

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

5 **Thursday, November 10th, 2016 at 7:00 PM**

6
7
8 **CALL TO ORDER**
9

10 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, it looks like we are back on. I would like to call the
11 meeting back to order. Let's move this on. We have already done the rollcall
12 and Pledge of Allegiance. We have approved tonight's Agenda. We are moving
13 onto the Consent Calendar.
14

15
16 **ROLL CALL**
17

18
19 Commissioners Present:

20 Commissioner Ramirez
21 Commissioner Korzec
22 Commissioner Baker
23 Alternate Commissioner Gonzalez
24 Commissioner Sims
25 Vice Chair Barnes
26 Chair Lowell
27 Alternate Commissioner Nickel
28

29
30 Staff Present:

31 Rick Sandzimier, Planning Official
32 Paul Early, Assistant City Attorney
33 Erica Tadeo, Administrative Assistant
34 Gabriel Diaz, Associate Planner
35 Chris Ormsby, Senior Planner
36 Michael Lloyd, Land Development Division Manager
37 Eric Lewis, City Traffic Engineer
38 Paul Villalobos, Fire Safety Supervisor/Assistant Fire Marshall
39

40
41 Speakers:

42 Kelly Fitzpatrick
43 Richard Archer
44

1 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

2
3
4 **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

5
6 Approval of Agenda
7
8
9

10 **CONSENT CALENDAR**

11
12 *All matters listed under Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and all*
13 *will be enacted by one rollcall vote. There will be no discussion of these items*
14 *unless Members of the Planning Commission request specific items be removed*
15 *from the Consent Calendar for separate action.*
16

17
18 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

19
20 Planning Commission - Regular Meeting - August 25th, 2016 at 7:00 PM

21
22 Approve as submitted.

23
24 Planning Commission - Regular Meeting - September 8th, 2016 at 7:00 PM

25
26 Approve as submitted.
27
28

29 **CHAIR LOWELL** – The Consent Calendar items are the approval of Minutes,
30 correct? So we have the Planning Commission Regular Meeting 8/25/2016 at
31 7:00 PM. It is recommended that we approve as submitted. Secondly, we also
32 have the Planning Commission Regular Meeting on 9/8/2016 at 7:00 PM. Unless
33 there are any questions, concerns, corrections, or actions, I would like to motion
34 to approve the Minutes as submitted. Do we have any questions or comments
35 before we go for a second? We can do them all together unless anybody wants
36 any specific questions or comments. No? Okay. Can I ask for a second?
37

38 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – I second that.
39

40 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Perfect. All in favor say aye.
41

42 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – Aye.

43
44 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Aye.

45
46 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Aye.

1
2 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – Aye.

3
4 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Aye.

5
6 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Aye.

7
8 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Aye.

9
10 **CHAIR LOWELL** – All opposed, say nay. Perfect. The motion passes 7-0. The
11 Consent Calender items approval of Minutes have been passed and approved as
12 submitted. That moves us onto the Public Comments portion.

13
14
15
16 Opposed – 0

17
18
19 **Motion carries 7 – 0**

20
21
22 **PUBLIC COMMENTS PROCEDURE**

23
24 *Any person wishing to address the Commission on any matter, either under*
25 *Public Comments section of the Agenda or scheduled items or public hearings,*
26 *must fill out a “Request to Speak” form available at the door. The completed*
27 *form must be submitted to the Secretary prior to the Agenda item being called by*
28 *the Chairperson. In speaking to the Commission, member of the public may be*
29 *limited to three minutes per person, except for the applicant for entitlement. The*
30 *Commission may establish an overall time limit for comments on a particular*
31 *Agenda item. Members of the public must direct their questions to the*
32 *Chairperson of the Commission and not to other members of the Commission,*
33 *the applicant, the Staff, or the audience. Additionally, there is an ADA note.*
34 *Upon request, this Agenda will be made available in appropriate alternative*
35 *formats to persons with disabilities in compliance with the Americans with*
36 *Disabilities Act of 1990. Any person with a disability who requires a modification*
37 *or accommodation in order to participate in a meeting should direct their request*
38 *to Guy Pagan, our ADA Coordinator, at (951) 413-3120 at least 48 hours prior to*
39 *the meeting. The 48-hour notification will enable the City to make reasonable*
40 *arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.*

41
42
43 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Do we have any Non-Public Hearing , I’m sorry, do we have
44 any Public Comments tonight?

45
46 **ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT ERICA TADEO** – We just have one speaker.

1
2 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay and yours is for an item or a non-item? Okay, if you
3 could submit that, and we will get it when it comes up.
4

5 **ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT ERICA TADEO** – I have one though for a
6 Non-Public Hearing Item.
7

8 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, and I believe that's Kelly Fitzpatrick.
9

10 **SPEAKER KELLY FITZPATRICK** – Good evening to the Commission and to
11 Staff. I am wanting to bring to you an idea that I came up with because I am
12 finding, through working with families that I am currently working with, that most
13 of those families are being bussed anywhere from 30 to 60 miles a day away
14 from the valley. They are called nonpublic schools. They are schools that
15 handle children that are on a behavioral level. If you do a 1/10, our Alessandro
16 School handles the one to five. But, from 6 to 10, there is nobody in the Valley
17 that can handle that. So I brought to the School District, the School Board, and
18 to the Commission there today my idea about we need to build a facility that can
19 handle these kids. For one, the liability alone in transporting kids through the
20 Badlands. Can you imagine to Beaumont every day there and back, there and
21 back? Then, Yorba Linda. Those are the two furthest schools. The rest of them
22 are in Riverside, Perris, and San Bernardino. So I'm just thinking we are paying
23 right now currently to those facilities anywhere from \$272,000 to \$757,600 a year
24 to handle those kids when we could be bringing that money into the valley
25 instead of taking it out of the valley. We would need a facility that would handle
26 120 to 150 kids. Currently, we have 68. What I'm trying to do a think ahead for
27 what our needs might be five years from now. We used to, over by Saint
28 Christopher's Church, we used to have what was called the continuation school,
29 and I realize I am going way back in time here, but that's what I have to do
30 because that it what I know. We had the continuation school over there. It was a
31 one building school house that was a lockdown facility. It had eight classrooms,
32 an office, a maintenance for janitors and that kind of thing, and storage. That
33 alone would facilitate what we have right now in these kids, and we could keep
34 them here. I have a parent who actually lost her child to CPS because she could
35 not get to Yorba Linda to pick up her son when her son was behaviorally out of
36 control. If her son was here in the valley, she could have gotten to him and
37 wouldn't have had charges filed against her for abandonment, but the Yorba
38 Linda school decided to call CPS and turn her in for abandoning her child
39 because she had no way to get there. So, if you guys have any feedback, I'll be
40 happy to answer your questions.
41

42 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you for your comments, Kelly, but I do believe that
43 might be a City Council issue not really a Planning Commission issue but Staff
44 heard the comments.
45

1 **SPEAKER KELLY FITZPATRICK** – I just know....don't you guys have to plan
2 on where that would be?

3
4 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yes, but we pertain mostly to Change of Zone, Conditional
5 Use Permits, I mean, and that is not something that we can really propose. The
6 City Staff has heard the comment, and they can bring it up to City Council
7 but.....

8
9 **SPEAKER KELLY FITZPATRICK** – Okay, thank you.

10
11 **CHAIR LOWELL** – But Rick has a comment about it.

12
13 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Just real quick. I'd be happy to
14 talk to you about it and at least collect your information. If that is in writing if you
15 just want to give it to me or we could set up a time to meet next week. We'd be
16 happy to look at it.

17
18 **SPEAKER KELLY FITZPATRICK** – We could set up a time. That would be
19 great.

20
21 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – But the Commission is correct
22 that sometimes these issues are dealt with at the City Council, but I would be
23 happy to meet with you.

24
25 **SPEAKER KELLY FITZPATRICK** – Okay. I'm sorry. I haven't met you yet.

26
27 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – I'm Rick Sandzimier. I'm the
28 Planning Official for the City.

29
30 **SPEAKER KELLY FITZPATRICK** – Okay. I will call and make an
31 appointment.

32
33 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Okay.

34
35 **SPEAKER KELLY FITZPATRICK** – Thank you.

