlands Boulevard (Farm Market)  
35 Case Planner: Claudia Manrique  
36 Council District: 3  
37 Proposal: Applicant request for continuance of PA15-0009  
38 (Conditional Use Permit) to the November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2015  
39 Planning Commission Meeting for a proposed new  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

1 Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) with a 60 foot  
2 monopine.  
3

4 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Which moves us onto the Public Hearing Items. The first  
5 Public Hearing Item is Case No. PA15-009, a Verizon Wireless cell tower and the  
6 Case Planner is Claudia Manrique. Do we have a....  
7

8 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – We do. We have a quick update.  
9 There will be no Staff presentation this evening on this particular item. This item  
10 was before the Commission at the last meeting and the Commission asked to  
11 continue the item to this meeting. Subsequent to that, the Applicant's  
12 representative (or the consultant) had asked that this item be further continued to  
13 November 12<sup>th</sup>. They are still trying to get a hold of Verizon to make sure that  
14 they've got proper authorization to do the additional investigation that the  
15 Commission was interested in. It is my understanding, as of today, that that  
16 representative is still trying to work with Verizon. I've talked with Claudia and so  
17 we will continue to push them to do what they need to do so that they can be  
18 here on November 12<sup>th</sup>. But, at this time, they've asked for the item to be  
19 continued to November 12<sup>th</sup>. We're supportive of that action at this time.  
20

21 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Alright. Do we need to take an action on that or can we  
22 just....do we vote on continuing the item?  
23

24 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – You should take an action so that  
25 we don't have to notice it again.  
26

27 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay.  
28

29 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – So you're accepting the  
30 recommendation to continue it.  
31

32 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, I motion to continue the item to November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2015,  
33 meeting. You are now able to vote. Waiting on Commissioner Korzec.  
34

35 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – It's still not....  
36

37 **CHAIR LOWELL** – You didn't hold your head right. Okay, so the motion passes  
38 7-0. So that item has been continued to November 12<sup>th</sup>.  
39

40  
41 Opposed – 0  
42

43  
44 **Motion carries 7 – 0**  
45

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Was there any.....okay, it shows  
2 that the Commissioner Van Natta made the motion and you seconded it. Is that  
3 correct?  
4

5 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yeah actually I motioned it. She seconded it but the buttons  
6 were pushed backwards.  
7

8 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Okay.  
9

10 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I don't know if that's an issue.  
11

12 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – It'll be what you've done and not  
13 what the computer shows. Thanks.  
14

15 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Alright. Okay, so I don't think we need to take any other  
16 action on that. So the item has been continued to November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2015. That  
17 moves us onto our second item, which is PA15-0028, a Tentative Parcel Map No.  
18 36468. The Applicant is Continental East Fund III, LLC. The Case Planner is  
19 Mr. Jeff Bradshaw.  
20

- 21
- 22 2. Case: PA15-0028 – Tentative Parcel Map 36468  
23
- 24 Applicant: Continental East Fund III, LLC  
25
- 26 Owner: Continental East Fund III, LLC  
27
- 28 Representative: Continental East Fund III, LLC  
29
- 30 Location: Northwest corner of Lasselle Street and Krameria  
31 Avenue  
32
- 33 Case Planner: Jeff Bradshaw  
34
- 35 Council District: 4  
36
- 37 Proposal: Tentative Parcel Map No. 36468 proposes to create a  
38 three parcel subdivision for finance purposes for  
39 property located within the approved 217 unit  
40 Continental Villages Project. The three parcels  
41 correspond to the three distinct residential product  
42 types located within the project. The Finance Map  
43 does not include any proposed development.  
44  
45  
46

1 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

2  
3 Staff recommends that the Planning Commission **APPROVE** Resolution No.  
4 2015-24, and thereby:

- 5  
6 1. **CERTIFY** that the project will not have a significant effect on the  
7 environment and is therefore exempt from the provisions of California  
8 Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as a Class 15 Categorical  
9 Exemption, as a Minor Land Division, per CEQA Guidelines Section  
10 15315; and  
11  
12 2. **APPROVE** PA15-0028 (Tentative Parcel Map) based on the findings  
13 contained in this resolution, and subject to the attached conditions of  
14 approval included as Exhibit A.  
15

