

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

5 **Thursday, January 26th, 2017 at 7:00 PM**

6
7
8 **CALL TO ORDER**
9

10 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Good evening ladies and gentlemen. I apologize for the
11 delay, but I would like to call to order tonight’s meeting of the Planning
12 Commission to order. Today is Thursday, January 26th, 2017. The time is
13 around 7:11PM. I would like to call the meeting to order. Could we have roll call
14 please?
15

16
17 **ROLL CALL**
18

19 Commissioners Present:

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

28
29
30 Staff Present:

- 31 Rick Sandzimier, Planning Official
- 32 Paul Early, Assistant City Attorney
- 33 Darisa Vargas, Senior Administrative Specialist
- 34 Mark Gross, Senior Planner
- 35 Gabriel Diaz, Case Planner
- 36 Jeff Bradshaw, Case Planner
- 37 Claudia Manrique, Case Planner
- 38 Michael Lloyd, Traffic Engineer
- 39 Vince Giron, Associate Engineer
- 40 Eric Lewis, City Traffic Engineer
- 41 Chris Ormsby, Senior Planner

- 1 Speakers:
- 2 Roy Bleckert
- 3 Rafael Brugueras
- 4 George Hague
- 5 Kathleen Dale
- 6 Rochelle Ruth
- 7 Carole Nagengast
- 8 Susan Zeitz
- 9 Marcia Narog
- 10 Barbara McCarthy
- 11 Kimberly Crow
- 12 Barbara Baxter
- 13 Damon Allen
- 14 Robert Then
- 15 David Carlson
- 16 Madeline Blua
- 17 Joe Lockhart
- 18 Jack Ergish
- 19 Don Wilson
- 20 David Zeitz
- 21 Shelly Lindekugel
- 22 Deborah Johnson
- 23 Glen Jacobs
- 24 Lindsey Robin
- 25 Tom Jerele, Sr.
- 26 David Cortez
- 27 Huda Kaoud
- 28 John Myers
- 29 Thomas Ross
- 30 Allison Gee
- 31 Daisy Franco

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

CHAIR LOWELL – Before we go too much further, I am noticing the TV, we have a live feed but, on the outgoing screen, it just says Moreno Valley, California Planning Commission. Is that something that IT knows about? There we go. Sorry. We were just having a little technical difficulty. Can you guys hear me okay back there? I will scream my guts out. Okay, what I was saying was, I would like to welcome you all to the Planning Commission tonight. We had a little technical difficulty, which is why we started a little bit late. The meeting is called to order. We have had the Pledge of Allegiance.....we have had roll call, and now it is the Pledge of Allegiance. Could you guys please stand and join me in the Pledge of Allegiance, please? Put your hand over your heart, ready, begin.

1 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

2
3 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. For tonight, would anybody like to
4 make a motion to approve tonight's Agenda?

5
6
7 **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

8
9
10 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – I so move.

11
12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – We have a motion by Commissioner Baker. Do we have a
13 second? We have a second by Commissioner Korzec. All in favor, say aye.

14
15 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Aye.

16
17 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Aye.

18
19 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Aye.

20
21 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Aye.

22
23 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Aye.

24
25 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Aye.

26
27 **CHAIR LOWELL** – All opposed, say nay.

28
29
30 Opposed – 0

31
32
33 **Motion carries 6 – 0**

34
35
36 **CHAIR LOWELL** – The motion passes 6-0. Tonight's Agenda is approved.
37 That moves us onto our Consent Calendar, which we only have one item on the
38 Consent Calendar tonight, which is approval of Minutes from December 15,
39 2016, which was a Special Meeting. Do we have any comments on the Minutes,
40 or are we set to motion to approve them as presented?

41
42
43 **CONSENT CALENDAR**

44
45 *All matters listed under Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and all*
46 *will be enacted by one rollcall vote. There will be no discussion of these items*

1 unless Members of the Planning Commission request specific items be removed
2 from the Consent Calendar for separate action.

3
4
5
6 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

7
8 Planning Commission - Special Meeting - December 15th, 2016 at 7:00PM

9
10 Approve as submitted.

11
12
13
14 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – I'll move to approve.

15
16 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – I'll second.

17
18 **CHAIR LOWELL** – We have a motion and a second. Any last comments? No?
19 All in favor, say aye.

20
21 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Aye.

22
23 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Aye.

24
25 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Aye.

26
27 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Aye.

28
29 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Aye.

30
31 **CHAIR LOWELL** – All opposed, say nay. Anybody abstaining?

32
33 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – I'm abstaining.

34
35 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Perfect, so motion passes 5-0 with one abstention. The
36 Minutes are approved. Man, we are just booking right along.

37
38
39 Opposed – 0

40
41
42 **Motion carries 5 – 0 – 1 with one abstention**

43
44
45
46 **PUBLIC COMMENTS PROCEDURE**

1
2 *Any person wishing to address the Commission on any matter, either under*
3 *Public Comments section of the Agenda or scheduled items or public hearings,*
4 *must fill out a “Request to Speak” form available at the door. The completed*
5 *form must be submitted to the Secretary prior to the Agenda item being called by*
6 *the Chairperson. In speaking to the Commission, member of the public may be*
7 *limited to three minutes per person, except for the applicant for entitlement. The*
8 *Commission may establish an overall time limit for comments on a particular*
9 *Agenda item. Members of the public must direct their questions to the*
10 *Chairperson of the Commission and not to other members of the Commission,*
11 *the applicant, the Staff, or the audience. Additionally, there is an ADA note.*
12 *Upon request, this Agenda will be made available in appropriate alternative*
13 *formats to persons with disabilities in compliance with the Americans with*
14 *Disabilities Act of 1990. Any person with a disability who requires a modification*
15 *or accommodation in order to participate in a meeting should direct their request*
16 *to Guy Pagan, our ADA Coordinator, at (951) 413-3120 at least 48 hours prior to*
17 *the meeting. The 48-hour notification will enable the City to make reasonable*
18 *arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.*
19
20

21 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Do we have any Non-Public Hearing Items tonight?

22
23 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – We do.
24

25 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Which is a General Plan Amendment. Do we have a Staff
26 Report today?
27

28 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – It’s actually not a General Plan
29 Amendment. It is a General Plan Annual Report and giving the Staff
30 presentation this evening would be Senior Planner, Mark Gross.
31

32
33 **NON-PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**
34

35 General Plan Annual Report (Report of: Community Development)

36
37 Case: General Plan Annual Report
38

39 Applicant: City of Moreno Valley
40

41 Owner: N/A
42

43 Representative: N/A
44

45 Location: City-wide
46

1 Case Planner: Mark Gross

2

3 Council District: N/A

4

5

6

7 **SENIOR PLANNER MARK GROSS** – Thank you very much and good evening
8 Chair Lowell and Members of the Planning Commission. Tonight we are going to
9 talk just a little bit about the General Plan Annual Report. The California State
10 Law requires local jurisdictions to adopt a comprehensive General Plan. The
11 document is a blueprint for the future and is the basis for all land-use-related
12 decisions that we make. Now, the Government Code requires the Planning
13 Commission provide an annual Progress Report to City Council on the
14 implementation status of the City’s General Plan, and that includes the progress
15 in meeting our share of regional housing needs. Now, this year’s General Plan
16 Annual Report contains development projects. Actually, a number of different
17 items, general projects or development projects, General Plan Amendments,
18 Municipal Code Amendments all.....not every project but major projects, and that
19 is all included.....Actually, it includes between January 2015 and up to
20 December 2016. Now, that also includes housing occupancy from 2014 through
21 2016. General Plan Annual Reports are completed by City Legislature Review,
22 and they are reported on an annual basis, and we have to provide these reports
23 to the State Office of Planning and Research and the State Office of Housing and
24 Community Development. Now, in addition to State Law, Moreno Valley recently
25 approved a strategic plan that I am sure a number of you are aware of that is
26 called Momentum MoVal, and in that particular plan, initiatives 1.9.1 and 1.9.2
27 require completion of the General Plan Annual Report prior to April 1st. Now, that
28 is consistent with the State Law requirements. That is what State Law would
29 require as well. Now, the initiatives require formation of a working group of key
30 City Staff to research and evaluate the current 2006 General Plan prior to
31 initiating a comprehensive General Plan update, which we are moving forward
32 towards in the next three years. Staff has been fully engaged with this working
33 group since October, and we have conducted actually four meetings. What you
34 see in the Staff Report, in fact a number of the attachments, especially Appendix
35 A, do relate to a lot of hard work that has been provided by the Staff, key
36 members of Staff, to go through and to look at every one of our goals, policies,
37 and programs in our General Plan. Now, I just want to talk a little bit about what
38 you’re going to see in the Annual Report. It includes (number one) a status of
39 General Plan in progress in its implementation. So I talked a little bit about
40 Appendix A, and that it was completed by the working group, and it is providing a
41 thorough assessment of how current land use decisions relate to the goals and
42 objectives, policies and programs, and implementation measures that are
43 included in the General Plan itself. Now, in addition to providing a synopsis of
44 items and how each are tied to their Municipal Code Sections or maybe
45 programs that we have, Appendix A is also providing information in bold text on
46 General Plan course adjustments for the working group that will be evaluating

1 these items as we move forward in completing a comprehensive General Plan.
2 The second item in the Annual Report is a report of progress in meeting our
3 share of the regional housing needs pursuant to Section 65584, the government
4 code. Now, Appendix B to the Annual Report, that is also a section or an
5 attachment to the Staff Report. It documents housing types that were both
6 constructed and occupied since the housing element was updated, and our
7 housing element was updated back in 2014. Now, the only housing constructed
8 and occupied in the City during this reviewing window has been single-family
9 tract homes. Actually, 315 occupancies to be exact, which count toward the
10 City's required regional housing needs assessment for above moderate income
11 level housing. Now, as housing numbers only reflect occupancy of single-family
12 dwellings, there have been more diverse housing types such as planned unit
13 developments and apartment complexes that the Planning Commission has been
14 involved in and these projects have been approved back in 2015 and 2016.
15 Likely, these housing tables will reflect this diversity in construction and
16 occupancy and provide for additional housing types. Now, in conclusion, the
17 General Plan continues to serve as an effective guide for both orderly growth and
18 development, as well as preservation and conservation of open space and
19 natural resources. As stated in the Annual Report, projects and amendments are
20 in full conformance with the seven mandated elements and document the City's
21 commitment to achieving these goals and objectives provided in the General
22 Plan. Staff now recommends that the Planning Commission forward the item to
23 City Council for final consideration. That concludes our report on the General
24 Plan Annual Report. Thank you very much.

25
26 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Mr. Chairman, if I may, just as an
27 order of business on the Agenda, you did skip over the Public Comments on
28 Non-Agenda matters. If you're going to take comments on this item, you can do
29 that and then you can go back to the Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items.
30 Or, if you'd like, you can take the comments on Non-Agenda Items and then
31 come back and take comments on this if you're inclined to do so. However,
32 you'd like to do it. I just wanted to point out that we do want to give anybody, the
33 public, an opportunity to speak on Non-Agenda Items tonight.

34
35 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – And I would recommend
36 completing this item.

37
38 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Okay.

39
40 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – And then going back.

41
42 **CHAIR LOWELL** – That's what I was going to go with. Okay, so what we have
43 to do now is.....do we have any questions or comments for Staff?
44

45 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Well I have one. There needs to be a correction in
46 regards to the listing of the names on the Planning Commissioners. On Erlan

1 Gonzalez, the expiration of his term is the same as mine. The two alternate
2 terms expire at the same time. That's all.

3
4 **SENIOR PLANNER MARK GROSS** – I will definitely look into that. Thank you
5 very much.

6
7 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Yeah, I talked to Marie.

8
9 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any comments or questions on the General Plan Annual
10 Report? I don't see anybody speaking up, so we just motion we received it,
11 acknowledged it.

12
13 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – No. You can take Public
14 Comment on this item.

15
16 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay. I'm sorry. I don't have any Speaker Slips. Is
17 anybody wanting to speak on this item?

18
19 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST DARISA VARGAS** – We have one
20 speaker.

21
22 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, who would that be?

23
24 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST DARISA VARGAS** – Roy Bleckert.

25
26 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Mr. Bleckert, come on up.

27
28 **SPEAKER ROY BLECKERT** – Yes, speaking on the General Plan. That is one
29 thing that this City really needs. You should update it every 10 years. It has not
30 been updated since 2006. Its way overdue. It's something, I mean, we've went
31 with Hillside Ordinance Zoning. We have an issue here tonight. The overall plan
32 of the City really needs to be looked over. Again, I've asked the question many
33 times. Where is downtown Moreno Valley? Nobody has an answer for that
34 because there is not one. We need to have a comprehensive plan in the City
35 that is going to make things look and work and make sense. The one we have
36 now is just a hodge-podge of a city that has been built for 30 years. The
37 Planning Commission, the Staff, the Council all should be working together to put
38 a comprehensive General Plan in place so when projects come up here they sail
39 right through because we have the plan in place, and we know what we're going
40 to do. We don't have to spend all this time in staff and resources rehashing and
41 redoing things. We know where this goes. We know where that goes. We know
42 what's here. Let's work to where we streamline the system where it makes the
43 city more business friendly, more development friendly all across the board, and
44 we can maybe avoid situations like you may have tonight. Good luck with Item 4.

45

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you. Anybody else wishing to speak on the General
2 Plan Annual Report? I don't hear anybody else or see anybody else raising their
3 hands. I don't think we have any more Speaker Slips do we, Ms. Vargas?
4

5 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST DARISA VARGAS** – No, we do
6 not.
7

8 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And then the action on this, Rick is just?
9

10 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Go ahead, Mark. Go ahead and
11 give him the recommended actions.
12

13 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So we would just motion to approve the Resolution?
14

15 **SENIOR PLANNER MARK GROSS** – Yeah, there's two things, and we can kind
16 of go through it. First of all, you're, if I can get to my section here.....
17

18 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – You're going to be certifying.....
19

20 **SENIOR PLANNER MARK GROSS** – Yeah, certifying that it qualifies for an
21 exemption in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act, Section
22 15313, no that shouldn't be it. I got the wrong one here. I'm sorry. I don't know
23 where, yeah.....
24

25 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Let me take a quick shot. You're
26 going to be approving the Resolution basically recommended to the City Council
27 that the Annual Report qualifies for an exemption under CEQA and you
28 recommend to the City Council that they consider the item before they submit it
29 to the Office of Planning and Research. Just one resolution here.
30

31 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – I can make the motion. Do you want me to make the
32 motion?
33

34 **CHAIR LOWELL** – By all means. Ms. Vargas, do we have the vote option up
35 here? I don't see it.
36

37 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – I'll second.
38

39 **CHAIR LOWELL** – We could just do a roll call vote. We'll just do a roll call vote.
40 So we have a motion by Commissioner Sims, and we have a second by
41 Commissioner Nickel.
42

43 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Just for clarity, I'm recommending Staff's
44 recommendation as recommended in the report.
45

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So just read that then. You’re recommending to approve the
2 resolution to.....

3
4 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Yeah, I, okay. Formally, so.....

5
6 **CHAIR LOWELL** – It’s January. We’re a little rusty.

7
8 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – It’s January. We’re off to a good start here. I make a
9 motion that the Planning Commission approve Resolution No. 2017-03 and (1)
10 certify that the proposed General Plan Annual Report qualifies as an exemption
11 in accordance with Section 15061 of the California Environmental Quality Act
12 Guidelines; and (2) that we recommend that the City Council that the January
13 2015 through December 2016 General Plan Annual Report presented is
14 consistent with the requirements of Government Code Section 64000 with regard
15 to reporting on the status of the City General Plan progress and its
16 implementation and is ready to be submitted to the Office of Planning and
17 Research and the Department of Housing and Community Development by April
18 1, 2017.