36
37 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you, Kelly. Unless there are any other public
38 comments, I would like to close the Public Comments portion. Are there any last
39 speakers? Going once, going twice. The comments are closed. That moves us
40 onto the Public Hearing Items. The first item is PA16-0039, a Plot Plan. The
41 Applicant is LATCO SC Inc., and the Case Planner is Mr. Gabriel Diaz.

42
43
44 **NON-PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

45
46 **None**

1 **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**
2
3

- 4 1. Case: PA16-0039 Plot Plan
5
6 Applicant: LATCO SC, Inc.
7
8 Owner: Professors Fund I, LLC and Professors Fund
9 IV, LLC
10
11 Representative: Pacific Development Solutions Groups
12
13 Location: Southeasterly of Alessandro Boulevard and
14 Perris Boulevard
15
16 Case Planner: Gabriel Diaz
17
18 Council District: 1
19
20 Proposal: PA16-0039 Plot Plan
21
22
23

24 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**
25

26 Staff recommends that the Planning Commission:
27

- 28 1. **ADOPT** a Mitigated Negative Declaration for PA16-0039, pursuant to
29 the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines; and
30
31 2. **APPROVE** the Mitigated Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared
32 for Plot Plan PA16-0039 pursuant to the California Environmental
33 Quality Activity (CEQA) Guidelines, and included as Exhibit A; and
34
35 3. **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2016-23 and there by **APPROVE** Plot Plan
36 PA16-0039, subject to the attached conditions of approval included as
37 Exhibit B.
38
39

40 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – Thank you, Chairman and
41 Commissioners. The project is located southeasterly of Alessandro Boulevard
42 and Perris Boulevard. It is located within Council District 1. The zone is
43 Residential 15 (R15). As you mentioned, LATCO is the Applicant. The owner is
44 Professors Fund I, LLC and Professors Fund IV, LLC. The proposal is to
45 develop a 272 unit multi-family apartment project on 19.82 acres of land. The
46 project site is relatively flat. The site is vacant and compromised of three

1 rectangular-shaped parcels. The site is bisected by the Questar gas line
2 easement. The gas line crosses the project's site midway between Alessandro
3 Boulevard and Brodiaea Avenue. No structures will be placed within the gas line
4 easement. The site has been disked over the years for weed abatement, and
5 there are no existing trees onsite. The project does include both a mix of one-
6 story and two-story buildings. There are four building types that will consist of
7 one, two, three, and four bedroom Floor Plans. Floor Plans range from 769
8 square feet to 1294 square feet of living area. The one-story apartment buildings
9 are located adjacent to the existing single-family homes that are located to the
10 southeasterly border of the project. The project provides numerous amenities
11 including a community building with a leasing office, a lounge area with a kitchen,
12 a fitness room, a game room, a theatre room, a computer room, and other
13 amenities like pool, a spa, a tot lot, and open space for activities. This project, as
14 designed and conditioned, conforms to all development standards of the R15
15 Zone and design guidelines per the Municipal Code and the landscape
16 standards. Architecturally, the architectural design of the buildings includes
17 stucco exteriors with some horizontal and vertical features to break up the
18 massing of the buildings. These detailed features include foam trim, concrete tile
19 roofs, towers, foam window sills, prefabricated metal stairs, wrought iron
20 guardrails, covered private patios and entrances, and exterior wall-mounted
21 lights. Variation among the buildings is created with a mixture of one-story and
22 two-story building rooflines, detached garages and carports, stairs, porches,
23 balconies, and a proposed color palette of earth-tone colors. I'll change the
24 slides for you. I apologize. There is the empty land. That whole empty area is
25 where the apartments are being proposed. This is the preliminary Grading Plan.
26 This is the northern portion of the site. This is the southerly portion of the site. It
27 is kind of hard to read with all the lines. Here is a prettier picture but not as
28 detailed. It gives you a sense of where the buildings are located, where the
29 landscaping areas are, and where the drives and parking is located. The
30 carports will be constructed of tubular steel columns and standard-seen metal
31 roofs. All walls and fences on the site will be constructed with a decorative block
32 wall and wrought iron fencing. Surrounding the project, I'm putting up the Zoning
33 Map for you. To the north side of Alessandro, there is existing commercial and
34 single-family residential consistent with the Neighborhood Commercial Zone and
35 Residential 5 Zone. To the south across Brodiaea, there are existing single-
36 family residences zoned R5, existing commercial development, and vacant
37 commercial property is located west across Perris Boulevard. The project site is
38 bordered to the east by Appleblossom. On the east side of Appleblossom Lane,
39 there are some existing single-family residences zoned R5, as well as the
40 Ridgeview apartments on the property zoned R20. Access and parking: The
41 proposed development will provide access from two gated driveways located on
42 the south side of Alessandro Boulevard and on the east side of Perris Boulevard.
43 The proposed project would construct medians on Alessandro Boulevard and
44 Perris Boulevard, and these would limit the Alessandro Boulevard and Perris
45 Boulevard driveways as right-in and right-out only. Circulation within the project
46 site includes driveway aisles that measure 24 feet wide, which will meet the

1 City's design standards. The proposed project site design includes an
2 emergency access drive to Appleblossom Lane. The project provides a total of
3 534 parking spaces including 160 garages, 141 carports, and 233 open parking
4 spaces for residents and guests meeting the Municipal Code parking
5 requirements. Notification: The Public Hearing for the project was published in
6 the local newspaper on October 21st. Public notice was sent to all property
7 owners of record within 300 feet on October 24th. The Public Hearing Notice for
8 this project was also posted on the project's site on October 21st. We are having
9 some calls in favor and against the project. Some of the issues have been the
10 added traffic to the area, having new neighbors, some are not supportive of
11 apartments and would like residential property that is owner occupied, and some
12 just wanted to know what was going on in their neighborhood. There was one
13 call in favor for the project, and he was a business owner in the area.
14 Environmentally, the initial study was prepared by Vista Community Planners in
15 compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The initial study
16 examined the potential of the proposed project to have any significant impact on
17 the environment. The initial study provides information in support of the findings
18 that a Mitigated Negative Declaration is appropriate. With the implementation of
19 Mitigation Measures identified, the project will not have significant effect on the
20 environment. Studies prepared for the project include a Traffic Impact Study, an
21 Air Quality Study, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact Analysis, a Cultural
22 Resource Assessment, a Hydrology Report, a Geotechnical Investigation, a
23 Focused Western Burrowing Owl Study, a Phase I Environmental Site
24 Assessment, Noise Impact Analysis, and a Water Quality Management Plan.
25 Mitigations are recommended for the project in the following areas: Cultural
26 Resources and Air Quality. The measures for cultural resources have been
27 included to address input from the tribe agencies. The measures are intended to
28 ensure that the potential resources that might be discovered are protected.
29 However, these measures are not required to address a known significant
30 impact. Overall, the proposed multifamily residential development has been
31 found to be consistent with the objectives, goals, and policies outlined in the
32 City's General Plan, as well as being compatible with the existing and planned
33 land uses in the project area. Therefore, Staff recommends that the Planning
34 Commission **ADOPT** a Mitigated Negative Declaration for Plot Plan PA16-0039
35 pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, **APPROVE** the Mitigation and Monitoring
36 Program and Reporting Program prepared for the Plot Plan pursuant to the
37 CEQA Guidelines, and **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2016-23 and there by
38 **APPROVE** Plot Plan PA16-0039 subject to the conditions of approval. The
39 Applicant also did provide elevations of the proposal, colored elevations. This is
40 a two-story building that will be kind of interior to the site. There is a little larger
41 building. This is the one-story, two-unit, next to the single-family residential that
42 is the existing neighbor southeasterly. This is their materials color board. This is
43 their recreational building office. This concludes Staff presentation. Any
44 questions?

45
46 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much, Mr. Diaz. Any questions for Staff?

1 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – I do

2
3 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Gonzalez.

4
5 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – Hi. In the past, they included the whole
6 studies and the reports. Is there a reason why this time around they were not
7 included? I didn't have a disc either so.....

8
9 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Okay, you're the second
10 Commissioner that brought this to my attention. In the Staff Report, we tried to
11 identify that the electronic version that was available online has all of the
12 attachments. For purposes of your packet, we did not print out the volumes of
13 the attachments, but we did have it available electronically. And, we indicated in
14 the Staff Report, in the Environmental Section, that, if you wanted to see a hard
15 copy, it was available at City Hall and to contact us. So, if that was missed in the
16 Staff Report, my apologies, but it was a call we made just to kind of reduce the
17 paper and the volume that would have been mailed out. But it was all available
18 for the public to review on our system, and we've met the requirements there.