16  
17 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – I'd like to introduce Mr. Jeff  
18 Bradshaw, our Planner on this, and we do have the Applicant present this  
19 evening as well.  
20

21 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – Thank you Chair Lowell and Members  
22 of the Planning Commission. The application presented to you this evening is for  
23 a proposal for a three parcel Finance Map. It is for property located on the 19  
24 acres at the northwest corner of Lasselle and Krameria as indicated on the  
25 Exhibit on display. The proposal is to create this subdivision for finance  
26 purposes only. The property was previously entitled through an action by the  
27 Planning Commission. This prior project was approved at this location in  
28 November of 2002 for a 217 unit project referred to as the Continental Villages  
29 project. That was a project that included a combination of residential product  
30 types. They approved, at that time, was a portion of the site to be developed as  
31 detached single-family residences on small lots, clustered units that would have  
32 been developed around courtyards, and multiple-family apartments. The  
33 proposed parcels, three parcels of this Finance Map, would match the  
34 boundaries of those three distinct residential product types from that original  
35 approval. The project, through review by Staff, Staff has ensured and  
36 determined that the design of this Finance Map conforms to all of the  
37 development standards (the applicable standards of the Moreno Valley Ranch  
38 Specific Plan) where it is located. It is also consistent with the requirements of  
39 the City's Municipal Code, and it is important to note that the Finance Map does  
40 not include any proposed development nor would approval of this Finance Map  
41 afford any development rights. It is for finance purposes only. Future  
42 development with any of the parcels within this map would be required to be in  
43 conformance with that original project, with the Continental Villages project. It  
44 was approved by the Planning Commission under a prior action. If the developer  
45 elected to do something different within the property, that would require separate  
46 review and separate approval under completely different applications And they

1 would go through that process, and it would be reviewed under its own merits. In  
2 the review of the project, Staff looked at the potential environmental impacts of  
3 this proposed subdivision and determined that it qualified and satisfied rather all  
4 of the criteria for a Categorical Exemption. And it would be Staff's  
5 recommendation that the Planning Commission recognize that the project is  
6 exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act as a  
7 Class 15 Categorical Exemption as a Minor Land Division. Standard Public  
8 Hearing Notice was completed for this project with a 10-day notice appearing in  
9 the paper, as well as notices being provided to all owners of record within 300  
10 feet of the site and the site was also posted. As of this evening, I did receive two  
11 phone calls in response to those noticing efforts. Both residents had questions  
12 about the Finance Map to better understand what is being proposed. They both  
13 stated, restated rather, their opposition to the original project, and there were  
14 some concerns with the City's criteria with how far away from a project we  
15 provide notice. They felt like 300 feet was not adequate. With that, Staff would  
16 recommend the following actions to the Planning Commission that they  
17 **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2015-24 certifying that the project will not have a  
18 significant effect on the environment and is exempt from the provisions of the  
19 California Environmental Quality Act as a Class 15 Categorical Exemption and  
20 additionally **APPROVE** Tentative Parcel Map No. 36468 based on the findings  
21 contained in the Resolution and subject to the conditions of approval attached to  
22 that Resolution. That concludes my report. I'd be happy to answer any  
23 questions that you might have.

24  
25 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you for that. Do we have any questions for Staff  
26 before we ask the Applicant up?

27  
28 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Yeah, I have one question.

29  
30 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Barnes, go ahead.

31  
32 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – I do have one question on LD6. Is it in conflict  
33 with P8 or do they imply different things because P8 says no development until a  
34 Future Map, a Conditional Use Permit, or a Master Plan for development  
35 whereas LD6 says that a Future Map must be processed? So it seems like there  
36 is no possible development without a Future Map.