19
20 **CHAIR LOWELL** – We have a motion by Commissioner Sims, and we have a
21 second by Commissioner Nickel. Can we have a roll call vote, please?

22
23 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Yes.

24
25 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Yes.

26
27 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Yes.

28
29 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Yes.

30
31 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Yes.

32
33 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Did you get Commissioner Korzec?

34
35 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT DARISA VARGAS** – I did.

36
37 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yes. The motion passes 6-0. The motion is approved. Do
38 we have any additional wrap-up on the General Plan Annual Report?

39
40
41 Opposed – 0

42
43
44 **Motion carries 6 – 0**

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – This item will be taken to the City
2 Council at an upcoming meeting prior to the required submittal date of April 1,
3 2017.

4
5 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, now do we.....I want to go back and open up the
6 Public Comments on any items not on the Agenda tonight. Is anybody wishing to
7 speak on any item that is not on the Agenda tonight? Do we have any Speaker
8 Slips?
9

10 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT DARISA VARGAS** – We have three.

11
12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Perfect. We have Rafael Brugueras, Mr. George Hague,
13 and Ms. Kathleen Dale. Rafael, come on up. I apologize for the mixup. Also,
14 since we're taking a momentary pause, anybody who would like to speak on any
15 of the items tonight, if you haven't done so already, please fill out a green slip.
16 It's on the back corner by the door, or the front corner by the door. And please
17 turn it into Mr. Eric Lewis right here to save you from walking all the way up front.
18 I'll remind everybody before the item is called, and I will put in a little bit of a
19 grace period once the item is called to make sure everybody has the opportunity
20 to speak who wants to speak. With that said, Mr. Rafael Brugueras.

21
22 **SPEAKER RAFAEL BRUGUERAS** – Good evening, Chair, Commissioners,
23 Staff, residents, and guests. I came to talk about what our president mentioned
24 in a speech to dream; to go back to dreaming again or dream bigger. That
25 wasn't done for a long, long time through many presidents and now that we have
26 a man that is not a republican or democrat or independent or libertarian but a
27 man for the people of this country because he wants to make the country proper
28 again. And I believe everybody that sits in this room wants that for their own
29 selves, their neighbors, their sons and daughters, even their grandsons and
30 children. We want that. See that's something that I grew up with in New York to
31 give everyone an opportunity to dream. We have dreamers here. We have
32 developers. We have planners. We have construction people. We've got
33 finance people that are here tonight to invest in our city because they found
34 something that we had that they need, so it works hand to hand to help each
35 other and to become and stay business friendly. Roy mentioned it well. We
36 need to update the General Plan because somehow George, part of the Sierra
37 Club, thinks it's unconstitutional and I got his email. It's not unconstitutional. It's
38 a plan that can be changed according to the times that we live in today. No one
39 in this room when that plan was made is still wearing the same clothes. Okay?
40 Today we have cellphones, laptops, smart cars, better medicine in the hospitals
41 because I know there are a lot of people here that are deeply grateful that they
42 got smart doctors that can help them with better medicine and, if we didn't have
43 that technology and plans to change, we'd be living in the old days. We cannot
44 live in the old days. We must change with the times and, as we go through our
45 cases, I'll explain what I mean by those changes. So George should have been
46 a better communicator with the members of the Sierra Club and tell the entire

1 truth why they are here, not just follow a club and think that the person that is the
2 head of the club is telling the whole truth. He is not telling the whole truth.

3
4 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you, Rafael. Okay, Tom Jerele. Would you like a
5 chair? We have a couple extras up here.

6
7 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Mr. Chair, we are using a timer if
8 you didn't notice on the screen.

9
10 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yeah, I just.....I'll just go down here too.

11
12 **SPEAKER TOM JERELE, SR.** – No. I'm okay. Thank you though.

13
14 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Okay.

15
16 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And then, in an effort to expedite, we also have Ms.
17 Kathleen Dale next and then Susan Zeitz.

18
19 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST DARISA VARGAS** – No. That's an
20 error.

21
22 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay.

23
24 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST DARISA VARGAS** – I'm sorry.

25
26 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Mr. Jerele, go for it.

27
28 **SPEAKER TOM JERELE, SR.** – I'm sure you realize that the Planning
29 Department serves as your Staff to provide you information to provide informed
30 decisions. You should feel comfortable directing them to provide you and the
31 public enough time to review and seriously consider any and all projects that
32 come before you. In fact, I hope you will direct them to make sure on all future
33 agendas that you have this section listed, which it hasn't for a year or more.
34 Anytime you're given an Agenda, along with a Staff Report of more than 4000
35 pages, you need to speak up for yourself and the public and direct your Staff that
36 this is not appropriate. Any project which has more than 2000 to 3000 pages
37 report that the public needs to read to make full comment should be given more
38 than one week to review. Whenever this happens, you need to continue the
39 project and keep the Public Hearing open to allow the public, as well as yourself,
40 the time to become informed by reading the entire project. And Staff receives
41 many letters on a project. It might be wise to have them forward to you instead
42 of handing you a big pile the day of your meeting. You should think of them as
43 public testimony and read each one before any vote. When you're considering
44 an Environmental Impact Report, you're giving the comments that the public
45 makes on the document. When you're given a Mitigated Negative Declaration,
46 however, you're not provided those comments made on the document, but you

1 can direct Staff to make them available to you, and you should prior to any vote,
2 especially when they include comments from attorneys, as well as the public.
3 Please make sure you let the public know you have had communication with
4 anyone connected to a project you're voting on and their relationship to the
5 project prior to your vote and/or if you've received any money from those
6 connected to the project. You should never say to yourself that there are
7 thousands of pages of reading. I must do and therefore they must have covered
8 everything required of them. Please, never approve the project because of the
9 number of pages that only after thoroughly reading and analyzing everything
10 before you and that includes all of the public comments that you have received
11 both tonight, what has been sent into City Staff, and every place else that is
12 available to you prior to your vote. I thank you very much.

13

14 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you, Tom. Ms. Kathleen Dale.

15

16 **SPEAKER KATHLEEN DALE** – Good evening. I wanted to talk to you about
17 three general issues related to the rules and regulations that this body is
18 supposed to work under. First one is I wanted to make sure that you're aware
19 that the City actually has its own rules and regulations for the implementation of
20 CEQA and, all of the documents that become before you, are supposed to be
21 prepared under those regulations, as well as the CEQA Statute and Guidelines.
22 That's not been the case in the past nor with the items that are before you
23 tonight. Public Comments are being submitted in response to Environmental
24 Document reviews and Public Hearing Notices that are not being shared with
25 you, and Staff and the Planning Department is making themselves the arbitrator
26 of what comments are valid and which ones you should see. That is simply not
27 acceptable. The third thing I want to talk to you about is your ethics rules, and I
28 wanted to remind you about the training that you've received from the City
29 regarding ethics and regarding disqualifications and particularly a recent training
30 example involving a scenario where an appointed Commissioner who had an
31 unsuccessful bid for a Council seat received monetary contributions from a
32 developer and the guidance that was given was that individual, if the contribution
33 was more than \$250.00, needs to recuse themselves from any items involving
34 that contributor for a period of one year. And you should know who you are, but
35 one of you up there does fall under that circumstance regarding an item that is on
36 the Agenda tonight. Thank you.

37

38 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And what was your comment about that last little bit that I
39 don't.....

40

41 **SPEAKER KATHLEEN DALE** – Pardon me?

42

43 **CHAIR LOWELL** – You said that I was given advice, but you were hinting
44 towards the advice not being correct. Is that advice accurate?

45

1 **SPEAKER KATHLEEN DALE** – Well, I’m assuming the attorney gave correct
2 advice. I’m just putting on the record that you all have been given advice. I
3 didn’t say who it was.
4

5 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I was just trying to clarify your statement. That’s all. And, if
6 anybody is curious, it is me. I received a contribution, and I will be recusing
7 myself from an item later on tonight. But we will cross that bridge later. Ms.
8 Vargas, is this last speaker not accurate?
9

10 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST DARISA VARGAS** – That’s correct.
11

12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay. Any other Public Comments on Non-Public, on Non-
13 Agenda Items tonight? Anybody else wishing to speak on something that is not
14 on the Agenda? Going once, going twice....the Non-Public Hearing Items, well
15 the Non-Agenda Items Public Comments are now closed. Moving onto our
16 Public Hearing Items. Our first item tonight is Case PEN16-0103 (PA16-0013)
17 Tentative Parcel Map. The Applicant is LGS Engineering, Inc. The Case
18 Planner is Mr. Gabriel Diaz. Do we have a Staff Report on this Item?
19
20

21 **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**
22

- 23 1. Case: PEN16-0103 (PA16-0013) Tentative Parcel Map
24
25 Applicant: LGS Engineering, Inc.
26
27 Owner: Catherine Kormos
28
29 Representative: David Knell
30
31 Location: Northeast corner of Jeranell Court and Alessandro
32 Boulevard
33
34 Case Planner: Gabriel Diaz
35
36 Council District: 3
37
38 Proposal: PEN16-0103 (PA16-0013) Tentative Parcel Map
39 37104
40
41

42 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**
43

44 Staff recommends that the Planning Commission APPROVE Resolution No.
45 2017-04, and thereby:
46

- 1 1. **CERTIFY** that PEN16-0103 (PA16-0013) Tentative Parcel Map 37104
2 qualifies as an exemption in accordance with the California Environmental
3 Quality Act Guidelines, Section 15315 (Minor Land Divisions); and
4
- 5 2. **APPROVE** PEN16-0103 (PA16-0013) Tentative Parcel Map 37104
6 subject to the Conditions of Approval included as Exhibit A to Resolution
7 No. 2017-04.
8
9

10
11 **CASE PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – Yes. Thank you, Chairman and
12 Commissioners. This is regarding.....the reason there are the two case numbers
13 is we're going from a new computer system. That is why we have the PEN16,
14 and the PA16 is the old case number. This project is located on the northeast
15 corner of Jeranell Court and Alessandro Boulevard. It is within Council District 3.
16 The Zone is Residential 3. The Applicant Representative is David Knell. The
17 Applicant is proposing to subdivide one legal parcel into two legal parcels on 1.1
18 gross acres of land. The property is presently developed with four existing
19 single-family homes, and we have the aerial there to demonstrate that. We have
20 three homes on the west parcel and one home on the east parcel. This is an
21 aerial photograph of the map, the proposed map. It is photographs of the site,
22 and this is the revised map. This project was heard before the Planning
23 Commission on August 25, 2016 at the Public Hearing Meeting where the
24 Planning Commission requested additional information regarding sewer or septic
25 tank systems on the property, and the item was continued. The Applicant, since
26 then, has done research and revised the map to show the locations of the septic
27 tanks, which he has provided up there, and he has also provided a preliminary
28 clearance letter from the County of Riverside Department of Environmental
29 Health. That is part of your packet. In working with the requirements for the
30 County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health, the map has been
31 revised so that each lot meets the half-acre minimum for properties with septic
32 tank systems. The surrounding areas of the project site to the north, east, south,
33 and west are all zoned Single-Family Residential 3. There are existing single-
34 family homes to the west, east, and empty lots to the north and south. No new
35 development is being proposed. The site is already developed. The proposed
36 Parcel Map is consistent with the City's development standards for lot size, lot
37 depth, and lot width within the R3 Zone. Public Notice was sent to all property
38 owners within 300 feet of the project on 1/12/2017. In addition a Public Hearing
39 Notice for the project was posted on the project site on 1/13/2017 and published
40 in the Press Enterprise Newspaper on 1/15/2017. Planning Staff has reviewed
41 the proposed project and determined that the item will not have a significant
42 impact on the environment and qualifies for an exemption under the provisions of
43 CEQA as a Class 15 Categorical Exemption, CEQA Guidelines Section 15315,
44 for Minor Land Divisions. Therefore, Staff recommends that the Planning
45 Commission certify that PEN16-0103 Tentative Parcel Map 37104 qualifies as an
46 exemption in accordance with CEQA Guidelines and approve PEN16-0103

1 Tentative Parcel Map 37104 subject to the Conditions of Approval. This
2 concludes Staff presentation. Thank you.

3
4 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you, Mr. Diaz. Do we have any clarifications from
5 Staff or can we move? Okay, I would like to invite the Applicant up if they would
6 like to speak.

7
8 **APPLICANT DAVID KNELL** – Good evening. I am David Knell, the
9 representative for the owners. I just want to reiterate there is no new building
10 planned here. Sorry. Can you hear me now? Thank you. Thanks. Okay guys,
11 you heard it, and ladies. I just want to remind you that there is no new
12 development planned as Gabriel had stated. This action is strictly the result of a
13 title company issue. For years, the properties have been treated as two separate
14 lots. They have been conveyed separately. They have been taxed separately,
15 but it was not a legal subdivision. What we're doing here is going through a
16 subdivision process to legally divide this into two parcels as it has always been
17 treated. Questions from the board?

18
19 **CHAIR LOWELL** – No. I don't have any questions. Anybody have questions for
20 the Applicant? Commissioner Sims.

21
22 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Not a question. I just want to thank you for the
23 additional work. I know that came up in August on the issue about the septic
24 tanks and whatnot so I appreciate the additional effort you guys did.

25
26 **APPLICANT DAVID KNELL** – I had no knowledge of septic tanks before now,
27 but now I probably know too much.

28
29 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – More than you ever wanted to know about them. The
30 only thing you really want to know is that they work.

31
32 **APPLICANT DAVID KNELL** – Yeah.

33
34 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, anybody waiting to speak on this item?

35
36 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST DARISA VARGAS** – No, we do not.

37
38 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay and, since we have a very full house, then I am just
39 double checking, being an abundance of caution, anybody wishing to speak on
40 this item, speak now or forever hold your piece. Going once, going
41 twice....Public Comments are opened. Public Comments are now closed. Okay,
42 thank you. Any Commissioner questions? Okay. Well, I appreciate the extra
43 work that has been put into this project. I know we had a couple of questions
44 pertaining to the septic tanks last time, and that was the only issue holding up the
45 vote on this item. With that said, I feel comfortable making a motion on this item.
46 I would like to make a motion to approve Resolution No. 2017-04 and thereby

1 certifying that PEN16-0103 (formerly PA16-0013) Tentative Parcel Map 37104
2 qualifies as an exemption in accordance with the California Environmental
3 Quality Act Guidelines, Section 15315, a Minor Land Division; and (#2) approve
4 PEN16-0103 (formerly PA16-0013) Tentative Parcel Map 137104 subject to the
5 Conditions of Approval included as Exhibit A to Resolution No. 2017-04. Does
6 anybody want to make a second? There we go. I have a motion, seconded by
7 Commissioner Sims. Please cast your votes. And Commissioner Gonzalez isn't
8 here. The motion passes 6-0 with no abstentions and no no's.

9
10
11 Opposed – 0

12
13
14 **Motion carries 6 – 0**

15
16
17 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Do we have a Staff wrap-up on this item?

18
19 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Yes. This is a subdivision, and it
20 is a decision of the Planning Commission that is appealable to City Council. If
21 any affected person would like to appeal this decision, they have 10 days to
22 appeal that decision through a letter to the Director of Community Development.
23 If we receive a letter, we will be coordinating through our City Clerk's Office to
24 schedule a hearing with the City Council within 30 days.

25
26 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much, Mr. Sandzimier. That moves us onto
27 the next item on the Agenda, which is Case PEN16-0119, Plot Plan, and PEN16-
28 0120, Tentative Map 35429. The Case Planner, once again, is Mr. Gabriel Diaz.