19
20 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Sims.

21
22 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – I would like to just, on the property lines that are
23 contiguous with the existing single-family homes, what is that going to look like?
24 Is there going to be a block wall or are they going to work with each of the
25 property owners to build a new fence, or how is that going to be? Or is it just the
26 existing fencing that is going to be.....what's kind of the interface going to look
27 like?

28
29 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – The southeast property line located
30 where this development and the existing single-family homes are required to
31 have a decorative block wall. The existing single-family homes and the
32 development, there is a Questar property that is not owned by the developer so
33 they do not have access to redo the existing fencing, which is wood fencing for
34 some of those properties, but they will put decorative wrought iron fencing and
35 landscaping within the Questar-owned property to match the existing
36 development to the east.

37
38 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – So the gas line property would be the area kind of
39 right here? This line right here?

40
41 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – Yes.

42
43 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – So that's not going to be.....so that's going to remain
44 whatever the existing fencing is?

45
46 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – That is the proposal, correct.

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – From my understanding, that's not an easement. That is
2 actually a separate parcel owned by the gas company not the typical
3 circumstance where there is generally an easement over it where they have
4 access to fix the block wall. That is my understanding. Is that the case?

5
6 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – That is correct.

7
8 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Yeah, I just, I think it is a really nice touch that they
9 have single-story units adjacent to the properties. You give it a better feel
10 transition from the single-family to the larger multi-story.

11
12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I completely agree.

13
14 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – And the treatment....I think this is just one of those
15 where the treatment, the interface between the two really needs to be sensitive
16 so it looks good. And, if I was an owner of a single-family house and a big
17 apartment complex was going in next....I just think you need to be respectful of
18 the interface so I would suggest that, if it is a property boundary and there is
19 already a fence there, it seems like the treatment should be consistent. But we
20 could hear more about that later. I would think that you'd want consistent with
21 the type of wall treatment, perimeter treatment all along there even if it is on the
22 Questar. I mean, try to work with them at least and try to get that sorted out.

23
24 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other questions for Staff? Commissioner Barnes.

25
26 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – The first question relates to conditions for Special
27 Districts. There are quite a few references to a funding source shall be provided.
28 Can I get a little background? Is each of those conditions a separate activity? Is
29 it a separate Assessment District or CFP, or are all of those uses bundled
30 together when they annex into CFP No. 1?

31
32 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – I think the developer would like....

33
34 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Mr. Alston, if you'd like to come up to the microphone and
35 talk, you can.

36
37 **APPLICANT WES ALSTON** – Hi. Wes Alston with PDSG representing LATCO
38 Enterprises. Typically on our other projects that we have done, when we do the
39 election for that particular condition, it covers all the other conditions that are
40 inclusive in there with the Special Districts.

41
42 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – They are bundled so it is essentially one operation?

43
44 **APPLICANT WES ALSTON** – It's all bundled together, yes.

1 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Alright. That was my question. I was just curious
2 whether that was a single activity or.....

3
4 **APPLICANT WES ALSTON** – If we process a map, we process an application
5 that goes to City Council. City Council approves it, and we’re basically elected
6 into our own District.

7
8 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Alright.

9
10 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you. I appreciate it.

11
12 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I have another question on LD57. It says existing lot
13 line shall be removed. Are they doing a parcel map? Are they doing a parcel
14 merger? Are they conditioned to do either?

15
16 **LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION MANAGER MICHAEL LLOYD** – I believe
17 they started the process and Wes can help me out here maybe, but the intended
18 process would be through a Lot Line Adjustment. I’m not sure if they’ve started
19 that process, but that’s the anticipated means to accommodate them.

20
21 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Okay. That’s good.

22
23 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – They are currently three parcels, so
24 they will make one big parcel.

25
26 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – So they are doing a parcel merger?

27
28 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – Yes.

29
30 **LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION MANAGER MICHAEL LLOYD** – It would be
31 through a Lot Line Adjustment.

32
33 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Right. Well they call it a Lot Line Adjustment, but they
34 basically adjust three into one. Right? That’s correct? You call it a Lot Line
35 Adjustment but.....

36
37 **LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION MANAGER MICHAEL LLOYD** – Correct.
38 Per the Map Act, it is a Lot Line Adjustment but, what you’re saying is, it is
39 merging.

40
41 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Okay.

42
43 **LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION MANAGER MICHAEL LLOYD** – But the
44 parcel merger applies to special circumstances, which don’t apply here so.....

45
46 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Okay.

1 **LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION MANAGER MICHAEL LLOYD** – We're
2 getting into semantics quite frankly, but we are merging the three into one.

3
4 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – You go from three to one, correct?

5
6 **CHAIR LOWELL** – A Lot Line Adjustment is essentially merging?

7
8 **LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION MANAGER MICHAEL LLOYD** – That is
9 correct.

10
11 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – The line's adjusted away. And then it did not
12 specifically say in the conditions, but in looking at the I think it was the Grading
13 Plan, there is a vacation on Alessandro Boulevard of 25 feet? Is that what the
14 section shows? And then on Brodiaea, there is a 7 foot vacation?

15
16 **LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION MANAGER MICHAEL LLOYD** – I believe
17 you're correct with regards to Brodiaea. With regards to Alessandro, I believe
18 there may be, I'm looking at it right now. It looks like we're going to need a
19 dedication along Alessandro.

20
21 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Oh, did I read that....well I had it backwards probably.
22 It's not a vacation, it is a dedication. Yeah, the Perris Boulevard section on sheet
23 1 of 3 shows the proposed at 55 and the existing is 25 foot outside of it, so there
24 is.....

25
26 **LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION MANAGER MICHAEL LLOYD** – Correct.
27 We would need a dedication along Perris as well.

28
29 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – It says it's getting narrower by 25 feet. The existing is
30 25 feet outside the proposed.

31
32 **LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION MANAGER MICHAEL LLOYD** – You're
33 correct. You're reading what is shown on the map correctly. It is my
34 understanding that it is reflected correctly so, in this case, there would be a
35 vacation.

36
37 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Okay. That is all my questions. Thank you.

38
39 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other questions for Staff?

40
41 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – Yeah, I have one more. On page 78, at the
42 bottom, it states, if required to be designed to the 2016 Building Code Standards,
43 installation of electric vehicle supply equipment will be addressed. Is there a
44 reason why it wouldn't be designed to 2016 standards or what makes it?
45

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – The Building Code is going to be
2 going into effect. January 1st next year becomes 2016 standard. The current
3 standard is 2013.

4
5 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – Okay.

6
7 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – So, in anticipation of when they
8 will actually be ready to go, they are going to be coming in during 2016. If they
9 were in a position where they would submit plans before the end of the year, we
10 would be able to talk to them about that but our assumption is that they are going
11 to be submitting after the first of the year.

12
13 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – That’s good.

14
15 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Sims.

16
17 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Just out of curiosity, on the infiltration basins shown
18 on the Grading Plan, whose responsibilities are those for long-term
19 maintenance? Is that private ownership and they will maintain it or does that
20 come into some type of City requirement to handle it?

21
22 **LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION MANAGER MICHAEL LLOYD** – It is
23 privately maintained. We would have an agreement for them to maintain.

24
25 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Are they connected into city storm drain?

26
27 **LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION MANAGER MICHAEL LLOYD** – There
28 would be an overflow feature so, in case of a large event, it would be connected
29 to an existing storm drain system.

30
31 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other questions for Staff?

32
33 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Yes.

34
35 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Vice Chair Barnes.

36
37 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – One more question, and this is driven from questions
38 that I get from clients all the time. Is it possible to identify in the COA’s for a
39 project which streets are eligible for DIF and TUMF?

40
41 **LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION MANAGER MICHAEL LLOYD** – That is
42 something, absolutely. We could look into that and provide that information.....

43
44 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – And put it in the Project Report.

1 **LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION MANAGER MICHAEL LLOYD** – That's
2 information that is available, yes.

3
4 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Okay. Would we happen to know on these?