37  
38 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – I'll try and provide a response if I could  
39 and then I'll let Land Development respond to their condition if you will. If you  
40 look at the section of the Code that discusses finance maps, it anticipates a  
41 couple of different scenarios. Typically, you would see I believe the chronology  
42 you would see the Finance Map created first with development that might then  
43 follow later showing some specific concept or design plan for those distinct  
44 parcels. In this case, the development has already been approved, and they are  
45 now asking for the opportunity to create distinct parcels. So, I believe, P8 and  
46 LD6 are accurate in they are trying to cover both of those scenarios. There is the

1 possibility again that the underlying entitlement is never developed and they  
2 decide to come forward with a different concept, which would then be reviewed  
3 through our process to ensure compliance with our Code. I don't know if Land  
4 Development has anything they wanted to offer for LD6.

5  
6 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Well I understand that, but even if the existing  
7 approved development is to move forward, based on that condition, they would  
8 still have to do another map because it says a future map for development must  
9 be processed. It seems...

10  
11 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – I don't believe the intent is to require a  
12 distinct map and so I will look to Land Development for some clarification on that.  
13 There is no requirement for the City to do a third map if you will for development  
14 at this location.

15  
16 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – That's the way I would read LD6. To me, it says  
17 another map is required before they can get any development permits.

18  
19 **SENIOR ENGINEER GUY PAGAN** – This is Guy Pagan with Land  
20 Development. I'll have to go back and double check, but if I'm not mistaking,  
21 Resolution for Finance Maps that was approved some time earlier this year. The  
22 statement that is put in there is exactly the statement that was part of that  
23 resolution.

24  
25 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Well I'll try and shed some light on  
26 it. It is actually correct the way that the condition is written. Both conditions are  
27 correct. This particular project was actually in play at the time that the Finance  
28 and Conveyance Map Ordinance was put in place and there was actually some  
29 consideration give to this particular project because, as Mr. Bradshaw has  
30 already indicated, typically you'd want to see a Finance and Conveyance Map  
31 done prior to any sort of a land division already haven taken place. So the note  
32 on the map is actually correct. I should say the language in LD6 is correct, and  
33 when they come in for the development, what we would be then confirming is  
34 that the map that was already previously approved is confirmed to still be  
35 accurate so you still would go through a process to say there was an approved  
36 map put in place. It may sound awkward. It may look awkward, but that is in fact  
37 what was intended. And so, if they make a change to that map and they have to  
38 come in for a modification or revision to that map, then we would be approving  
39 another map for those development purposes. So it sounds a little convoluted. I  
40 can appreciate the Commissions questions and concerns, but we do believe that  
41 it is correct.

42  
43 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Okay.

44  
45 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – In my providing a background, I maybe  
46 didn't do as complete a job of explaining what the underlying entitlement



1 includes, so just for reference purposes this is the map that was approved with  
2 that original Continental Villages project. And that, I believe, is the map that is  
3 being referred to here in LD6 that development cannot occur as an outcome of  
4 this Finance Map unless there is an actual Development Map recorded. The  
5 Tentative Map that would correspond to this condition is this map, so.....

6  
7 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – So this map that exists is the future map that will  
8 exist?

9  
10 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – That’s correct.

11  
12 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – That’s crystal clear to me.

13  
14 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – Back to the future.

15  
16 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Along that same note, LD5, it says that the developer shall  
17 protect downstream properties from damage caused by alternation of drainage  
18 patterns, i.e., concentration or diversion of flows. Protection shall be provided by  
19 constructing adequate drainage facilities, including but not limited to modifying  
20 existing facilities by securing a drainage easement. But, everywhere else in  
21 these conditions, it says no work can be done. But we’re telling them they have  
22 to do work.

23  
24 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – I didn’t prompt him to ask that.

25  
26 **SENIOR ENGINEER GUY PAGAN** – This statement is basically to put the  
27 Owner or the Applicant on notice that anything that’s done within the property  
28 that may change the drainage pattern, such as going out and testing the  
29 property, that may change the drainage pattern. And they are responsible to  
30 ensure that any change to that drainage pattern does not do any harm to  
31 downstream any development that exists. So, if they go out and do work other  
32 than a development of the property itself, they need to make sure that whatever  
33 they do doesn’t change that drainage pattern and causes damage to anything  
34 that is downstream of the property.