29
30
31
32
33 2. Case: PEN16-0119 Plot Plan &
34 PEN16-0120 Tentative Tract Map 35429
35
36 Applicant: Creative Design Associates
37
38 Owner: ENR Resources, LLC.
39
40 Representative: Creative Design Associates
41
42 Location: Northwest corner of Alessandro Boulevard and Chara
43 Street
44
45 Case Planner: Gabriel Diaz
46

1 Council District: 3
2
3 Proposal: PEN16-0119 Plot Plan & PEN16-0120 Tentative Tract
4 Map 35429
5
6

7 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**
8

9 Staff recommends that the Planning Commission APPROVE Resolution No.
10 2017-01 and Resolution No. 2017-02, and thereby:
11

- 12 1. **CERTIFY** that PEN16-0119 (PA13-0061) Plot Plan and PEN16-0120
13 (PA13-0062) Tentative Tract Map 35429 qualifies as an exemption in
14 accordance with California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, Section
15 15332 (In-Fill Developments). The project is within the city limits, on a
16 project site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban
17 uses, and consistent with all applicable general plan and zoning
18 designations; and
19
- 20 2. **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2017-01 and thereby APPROVE Plot Plan
21 PEN16-0119 (PA13-0061), subject to the attached conditions of approval
22 included as Exhibit B; and
23
- 24 3. **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2017-02 and thereby APPROVE Tentative
25 Tract Map PEN16-0020 (PA13-0062), subject to the attached conditions of
26 approval included as Exhibit B.
27
28

29 **SENIOR PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – Thank you Chairman and
30 Commissioners. This project is located on the northwest corner of Alessandro
31 Boulevard and Chara Street. It is within Council District 3. The Zoning is R15-
32 Residential. The Applicant is Creative Design Associates, and the owner is ENR
33 Resources, LLC. The proposal is to develop 58 multi-family condominium units
34 with common open space on 4.8 acres. The site is relatively flat with no
35 buildings onsite. It has been routinely disked for weed abatement over the years.
36 There are some older trees and some tree stumps with older stock pilings of dirt.
37 Per the Municipal Code, a Conditional of Approval has been placed on the
38 project to ensure relocation or replacement of the existing trees. The project
39 does include a total of 22 buildings. There are 14 buildings with three units, and
40 there are eight buildings with two units. All units have three-bedroom floor plans.
41 Buildings are two stories in height all with enclosed garages. The two-story
42 buildings are set back a minimum of 57 feet from the east property line adjacent
43 to the single-family residential homes. The unit size ranges from 1,518 square
44 feet to 1656 square feet. The project is providing common open space on the
45 northern and southern portions of the site, and each unit meets the minimum
46 requirements of 150 square feet of private open space. Here is a map of the R15

1 Zoning for the project site. Here is the Tentative Tract Map. This project, as
2 designed and conditioned, conforms to all development standards of the R15
3 Zone and Design Guidelines. The design of the building includes a variety of
4 color and architectural features. Let me show you some of these buildings. This
5 is the conceptual grading of the units onsite. Here is what the product looks like
6 in black and white. Okay. There are some colored elevations. The design of the
7 buildings includes a variety of color and architectural features. The architectural
8 design include stucco exterior with architectural features around the windows and
9 entrances to the building to break up the massing and add focal points to the
10 building. Other features also include concrete roof tiles, wood trim and shutters,
11 wood siding, wood trellises, wrought iron guardrails, covered balconies, and
12 stone veneer. The building elevations along Alessandro Boulevard have been
13 enhanced to provide visual interest from the street view. This includes the
14 addition of stone veneer to the façade. The proposed wall along Alessandro
15 Boulevard is being upgraded also with a combination of tubular fence on top of a
16 decorative block wall. Surrounding the area, the site is bounded to the north by a
17 concrete storm channel and single-family homes zoned R5. The existing single-
18 family homes zoned R5 are located to the east. To the south of the site is
19 Alessandro Boulevard and a mobile home park zoned R15. To the west is
20 Moreno Valley Unified School District Offices zoned O for Office. Let me go back
21 to the Grading Plan. Access to the project site will be from two driveways located
22 on Timo Street and from Chara Street. Both driveways are located on the
23 Eastern Boundary of the project. There is no access from Alessandro Boulevard.
24 Timo Street currently dead-ends to the project and will now become a private cul-
25 de-sac at the property line, which leads to the internal circulation of the units.
26 The project, as designed, provides a total of 158 parking spaces including 116
27 garages and 42 open parking spaces for residents and guests. Based on the
28 Municipal Code, the project requires a total of 145 parking spaces of which 116
29 must be covered. The project, as designed, satisfies all parking requirements of
30 the City's Municipal Code. Notification: A Public Hearing Notice for this project
31 was posted in the local newspaper on 1/15/2017. Public Notice was sent to all
32 properties within record of 300 feet on 1/12/2017. The Public Hearing Notice
33 was posted onsite on 1/13/2017. There was one call on the project, and there
34 were concerns with traffic on Timo. Obviously, currently, Timo is a dead-end
35 street and adding this project will increase the traffic on Timo, but no Traffic
36 Study was required for the project. Environmentally, Planning Staff has reviewed
37 the project and determined that the project qualifies for an exemption under
38 provisions of CEQA as a Class 32 Categorical Exemption, CEQA Guidelines
39 15332 for In-Fill Development projects. The project is within the city limits on a
40 project site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban uses
41 and consistent with all applicable General Plan and Zoning Regulations.
42 Therefore, Staff recommendation is that the Planning Commission certify that
43 PEN16-0119, Plot Plan, and PEN16-0120, Tentative Parcel Map 35429, qualify
44 as an exemption in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act
45 Guidelines Section 15332, In-Fill Developments; and approve Resolution No.
46 2017-01 and thereby approve Plot Plan PEN16-0119; and approve Resolution

1 No. 2017-02 and thereby approve Tentative Tract Map PEN16-0020 subject to
2 the attached Conditions of Approval. This concludes Staff presentation.

3
4 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you, Mr. Diaz.

5
6 **SENIOR PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – Thank you.

7
8 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any clarifications from Staff? Vice Chair Barnes.

9
10 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I have a question. Did you say that the extension of
11 Timo was private?

12
13 **SENIOR PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – Yes.

14
15 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Okay. The purpose of that is?

16
17 **SENIOR PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – We do have Transportation here to talk
18 about that but.....

19
20 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Did we not want that to be public?

21
22 **SENIOR PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – There is no fence or anything. It is open
23 but, yeah, the condominium would have to maintain the road.

24
25 **CHAIR LOWELL** – There is no perimeter fencing on the project?

26
27 **SENIOR PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – Yeah, but it is not a private community.

28
29 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – If I could have our Land
30 Development Staff add some input on this, I would appreciate it.

31
32 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER MICHAEL LLOYD** – Good evening Commissioners,
33 Michael Lloyd with Land Development. To make it a little more clear, not to
34 contradict what Gabriel was saying, but the extension of Timo, the cul-de-sac,
35 there would be a public street so it would fall within public right-of-way and
36 ultimately the City would accept it for maintenance as long as it meets our
37 standards.

38
39 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Okay, very good. Thank you.

40
41 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other clarifications? Okay, I would like to invite the
42 Applicant up.

43
44 **APPLICANT ERIC CHEN** – Good evening Chairman, Vice Chair, and
45 Commissioners. My name is Eric Chen. This is my colleague, Rick Wang.
46 We're with Creative Design Associates, which is the design firm for the project.

1 We don't have much to add to the pretty complete report, but we're here to
2 answer any questions that you may have.

3
4 **CHAIR LOWELL** – If you don't have anything else, I appreciate it. Thank you.
5 Any questions for the Applicant before we go now? No? Okay, thank you very
6 much. It looks like we have a couple speakers ready to speak. Mr. Rafael
7 Brugueras followed by Ms. Rochelle Ruth.

8
9 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – You may just want to say we're
10 opening the Public Hearing and then, when it's done, closing the Public Hearing.

11
12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I would like to open the Public Hearing. Rafael, please.

13
14 **SPEAKER RAFAEL BRUGUERAS** – Good evening once again Chair,
15 Commissioners, Staff, residents, and guests. I have made the Planning
16 Commission part of my life now as a retiree to make an effort to come to these
17 meetings to know what the City is bringing in and to help development and job
18 creation for our city and for those that want to work. Even if you're a retiree, if
19 you're not making ends meet, there are opportunities in this city to do that. This
20 is what I do. This is what I want to do until the day the lord calls me home.
21 That's my goal. My goal is to go through every case every month when the
22 Agenda comes out, so I'm talking to the residents now. This is to the residents. I
23 want you to sign up at morenovalley.org so you can get your Agendas 12 days in
24 advance so you can know what's going on for yourself and be your own human
25 being and know what's going on in the city without having to hear it from
26 someone else so you can be informed and educated like a lot of people are like
27 myself who become that. I go to these places to visualize what the developer is
28 trying to do for our city because they don't have to pick our city. They can go to
29 anywhere they want and invest their money, but we want to stop them in our city
30 so our city can have these empty lots, these big lands filled with houses, projects
31 of jobs, manufacturing jobs, places where people can live in Moreno Valley and
32 go work. I went to this place, and I couldn't believe it as I headed towards Perris
33 looking at where it was because I missed it so I had to go around and look for it.
34 And it was hiding behind the trees because it's behind the trees if you went and
35 looked. This is why I asked you to get the agenda, residents, so you can go for
36 yourself and look at the board because the agenda does not tell you the whole
37 story what's being built on these projects and how they profit the City of Moreno
38 Valley and the County because everybody makes a little income. The county
39 makes taxes, and we make revenues, and we have families that go to churches
40 and all these stores that are here in Moreno Valley. This is what we want to do.
41 We want to keep them in our city, okay? And that's how they become your
42 neighbors and friends. So I went to the site and, behold, I looked across the
43 street like Mr. Diaz mentioned, the mobile homes. I said that would be an
44 improvement for across the street for something that has been there for quite a
45 while. Then, I looked over to my left. I stood there, and I saw the School Board
46 Building. That needs an improvement with new site. See, this is not where

1 people are going to rent. This is where people are going to buy condominiums,
2 people that are going to live there and take care of it. This is why I support this
3 development to help District 3 in that area that needs improvement. And many of
4 you that live in District 3 ride down Alessandro Boulevard heading towards Perris
5 and you know what I mean.

6
7 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you, Rafael. Thank you. Rochelle Ruth please.

8
9 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – I have asked our media folks to
10 keep the clock running up there but somehow it keeps switching off, but they are
11 using it.

12
13 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Three minutes.

14
15 **SPEAKER ROCHELLE RUTH** – I understand what he's speaking at. I stay on
16 Chara and Timo. My question is, I have no problem with them building, but my
17 problem is why are they having the entry on Timo? Why can't the entry of this
18 unit be on Alessandro? The community is a very good area over there, but is this
19 going to be a secured building that they are building? Is it going to
20 have....because my house is right in the back of where they are building. Are
21 they going to change our backyard fence to brick? I don't know what they are
22 bringing into the neighborhood as far as how many condos or whatever the case
23 may be, but I just think that's the wrong approach to have the entry of the
24 building that they are trying to build on Timo. It should be on Alessandro. So
25 that's my question of the people that are building. Where are they going to have
26 the entry? Why is the entry going to be on Timo? Why can't it be on
27 Alessandro? We have.....it's going to be too much traffic right there for our
28 community. You're talking about a lot of condos there. I have no problem with
29 them building and also the paper that you guys sent out to all the owners of the
30 homes over in that area. I can count how many people received this. I don't
31 think it's fair. I think everybody in that area that they are building these units,
32 they need this so they can come and have their input of what they are building
33 there. I have been there for 20 years, and I don't think it's fair for some people to
34 receive this letter and some did not receive this letter. So I have questions about
35 that. I have questions....are these...is this condo....are they going to be for rent,
36 for sale? What is that? I need, we need to know that in that area. I mean, it's
37 beautiful that they want to build but our concern.....we have a lot of concerns.
38 Thank you.

39
40 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much, Ms. Ruth. Anybody else wishing to
41 speak on this item before I close the Public Comments? Going once, going
42 twice....okay Public Comments are closed. Would the Applicant like to respond
43 to anything they heard?

44
45 **APPLICANT ERIC CHEN** – Hi, yeah, I know...I think the question is regarding
46 Timo access. Actually, that is one of the things that the fire department requires

1 to access and actually Timo is not going to be the major access. Probably, most
2 of the people would still be coming from Alessandro. The thing that is good there
3 actually is good for the, I think the street, is that we're actually providing a
4 turnaround. If it were up to us, we actually prefer not to have anything there, but
5 I think it is good for the community to have the turnaround right there. And, also,
6 I know it sounds like a lot of units. Actually, the units that, I mean, the traffic
7 count that is generated by the residents is relatively low and, with the design, if
8 you.....truthfully, most of the people would go in and out from Alessandro, the
9 Chara Street, not the Timo.

10
11 **SPEAKER ROCHELLE RUTH** – No you don't live there. I've been living there
12 for 22 years. What I'm saying is Timo is four houses right there on Timo and
13 there is Alessandro, I mean Chara.

14
15 **APPLICANT ERIC CHEN** – Right.

16
17 **SPEAKER ROCHELLE RUTH** – So when you turn on Chara going to Timo,
18 there are only four homes right there. It is a very quiet area.

19
20 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Ma'am. You had your couple moments. We have your
21 questions. We will answer them for you.

22
23 **APPLICANT ERIC CHEN** – Okay, alright, I think that's it. Thank you.

24
25 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you.

26
27 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – There were additional questions that we would like to
28 have answered.

29
30 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I forgot your name. Could you come back up? We had a
31 question for you, Sir.

32
33 **APPLICANT ERIC CHEN** – Yes. Eric Chen is my name.

34
35 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Go ahead Mr. Sims.

36
37 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Thank you. So one of the other questions that came
38 up was are these units going to be rentals or are they going to be for sale?

39
40 **APPLICANT ERIC CHEN** – For sale.

41
42 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Okay. The other is what is going to be the perimeter
43 fencing treatment along the Easterly Boundary?

44
45 **APPLICANT ERIC CHEN** – We're proposing a six foot decorative block.

46

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Would that be sandwiched on top of the existing fence or
2 would the existing fences be removed and replaced?
3

4 **APPLICANT ERIC CHEN** – We probably could talk to the....we will build it so
5 we could talk to the neighbor if they are welcome to remove theirs.
6

7 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So a lot by lot basis?
8

9 **APPLICANT ERIC CHEN** – Yeah. Oh no, we will build.....
10

11 **CHAIR LOWELL** – As far as like coordinating with the various neighbors to get
12 theirs removed, but there will be a wall the entire length but.....
13

14 **APPLICANT ERIC CHEN** – Right, yeah.
15

16 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, and I had a question for Staff. Anybody else for the
17 Applicant? Thank you, Mr. Chen. Sorry about that.
18

19 **APPLICANT ERIC CHEN** – Thank you.
20

21 **CHAIR LOWELL** – One of the other questions Ms. Ruth had was the
22 notifications. That has kind of been a question that I have had for a while. I think
23 that we should expand the notification radius. I know, currently, we're doing 300
24 feet.
25

26 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – We do 300 feet. That's by our
27 Municipal Code standard. That's pretty standard from agency to agency. If we
28 follow that rule, if we draw the 300 foot line, there is always going to be
29 somebody just outside of that 300 foot line, but at least we're being consistent
30 form project to project.
31

32 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Correct and what I was thinking of was, for future reference,
33 maybe talking to City Council about amending it to the notification radius being
34 specific to the size of the project. So, if you have a large project like we have
35 had in the past, the notification radius could be extended to 1000 feet or whatnot.
36 Or, if it is a little tiny monopalm, it could stay with the 300 foot radius. It is just
37 something to maybe bring up to City Council moving forward.
38

39 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – I'm happy to do that. I just also
40 want to point out that, in addition to the 300 foot notification, all of our Public
41 Notices are put in a newspaper of general circulation. We also go through the
42 effort to put the sign on the site. Most of that posting with the signs on the site
43 are very large so that people driving by are notified. Doing all three of those
44 notifications is above and beyond what the requirements are so I just wanted to
45 make sure you're aware of that.
46

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I completely agree, and I know that you guys do go above
2 and beyond as far as notification goes. But, as far as publishing in the
3 newspaper, I don't know how many people in this room actually get the
4 newspaper anymore so it's just something to look at moving forward.