5
6 **LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION MANAGER MICHAEL LLOYD** – Off the top
7 of my head, Alessandro is both a DIF and TUMF facility, as well as Perris
8 Boulevard. Brodiaea is neither because it is a collector, as well as Appleblossom
9 because it is a residential street.

10
11 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Okay, thank you.

12
13 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other questions? Okay, my turn. I have a question on
14 page 91 of the packet, which is Planning P10. It says, if the project requires
15 blasting, it should be as a last resort and such a case shall be approved by the
16 Fire Marshall. Is this even a possibility? Is there a SOHS Report out there
17 saying that there is going to be so much excavation that blasting is necessary?
18 The reason why I ask is it is so close to the residential and there is that gas main
19 going right through there. You don't want to blast on a gas main, and I know it
20 says only as a last resort and requires special permission...I was just, it was just
21 one of the questions that I had to ask.

22
23 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – It is a standard condition and, if
24 blasting was required, the condition is in place. If it is not, we're not far enough
25 along to know that it is not. There may be a good assumption that it won't be at
26 this point based on just looking at the site, but it is a standard condition.

27
28 **CHAIR LOWELL** – That was just one of those questions that kind of red flagged
29 me. One of the other major questions that I have is on Appleblossom. I walked
30 Appleblossom and talked to the residents there, and it is a very quiet and calm
31 neighborhood. There is a little tiny connector road connecting Appleblossom all
32 the way to Alessandro. It is one lane in one direction, and we are proposing to
33 widen Appleblossom to multi-direction full width residential street. I don't think
34 that is a good fit for this specific project. Is there any way of putting maybe like a
35 double cul-de-sac where Appleblossom meets the property boundary so we
36 could alleviate people drag racing through there because Appleblossom is a
37 connector from Alessandro to bypass the intersection of Perris and Alessandro,
38 and I anticipate this as being a thorn in everybody's side moving forward.

39
40 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – If I may. I'd be happy to have that
41 discussion. I think, at that point, we are kind of getting into the deliberation on
42 the project and options for the project, but I think first I would like to hear from the
43 Applicant and then also if there are any public comments. We have anticipated
44 that this could be an issue, and we are prepared to discuss it, but I think to the
45 Commission's benefit, it would be helpful to hear from the Applicant and anybody
46 from the public that is willing to speak.

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, I will hold that comment until later then.

2
3 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Just for clarification, the Staff
4 Report, though, Appleblossom the way it is today, the way you described it as
5 being one lane that one lane does not actually go all the way through. There is
6 one lane that it comes and it dies into the adjacent apartment complex and then,
7 coming from Alessandro, it dies into the apartment complex. The only way that
8 you can actually effectively get through Appleblossom all the way in one direction
9 is, if you're coming from the south to the north, would be to go onto the private
10 property and make a u-turn or kind of a convoluted turn and come back out and
11 then get out Alessandro. And, if you were coming from Alessandro trying to get
12 all the way to Brodiaea, you'd actually have to get onto the road and go into the
13 other direction, which would be an illegal move at this point.

14
15 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Correct.

16
17 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – So it's not one full contiguous lane
18 in each direction. I wasn't sure, if the way you described it, was correct. I just....

19
20 **CHAIR LOWELL** – It is paved the majority of the way with about 10 to 12 feet,
21 and it kind of has a gray area where it stops, but it starts, but we're paving it to a
22 full thoroughfare.

23
24 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Right, okay. We're prepared to
25 have more discussion. I would like to do it now if you want.

26
27 **CHAIR LOWELL** – No. We will follow the order of operations.

28
29 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – But my preference would be to
30 wait. Maybe I said that wrong.

31
32 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And then another one on 97. What is a windows closed
33 condition? It says P41, on page 97 of the packet, it says the project applicant
34 should provide a windows closed condition for each proposed residential
35 apartment unit.

36
37 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – I believe that was part of the Noise
38 Study Mitigation, and I believe the decibel levels are when you're.....They are
39 studying the noise from the inside of the apartment. We do have the
40 environmental consultant here if you would like further information on that.

41
42 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Well it says the condition requires a means of mechanical
43 ventilation for Chapter 12 of the Building Code. What does that mean? Is it a
44 means of pumping outside air in without air conditioning like just a ventilation
45 fan? I've never seen that condition before, so I was curious.

46

1 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – I think really that is addressed through
2 the last sentence, which talks about the filtered outside air intake vent, so that
3 would be perhaps the extra that maybe wouldn't be part of the air conditioning
4 system normally so it would be something in addition. But I think we would want
5 to also have the environmental consultant also speak to that.

6
7 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay. Mr. Alston.

8
9 **APPLICANT WES ALSTON** – Wes Alston again. Yeah, it essentially means
10 that we have to have an air handling system in there, which we do in all the units.

11
12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yeah, it just kind of stood out as a windows closed, which....

13
14 **APPLICANT WES ALSTON** – In order to make our sound requirements, you
15 had to have a windows closed condition so, if you have the windows open, they
16 are going to get road noise from the road.

17
18 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Do the windows have the option of opening? Can you open
19 the windows as an option?

20
21 **APPLICANT WES ALSTON** – Yes.

22
23 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay then I guess my question is kind of not important I
24 guess. And then I will hold this until the deliberations, but yeah those are my
25 primary concerns. I've got a couple more. At this point in time, I would like to
26 invite the Applicant up to speak. I know we're just getting you up. You know
27 you're getting you exercise today.

28
29 **APPLICANT WES ALSTON** – Wes Alston again with PDF representing LATCO.
30 This is our second project in the city. The first project is under construction at
31 Edgemont and Eucalyptus Street. It is about 50% done right now. So, when we
32 looked at this project originally, we had two concerns. One was traffic into the
33 existing community and one respecting the edge conditions of the existing
34 community. So, through our design process, we have all the traffic going onto
35 Alessandro and onto Perris. No traffic from our site leaves Brodiaea or
36 Appleblossom, and those were the two things that we were really concerned
37 about. The second is not encroaching on the existing homes on the site, so our
38 edge conditions all have one-story buildings, and then there is about 40 to 50
39 feet before we even get to the two-story buildings. We have reviewed the
40 conditions. We thanked Staff for all their hard work. There was a lot of effort that
41 went into this from all the Staff. In regard to the fence along the Questar
42 easement there, those two lots are actually owned by them, and they were part
43 of lots that were designated as part of the existing tracks that are there. And so
44 what we did is we matched the edge conditions and the conditions that are in that
45 easement to the Ridgeview apartments that are to the east. So it will be
46 continuously landscaped through there to match what is already to the east and,

1 because we don't have the rights to go on that property, we can't improve that
2 fence so we will fence to our property line. In regard to Appleblossom, we are
3 not going to widen Appleblossom anymore than it is. That would remain almost
4 the same edge condition. We will put a sidewalk in. We will put some
5 landscaping in, but we were not going to make improvements to Appleblossom to
6 its full ultimate width. We have reviewed our conditions. We find them
7 acceptable and, if you approve it today, we should hope to start construction
8 sometime the middle of next year. The whole team is here if you guys have any
9 questions.

10
11 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much, Mr. Alston. Any questions for the
12 Applicant? Commissioner Ramirez.

13
14 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – Thank you for bringing another project to our
15 community. Do you intend to have any of this project for Section 8 Housing?

16
17 **APPLICANT WES ALSTON** – No. It is all market rent.

18
19 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – Wonderful, thank you.

20
21 **APPLICANT WES ALSTON** – And that market rent runs between \$1200 and
22 \$1500 a month.

23
24 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other questions? No? Thank you very much. I'm sure
25 we'll have some more questions for you in a minute so don't rest up too much. I
26 would like to open up the Public Comments portion. Do we have any Public
27 Speaker Slips tonight Ms. Tadeo?

28
29 **ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT ERICA TADEO** – We have one.

30
31 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Perfect. Who would that be?

32
33 **ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT ERICA TADEO** – Richard Archer.

34
35 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Mr. Archer come on up, please.

36
37 **SPEAKER RICHARD ARCHER** – Yes, good evening. First of all, as far as
38 Appleblossom is concerned, considering I've got a perfect view of that, I can tell
39 you that there is a lot of traffic that comes down Appleblossom in the opposite
40 direction there. People go around that all the time so.....

41
42 **CHAIR LOWELL** – It's a nice shortcut.