35  
36 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, so it’s not referring to actual development. It’s  
37 referring to anything that goes on with the property.

38  
39 **SENIOR ENGINEER GUY PAGAN** – Correct.

40  
41 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Do we have any other questions for Staff before I move on?  
42 Vice Chair Sims.

43  
44 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – So mine is regarding on the conditions of approval, P4,  
45 which just it seems to be the Financial Map has a three year time on it and then it  
46 expires. Is there any conflict with the three years on this not lining up with the

1 prior three approvals, whatever PA11-025 through PA11-027? Are those  
2 consistent? Because it would just seem like, I don't know what the statutes are  
3 for Financing Maps per the Subdivision Map Act, but it would seem like you'd  
4 want to have this run concurrent with the length of time for the previous  
5 approvals.

6  
7 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – They are distinct. The life afforded to  
8 the map would be the same as the Development Map, so by our statute is  
9 consistent or it matches the Subdivision Map Act, so a total of eight years. So,  
10 the three years is the initial approval. There would be opportunities for  
11 extensions through our process and possibly extensions if the State offered  
12 those again like they have over the last couple of years. The Finance Map is not  
13 a requirement for development. It was something that was a choice that was  
14 made by the developer. And so, to date, there has not been an effort to pair  
15 those. The Development Map would run on its own life or its own terms. And I  
16 don't know if Rick has anything additional he wanted to add.

17  
18 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – The only thing I would say is,  
19 along the lines of the discussion we had a little bit earlier, they do run their own  
20 course for their own three years. Say the previous approval expires. You can  
21 still have the Finance and Conveyance Map approval in place and it almost is  
22 effectively then having the Finance and Conveyance Map in advance of actually  
23 having a development approval for the site. So the owner of the property still has  
24 the opportunity to sell the properties off for finance and conveyance purposes  
25 and then each of those individual properties, which are indicated in the  
26 conditions, would come in for subsequent approvals. So it is covered.

27  
28 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other questions for Staff before we move on? No?  
29 Okay, I'd like to invite the Applicant up to speak.

30  
31 **APPLICANT ALEX RAMIREZ** – Good evening. I am Alex Ramirez and I am  
32 here on behalf on Continental East. We just first would like to thank Staff. They  
33 have been very helpful with this process and everything they've stated is  
34 accurate. We would just like to be on record and clarify that we are not looking to  
35 change any conditions, any entitlements to the property. This is clearly, as Staff  
36 has reiterated, just a financial tool. It is used throughout the State of California at  
37 various cities. We recently used it in Marietta as a tool to provide additional  
38 financing for our future development of the same projects that we're not changing  
39 any conditions on or entitlements. Having said that, we do appreciate the  
40 concern of citizens, but we'd like to have them be assured that we are not  
41 seeking to change the project. What was approved is what we will submit, and  
42 we will submit a Final Map (a final approval) once we get to that position. If there  
43 are any other questions, we'd be open to receive them through contacting our  
44 company or through our Legal Staff.

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Do we have any questions for the  
2 Applicant? Commissioner Gonzalez, do you still have any questions?

3  
4 **ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – That was earlier.

5  
6 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Alright. Do we have any questions for the Applicant? No?  
7 Okay. Grace, do we happen to have any Public Speaker Slips, any Comment  
8 Slips?

9  
10 **PERMIT TECHNICIAN GRACE ESPINO-SALCEDO** – I have not received any  
11 Speaker Slips.

12  
13 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay. With that said, do we have any Commissioner  
14 Comments or Discussion? I don't see anybody raising their hands. So, with that,  
15 would anybody like to motion the item? Okay, so we have a motion by  
16 Commissioner Van Natta and a second by Commissioner Korzec. Place your  
17 vote. Please cast your vote.

18  
19 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – We're no longer reading into the record the motion? Is  
20 that a requirement or are we just.....