5
6 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – If I may, just one last thing on this.
7 We have a fee schedule that is set up that we do a Nexus Study to figure out
8 what the cost of development processing is. The Applicant's do pay a fee for the
9 Public Noticing and for the posting of the signs, so there's a cost involved. If we
10 did increase the radius, that is something that would have to be addressed in the
11 fee resolution. So it's not just a simple change. There's lots of things that go
12 with it.

13
14 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I think it's at least worth a look.

15
16 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Could I interject here? In the project that went up
17 behind my home, and you use the 300 foot, we only have 42 houses in that tract.
18 So only half the houses half way up my street got the notification, so it kind of
19 impacts that whole area so that's something else to consider.

20
21 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Vice Chair Sims, I'm sorry, Commissioner Sims.

22
23 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – I've been demoted.

24
25 **CHAIR LOWELL** – He said he had a comment but I looked at Jeff so I was like
26 wait a minute.

27
28 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – So I have a question of Staff on the...kind of to
29 address a little bit of this issue about access off of Alessandro because
30 somebody asked what is the street classification for Alessandro?

31
32 **CITY TRAFFIC ENGINEER ERIC LEWIS** – Good evening, Eric Lewis from City
33 Traffic Engineering. The street designation for Alessandro is a divided major
34 arterial.

35
36 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – So in looking at the Tract Map, it is about 285 feet
37 frontage on Alessandro, so for City Design Standards, would it even be possible
38 to have another intersection off Alessandro within the lot frontage on...for this
39 property?

40
41 **CITY TRAFFIC ENGINEER ERIC LEWIS** – Per current Design Guidelines, no, it
42 would not be enough street frontage to accommodate another entrance based on
43 the street classification.

44
45 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Thank you.

46

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Now Vice Chair Barnes.

2
3 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – That was also going to be my question whether
4 technically they could fit a driveway in and, per the Ordinance, they could not.
5 Regarding the mail-out issue, is it possible to publish the addresses that they get
6 sent to because I know there is a lot of confusion as to who gets and who
7 doesn't, but we never seem to know who was mailed notifications. If the list were
8 included, you know, a lot of people just throw out junk mail. It just goes in the
9 trash. So, if at least there was a record in the Project Report of what addresses
10 received it, then I think that would clarify for a lot of people.

11
12 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – I know that the Applicant's do
13 provide that information to us because we have to know who we're mailing it to.
14 We'll take a look at it in terms of what information we could send out. It may just
15 be the address. We want to be sensitive to the names of individuals and giving
16 out information.

17
18 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Right. I say strike the name and just identify the
19 properties that received the mail just so there is, at least, no confusion on who
20 got it and who did not get it.

21
22 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – We'd be happy to look into that.

23
24 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I think that would help in a lot of these cases.

25
26 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other questions or clarifications?

27
28 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Yeah, I actually have a couple of questions from the
29 conditions. P15, regarding landscaping in the median, says timing of the
30 installation shall be determined by Special Districts. That seems a little vague.
31 Can they just come back in three years and say okay you need to spend
32 \$100,000 and put in the landscaping or what's the point of that?

33
34 **SENIOR PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – Yeah, this is just a standard Condition of
35 Approval, and it defers to Special Districts on the median. They are the ones that
36 would maintain it or have the design on the median.

37
38 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Well doesn't it seem a little burdensome on the
39 developer to have that hanging over them potentially for years? Shouldn't there
40 be some type of determination as to what drives that?

41
42 **SENIOR PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – Yeah, it's prior to Grading Permits.

43
44 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Oh, okay. Well, they can't install it prior to Grading
45 Permits. That can't happen.

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – No. It says prior to approval of the Grading Permits. The
2 plan should be submitted but installation is to be determined.

3
4 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Right. So my question is, is it appropriate that we
5 leave installation indeterminate time?
6

7 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Is the median landscape installation done by the Special
8 Districts or is it done by the developer?
9

10 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – Typically, it would be done by the
11 developer, but we're going to have to get an answer from Land Development.
12

13 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay.
14

15 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I didn't know it would be such a tough one.
16

17 **ASSOCIATE ENGINEER VINCE GIRON** – Yes, good evening, Commissioner
18 Barnes and fellow Commissioners. Vince Giron with the Land Development
19 Division. We do have in our conditions the requirement to construct the median.
20 I believe it is under LD59A. The requirement to construct the median is in Land
21 Development's Conditions. All public improvements will be required to be
22 completed prior to the first occupancy. So we coordinate with the Special
23 Districts Division to have landscape plans submitted to them for review.
24

25 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – So the answer is it is not an
26 indefinite period of time because, before they are going to sign off and get CO's,
27 all these improvements are going to have to be done so it's going to be done
28 during the course of the project implementation, but it's not specifically identified
29 until the other.....
30

31 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Your microphone is off.
32

33 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – The landscaping would be put in
34 prior to CO, but the requirement to look at the plans, what this condition is calling
35 for, is prior to the.....
36

37 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Grading Permit.
38

39 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Grading Permit.
40

41 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Right.
42

43 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – So we're looking at what the
44 landscape is going to be at an early stage, but the actual installation goes in....
45

46 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Prior to Certificate of Occupancy.

1
2 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Prior to Certificate of Occupancy.

3
4 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – And the condition just says they will be installed prior
5 to Certificate of Occupancy?

6
7 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – We can work on that modification.

8
9 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – It just seems more appropriate. That was my only
10 question.

11
12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other questions or clarifications? I don't see anybody
13 raising their hand. Would anybody like to make a motion?

14
15 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Chair, if it helps because I
16 know there are a lot of subparts to this, it is okay to just make a motion to
17 approve the Resolution. It's not required that you read what those resolutions do
18 on every one. You can, but it's not required.

19
20 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Nobody is chomping at the bit to make a motion. Let me get
21 to the right page on this one also. Oh, we have a motion.

22
23 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I make said motion.

24
25 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – I'll second it. I'll second the motion.

26
27 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Is that a motion to approve
28 Resolutions 2017-01 and 2017-02?

29
30 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Yes.

31
32 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So we have a motion by Vice Chair Barnes and a second by
33 Commissioner Sims. All in favor, say yes. All opposed, cast your vote nay; any
34 abstentions. Commissioner Baker, and Carlos Ramirez is absent. So going
35 once, going twice.....the motion passes 6-0. Do we have any Staff wrap-up on
36 this item?

37
38
39 Opposed – 0

40
41
42 **Motion carries 6 – 0**

43
44
45 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Yes. There are two items that
46 you've approved with the two separate resolutions, one is the Tentative Map and

1 one is the Plot Plan. Both of those decisions are appealable to the City Council.
2 If any interested party wanted to appeal, there are two separate timeframes
3 though. I want to make it clear that, if anybody wants to appeal the action on the
4 Tentative Map, there is a 10-day appeal period. That appeal would be filed to the
5 Director of Community Development and, if such one is received, it will be
6 coordinated through the City Clerk for a Hearing within 30 days before the City
7 Council. If anybody is interested in appealing the Plot Plan, the appeal period is
8 15 days also submitted through a letter to the Director of Community
9 Development, and then we will coordinate with the City Clerk to have it on the
10 Agenda with the City Council within 30 days.

11
12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Sorry, I'm trying to get myself
13 organized up here. Okay, that moves us on....oh, I heard somebody say take a
14 break. Anybody want to take a break? Can we take a 5 minute break? What?
15 Just 5 minutes.

16
17
18 **BREAK**

19
20 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay welcome back ladies and gentlemen. Sorry about that
21 break. I would like to begin with the next item, which is Case PEN16-0092
22 (formerly PA16-0018) General Plan Amendment; PEN16-0093 (also PA16-0019)
23 Zone Change; PEN-0094 (PA14-0052), which is a Conditional Use Permit; and
24 finally PEN16-0095, which was also PA14-0052, Tentative Tract Map 36760.
25 The Applicant is Mission Pacific Land Company, and the Case Planner is Mr. Jeff
26 Bradshaw. Do we have a Staff Report on this item?

27
28
29
30 3. Case: PEN16-0092 (PA16-0018) - General Plan
31 Amendment
32 PEN16-0093 (PA16-0019) - Zone Change
33 PEN16-0094 (PA14-0052) - Conditional Use Permit
34 PEN16-0095 (PA14-0052) Tentative Tract Map 36760
35
36 Applicant: Mission Pacific Land Company
37
38 Owner: MPLC Legacy 75 Associates, LP.
39
40 Representative: Rick Engineering Company
41
42 Location: Southeast corner of Indian Street and Gentian
43 Avenue
44
45 Case Planner: Jeff Bradshaw
46

1 Council District: 4
2
3 Proposal: Legacy Park Project
4

5
6 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**
7

8 Staff recommends that the Planning Commission:
9

- 10
11 1. **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2017-08 and thereby RECOMMEND that the City
12 Council:
13
- 14 • **ADOPT** a Mitigated Negative Declaration for General Plan Amendment
15 application PEN16-0092, pursuant to California Environmental Quality
16 Act (CEQA) Guidelines; and
17
 - 18 • **APPROVE** General Plan Amendment application PEN16-0092 based
19 on the findings contained in this resolution, and as shown on the
20 attachment included as Exhibit A.
21
- 22
- 23 2. **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2017-09 and thereby RECOMMEND that the City
24 Council:
25
- 26 • **ADOPT** a Mitigated Negative Declaration for Zone Change application
27 PEN16-0093, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act
28 (CEQA) Guidelines; and
29
 - 30 • **APPROVE** Zone Change application PEN16-0093 based on the
31 findings contained in this resolution, and as shown on the attachment
32 included as Exhibit A.
33
- 34
- 35 3. **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2017-10 and thereby RECOMMEND that the City
36 Council:
37
- 38 • **ADOPT** a Mitigated Negative Declaration for Conditional Use Permit
39 application PEN16-0094, pursuant to the California Environmental
40 Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines; and
41
 - 42 • **APPROVE** the Mitigated Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared
43 for Conditional Use Permit PEN16-0094 pursuant to the California
44 Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, included as Exhibit A;
45 and
46

- 1 • **APPROVE** Conditional Use Permit application PEN16-0094 based on
2 the findings contained in this resolution, and subject to the attached
3 conditions of approval included as Exhibit A.

4
5

6 4. **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2017-11 and thereby RECOMMEND that the City
7 Council:

8
9

- 10 • **ADOPT** a Mitigated Negative Declaration for Tentative Tract Map
11 36760 (PEN16-0095), pursuant to the California Environmental Quality
12 Act (CEQA) Guidelines; and

13

- 14 • **APPROVE** the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared
15 for Tentative Tract Map 36760 (PEN16-0095) pursuant to the
16 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, included as
17 Exhibit A; and

18

- 19 • **APPROVE** Tentative Tract Map 36760 (PEN16-0095) based on the
20 findings contained in this resolution, and subject to the attached
21 conditions of approval included as Exhibit A.

22

23 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – Thank you. Good evening Chair Lowell
24 and Members of the Planning Commission. The Applicant has proposed a
25 project they refer to as the Legacy Park Project. The concept there would be to
26 develop 221 single-family residential lots in a Planned Unit Development on
27 approximately 53 acres located at the southeast corner of Gention and Indian on
28 the west side of the California Aqueduct. The project, as presented, will require
29 legislative actions by the City Council in their adoption of a General Plan
30 Amendment and Zone Change in order to change the Land Use Designation for
31 the 15 acre portion of the project that’s located on the east side along the
32 Aqueduct. The proposal there would be to change from Residential 30 to
33 Residential 5 or R30 to R5. They are also seeking approval of a Tentative Tract
34 Map and a Conditional Use Permit to create a Planned Unit Development. The
35 Planned Unit Development would guide the neighborhood design, it would
36 establish or guide the lot configurations, create park and open space, and also
37 provide a set of design guidelines for the project. As you noticed, Chair Lowell,
38 the project has two sets of case numbers. The project has been around long
39 enough that it is being tracked under two systems. Ultimately, when the project
40 is approved, we will referring to the PEN numbers as the case numbers for this
41 project.

42

43 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And, for clarification, the PEN stands for Planning
44 Entitlement Number? I’m getting a nod.

45

46 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – That is correct, yes.

1
2 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – I have also learned something new
3 then. I didn't know what that was. The design of the project includes some park
4 amenities and so consistent with General Plan Policies, our City's Master Plan of
5 Trails and Master Plan of Parks. The project will do two things. One will be to
6 complete the segment of the Juan Bautista de Anza Trail, which is a trail system
7 within the California Aqueduct. That will be constructed by the developer and
8 then conveyed to the City for maintenance. The project is also responsible for
9 constructing and conveying to the City a 2.8 acre size park, a public park, with
10 amenities that would include play equipment, a picnic shelter, a gazebo,
11 barbeques, picnic tables, benches, concrete walkways, and a decomposed
12 granite walking path through the park. The public park is located on the south
13 property line of the project site immediately adjacent to some ball fields that were
14 developed on the middle school site in cooperation with the City. The Planned
15 Unit Development for this project will establish minimum lot sizes of 4000 and
16 5000 square feet based on the layout and lot mix of the two conceptual lot sizes.
17 The average lot size for the whole project would be approximately 5800 square
18 feet. The Design Guidelines for the project, as proposed, would provide site
19 development standards. It was establish architectural styles for the future
20 residential development that would occur there, and they would also provide
21 criteria for community walls, fences, landscape, some of the hardscape
22 elements, and also identify the common amenities within the project, which
23 includes some passive recreation areas, pocket parks, and pathways and paseos
24 within the project. An initial study was prepared for this project to examine the
25 potential of this project to have impacts on the environment. The study provides
26 information in support of and also findings for a Mitigated Negative Declaration
27 for this project. The result of that initial study is that the project will not have a
28 significant effect on the environment with the implementation of mitigation. The
29 technical studies prepared for this project included an Air Quality Study,
30 Greenhouse Gas Analysis, Traffic Study, Cultural Resource Assessment, a
31 Biological Assessment, preliminary studies for both hydrology and water quality,
32 and geotechnical studies. Based on the findings of those technical studies that
33 were prepared, it was determined mitigation for this project would be necessary
34 for the categories of biological resources and traffic to reduce impacts to a less
35 than significant level. There were no other categories in that checklist that
36 required mitigation. A Mitigation Monitoring Program was prepared for the
37 project. That's attached in the Staff Report as Attachment 8. It's also attached to
38 the resolutions for both the Conditional Use Permit and the Map. There are
39 additional Conditions of Approval that have been incorporated into that
40 monitoring program to ensure compliance of this project with General Plan
41 Policies, and those Mitigation Measures relate to noise and cultural resources.
42 Public Notice for this project was provided in the newspaper 20 days in advance
43 of the meeting to allow for comment on the Mitigated Negative Declaration.
44 Notice was also sent to all property owners within 300 feet of the property, and
45 the site was posted for the hearing. As of this evening, Staff has received no
46 phone calls or inquiries in response to the noticing efforts of the City. Before you,

1 you should have a memo that is specific to this project. After the Staff Report
2 was prepared, we had an opportunity to work with the Applicant to discuss the
3 Conditions of Approval, and there were a number of conditions that Staff felt
4 would be appropriate to modify. Those modified conditions are referenced within
5 that memo including modification to one of the Mitigation Measures and so Staff's
6 recommendation would be to approve the project implementing those revised or
7 modified Conditions of Approval. There is quite a bit of detail related to this
8 project, but I know the Agenda is a full Agenda so I was trying to keep my
9 presentation brief. If there are any details of the project that you would like me to
10 revisit, I'd be happy to answer any questions for you. With that, Staff would
11 recommend approval of the project with consideration given to those revised
12 Conditions of Approval.