43
44 **SPEAKER RICHARD ARCHER** – It is, but I mean that's a chronic situation over
45 there. My property abuts the project that you're talking about, and there seemed
46 to be some question as to fencing that would along my particular property line.

1 I'm particularly concerned from the privacy aspect and also as far as site lines
2 because currently obviously I have a nice unimpeded view of the mountains, as
3 well as the hill with the "M" so I am not sure how that is going to be impacted by
4 this particular project. But, more importantly, I'm concerned about what sort of a
5 buffer there is as far as my property is concerned what the noise levels are going
6 to be as far as, again, impact on my particular property but also, more
7 importantly, the privacy aspects. So, at any rate, that would be my concerns
8 going forward on this, but it seemed like initially we were talking about a block
9 wall. But then again it sounded to me like maybe not a block wall as far as my
10 particular area is concerned because I do run right along that gas line. So that's
11 simply my comments. I see this project going forward, and we'd certainly like to
12 be favorable neighbors there but, at the same time, I want to make sure that the
13 quality of our life is not severely impacted by this particular project. So that's my
14 comments and thank you.

15

16 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you. From what I heard Mr. Archer, the east-west
17 property line that will be affecting you on the other side of the gas property there
18 will be a wrought iron fence, but the north/south property line on the other side of
19 the street from you would be a block wall.

20

21 **SPEAKER RICHARD ARCHER** – That side of the street.

22

23 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yeah.

24

25 **SPEAKER RICHARD ARCHER** – Okay.

26

27 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So the neighbors across the street from you, they would
28 have a block wall.

29

30 **SPEAKER RICHARD ARCHER** – Okay, alright, very good. Thank you.

31

32 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you Mr. Archer. Any other Public Comments tonight?
33 Going once, going twice. Public Comments is now closed. Would the Applicant
34 like to reply to anything they've heard tonight so far? Mr. Alston? We should just
35 pull a chair up there for you.

36

37 **APPLICANT WES ALSTON** – No. No other comments. We would just like to
38 receive your approval and move the project forward. Again, we would like to
39 begin our construction about the middle of next year and occupy it probably in
40 the middle or third quarter in 2018.

41

42 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Okay, I would like to open up the
43 floor to Commissioner Debate. Did anybody have any other questions or
44 comments? I still have a few that I was going to ask Staff. Would anybody like
45 to go first? Okay, then I would like to reactivate the Appleblossom question.

46

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Okay, so with regard to
2 Appleblossom, I have a different understanding from what Mr. Alston shared with
3 the Commission this evening so I think it is important that we do flush this out. It
4 is my understanding that the project would actually be putting an improvement
5 into Appleblossom, which would allow for one direction of traffic in each direction
6 all the way from the adjacent neighborhood down to Alessandro. I would like to
7 ask our Traffic Engineer to comment on that.

8
9 **CHAIR LOWELL** – That’s the way I read the condition also.

10
11 **CITY TRAFFIC ENGINEER ERIC LEWIS** – That is correct. That is the way the
12 condition is written both from transportation, as well as land development.

13
14 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Is there any need for making the street two directions, full
15 width, from Brodiaea all the way up to Alessandro or could we do like they do in
16 residential neighborhoods where they have a double cul-de-sac so fire has
17 access through the cul-de-sac, and it is a way of preventing traffic from going
18 from point A to point B?

19
20 **CITY TRAFFIC ENGINEER ERIC LEWIS** – Certainly, that would be an option
21 subject to fire approval. The roadway does not serve a great deal of traffic, but
22 we want to make sure that pedestrian access and bicycle access would be
23 maintained.

24
25 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I know it doesn’t serve a lot of traffic currently from the City’s
26 view but, standing in the neighborhood, you will see a lot of cars come by when
27 there shouldn’t be. And I know the residents on Appleblossom would appreciate
28 maybe not having to put in speed bumps in the future to slow the people down,
29 but if you actually physically prevent them from driving through. The other
30 streets in that same neighborhood are all cul-de-sacs and this one for whatever
31 reason is a thoroughfare, and I don’t see this as being a necessary thoroughfare.

32
33 **CITY TRAFFIC ENGINEER ERIC LEWIS** – Well actually Appleblossom
34 currently does have speed humps on it, so we built those previously. The one-
35 way condition is a violation, as the gentleman spoke consistently, so we’ve heard
36 that as well. So I guess we’d have to work with the Applicant to see what options
37 are available and the impacts to the site if the double cul-de-sac idea came to
38 light.

39
40 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay. Mr. Sandzimier.

41
42 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – So we have talked about this
43 issue with the Applicant, and we have not come to a conclusion on what the best
44 design would be. There are pros and cons to both, whether you leave it open
45 and construct it as proposed, leave it as is, or try and create a cul-de-sac
46 condition. Some people are going to be happy and some people are not. The

1 people that would not be happy if we were to put in two cul-de-sac conditions
2 where you couldn't have any sort of movement through there would be the
3 people that are coming from the south and trying to get to those apartment
4 complexes today because they do have a direct route into their apartments from
5 that direction. The other people that would be probably be disappointed would
6 be the people that illegally go in the wrong direction. They are not supposed to
7 be doing it anyways, but they may have developed a habit of doing that for a long
8 period of time. Based on the speaker, it sounds like it happens all the time.
9 That's really an unsafe condition because they are going in the wrong direction,
10 so it would be better to improve that if there is really that high of a volume of
11 activity. When I look at it from a planning standpoint, the road that would serve
12 traffic going in both directions having some appropriate street improvements put
13 in with appropriate drainage, appropriate landscaping, it also provides access to
14 the detention basin that is going to be constructed with this project. There are
15 other benefits to having the road in as shown on the plans. So it would be my
16 recommendation that we would move forward with the project as proposed. But
17 we have started to explore the cul-de-sac conditions, and what we'd want with
18 the cul-de-sac conditions if we were willing to live with eliminating the vehicular
19 movement from the south to the north, is to at least have some pedestrian and
20 bicycle connection through there because we think that mobility from the
21 adjacent residents, the existing residents, to Alessandro Boulevard, the shopping
22 centers, and those things that are available there is something that should be
23 considered. This development.....
24

25 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Well I know the double cul-de-sacs generally have
26 pedestrian and bicycle access across them, which is why they are intended to be
27 that way. They are intended for pedestrian traffic but to reduce vehicle traffic.
28

29 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – So the other significant challenge
30 that we would have to think through would be the fire department access,
31 emergency access, so I would like if Paul would like to chime in a little bit on that
32 from a fire department point of view. That is one of the considerations we would
33 have to work through.
34

35 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Well I know, on these double cul-de-sacs, I have seen them
36 where they have fencing coming up and they have a gap with bollards that are
37 removable with a KNOX-BOX or something.
38

39 **ASSISTANT FIRE MARSHALL PAUL VILLALOBOS** – Yeah, I believe that
40 what we would require on a double cul-de-sac would be an emergency access
41 gate with a KNOX-BOX for fire access throughway. It can be done. We did
42 some analysis today on this concept that we were given to review, so it is
43 possible, and we just have to look and see what the final submittal would look
44 like so we could discuss that.
45

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – If our media folks could help us
2 advance the slides. We did provide a slide that the Applicant had given us. I
3 don't know if you can get it up there or not? It's kind of hard to see here. I
4 actually have a couple of hard copies of it if you would like us to give it to you.
5 We were not sure IF it would come up. We thought that it might so that's why we
6 included it here. The one thing that you can see from the exhibit that is shown up
7 there right now is, to put in one cul-de-sac just on the Appleblossom side on the
8 project site on that gas line, to put the cul-de-sac in starts to encroach on the
9 detention basin, and so it has a ripple effect on the project. So if the detention
10 basin can be sized properly with a cul-de-sac that would be something that we
11 would have to explore. If the detention basin had to be increased in size, then it
12 presses on the unit and possibly the unit count and we'd have to lose some units.
13 We haven't figured that out. And the other option is to make that detention basin
14 deeper, but then there are all the calculations that would have to be done for that
15 detention basin. Another configuration would be not to do this type of an offset
16 cul-de-sac but to do a traditional cul-de-sac but then you start encroaching on
17 rights of way on the adjacent apartment project or you start encroaching on right-
18 of-way within the gas easement and this isn't even considering putting a cul-de-
19 sac on the other side. And, on the other side, you would have to look at the
20 encroachment on the gas line easement and possibly on the other private rights
21 of way. So those are the things that we have looked at. It becomes a challenge
22 and, as proposed, it seemed to have the least physical impact and the possible
23 greatest mobility benefits by leaving it as a through movement. We fully
24 appreciate that it could have a negative traffic impact to neighbors that don't see
25 as much volume of traffic going through there. So I welcome comments from the
26 Applicant if they have any other thoughts on this since they put this kind of
27 together, and then we're welcome to listen to whatever the Commission has and
28 try an react to that.