21  
22 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Do we still read in the motion?

23  
24 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – There is no requirement that  
25 you read it verbatim. I know that some Commissioners and some  
26 Councilmember's prefer that, but if you're not making any changes to it, you can  
27 simply reference what was included in the Staff Report that you move to  
28 **APPROVE** as recommended by Staff and that would cover the entire thing as  
29 written.

30  
31 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay then I move to **APPROVE** Resolution  
32 No. 2015-24 as recommended by Staff.

33  
34 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And do you still second that Commissioner Korzec?

35  
36 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Sure, absolutely.

37  
38 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So motion by Commissioner Van Natta and seconded by  
39 Commissioner Korzec. All votes have been cast. Motion passes 7-0. Do we  
40 have a Staff wrap-up on this item?

41  
42  
43 Opposed – 0

44  
45  
46 **Motion carries 7 – 0**

1  
2  
3 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – This item is appealable. For any  
4 interested party that would be interested in appealing the project, they can make  
5 that appeal to the City Council within 15 days of your action this evening. That  
6 appeal should be directed to the attention of the Community Development  
7 Director. If an appeal is filed, it would be scheduled for a hearing before the City  
8 Council within 30 days. I'm sorry, 10 days. It's a map.

9  
10  
11 **OTHER COMMISSIONER BUSINESS**

12  
13 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. That moves us onto Other  
14 Commissioner Business. Do we have any other Commissioner Business?

15  
16 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – None.

17  
18 **CHAIR LOWELL** – How about our Joint Study Session this upcoming  
19 Thursday?

20  
21 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – We have a Joint Study Session,  
22 which is still in the process of being set up through the City Clerk's office. You  
23 will be notified of the final Agenda we expect tomorrow, but since that hasn't  
24 been set yet, we'd still be asking you to adjourn your meeting to the next Regular  
25 Meeting of November 12<sup>th</sup>. But the Study Session that you're referencing is a  
26 Study Session that has been contemplated for next Thursday night, and it would  
27 include possibly three items. Those three items would be a discussion about  
28 Vineyard Zoning. It would be on Hillside Residential Ordinance and  
29 Development, and the third one would be a discussion about the Nissan Corridor  
30 Study, which has been under works for the last year.

31  
32 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Perfect. Thank you very much.

33  
34  
35 **PLANNING COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

36  
37 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Do we have any Planning Commissioner Comments? I  
38 don't see anybody's hands.

39  
40 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I just have one.

41  
42 **CHAIR LOWELL** – By all means, Commissioner Van Natta.

43  
44 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I just wanted to express my appreciation to  
45 the Staff and the Planning Commission for all their condolences on my mother's

1 passing and that I appreciated all the cards and the flowers. Thank you very  
2 much.

3  
4 **CHAIR LOWELL** – You’re welcome. Any other comments?

5  
6 **ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – I just wanted to say that  
7 Commissioner Baker and myself attended Walmart’s open house down at Vista  
8 Verde Middle School. It was fairly well attended. The only item of contention  
9 was the City’s Trucking Map, so that was the only thing. The residents seemed  
10 very happy about it.

11  
12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Last call for comments. Nobody?

13  
14  
15 **ADJOURNMENT**

16  
17 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, with that said, the Planning Commission Regular  
18 Meeting we are not adjourning to our next Regular Meeting, which is November  
19 12<sup>th</sup>, 2015 at 7:00 PM right here in the City Council Chambers. Thank you very  
20 much and have a good night.

21  
22  
23 **NEXT MEETING**

24 *Next Meeting: Planning Commission Regular Meeting, November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2015 at*  
25 *7:00 PM, City of Moreno Valley, City Hall Council Chamber, 14177 Frederick*  
26 *Street, Moreno Valley, CA 92553.*

27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34 \_\_\_\_\_  
35 Richard J. Sandzimier  
36 Planning Official  
37 Approved

\_\_\_\_\_ Date

38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45 \_\_\_\_\_  
46 Brian R. Lowell  
Chair

\_\_\_\_\_ Date