13
14 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you, I had.....

15
16 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Just for clarification, Jeff
17 mentioned a memo that was put on your dais. It is the salmon colored one. We
18 put a lot of information in your dais this evening, so I just wanted to make sure
19 you understood that one. The other ones are for the next item. Those are in
20 white.

21
22 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I didn't see it in the packet, but the California Aqueduct runs
23 right next to this project and to the neighboring parcel. Is there any plans.....or
24 are there any plans to make the California Aqueduct a trail throughout the City?

25
26 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – Yes. That is part of our Master Plan of
27 Trails and so.....

28
29 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I didn't....I guess what I was going for was in the conditions,
30 I didn't see any condition saying they would have to improve a portion of that.

31
32 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – It's in the Park Conditions. So a key
33 element of this project is their responsibility for completing those improvements.

34
35 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – If I could, I will just take the liberty
36 to ask Eric Lewis to give a little bit more information about the Juan Bautista
37 Trail. It is a very nice jewel within the community. It's being worked on, and
38 we've got some recent grants. If Eric could just touch on that for a second.

39
40 **CITY TRAFFIC ENGINEER ERIC LEWIS** – The Juan Bautista Trail,
41 approximately seven miles, is currently being looked at for its 35% plans for the
42 alignment of the entire segment. We've also received two grants totaling four
43 million dollars for the Active Transportation Program to build certain segments,
44 and we're just kind of building a segment at a time until it's completed. It is one
45 of the initiatives by the City Council contained in Momentum Moreno Valley to
46 build the entire segment say within three years.

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

3
4 **CITY TRAFFIC ENGINEER ERIC LEWIS** – Thank you.

5
6 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I'd like to, unless we have any questions or clarifications for
7 Staff, I would like to invite the Applicant up.

8
9 **APPLICANT JASON KELLER** – Good evening Commissioner, City Staff, and
10 guests. My name is Jason Keller with Mission Pacific Land Company, the project
11 applicant. Jeff did a great job of giving you the details and the background of the
12 project. I just have a few items I would like to elaborate on and just some key
13 points. Jeff mentioned we're proposing 221 lots as part of a PUD development.
14 We're looking at having two different neighborhood types, or two different product
15 types within that, which are the 5000 square foot lots and the 4000 square foot
16 lots; 145 of the 5000 and 46 of the 4000. Our process to determine this land
17 plan, we considered the adjacent land uses and lot sizes around the project.
18 Namely, to the north, we have a project that is under, not us. We sold a project
19 to a builder that's under construction. Those lots are 7200 square feet. To the
20 west, there are existing residential communities that are between 4500 and 5000
21 square foot lot sizes. And then, to the south, we have the March Middle School
22 and other R30 future developments. And then, to the east, there is the approved
23 commercial site that is adjacent to the Aqueduct. With the proposed lot sizes of
24 4000 and 5000 square foot lots, we were looking at trying to create a diversity in
25 housing product while providing a logical transition of land uses being adjacent to
26 the higher intensity uses. Namely, the commercial site to the east and the R30
27 future developments to the south. Jeff mentioned some of the park amenities
28 that I proposed as part of our plan. I'll just briefly kind of go over a couple of
29 those. The 2.8 acre neighborhood park, we worked very closely with Parks
30 Department in coming up with the amenities and design for that at least at this
31 conceptual level. The 3.5 acre Aqueduct Trail, which you just heard a lot about,
32 this will be a very nice amenity and also will be a nice buffer between our
33 proposed residential development and the commercial site to the east. Adjacent
34 to that, and that'll be integrated as part of the use, will be the 0.85 acre fitness
35 park that will have direct access from the Aqueduct Trail and be a benefit and be
36 able to be a good use that ties in. In addition to that, within the internal part of
37 our project, we have seven open space lots that'll be utilized for passive park
38 uses, paseo path connections that integrates to the DWR or Aqueduct Trail and
39 other areas for enhanced landscaping and entry monumentation. Those seven
40 open space parcels total roughly just under one acre. Some other amenity
41 features that we are offering that are not necessarily open space or park, we
42 looked at trying to create some different esthetic feels and looks within the street
43 sections. We have enhanced parkway landscaping that we're proposing on two
44 of the major roads within the development, streets D and L. By enhanced
45 landscaping, I mean a larger or wider landscaped section adjacent to the curb
46 rather than behind sidewalk so it kind of creates a break between the curb and

1 the sidewalk, and it's wider so it will have an opportunity to do more landscaping
2 within that area. L Street provides.....I'm sorry, back to D. Street. With the
3 enhanced landscaping there, we're trying to promote a path of travel that extends
4 from the southwest corner of the project at Indian. D Street kind of runs north
5 and then east through the project and then extends to the paseos so it provides a
6 nice connection to the Aqueduct Trail and the Fitness Park. So, with that wider
7 section on that side of the street, it will promote a path of travel central to the
8 project. Similarly, on L Street, we're doing similar expanded curb adjacent
9 parkway landscaping on both sides of the street to create an entry statement and
10 an enhanced look the full length of the street and that would be the north/south
11 street central to the project. To add to the enhanced look of the residential
12 collector at L Street, we have utilized decorative paving at crosswalks and one
13 raised crosswalk with decorative paving. These raised crosswalks, or the raised
14 crosswalk and the decorative pavement will have contrasting colors to the dark
15 asphalt. This will provide a traffic calming effect and to discourage speeding and
16 to create a visual impact alerting drivers to pedestrian crossings. And then, just
17 as a general overlay, we had the PUD Design Guidelines that provided
18 architectural guidelines to promote a high standard of neighborhood design in
19 architectural quality. That's about all I have for you for now. I've got a couple of
20 members from our consultant team here, so I'll be happy to answer any
21 questions you guys may have. Thank you.

22
23 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you, Sir. Any questions for the Applicant before he
24 sits down? I don't see anybody chomping at the bit. Thank you very much. I
25 only see one speaker. Is that accurate?

26
27 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST DARISA VARGAS** – Yes it is.

28
29 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, I'd like to open the Public Comments portion of this
30 item. This is going to be the last call for anybody wanting to speak on this item.
31 Okay, with that said, we have one speaker, Mr. Rafael Brugueras.

32
33 **SPEAKER RAFAEL BRUGUERAS** – Good evening Chair, Commissioners,
34 Staff, residents, and guests. Once again, like I said in the last case, that I make
35 an effort to go to each one of these places and stand.....no. I get out, I go to the
36 places, and I get out of my truck. I just don't drive by. I get out and look and step
37 on the dirt so you can see the mud on my feet. I do my job to make sure that
38 whatever we put in this city does not harm the residents of Moreno Valley. That
39 is my first priority and that includes your sons and daughters and your grandkids.
40 That's important to me because I have a granddaughter, and I look after her very
41 well so I make an effort. So, as I started down the street, down Indian heading
42 towards the project, I saw the school. I said uh-oh. What are they going to do on
43 this big corner? Because that's important to know what they are going to put
44 next to a school. So I drove into the block and I couldn't find the sign, so I made
45 my left down the street and I winded up on Heacock. And I said well I must of
46 missed it because I'm looking for a small parcel, and I didn't realize it was a 53

1 acre lot or acreage what they wanted to build on. Then, right next to the land,
2 there was already development going on. And I said, oh, oh, what are they going
3 to build there? Because I finally got to the sign, and I read everything that the
4 Applicant mentioned. See, this is what's good about going to the site. This is
5 what's good about going to the Agenda, to the packet yourself, so you can read
6 for yourself what's going on and what they are bringing to our city so you can
7 make an adult decision and an honest one to yourself first. This is what I keep
8 telling the city to do, the residents. Go out for yourself. Don't allow others to
9 speak for you. Don't do that because you'll miss the opportunity to see how your
10 city can grow. I got out, and I saw the 221 houses and, I said to myself, let me
11 go to the other side and find out what they are doing. And I spoke to the, I guess
12 the general manager that's inside the little trailer, and I got a chance to talk to
13 John. He told me they are going to build another 140 houses, and I said that's
14 wonderful because that'll accommodate the school, the new Walmart that they
15 are building right next to it, and the houses next door. But, residents, I want you
16 to think about this, 4000 and 5000 square foot lots. I want you to remember
17 those two numbers because they are going to be important in the next case,
18 4000 and 5000. Because some people are telling you something wrong about
19 the next case.

20

21 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you, Mr. Brugueras. Last and final call for speakers.
22 Anybody want to speak on this item? Nope? Going once, going twice.....Public
23 Comments are closed. Thank you very much. Mr. Keller, would you like to
24 respond to anything you've heard so far? No? Okay, thank you. Questions or
25 comments before we move to motions?

26

27 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Yes.

28

29 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Nickel.

30

31 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – I have questions that should probably go to Eric.
32 The way I'm seeing this, it looks like on the California Aqueduct, that they are
33 doing like little feeders that go directly into that commercial property or so that
34 there won't be fencing on that side, on the Walmart side.

35

36 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – If I could, I'll respond to that.

37

38 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Okay, whichever one.

39

40 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – There will be fencing along the Walmart
41 site, except for those instances where there is a dedicated connection into the
42 trail.

43

44 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Okay, so can you give me an idea of like how
45 many? Is it just one?

46

1 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – That I recall. There is an opening that’s
2 in alignment with the storefront where the future Walmart building would go so it
3 lines up with that sidewalk access across the front of the store, and I believe
4 there is a second point of access to the south near Santiago.

5
6 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – So that would be lot 172, 173, and 174 is where
7 that connector is, right? Okay. My other concern is, is Santiago being
8 considered to be added to the Master Bikeway Circulation Map? Gentian is on
9 the Bikeway Map that I have but, with the school site, that public park there, what
10 type of action is going to be taken on increasing circulation for bikes from the
11 Aqueduct through the park?

12
13 **CITY TRAFFIC ENGINEER ERIC LEWIS** – Again, Eric Lewis, City Traffic
14 Engineer. Santiago would function as a Class 3 bike route. It’s basically a two-
15 lane roadway.

16
17 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Thank you. I appreciate it.

18
19 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Baker.

20
21 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – I have one other question that kind of piggybacks
22 on that. I assume that trail is going to get extended with that property to the north
23 they are developing now. Is that correct?

24
25 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – Yes. Jeff Bradshaw with Planning.
26 That is correct. When tract 22180 to the north is developed, they are responsible
27 for completing those segments of the trail.

28
29 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Okay, very good. Thank you.

30
31 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Vice Chair Barnes.

32
33 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I have a question on the street section on Indian.
34 There’s a 10 foot landscape easement along the median that is outside the wall.
35 That property is privately owned, but it is not usable by the residents, correct?

36
37 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – Correct. It would be considered reverse
38 frontage parkway and so it’ll be developed, planted, initially by the Applicant, by
39 the developer, to city standard. And then with an easement over that area to
40 allow city access for maintenance through Special Districts.

41
42 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Alright. Why does the....why do the residents have to
43 pay that yet have no access or use of it? Can’t that be part of the right-of-way on
44 Indian? What functionally is the difference? Alright, my question was, the 10
45 foot easement along Indian Avenue that is privately owned but outside the wall,

1 what's the goal of having that privately owned but not useable by the owners of
2 the internal lot?

3
4 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – Well the....I'll ask maybe Public Works
5 to respond to the right-of-way portion of that question.

6
7 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER MICHAEL LLOYD** – Michael Lloyd with Land
8 Development again. Good evening Chair and Commissioners. With regards to
9 the right-of-way aspect, our General Plan dictates what our right-of-way widths
10 are. So, in this case, Indian Street is classified as a minor arterial. On the half-
11 width section from center line to right-of-way, it is 44 feet. So, anything above
12 and beyond that, we have to work a separate instrument, which is why we handle
13 it through the easement so that Special Districts has the opportunity to go in and
14 maintain it. So, from a purely right-of-way classification that you're eluding to, we
15 have to abide by the General Plan. And, like I mentioned, the classification is
16 minor arterial. Does that provide any clarity or?

17
18 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Some. I guess my concern is those people are paying
19 taxes on property that is outside their wall.

20
21 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – They are, but the intent I think is to
22 satisfy other sections of our General Plan in that their homes are backing to a
23 roadway, and the intent is to provide some passing space as a buffer between
24 the back, the rear of those homes, and provide an esthetic element to the project.
25 And so the placement of the wall is such that there is space or room for that
26 landscape to be planted and established.

27
28 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Well I can appreciate the desire for the buffer, it just
29 doesn't seem that those people should be singled out to pay for it.

30
31 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – This is a standard throughout the City,
32 so anywhere you see reverse frontage parkway, you're going to see that same
33 implementation of an easement area outside of the right-of-way in that buffering
34 landscape.

35
36 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Right. I don't agree with those either.

37
38 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – Understood.

39
40 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I guess what he was trying to go for is, is there another
41 mechanism of taking that land away from the owners, configuring it into a single
42 lot, and dedicating it to the City of the HOA with an easement over it?

43
44 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – If I may, to go along with Michael
45 Lloyd. He spelled it out pretty clearly but just, from a Planning standpoint, in
46 order for the City to acquire right-of-way you have to make a finding, a 65402

1 determination out of the Government Code. And your acquisition of the property
2 has to be consistent with the General Plan. If our General Plan does not dictate
3 that we want that on a right-of-way for the road, then we have to come up with
4 the other instrument that Michael has outlined. That would be one of the other
5 challenges so I don't know if that helps or not, but there are some requirements
6 in terms of the way cities can acquire property.

7
8 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – So the answer is we can't solve the problem so.....I'm
9 being sarcastic. I apologize.

10
11 **CASE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – The other option is the HOA
12 maintaining ownership of that area, and those fees would still go back to those
13 property owners through.....

14
15 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yeah, but it would be diversified over the entire tract versus
16 the few neighbors on the street.

17
18 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – That seems a preferable compromise, although not the
19 best.

20
21 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Our Land Development Staff has
22 a little bit more input.

23
24 **ASSOCIATE ENGINEER VINCE GIRON** – Yeah, good evening Commissioners.
25 It would have to be verified, but typically when an easement is dedicated to the
26 public, or the City in this case, that portion or that area that is dedicated to the
27 public is not rolled into the square footage or the acreage on the tax bill. I would
28 have to verify it for this landscape easement but typically the county or the
29 assessor realizes that the burden is the owners. It is very similar to how this map
30 or all maps dedicate streets. All the lots are dedicated. They are essentially
31 easements that are dedicated to the City. The underlying properties go out to the
32 center line of the street. However, the county or the assessors recognize this as
33 an owner's easement, if you will, on the properties and they do not include that
34 right-of-way or easement in this case as part of the assessment that's collected.
35 The landscaping for that, or actually I should say the assessment for the
36 landscaped area is collected via a different vehicle mechanism. It is through our
37 Special Districts balloting that just those property owners would be assessed
38 those fees in that tract.