29
30 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Does the cul-de-sac have to reach all the way down to the
31 gas easement or can you pull the cul-de-sac back up so it's by the entrance
32 that's just south of Alessandro basically diagonally across from the existing
33 entrance to the apartment complex to the east?

34
35 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – That was one of the things that
36 was considered and absolutely the cul-de-sac could be pulled down but, again,
37 wherever you put the cul-de-sac it starts to push out onto where the units are
38 so....

39
40 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Correct. But, if you push out on those units, I know we're
41 not supposed to be designing for the dais but, if you pulled that cul-de-sac back
42 up, the entire right-of-way of Appleblossom could be vacated and the basin could
43 be widened and you could pull those big units down. It would not affect the unit
44 count at all because you'd have more developable green space.

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – And that’s an option that could be
2 considered. The other thing that was being considered was access to the
3 detention basin. So, if you pulled the cul-de-sac back and left the detention basin
4 where it was, then you don’t have the benefit of being able to get vehicles all the
5 way to the back of there so.....

6
7 **CHAIR LOWELL** – You could get access from internally through the apartment
8 complex. You could put a little access road or something like that. I personally
9 think the better design would be to have a cul-de-sac a little farther north. I know
10 the residents to the south would be a lot more open to the idea of having these
11 apartments being put in. After talking to the residents, they don’t want that
12 thoroughfare there.

13
14 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Okay. It looks like Wes might
15 have some comments, but I don’t want to discount that our Land Development
16 and our Traffic Staff are here and our Fire Department Staff are here. I would
17 like to hear their comments.

18
19 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I would really like to hear Staff’s comments so please the fire
20 marshall, or Mr. Lewis, or Mr. Lloyd, whoever, and then Mr. Alston also.

21
22 **ASSISTANT FIRE MARSHALL PAUL VILLALOBOS** – Yeah one thing, the cul-
23 de-sac where it’s located right now, we discussed earlier that we would have to
24 have that gate access to make it all the way through to that Appleblossom
25 access that their designing. Where that cul-de-sac is really isn’t too much of a
26 concern as long as we can make it through there one way or another but I do
27 know that, if it is too far up or too far down, it exceeds the 150 feet throughway,
28 which would require another turnaround or cul-de-sac. So if you’re talking about
29 double cul-de-sac and you’re closing off that area that would require that turn
30 around on both sides. I don’t know if I’m making that clear or if it’s more
31 confusing but, for us, we have access from Alessandro and then, coming up from
32 the south to not only reach those southernmost portion of that development, we
33 would have to have some kind of access from that way as well.

34
35 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Is this a vital thoroughfare for fire department considering it’s
36 one-directional traffic barely paved?

37
38 **ASSISTANT FIRE MARSHALL PAUL VILLALOBOS** – I wouldn’t call it vital,
39 but we are adding quite a few residences there that are going to cause more than
40 a one alarm if we get a call.

41
42 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Correct, but you would just go down Alessandro to Perris.....

43
44 **ASSISTANT FIRE MARSHALL PAUL VILLALOBOS** – Right.
45

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And then up Brodiaea versus going against the flow of
2 traffic.

3
4 **ASSISTANT FIRE MARSHALL PAUL VILLALOBOS** – Right. No, I agree.
5 That's correct. So, right now as it stands, I mean we still access it anyway the
6 multi-families. We have to probably come down that one route on Alessandro to
7 Appleblossom to get in so either way it doesn't change a whole lot for us as long
8 as we're not blocked coming from either direction.

9
10 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I don't know if I'm the only one expressing this concern, but
11 it looks like City Staff has done quite a good theoretical analysis of this. So it is
12 something that has been on the radar, so it is something you guys are thinking
13 about.

14
15 **ASSISTANT FIRE MARSHALL PAUL VILLALOBOS** – Yes.

16
17 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Personally, I think it would be better to not have it as a
18 thoroughfare. Now we have quite a few Commissioners wanting to speak. How
19 about Commissioner Korzec?

20
21 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – I always go for the most simple and the most cost
22 effective, and it looks to me that the way it's been proposed to us is the most
23 simple way of dealing with this. Rather than redesigning, they've vetted the
24 whole thing pretty much. I see no problem with it the way it has been designed.

25
26 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Vice Chair Barnes.

27
28 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I agree. It is dedicated right-of-way. It has been there
29 for quite some time. It has been proposed as a street for I don't know how many
30 years. The unintended consequences of putting in a cul-de-sac south of the gas
31 line, you've got the right-of-way acquisition from existing residences. They would
32 lose the ability to use the northbound direction that they are using now. I think
33 the downside far exceeds the benefits of putting it through. I think the street
34 should go through as designed. I think that is the best solution.

35
36 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Sims.

37
38 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Just a question. Where Appleblossom goes out onto
39 Alessandro, is that a signalized intersection there? It looks like it with the.....

40
41 **ASSISTANT FIRE MARSHALL PAUL VILLALOBOS** – Yes, it is.

42
43 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – And another question for the, whoever wants to
44 answer this, I'm looking at the little aerial photograph. So when the apartments
45 that went in directly to the east of this one and it looks like Willoughby Road,
46 what happened there? What's the deal there? That's a little mini cul-de-sac.

1 How did that get there? Is that a little hammerhead that we can't tell on, not that
2 we're going to fix that problem right now, but I just would like to understand that.

3
4 **APPLICANT WES ALSTON** – Yeah I entitled that project also, and they just let
5 us close it off. It just ended right there.

6
7 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – I mean, well, I wasn't on the Planning Commission
8 probably.

9
10 **APPLICANT WES ALSTON** – That was before Eric's time.

11
12 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Well, I mean, so I guess I tend to agree that the road
13 should just be a road and not mess around with cul-de-sacs. I think, looking at
14 the aerial photography here, it looks like that is what it wanted to be. It wants to
15 be a road. It wants to get out and probably when they were doing all of the
16 development there years ago when they built that was probably what they
17 intended to do. So the unintended consequences like Jeff was saying is there is
18 vacant property some day. When you buy a house next to vacant property, it is
19 going to develop in its time, and it needs a road.

20
21 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yeah my concern is just the driveways on Appleblossom and
22 the residents having to have people racing down the street. I mean, granted, it's
23 a T-intersection at the southern tip of Appleblossom, but there are already speed
24 humps out there so it's already an issue. Making it a paved thoroughfare is only
25 going to exacerbate the issue and, if we can nip it in the bud early with some sort
26 of design mitigation to prevent the issue from becoming worse down the line, I
27 think now is the time. Mr. Alston, what are your thoughts? I mean, you're
28 designing the project, you're building the project. If you have no concerns about
29 having a thoroughfare or cul-de-sacs, I mean, you haven't really had much of a
30 chance to speak on this issue yet.

31
32 **APPLICANT WES ALSTON** – Yeah having done the other project, we did it the
33 way we did it to mitigate the traffic going down the street. Of course, our position
34 is, we'd like to leave it the way it is, the way we originally designed the project
35 and just build the portion of Appleblossom that we're required to build and just
36 kind of leave that weird pork chop thing in place. The other easiest thing for us is
37 just to put the cul-de-sac in, and we might have to remove the emergency vehicle
38 access and move some of those buildings back to make our water quality basin
39 work.

40
41 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Would you see it as being a huge burden to put a cul-de-sac
42 up by the northerly entrance on Appleblossom and not build Appleblossom from
43 that point south and then providing some sort of a hammerhead turnaround just
44 on you southern property line?
45

1 **APPLICANT WES ALSTON** – Yeah know, actually the building design, the east
2 that whole opening that they have in there if you look on your aerials, that was
3 designed for fire department turnaround because it needed one there. I think
4 anything that we do further north on Appleblossom is going to impact our
5 buildings more than having something more to the south.

6
7 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I know your desired outcome would be to have this thing
8 approved as conditioned but is it a, I'm speaking for myself here, I know
9 everybody else here.....It seems to that I'm the oddball out. Is it a no-go situation
10 by trying to put in a cul-de-sac?

11
12 **APPLICANT WES ALSTON** – No. It's not a no-go. That's why we discussed
13 this already internally with the City.

14
15 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – If you're going to close off Appleblossom, to me, you'd
16 have to look at the people coming from the east on Brodiaea who now might turn
17 right on Appleblossom to get to Alessandro. They would now be forced to go
18 almost all the way to Perris and go through Perris/Brodiaea, Perris/Alessandro
19 back to Perris/Appleblossom to go back to the east.

20
21 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Well Vice Chair Sims, I'm sorry, I mean Vice Chair Barnes,
22 according to City Staff, it currently isn't open so it's not closing it off. We're not
23 going to be opening Appleblossom, the City is.....

24
25 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I thought it was open to going northerly.

26
27 **APPLICANT WES ALSTON** – It's open to northbound traffic.

28
29 **CHAIR LOWELL** – It is currently paved on one side, but City Staff was saying
30 that it wasn't thoroughly opened.

31
32 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Yeah but it's open going north, so now they'd have to
33 go all the way around the block so.....

34
35 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – It's open.....

36
37 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And I think the residents there would appreciate it.

38
39 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – It's open going north, but you
40 have to make a turn to go north into the private property and then come back out.
41 So it can be made, but it is not all on the public right-of-way.

42
43 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – It's just not legal.

44
45 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Correct.

46

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Well I'd like our two engineers that
2 are here this evening. I'm speaking from a planning standpoint but, from the
3 technical standpoint, Michael Lloyd and Eric Lewis are prepared to provide some
4 input. I'd would like them to do so.

5
6 **LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION MANAGER MICHAEL LLOYD** – Rick hit on
7 one concern that land development has and that is with regards to the water
8 basin. If we put in the cul-de-sac, whether it is immediately adjacent or further to
9 the north, we don't know what those impacts are. The second one that I'm a little
10 more concerned about is how do we accommodate the drainage, whether it's all
11 the way down towards the gas property or whether it is further north, we are
12 going to have to accommodate the drainage. As it is proposed, the water would
13 stay within the street and flood to the south and be picked up down at Brodiaea.
14 So that's something that hasn't been considered or planned for. It doesn't mean
15 it can't be but, as it stands, it is not addressed. The final item from a land
16 development perspective, again, no matter where the cul-de-sac is located, we
17 need to maintain access to that fee title property that the gas property has. They
18 have to have access to it. So those are the three things that, even though we
19 have a concept in front of you, and it's not a case of I don't think it can work, it's
20 just we haven't thought through all the things we need to think through to
21 confidently say yes we have a design that will absolutely work. So that is just a
22 perspective from land development.

23
24 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And I appreciate that. I don't want to be misunderstood. I
25 am in favor of this project. I like this project. I think it is a great project, and it is
26 very welcome in the City. My holdup is Appleblossom. Having talked to one of
27 our fellow audience member over here, a future Councilman, can believe in the
28 residents. When you talk to residents that are on driveways fronting on large
29 thoroughfare roadways, everybody complains about speeding in their
30 neighborhood. Speed bumps along Ninebark from the north to the south
31 because people are speeding. This is a situation where the street to the east
32 and the street to the west all have cul-de-sacs. There is one that is dead-end
33 with no cul-de-sac. This street should have been a cul-de-sac, and I would like
34 to fix that now. I don't know if that's possible. I don't know if I'm the only one up
35 here feeling that way. I don't know if it's proper to put it to a vote as to make it a
36 cul-de-sac or leave it open, but that's my personal belief. I would love to approve
37 this project. I also would like to see this not a thoroughfare just to make the
38 residents happy.

39
40 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I don't think it's appropriate after all the analysis that
41 has gone into this to force them to go back and revisit this, and the fact that it
42 should be a cul-de-sac is debatable. At some point, you have to have a through
43 street or you could never go anywhere.

44
45 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Correct, but you wouldn't design it with your lots fronting
46 onto a through street.

1 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – There’s lots fronting on Brodiaea all over the place,
2 and that is going to be a higher speed street than Appleblossom so.

3
4 **CHAIR LOWELL** – It’s just my opinion.

5
6 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I would actually oppose sending this back to Staff and
7 requiring that.

8
9 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Is there any way to move forward putting in a condition to at
10 least look at that?

11
12 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – We can do whatever the pleasure
13 is of the Commission this evening, but the last person I would like to hear from
14 would be our traffic engineer because, closing a street or opening a street or
15 widening a street, really is his purview.

16
17 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Sorry for cutting you off Mr. Lewis, sorry.

18
19 **CITY TRAFFIC ENGINEER ERIC LEWIS** – In either circumstance, there is
20 going to be tradeoffs. There is maintenance along that roadway for utilities that
21 are probably underneath the road, as well as the fence on both sides, the trees,
22 and any other heavy equipment that would have to have access there. As far as
23 going through, right now, it is only a one-way condition, although they violate it.
24 And, usually when people are violating a condition, it means that there’s a need
25 to do something different. The current configuration also requires that people
26 make u-turns within private property so they come down and so delivery trucks or
27 people that are lost are forced to go into the east side of the apartment complex,
28 so that is not desirable. We want to keep them turning around in public right-of-
29 way. And then drainage, as Michael mentioned, is important because we don’t
30 want to have flooded conditions at the end of a cul-de-sac where debris builds up
31 and becomes a vector field, which is another complaint that is often heard. So
32 but I don’t necessarily have a preference one way or the other because, from a
33 traffic loading standpoint, the direction of traffic that would be diverted with two
34 cul-de-sacs or with it open is not going to have a detrimental effect on the
35 surrounding network.

36
37 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Thank you, Eric. So back to the
38 Chair’s question, we would have to draft a condition this evening if you wanted to
39 go with an alternative than what’s being proposed before you. I think it is clear
40 that, based on the speakers so far, we haven’t vetted the entire impact of a
41 change condition. So, with certainty this evening, I don’t know if the Applicant is
42 going to be comfortable with any impact on the unit count, or if there is going to
43 be any additional cost to handle the drainage that Mr. Lloyd has indicated that we
44 haven’t considered, and then also the redesign or at least the re-conceptual
45 design of the detention basin is something that has to be carefully considered,
46 and I don’t know what that impact would be yet. So I probably would be asking

1 for you to continue it, and I don't know if the Applicant would be willing to delay
2 the project to evaluate that so I would like to hear from the Applicant on that
3 because.....

4
5 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I know we send out letters to all the residents within a couple
6 hundred feet of the project, and we have one resident present. Are there any
7 other residents here that are in the area affected by this? Did we get any
8 responses, any phone calls, or emails, or letters or anything?

9
10 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – Yes we did. Some of the....we
11 didn't get very many calls. I would say about six or seven calls. I think traffic
12 was an issue that I addressed in my Staff Report but, like you said, you walked
13 the neighborhood and the people that live on Appleblossom did talk about the
14 cars going the wrong way on Appleblossom. They spoke about, I think the
15 people on Appleblossom would rather have the cul-de-sac according to some of
16 the phone calls, but I don't know. It's hard to say. I asked people to put things in
17 writing so we could present it to you. We also asked them to show up and state
18 their opinion and be part of the process.

19
20 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay. We have a couple Board Members that are wanting
21 to speak about it. Let's go Commissioner Barnes, then Commissioner Korzec,
22 then Commissioner Sims.

23
24 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – At this point, I would say that I wouldn't second or
25 support moving forward on this with a modified condition to consider a cul-de-
26 sac. I am in favor of moving forward with the project as it's proposed.

27
28 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any I, by no means, want to hold up the project. I just want
29 to be the voice of the residents, so Commissioner Korzec.

30
31 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – I also agree. I think we should put this to the vote
32 for the project as noted, see where we come up, see where the vote lies, and
33 then work from there. But I think, for me, I feel that it is a complete project. I'm
34 happy with it. I think it is well done, and I know I will vote for it the way it is
35 presented.

36
37 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Sims.

38
39 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Well I guess I don't even need to ask my question
40 now. But, since we have put this one through the sausage maker, I want to ask a
41 couple more questions. From a fire department standpoint, what is an
42 acceptable length for a cul-de-sac? Or what is the maximum length for a cul-de-
43 sac?