39
40 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – So you're saying the assessors provided the net
41 acreage when he calculates the tax not the gross?

42
43 **ASSOCIATE ENGINEER VINCE GIRON** – That's correct.

44
45 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Okay.

46

1 **ASSOCIATE ENGINEER VINCE GIRON** – And, once again, I would verify....I
2 would go....we could look into it and see if this is true for this landscape
3 easement.

4
5 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Well it's an issue to me and, if it's an amenity to the
6 tract, I'd prefer as a compromise that the cost be distributed amongst all the
7 property owners and not just the ones that are giving up the property.

8
9 **ASSOCIATE ENGINEER VINCE GIRON** – At this time, no.

10
11 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Does anybody else have any questions or comments?

12
13 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – I did want to interject a little bit. In
14 the Staff Report, you may have noticed that the Staff did provide a little
15 discussion about the fencing around the park site. We have worked with our
16 Community Service Staff, and I think Jason did a nice job outlining all the
17 amenities of the development. What we're trying to achieve in the development,
18 is kind of an open feel. The fencing requirement that is put around the park right
19 now is at four feet. It provides some security or maybe some safety benefits, but
20 we're looking into what I call CPTED Principles, crime prevention through
21 environmental design. We're going to be hopefully getting some training on that
22 in the near future and, what we're looking for is the other techniques to still
23 achieve what we're trying to do with that fencing around the parks. We'll still get
24 the security, but maybe it could provide some additional openness. I only
25 mention that now because we do have a condition that talks about a four-foot
26 fence but, if time was to go by before this development relearned other
27 techniques, I just want to ask the Commission, do you think there's enough
28 flexibility in that condition that, if we came up with an alternate design and still
29 achieve that same security or safety objective but without a fence? Maybe it was
30 to berm it. Maybe it was to do some landscaping or something else, and we
31 could work with the developer when they are getting closer to the construction
32 phase. We just think that might be a better fit. The cost of the fence right now is
33 something that the developer has to incur but, if they don't have to incur that sort
34 of a cost, maybe it could be spent on some other type of amenity or eliminated
35 altogether. So I just wanted to see if you had any thoughts or input on that?

36
37 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Can I ask you which specific condition you're talking about?

38
39 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Do you remember the condition
40 for the fence? While he's looking for that, I hope you're noticing that the last
41 project, and this project, and we are still to have one more project in front of you.
42 Staff has been working very hard to make sure that we give you some really
43 good quality developments, and we're trying to work with these applicants.
44 Jason and his team have been very good working with us. It has taken a little bit
45 of time but, to come up with the treatment that they are looking along those two

1 streets, we think those are going to be a real improvement to these kind of
2 communities so.

3
4 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – I got one question on here.

5
6 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – PCS1A is the condition.

7
8 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Once again.

9
10 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – PCS1A, and it's on page 390 of
11 your packet.

12
13 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Which portion are you saying?

14
15 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – On page 390 of your packet.....

16
17 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Right.

18
19 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – It's the bottom paragraph,
20 paragraph E. It's close to the bottom. The last four lines of that. It talks about a
21 four-foot high tall wall. The Applicant is not objecting tonight. We've worked with
22 them. We've worked with the Community Services Staff. I'm just pointing it out
23 that that's the best we've come up with so far to kind of lead our interest, but we
24 think there still may be some room as the project gets into design.

25
26 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Why four foot? Aren't most security fences six foot?

27
28 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – It's kind of a compromise. What
29 we're trying to do is, if we put a six foot fence around that park, it then becomes
30 less inviting and the openness of the development and all the walking elements
31 that we're trying to get connection to the Aqueduct Trail we're trying to get this
32 ability for the homeowners to kind of walk around and feel like their in a
33 neighborhood. It's also right adjacent to the school site, which is not showing up
34 on the map right here, but the intersection Santiago and Emma Lane is a school
35 site so you've got this open feeling happening, and we didn't want there to be just
36 this six foot fence around this what we hope is going to be a really nice amenity
37 in the development so four foot was the kind of compromise.

38
39 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – So it's a security issue?

40
41 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – It's a security issue. Tony is
42 here.....

43
44 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – That's driving the fence?
45

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – He might be able to add some to
2 it.

3
4 **CHAIR LOWELL** – A four-foot fence doesn't really secure anything. The people
5 that would be hooligans in the park wouldn't really be mindful of a four-foot fence.
6 They would just hop over it. The people that would be mindful wouldn't do
7 anything anyways.

8
9 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – So we recognize that. That's
10 why.....

11
12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – That's who'd be going there are midnight to spray paint it.

13
14 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – That's why we pointed it out, but
15 we're working on trying to figure out what to do.

16
17 **CHAIR LOWELL** – The honest citizens that wouldn't do anything nefarious
18 would respect the four-foot fence, but the people that would do nefarious things
19 wouldn't care about a four-foot fence.

20
21 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – The other benefit of a fence, and
22 Tony probably has much more expertise than this but, if you see on there, there
23 is kind of a layout for a soccer field. There is enough room there for maybe a
24 pickup game. The four-foot fence actually kind of keeps the balls from going in to
25 the street and keeps small children from going out, and it still feels open. There's
26 some benefits. That's what we were thinking through, but I just wanted to point it
27 out just to try and get some kind of feedback from you guys.

28
29 **CHAIR LOWELL** – There's a park up off Sunnymead Ranch area that was wide
30 open and just recently was fenced in I would say about a year or so ago. And I
31 think the intent was to keep the burros out of the grass, but it looks like a prison.
32 It's just a six-foot tall wrought iron black fence. It's just uninviting. It cuts off the
33 walkway so you can't walk completely in a circle. You have to actually leave the
34 park to go on the walkway and back, and so I would commend any efforts you
35 could do to revise the fencing issues. And I think four foot, although isn't going to
36 keep the criminals out that are going to do horrible things, but I think it's a good
37 start to secure it for kids and soccer games and whatnot so, as long as it is
38 somewhat open, I am okay with it. Commissioner Sims.

39
40 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Doesn't the school that's directly to the south going to
41 have a six-foot fence around it to begin with so isn't the park going to be, by
42 definition, fenced on the south side? And I guess my followup question would be
43 is how many of the parks within the city are actually fenced? It almost seems a
44 little counterintuitive. I thought parks were for everybody to use. I mean there is
45 a security issue parks. If you fence them, they are really not accessible to the
46 public.

1
2 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – The one next to Moreno Valley High School, it's
3 fenced where all the soccer fields are.

4
5 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Like I said, I think anything you can do to help secure parks
6 would be great. I live by a park that doesn't have fencing, and it is tagged
7 regularly. People are trying to light the play structures on fire. They are
8 destroying things. A fence would be welcome in that situation but, then again, it's
9 uninviting. So you're kind of, it's a catch 22. You're stuck either way you go.

10
11 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – And that's why we're trying to
12 invite....we have a professional consultant that we're looking at bringing in to kind
13 of start identifying some different techniques maybe it's through, like I said,
14 landscaping. Maybe it's lighting. Maybe it's just different orientation. We're also,
15 in our Momentum Moreno Valley Strategic Plan, we've identified an initiative in
16 there to actually engage the public. So, at some point in the next year or year-
17 and-a-half, we hope to actually have a session with the residents to talk about
18 things like maintenance or eyes on the street or neighborhood watch. Different
19 things to kind of maybe start to deter some of that activity that's been happening
20 where people take better ownership of their neighborhoods and parks because
21 we want them to be open and beautiful.

22
23 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And you said that we're in process of hiring professional
24 consultants? Is that consultant here?

25
26 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – That consultant is not here, no. In
27 our Strategic Plan, the Momentum Moreno Valley, it identifies one initiative for
28 bringing in a training for our professional staff and then there's another initiative
29 kind of geared towards helping do some of that training for the neighborhood, for
30 the community.

31
32 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Do we want to add any kind of language to Condition
33 PCS1A that says the four-foot tall fencing or approved equivalent by the City or
34 some sort of flexibility that should the plans change, or the standards change, to
35 come up with a better solution before this project gets constructed. We have a
36 little flexibility to implement that new standard.

37
38 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – I think your suggested language
39 or equivalent actually provides that flexibility.

40
41 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Or City-approved equivalents. Something along those lines.

42
43 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – I'm just saying or equivalent. I
44 think.....

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Well equivalent could be that they so, oh this is our
2 equivalent, but it gives you the onus of saying yes or no.

3
4 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – City-approved equivalent. That
5 helps. Thank you.

6
7 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other questions or comments? Commissioner Baker.

8
9 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – On this, for Traffic Engineering, on this salmon
10 sheet, you've got where Indian and Cactus they've got an assessment of 12,586
11 at that intersection. How did we come about that? I'm all for it. I just kind of
12 wondered how that was calculated?

13
14 **CITY TRAFFIC ENGINEER ERIC LEWIS** – It's a fair share contribution to
15 improvements, so it's a percentage of traffic that's added to it and so, the
16 improvements that are needed to mitigate it, they pay a fair share. So there's a
17 standard formula for calculating it.

18
19 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – And the tract north of there is paying their fair share
20 too, right? I assume. That one that's under construction north of this one?

21
22 **CITY TRAFFIC ENGINEER ERIC LEWIS** – I couldn't speak to that without
23 having the conditions in front of me but, yes, that's typical practice.

24
25 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – That's the typical deal, okay, very good. Thank
26 you.

27
28 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other questions or comments? No hands going up.
29 With that, I'd like to entertain a motion. Would anybody like to make a motion on
30 this project? Man, nobody's piping up today. I'll make a motion. I beat you to it.
31 I'd like to make a motion to approve Resolution No. 2017-08 and thereby
32 recommend that the City....that's a lot.

33
34 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – You can just stop after the
35 Resolution number.

36
37 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Can we just stop after the Resolution No. 2017-08 as
38 amended?

39
40 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – And there's three others.

41
42 **CHAIR LOWELL** – What was that?

43
44 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – And there's three others as
45 well.

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay.

2
3 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – A total of four Resolutions.

4
5 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I would like to make a motion to approve Resolution No.
6 2017-08, approve Resolution No. 2017-09, approve Resolution No. 2017-10 with
7 the conditions as amended.

8
9 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – One more.

10
11 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Oh, I crossed that one out. And approve Resolution No.
12 2017-11.

13
14 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – As amended by both the sheet
15 and PCS1A, I believe it was.

16
17 **CHAIR LOWELL** – As amended by the memorandum dated 1/26/2017 on the
18 salmon color given to us tonight and the conditions as amended.

19
20 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – And the PCS1A amendment.

21
22 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And the PCS1A amendment. That was a lot. Does anybody
23 want to second it? We have a second by Commissioner Nickel. All in favor, all
24 opposed, any abstentions, cast your votes. All votes cast, going once, going
25 twice....the motion passes 6-0. Do we have a Staff wrap-up on this Item?

26
27
28
29 Opposed – 0

30
31
32 **Motion carries 6 – 0**

33
34
35 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Yes. This project requires
36 legislative action by the City Council so we don't expect there would be any
37 appeals. It goes to the City Council. That date has not yet been set, but it
38 should be within the next month or two.

39
40 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you. I'm assuming, since everybody is still here, this
41 is the Item that everybody wants to talk to. Unfortunately, I cannot stick around
42 to hear what's going on. I have a little statement here. Pursuant to Government
43 Code Section 84308, which disqualifies any Planning Commissioner from
44 participating in decisions affecting campaign contributions when contributions
45 exceed \$250 over the past 12 months, I personally have received a campaign
46 contribution from the Applicant totaling \$1000 over the past 12 months.

1 Therefore, I am recusing myself from any participation on this Item. With that, I
2 do recuse myself. I will pass the gavel off to Vice Chair Barnes, and I wish you
3 luck.

4
5 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you. Alright, at this time, we would like to
6 commence the hearing for tonight’s Case No. 4, which is the Ironwood Village. It
7 is a General Plan Amendment, Change of Zone, Tentative Tract Map, and
8 Design Guidelines for a 181 lot Single-Family Development. Do we have a Staff
9 Report?

10
11
12
13 4. Case: Ironwood Village - General Plan Amendment, Change
14 of Zone, Tentative Tract Map 37001, and Design
15 Guidelines for a 181 lot Single Family Residential
16 Development
17
18 Applicant: Global Investment & Development, LLC.
19
20 Owner: Ironwood 8 Properties LP
21
22 Representative: Anderson Consulting Engineers, Inc.
23
24 Location: Ironwood Avenue, east of Nason Street and west of
25 Oliver Street (APN: 473-160-004)
26
27 Case Planner: Claudia Manrique
28
29 Council District: 2
30
31 Proposal: Ironwood Village - General Plan Amendment, Change
32 of Zone, Tentative Tract Map 37001, and Design
33 Guidelines for a 181 lot Single Family Residential
34 Development
35

36
37 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

38
39 Staff recommends that the Planning Commission take the following action:

- 40
41
42 1. **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2017-05 and thereby RECOMMEND that the City
43 Council:
44

- 1 • **ADOPT** a Mitigated Negative Declaration, pursuant to California
2 Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines for General Plan
3 Amendment Application No. PEN16-0077 (PA15-0037); and
4
- 5 • **ADOPT** the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared for
6 General Plan Amendment Application No. PEN16-0077 (PA15-0037)
7 pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
8 Guidelines; and
9
- 10 • **APPROVE** General Plan Amendment Application No. PEN16-0077
11 (PA15-0037)
12
13

14 2. **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2017-06 and thereby RECOMMEND that the City
15 Council:

- 17 • **ADOPT** a Mitigated Negative Declaration, pursuant to the California
18 Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines for Change of Zone
19 Application No. PEN16-0078 (PA15-0038); and
20
- 21 • **ADOPT** the Mitigated Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared for
22 Change of Zone Application No. PEN16-0078 (PA15-0038) pursuant to
23 the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines; and
24
- 25 • **APPROVE** Change of Zone Application No. PEN16-0078 (PA15-0038)
26
27

28 3. **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2017-07 and thereby RECOMMEND that the City
29 Council:
30

- 31 • **ADOPT** a Mitigated Negative Declaration, pursuant to the California
32 Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines for Tentative Tract Map
33 37001 Application No. PEN16-0079 (PA15-0039) and Plot Plan
34 Application PEN16-0080 (PA15-0040); and
35
- 36 • **ADOPT** the Mitigated Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared for
37 Tentative Tract Map 37001 Application No. PEN16-0079 (PA15-0039)
38 and Plot Plan Application PEN16-0080 (PA15-0040) for the Ironwood
39 Village Design Guidelines pursuant to the California Environmental
40 Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines; and
41
- 42 • **APPROVE** Tentative Tract Map 37001 Application No. PEN16-0079
43 (PA15-0039)
44
- 45 • **APPROVE** Plot Plan Application PEN16-0080 (PA15-0040) for the
46 Ironwood Village Design Guidelines

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – We do, Claudia Manrique, from
2 our Community Development Department.

3
4 **CASE PLANNER CLAUDIA MANRIQUE** – Good evening. I'm Claudia
5 Manrique, the Case Planner for.....

6
7 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – You're going to need to move the,
8 yeah.