44
45 **ASSISTANT FIRE MARSHALL PAUL VILLALOBOS** – We're looking at 150
46 feet.

1
2 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – So if, for instance, Appleblossom south of the Questar
3 where would, from just City Code or Fire Code, where would it have to go?

4
5 **ASSISTANT FIRE MARSHALL PAUL VILLALOBOS** – Well, if you're coming
6 from Brodiaea north, you'd have to have a turnaround at 150 feet.

7
8 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Similar to the cul-de-sacs, if you look at the aerial
9 map, those are probably somewhere in the....what are those 50 foot, 60 foot lots,
10 the widths?

11
12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – It's probably like 600, 700, 800 feet.

13
14 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I thought the 150 feet was the maximum without a
15 turnaround?

16
17 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Correct.

18
19 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – With a turnaround, it's 660.

20
21 **ASSISTANT FIRE MARSHALL PAUL VILLALOBOS** – It's 660. Yeah, you're
22 correct, you're correct. That's a fire hazard area, that's right.

23
24 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – But they are probably the cul-de-sacs, I don't see the
25 names of the streets on the two cul-de-sacs that are on the east and west of
26 Appleblossom. But there are probably 10 houses or whatever, 600 feet, they are
27 probably right at the 660 limit or something to that extent.

28
29 **ASSISTANT FIRE MARSHALL PAUL VILLALOBOS** – Right.

30
31 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – I guess my question is, I don't see how you would
32 install a cul-de-sac if we were to....

33
34 **CHAIR LOWELL** – It would have to be north of gas line.

35
36 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – To humor this further, I don't see how you get one in
37 though unless you.....

38
39 **CHAIR LOWELL** – You would have to be north. It was have to be in the
40 apartment complex. They'd have to extend the road out there.

41
42 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – And then that would exceed the maximum length.

43
44 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Yeah, then you're past the maximum length so okay.
45 So, I agree with Barnes and Korzec.

46

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Mr. Chairman, just for benefit of
2 the Commission, I have asked the Staff to put the colored Site Plan up there
3 because it shows the full project site, but it also shows where Brodiaea is in
4 relationship to Alessandro so you can see the distance where Appleblossom
5 currently terminates. Where it currently terminates is about the gas line where it
6 is kind of white going all the way down to Brodiaea is an existing local street that
7 serves that neighborhood, so they are both about equal distance from either
8 Brodiaea or from Alessandro. So you're right about the middle point where both
9 cul-de-sacs would be able to come together so just for the benefit of scale.

10
11 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Okay, I know we beat you up pretty good Mr. Alston,
12 but do you have anything you'd like to say before we go to a vote? Well just
13 bring a chair up.

14
15 **APPLICANT WES ALSTON** – We believe it was a good discussion. It was
16 something that needs to be discussed. We would like to see the project just
17 move forward just the way it is. That's our desire and, if you guys can get your
18 arms around that, then we will go to work in July building it.

19
20 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I feel that I am the only one that really expresses the
21 concern of cul-de-sacs so I'll entertain a motion on this if anyone would like to
22 make a motion on this item.

23
24 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Before you do that, you may want
25 to close the Public Hearing. I'm not sure that was....

26
27 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I think I did.

28
29 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Did he? Oh, he did? Okay.

30
31 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Let me move my thing here.

32
33 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – May I add one more thing, Mr
34 Chairman?

35
36 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yes.

37
38 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – I wanted to try to close the loop
39 with you on that noise mitigation. If you go to page 207, the packet page 207,
40 the discussion in the initial study (negative declaration). It talks about very
41 specifically.....

42
43 **CHAIR LOWELL** – 207 or 107?

44
45 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Packet page 207.

46

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – It doesn't go that far on ours.

2
3 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – My packet only goes to page 110.

4
5 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yeah, I've got 116 is my last.

6
7 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – My apologies. My apologies on
8 that, but clearly in this document that I have in front of me that you didn't see,
9 well you would've seen it if you saw it electronically. Sorry about that. Sorry
10 Paul. Craig, help me. No, but it basically says that the apartments facing Perris
11 Boulevard and Alessandro were identified to have a noise impact. And so,
12 because of that noise impact, the Mitigation Measure (Noise Impact No. 2) was
13 put in there with the windows closed condition. And that's exactly what was
14 discussed earlier is that it gives the option of the resident in a windows closed
15 condition to actually be able to enjoy the quiet and also the proper ventilation
16 inside the unit. But it also leaves that open to the resident, if they want to open
17 up the windows and have natural air, they know that in doing that they are
18 exposing themselves to noise that they could also avoid if they close the window.
19 So that's what I wanted to share with you.

20
21 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I appreciate that. I'm still trying to find 207 up here. I'm
22 almost there. There we go. I got it.

23
24 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – But it's available online for the post to see.

25
26 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So, with that said, I am confident that this project has been
27 well vetted. I have read everything that was provided to us. I still feel that there
28 should be cul-de-sacs. I think that the residents that live on Appleblossom would
29 greatly appreciate the forethought in putting in cul-de-sacs. But, as the fellow
30 Commissioners up here have said, they would like to vote on the item as
31 presented, and I'm the odd man out so I will entertain a motion. Would
32 somebody like to make a motion on this project?

33
34 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – I so move.

35
36 **CHAIR LOWELL** – The click the move button please, Commissioner Baker. Do
37 we have a second? So we have a motion by Commissioner Baker and a second
38 by Commissioner Sims. All in favor say yes. Please cast your vote. All opposed
39 say no. You can also abstain. All votes have been cast. The motion passes 7-
40 0. I would like moving forward to at least, in future projects, look at cul-de-sacs.
41 There's already speed humps out there. I worked for the residents. Do we have
42 a Staff wrap-up on this Item?

43
44
45
46 Opposed – 0

1 **Motion carries 7 – 0**

2
3
4 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – We do. This action by the
5 Planning Commission is an appealable action. If there is any interested party
6 that would want to appeal this decision they can do that appeal within 15 days of
7 this action. They would be directing their appeal through the Director of
8 Community Development, which would be going onto the City Council. And, if an
9 appeal is filed, we would have that scheduled before the City Council within 30
10 days. Thank you.

11
12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – No because we....I have a question. Commissioner
13 Gonzalez over here just reminded me we didn't read the recommendation. Is it
14 okay to vote the motion as approved?

15
16 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – The motion was to approve the
17 Resolution, which did include everything within the recommendations.

18
19 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Oh, so we did do it correctly. Good call. With that, we are
20 moving on. Where's my paperwork? So that moves us onto Other
21 Commissioner Business, which I don't think we have any.

22
23
24 **OTHER COMMISSION BUSINESS**

25
26
27 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Do we have any Staff Comments tonight? Mr. Sandzimier,
28 do you have any Staff Comments tonight?

29
30 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – No.

31
32 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Perfect.

33
34
35 **STAFF COMMENTS**

36
37
38 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other Commissioner Comments tonight? Mr. Sims.

39
40 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – I just want to wish everybody a nice Veteran's Day
41 tomorrow and, if we don't see each other before, have a great Thanksgiving.

42
43 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Anybody else? Commissioner
44 Ramirez.

1 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – I just want to wish a Happy Birthday to my fellow
2 United States Marine Corps brothers and sisters present or fallen.

3
4 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you.

5
6 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Semper Fi.

7
8 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – You're welcome, and I just want to say it's nice to
9 see everyone again. We haven't seen each other in two months, and I missed
10 you guys.

11
12
13 **PLANNING COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

14
15
16 **CHAIR LOWELL** – With that, I'd like to adjourn the meeting to the next Regular
17 Meeting of the Planning Commission on December 8th, 2016 right here in Council
18 Chambers at 7:00PM.

19
20
21 **ADJOURNMENT**

22 *Next Meeting: Planning Commission Regular Meeting, December 8th, 2016 at*
23 *7:00 PM, City of Moreno Valley, City Hall Council Chamber, 14177 Frederick*
24 *Street, Moreno Valley, CA 92553.*

25
26
27
28
29
30
31 _____
32 Richard J. Sandzimier
33 Planning Official
34 Approved

_____ Date

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42 _____
43 Brian R. Lowell
44 Chair

_____ Date