9
10 **CASE PLANNER CLAUDIA MANRIQUE** – Sorry about that. Good evening, I'm
11 Claudia Manrique, the Case Planner for the Ironwood Village Project. The
12 Applicant is Global Investment and Development, LLC, and they are requesting
13 approval of their Ironwood Village Project, which consists of the following
14 entitlements. They have a General Plan Amendment, which will amend the
15 existing land use designation from Residential 2 (R2), to Residential 3 (R3), and
16 Residential 5 (R5). Approximately 10.3 acres of the residential R2 in the
17 northwest corner will become Hillside Residential or HR. Here we have an aerial
18 of the site. It's on the north side of Ironwood. It is between Nason and Oliver.
19 The next slide is showing the General Plan Amendment, and we can see in the
20 northwest corner the Hillside Residential. The west half if the R3, and the
21 eastern half will be the R5. As part of the General Plan Amendment, the project
22 will amend Figure 4.2, which is the Future Parkland Acquisition Map and the
23 General Plan Figure 4.3, which is the General Plan Master Plan of Trails. The
24 next slide here, this is the Parkland Map. The red box is the project, and it will be
25 deleted from this map. The next one is our Master Trails. Again, in the red box,
26 is a part of the trail that will be deleted from this exhibit in the General Plan as
27 well. The Change of Zone will amend the underlying zoning from Residential
28 Agriculture 2 or RA2 to R3 and R5. Again, the northwest corner, which is Hillside
29 Residential, will remain Hillside Residential. The next slide shows the different
30 zoning that will occur. Again, the west side is R3. The east side will become R5.
31 The Change of Zone also affects the primary animal keeping overlay or the
32 PAKO. The next slide shows the project site in green, and it will be removed
33 from the PAKO area that is shown in the black hashmarks on the slide. Tentative
34 Tract Map 37001 proposes to subdivide the 78.4 gross acre parcel into 181
35 single-family parcels, and this includes 49 lots of R3 with an average size of
36 11,654 square feet and 132 R5 lots with the average size of 8359 square feet.
37 Along with the 181 units to be developed in approximately 38.5 acres of the site,
38 there is approximately 39.4 acres of open space throughout the proposed tract,
39 including the 10.3 natural open space that will remain in the northwest corner of
40 the site. The tracts proposed density is 2.7 dwelling units per acre. Though
41 there's a mix of R3 and R5, the density of the tract will be closer to the standard
42 for the R3. And, again, this does not include the HR portion of the site. The last
43 application is a Plot Plan, and it's for the Ironwood Village Design Guidelines,
44 which include the site development regulations in order to provide a cohesive
45 design throughout the whole tract, and this includes a range of housing
46 alternatives within the different lot sizes, different architectural styles. There are

1 a wide range of trails throughout the project. There's a park and, again the open
2 space features in the northwest and northeast sections of the tract, as well as
3 some water quality features along Ironwood are some nice landscaped basins.
4 The project, as designed, provides for a suburban lifestyle that's cohesively
5 planned and offers a wider range of amenities that is not normally found in most
6 of the subdivisions in Moreno Valley at this point. An initial study was prepared
7 by ESA in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA),
8 which supported the findings for a Mitigated Negative Declaration as proposed by
9 the project. It will have no significant impact on the environment with the
10 implementation of the Mitigation Measures that are required by the project.
11 There were various studies prepared for this project, and they include a Traffic
12 Study, an Air Quality Study, Greenhouse Gas Analysis, a Cultural Resource
13 Assessment, a preliminary Hydrology Study, Geotechnical Study, a Biological
14 Resource Assessment, a determination of biological equivalent or superior
15 preservation (DBESP), and lastly a preliminary Water Quality Management Plan.
16 We had a 30-day review period of the MND, which commenced on 11/15/2016
17 and concluded on 12/14/2016. We received 43 public comments during that
18 time, and they have been considered in preparing the final MND, which will be
19 available in time for the City Council. A written summary response memo has
20 been attached to the Staff Report by the consultant who will come up shortly.
21 City Staff completed a detailed review of the initial study and the MND and,
22 based on independent judgment of City Staff, the analysis fully addresses the
23 requirements under CEQA. The MND recommends 30 Mitigation Measures to to
24 reduce project specific and cumulative impacts related to air quality, biological
25 resources, cultural resources, geology, soils, hazards, hazardous materials,
26 noise, transportation/traffic, and public safety. The City complied with the
27 requirements of the State Assembly Bill 52, which required noticing in
28 consultation with the American Native Tribe Groups, and we have been in
29 consultation with four of the tribes. And all four have agreed on the Mitigation
30 Measures that are included in our Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
31 and, at this time, I would like to introduce Dave Crook. He is the Environmental
32 Consultant from ESA, and he will go into further details of the environmental
33 processes that we covered and also if I could have the PDF show #2 up on the
34 board please.

35
36 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – While Mr. Crook is coming up and
37 while they are putting up the slide show, I did want to point out that, on your dais
38 this evening, is three additional packets of information. Those additional packets
39 of information are related to what Ms. Manrique outlined in terms of the public
40 comments that were received on the Mitigated Negative Declaration between
41 November and December. There is a packet that has all of those comments in it.
42 There are also comments that were generated through emails or letters to us
43 between the appropriation of the Staff Report up until 1/24/2017, which we had
44 sent to the Commission in advance as best we could. And then, even after that
45 1/24/2017 distribution to you, we've continued to receive some additional emails
46 and some additional correspondence. Even up to the time that we took our seats

1 here this evening, additional information was being put out in front of us. So
2 sometimes that's kind of an information dump that's typical on a large project
3 where there is a lot of interest in the community. That's okay. The Staff has
4 done the best effort we can to review all of the information that has been
5 submitted in a quick and timely fashion. Aside from the stuff that's come in late
6 this afternoon or just on the dais this afternoon, I can assure you that we've
7 looked at it as closely as humanly possible, and we've shared that with the
8 environmental consultant who is going to be giving you a presentation this
9 evening. We're prepared to answer any questions you might have on that, again,
10 to the best of our ability this evening.

11
12 **ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANT DAVID CROOK** – Okay so, good evening,
13 Vice Chair and Commissioners. Again, my name is Dave Crook. I'm with ESA.
14 I'm a project manager, and I worked with the City to prepare the Environmental
15 Document that you've reviewed. I just wanted to step through a few things. In
16 the interest of time, I know we have a lot of people here interested in the project,
17 so I was going to try to be brief. But I wanted to step through kind of the findings
18 of the document, kind of the background of the environmental review process
19 and how we came to the conclusions we have in the document and the mitigation
20 that is included as well. So, just really quick, what we're going to cover, I just
21 want to say again my name is Dave Crook. We have several members of the
22 Applicant's Consultant Team here that prepared the technical studies that
23 Claudia mentioned that were in support of the Environmental Document. So they
24 can answer any specific questions that may come up with regard to certain key
25 issues that I'll touch on later. So I'll talk about the environmental review process,
26 some of those key issues, and then any questions and answers that might come
27 up from the Commission. First, as Claudia mentioned, the site is vacant. It is
28 about 75 acres that doesn't contain any notable biological resources.
29 Essentially, it has been cleared of a lot of vegetation that has been disturbed.
30 However, there are several drainages that do cross the site in a north/south
31 direction generally speaking. Also, as Claudia mentioned, the rock outcroppings
32 in the northwest portion of the site would also be preserved as part of the site
33 and will remain as open space, though the zoning would remain as it is, Hill
34 Residential. And no utilities are currently serving the site since there is no
35 development. The next slide, let's see if this works. There we go. I just wanted
36 to show the Land Use Plan. It aligns with essentially the Zone Change that
37 Claudia showed in her previous slide where you have the lower density on the
38 west side, the higher density products or lots on the east side of the project with
39 the open space in the northwest corner still preserved. Here is the Tentative
40 Tract Map, and I won't go into detail on this. I just wanted to show that the layout
41 of the proposed lots and the civil engineer may speak to this in his presentation
42 that follows mine, but I won't go into any detail on this. I just wanted to present
43 that for information. As far as offsite improvements, there are a number of offsite
44 improvements including right-of-way and other types of utility improvements that
45 would require offsite construction mostly of buried structures like pipelines. At
46 the time the document was prepared, there was not a decision still on where

1 some of these utilities would be routed from. So, in the interest of being
2 comprehensive, we evaluated the impacts of all of them in the documents. So
3 the disclosed impacts in the document address all of these areas and not just
4 one or a subset of those. However, we did note that, ultimately, some part of that
5 would be ultimately constructed, but we didn't know at the time what they would
6 be. So, hence, there's a number of offsite areas that we included for analysis. I
7 just wanted to touch on the basic prefaces of CEQA, which are essentially to
8 inform bodies like yourselves, decision makers of environmental impacts of a
9 project, not just the economic or social impacts or design aspects of a project but
10 to consider those in their decision making. Also to identify ways that we could
11 reduce environmental impacts either through Mitigation Measures, project design
12 features, or alternatives in the case of an EIR also preventing significant
13 unavoidable impacts by requiring changes in projects, like I said, either through
14 mitigation or alternatives say if an EIR is prepared. Then, although we did not
15 prepare an EIR for this, I'll go into that on the right side of the slide. If there is a
16 significant unavoidable impact, part of the law is to require that that is disclosed
17 and the reasons why the project would be approved if there were significant
18 impacts. However, as the process on the right describes, we went through all
19 this. We, as Claudia mentioned, determined that the impacts could all be
20 mitigated below the level of significance. Therefore, there is no need to prepare
21 an EIR. The technical studies and the initial study process led us to that
22 conclusion, and the City concurred. So essentially, the flow chart on the right,
23 what I wanted to just touch on, was that the City determined the project is subject
24 to CEQA. It is not an exempt project or it's considered a project "under CEQA"
25 that it did not qualify for an exemption as some of the other projects you heard
26 earlier tonight did qualify. So, as part of the process, we prepared the initial
27 study with the City and, like I said, the impacts were determined to be mitigated
28 below significance with the implementation of Mitigation Measures. So, on the
29 left, you'll see all the issues that were addressed in the Initial Study Mitigated
30 Negative Declaration. And you can see it's comprehensive. It covers all of the
31 issues. And, on the right, I wanted to touch on some of the key aspects that
32 Claudia already mentioned but that the ISMND was circulated for public review
33 for the 30-day period from mid November to mid December, and we received a
34 number of comments. However, as Rick said, the City is still considering
35 comments that have been received since then from the public including up until
36 today so we're taking a look at those as well. Based on review of the comments,
37 however, the City has concurred that, based on the comments received and the
38 documentation provided in the Initial Study, that the MND is the appropriate
39 document for the project. And a few of the issues here that we looked at were
40 more involved as far as our treatment of them was the esthetics and visual
41 resources namely views and visual character; construction effects related to the
42 neighbors, such as noise and air quality; biological resources; and drainage like
43 jurisdictional features like the drainages I mentioned and, as Claudia mentioned,
44 the DBESP addresses some of those resources; cultural resources; Native
45 American resources and, as Claudia mentioned, there was outreach with the
46 tribal groups, and they will continue to be involved; hydrology and flooding, the

1 basins that are going to be put on site as far as addressing those flooding issues
2 that currently exist. The project would address some of those and then, of
3 course, traffic. So we have representatives from a number of consultants that
4 work for the Applicant, as I mentioned, that prepared these studies including
5 traffic, air quality, greenhouse gases, noise, the biological resources, as well as a
6 civil engineer, and the hydrology and drainage. So, if there are any questions, I'd
7 be happy to answer them and, if I can't, we'll have some of our technical experts
8 step in. So, thank you.

9
10 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you very much. Commissioners, any
11 questions?

12
13 **CASE PLANNER CLAUDIA MANRIQUE** – Thank you, David. I'm going to.....

14
15
16 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Oh, I apologize.

17
18 **CASE PLANNER CLAUDIA MANRIQUE** – Sorry.

19
20 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Go ahead.

21
22 **CASE PLANNER CLAUDIA MANRIQUE** – Just to go over the public noticing.
23 The project was published in the local newspaper on 1/15/2017 and public notice
24 was sent to all property owners within 300 feet on 1/13/2017. We also did
25 expanded mailing to include the agencies that we sent the MND and, anybody
26 who commented during the MND review, also received a notice, as well as
27 posting onsite about the Public Hearing tonight. As of tonight, I have received
28 approximately 73 email correspondences, 9 phone calls, and 2 members of the
29 public at the Planning Division front counter in response of this project. Staff
30 recommends that the Planning Commission recommends that the City Council
31 approve the Ironwood Village Project. Thank you.

32
33 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you, Claudia. Do we have any questions of the
34 Staff at this time?

35
36 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – I do. Claudia, I got this packet late, and I was just
37 flipping through it. The December 13th letter from the Soboba Band of Luiseno
38 Indians and their concerns, has that been addressed?

39
40 **CASE PLANNER CLAUDIA MANRIQUE** – Yes.

41
42 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Okay, so that's addressed in what you were
43 talking about?
44

1 **CASE PLANNER CLAUDIA MANRIQUE** – The MND that was attached, to the
2 Staff Report has updated Mitigated Measures that were accepted by Soboba, as
3 well as the Pechanga, San Manuel, and Agua Caliente Indian Bands.
4

5 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Any other questions?
6

7 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – I have one. I'm unfamiliar with the Applicant
8 Global Investment and Development. Do they have any current projects going
9 on or anything that they are looking to develop other than this in the City?
10

11 **CASE PLANNER CLAUDIA MANRIQUE** – The Applicant is here who could
12 verify that. It is my understanding, no, but I'm not 100% sure.
13

14 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Okay, I'll ask.
15

16 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – As of right now, I am not aware of
17 any other active applications that they have submitted for development.
18

19 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – This is their first project?
20

21 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – This is the only active project that
22 we're processing from this particular applicant at this time, so that's our
23 knowledge.
24

25 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Alright, seeing no other questions from the
26 Commission, would the Applicant or Consultant Staff like to make a
27 presentation?
28

29 **CONSULTANT JEFF ANDERSON** – Yes. Thank you, Vice Chair and
30 Commissioners and Staff. My name is Jeff Anderson. I'm with Anderson
31 Consulting Engineers. I am the....I basically represent the entire team to present
32 the project tonight. Gotcha. That's usually not a problem for me, but I will try to
33 speak louder. Just, real quick, most of the team is here, myself and Anderson
34 Consulting Engineers, JLC Consulting. They are our drainage engineer. This is
35 a big part on this project. ESA, obviously we just met....talked with David Crook,
36 but we also have Amir Morales that was with ESA and handled all the biological
37 and the jurisdictional issues. Erwin Crossroads is here. Haseeb Qureshi is here.
38 He will address the TIA, greenhouse gas, air, noise, and quality; everything like
39 that, air, noise, and air quality. KTG Y was also one of the early consultants on
40 the project. They actually did the initial layout of the project that we followed kind
41 of we were able to work from as a key to kind of work for the project. EEI
42 Geotechnical did a lot of the initial subservice investigations. We also had Kane
43 Geotechnical. They are actually a geohazard consultant nationally recognized,
44 and they handled all of our rock fall analysis of the project. That was completely
45 evaluated on the project from the surface above, so above and below surface
46 analysis. Capital Leverage is Alex Ramirez. He is here. He handled a lot of the

1 public outreach and the coordination with the City as well on a lot of the issues
2 on the project. You see in the Land Use Plan, one clarification I want to make to
3 the Land Use Plan, the upper northwest corner, it is going to be designated.....it
4 was originally designated Hillside Residential. It is going to stay Hillside
5 Residential. It's not moving. Even though it is....there is ability to develop the
6 Hillside Residential, we are not including that development within the project. We
7 are basically doing all development off the hillside. And, again, we also are
8 leaving the open space northeast corner of the project as well, which has got a
9 lot of hillside and a lot of rock outcroppings we want to kind of avoid. Again,
10 we're processing a Tentative Tract Map on the project where we have detailed
11 quite a bit of the drainage analysis, as well as a lot of the grading analysis of the
12 project that will come in a little more handy when we talk about why we selected
13 the lots that we did, as well as you can identify in detail the buffers that we have
14 done on the project to kind of buffer from a lot of the community, as well as trying
15 to create more of a separation from the roadway area there. A lot of the
16 information you have right here is already kind of developed. It is in your packet
17 already. We have the 10 acres of designated open space. In addition, we have
18 another 29.3 acres of trails, neighborhood park buffers, HOA maintained slopes,
19 the drainage basins, and a trailhead, which was actually not mentioned
20 previously. The gross density of the entire project is to the acre, and the net
21 density excluding the natural open space that Claudia mentioned earlier is 2.7
22 DU per acre. Again, straddling the R3 versus the R5, there was a discussion
23 with the Staff to basically segregate the two zones so we could have specific
24 requirements for each of the two zones within the project that we're proposing in
25 the Land Development Plan. One thing that was also not mentioned, this will be
26 a private community, but it will be non-gated. So a lot of the trails and a lot of the
27 parks that are being provided as part of this plan will help meet the trails.....the
28 impacts we are having to the Trail General Plan, as well as making it open to the
29 community so they can actually utilize a lot of the trail systems inside the project
30 as well to connect to a lot of the regional trails that are proposed around the
31 project. Okay, so the project proposed, we have two city-maintained trails that
32 go along Ironwood Avenue and along Oliver Street. That is actually in
33 consistency with the General Plan of Trails. There is another trail connection that
34 we're going to have that will connect to Oliver and connect along the project and
35 then connect along the drainage channel to the top there, and it will then connect
36 with the Master Plan of Trails from the top as it connects right about at the edge
37 of the.....near the end of the drainage channel there. In our discussions with the
38 Trails Committee yesterday, the one discussion was that we may want to take
39 the trail, the north trail may actually go into the City as part of the Master Plan of
40 Trails. Tony had thought that was an option. What's interesting about that is,
41 while the trail system comes down and ties to Ironwood, the actual trails start
42 actually at Juniper and along Ironwood so this would actually.....this relocation
43 actually ties in a little bit better with the actual Juniper Trail System that starts at
44 Oliver and then heads east. But, in addition to those trails, we actually have all
45 internal trails, which will be a smaller version of the City's Standard Multi-Purpose
46 Trail. The current multi-purpose trail is an 11-foot-wide DG. We are proposing a

1 number of trails along the project that will connect every one of the cul-de-sacs to
2 the central trail system that goes up and down the project that will be, I guess,
3 smaller feeder trails is what they are called. But it will allow people anywhere in
4 the project to have access to the trail system without having to walk down their
5 cul-de-sac to the very bottom and out. Also, in addition, that was recommended
6 by the Planning Staff, was to create two pedestrian access points from the Street
7 A, which is the first street there down to the Ironwood Avenue. And we added
8 those including one of those, which will be an actual, over the basin, will actually
9 be a pedestrian bridge. Instead of creating two separate basins and a walkway,
10 we're going to propose an actual pedestrian bridge over the top of the basin
11 there. We also have notes of interest. This is.....again, we're open with trails to
12 talk about throughout the middle of the project we can creates some notes of
13 interest. They could be dog stations. They could be fitness stations. They could
14 be just about anything you can think of that we can kind of put along the middle
15 of the project. And also along the two locations at the base, at Ironwood, what
16 we're proposing to do is actually amenitize the City Trail System there by
17 creating kind of a park bench or something that the HOA would maintain that
18 could actually enhance the trail system as you're going through the area. So you
19 could have a dog station. If you're walking your dog along Ironwood Trail, you
20 could stop and then sit and actually there could be a dog station there to relieve
21 the.....water the dog or give water to the dog, sorry, or provide trash as well.
22 Another thing to note is the fact that we have significant buffers along the south
23 end of the project so we have, in addition to the City Parkway, we have the City
24 Trail, the 11-foot trail, and then we have a buffer that is either going to be
25 landscaped basins or will be landscaped open space that is anywhere from 65
26 feet wide to 130 feet wide throughout the entire project. So, as you drive down
27 Ironwood where a lot of your smaller lot projects with 7200 square foot lots,
28 which is proposing throughout the middle of the city, you see wall. Then, you
29 have the units. We're going to be setback quite substantially from the
30 city's.....from the roadway there. And then we also added a trail head at Oliver
31 and Ironwood that's not in the plan right now. That's not part of the General
32 Plan, but it will be added to the project. There will not be any onsite parking for
33 that but, since Oliver is going to be a collector, it would be.....there could be
34 parking on Oliver for anyone who wants to use bikes or to get out and walk or
35 meet, and we would be able to take advantage of that. We also have, last but
36 not least, an actual neighborhood park within the project approximately one acre
37 in size that we'll work close with the City to try to build that out and try to integrate
38 it into the entire plan. But, again, all that area is to be maintained by the HOA.
39 Everything in yellow you see here is to be maintained by HOA. The key thing to
40 note here is all the open space. Obviously, it will be the responsibility of the HOA
41 to maintain, but we also included a lot of the interior spaces. A lot of the interior
42 slopes will be maintained by the HOA so there wouldn't.....where we talk about
43 with a buffering that you see and, in the open space of the slopes, would all be
44 maintained by the HOA to make sure that we maintain the integrity of the
45 landscaping and the irrigation that would be required by EMWD for this project.
46 The only thing in question, obviously we have to change potentially is the trail

1 along the north would be....could be City maintained and chances are the
2 channel along the top there would probably be HOA maintained. We haven't
3 really gotten into that level of detail with the City Staff yet on that. Okay, we have
4 a pretty intense drainage plan for the project. We are reducing the peak flows
5 that are hitting the project by about 60%, down to about 60% of their existing
6 condition. Just kind of some numbers here. Currently, the existing road at
7 Ironwood was under design when it was originally constructed. The project to
8 the south carried on that same drainage design. In reality, it is significantly
9 deficient to handle the flows that are hitting that area right now. Three hundred
10 and fifty-six CFS is actually getting there. There is only about the capacity in the
11 existing three pipes for about 250 CFS. Our post-project design will actually
12 reduce that down to another 207 coming out of those pipes, so we are going to
13 reduce it substantially from what the existing condition is. So, at the end of the
14 day, we are removing 149 CFS from the overall project, which is a 42%
15 reduction, which is taking it almost below from a 100-year PQ down to a
16 10-year PQ, which is pretty substantial. We.....in addition, we addressed the
17 issues with the storm flows at Nason and Ironwood, which currently there is no
18 drainage facility there. We're going to be addressing that completely. And, one
19 of the big concerns that we have from a lot of the residents we talked to that are
20 south of the project, Joe Casanada had a field meeting where he walked and
21 talked with a lot of the residents that are impacted by immediate drainages.
22 Their issue was maintenance of the culverts. We brought that to the attention of
23 the City, as well as the fact that there is a lot of debris flow. Well, naturally, that
24 project would take all of the debris flow out of the, out of the tributary. And also,
25 at the same time, it would reduce a lot of the peak flows into the Nason Basin as
26 the Nason Basin, as you know, will be the recipient of a lot of the drainage flows
27 that comes from the Moreno Beach area and so we are reducing the impact and
28 providing more capacity with that basin. How we're doing it essentially is we're
29 using the three basins below. We are currently using 11 acre feet of storage
30 capacity. We have more than that available and, what we're going to create is,
31 special structures that basically only allow so much water to remove through the
32 basins where the rest of the water will actually pond into the basins and provide
33 ample capacity for virtually all storm flows, storm frequency flows. So it's a pretty
34 intense part, and we worked closely with the City Staff in regards to that. We
35 talked a little bit about the Water Service Plan. Just to clarify, David brought
36 clarity. We actually looked at three different alignments for the water line, and we
37 studied all three. We've selected two primary alignments. One up to the north to
38 Kalmia and then another one out to Juniper, as well as there's an offsite sewer
39 line. Just a point of clarification, a Sewer Plan was done. There is a requirement
40 in the tributary, the sewer tributary, for a sewer line to come across it. Exclusive
41 of our project, there is actually zoning that will require a sewer line, so we are
42 advancing the construction of that sewer line that eventually be required to come
43 across the deal there. The next question is why did we go to 10,000 and 7200
44 square foot lots? A couple things to note. One is we have a brand new high
45 school coming in within a mile of the project. We've done, as related to another
46 project we worked on, we had a study done where it looked at 42 high schools

1 throughout the Riverside County area. Every single area that high schools go
2 into changes the zoning. And, typically with high schools, come a change in how
3 the area functions. We're just part of that natural evolution that's coming with the
4 high school development. What we're trying to do is actually create a template
5 for the City to use as the area moves forward that will be something better,
6 provide a better transition for the area with all the buffering and things that we're
7 trying to do with the project. Secondly, for those of you who have been on the
8 site and you've walked the site or seen the site, you've realized that there is quite
9 a bit of hillside on this project. Typically, if you're going to do.....we would do the
10 smaller-type lots in an effort to try to reduce the amount of draining that we're
11 trying to do on a project, and you would do that will a smaller product. Ten
12 thousand is not a small lot by any stretch of the imagination to do grading design
13 with but larger lots will create a lot more slopes and things of that nature. A lot
14 more grading of the project, and so that's one of the reasons why we wanted to
15 go with a smaller-lot product in that area. Anyways, we like to think.....we like to
16 believe that, with the amount of area that we're setting aside the project within
17 the project and the clustering that we're doing, we're trying to provide a variety of
18 product within the community in this area that will provide unique housing
19 opportunities in addition to the additional housing opportunities that are in the
20 area. Lastly, is team work. A lot of the plan that you see here has been a
21 product of a lot of communication we've had with the City in a variety of areas, as
22 well as all of our consultant team to try to develop the best plan we possibly
23 could. Staff has been gracious and has spent quite a bit of time with us to kind of
24 work a lot of these issues out. With that, I have the entire, virtually the entire
25 consultant team here to answer any questions you might have.

26

27 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thanks very much Jeff. Any questions?

28

29 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – You know, you were showing the high school,
30 the density and all that. I guess I'm still confused on this as to why this project
31 has to have the smaller lot sizes. You've got property there. Why not just build
32 the appropriate houses on that lot size, and there is no issue? That's.....I
33 just.....we will get to this I'm sure with the comments, but it seems like we're
34 always trying to squish things in in this city into places, and this is a very pristine
35 area. I drive through.....I don't live there, but I drive through every day. I guess I
36 don't understand why you just can't build the houses that you can build in that
37 area and why it has to be high density.

38

39 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – If I might, if we save the deliberation until after we
40 hear the public comments so that we can incorporate all of that into the
41 discussion, I think.....

42

43 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – I will wait.

44

45 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Yes. I appreciate it. You're welcome to respond if
46 you'd like.

1
2 **CONSULTANT JEFF ANDERSON** – No. I imagine we’re going to have other
3 problems but, to answer your question, personally the issue that you’re going to
4 have a lot with these larger lots on a project like this is a number of things. One,
5 the drainage solution that needs to be solved on this project will be extensive.
6 Public safety is a very important aspect to the City of Moreno Valley, which is
7 why they gave us the direction that they did on the drainage basins and the
8 significant amount of drainage that we’re going to be adding to the project that
9 would be required. There is also a relatively significant level of infrastructure
10 required for this project. In doing so, as well as the fact that there would be a
11 rather intense grading analysis, the grading requirement to do and to go with the
12 larger lots could create a higher grading create almost a worst condition
13 potentially that we could ever propose. That’s why we chose these lot sizes in
14 configuration to those areas but, with the drainage conditions you have on the
15 site, trying to resolve that with a larger lot size, the smaller density that you’re
16 talking about, it may be difficult for us.....it would be difficult for any project to
17 actually proceed with that type of design. We doubt that the City is looking to not
18 develop projects. We thought this was a nice blend between the two to meet
19 those requirements.

20
21 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Everyone will get their opportunity to speak so if we
22 could please respect everybody’s time. Thank you.

23
24 **CONSULTANT JEFF ANDERSON** – Thanks.

25
26 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Any questions, Commissioners?

27
28 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – I’ll hold my questions until after so the people
29 have a chance to speak.

30
31 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Well I’d like to hear a brief summary from the traffic
32 engineers to the high points of the study and the Mitigation Measures if we could
33 get something from them.

34
35 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – While he’s coming up, Vice Chair,
36 before you go to Public Comments, I had a couple more things to say.

37
38 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Okay, thank you.

39
40 **URBAN CROSSROADS HASEEB QURESHI** – Good evening, Vice Chair and
41 Planning Commissioners. My name is Haseeb Qureshi from Urban Crossroads.
42 Can everybody hear me? So brief overview of the Traffic Study. The Traffic
43 Impact Analysis was prepared consistent with City of Moreno Valley
44 Transportation Engineering Division’s Traffic Study Guidelines and other traffic
45 studies that have been prepared in the City of Moreno Valley, as well as the
46 County of Riverside so following standard engineering practice in the area. The

1 study area that was evaluated includes all intersections that are designated as
2 collector higher streets or un-collector higher streets where the project adds 50 or
3 more peak hour trips. The 50 peak-hour trip criteria is consistent with
4 methodology employed by the City of Moreno Valley and other jurisdictions
5 throughout Riverside County, and it generally represents a threshold of trips at
6 which typical intersections would be impacted at. The projects potential impacts
7 to traffic were assessed for existing conditions, opening air conditions, opening
8 air cumulative conditions, and horizon or general plan build-out conditions.
9 Improvements were recommended where applicable to maintain acceptable
10 levels of service at all study area intersections. There are two Mitigation
11 Measures that area required by the project. One is to provide traffic calming
12 measures onsite at the A Street that goes east-west on the project property and
13 that was in consultation with the City. There was a desire to put in traffic calming
14 measures to ensure that cars don't speed as they go into the development and
15 go from one side to the other. The second condition was that the project
16 applicant would participate in the funding of offsite improvements including any
17 signals that were needed and pay their fair share of TUMF and DIF and, if the
18 improvements are not in TUMF or DIF, they would pay their fair share at those
19 intersections.

20

21 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – So no physical improvements beyond the project
22 limits?

23

24 **URBAN CROSSROADS HASEEB QURESHI** – Well the project is, like I said,
25 paying its fair share at intersections where it's impacted.

26

27 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – And one question, can you speak to in general terms
28 of the difference in traffic impacts between the current zoning and the proposed
29 density?

30

31 **URBAN CROSSROADS HASEEB QURESHI** – Sure. So that's all.....the
32 analysis that we did obviously is for the project that's before you today. It's
33 important to just understand that, even without the project, for example, the only
34 impacted scenario was long-range or general plan build-out conditions, and it
35 was one intersection that was impacted. It is important to note that, even without
36 this project, let's say this project didn't come before you today, that one
37 intersection would still be impacted even without the project. So, with this project
38 going in, it's contributing to that existing cumulative impact that occurs in the
39 long-range condition, and there are Mitigation Measures that are going to solve
40 that. So, whether this project is developed as proposed today, or it would be
41 developed consistent with the zoning that exists, that impact would occur and
42 mitigation would be required.

43

44 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you. Any other questions for Staff or the
45 Applicant?

46

1 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – I'll hold for now.

2
3 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Alright.

4
5 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – But I got them.

6
7 **URBAN CROSSROADS HASEEB QURESHI** – Well I'm not too tired to answer
8 any questions.

9
10 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Alright, Mr. Sandzimier.

11
12 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Yes, I just wanted to cover one
13 more thing. In this particular project, because there are legislative actions that
14 are going to be required, you guys are serving as an advisory body to the City
15 Council so the City Council will be the final decision maker on the project. Why is
16 that important? Well, the final decision-making body will have to consider all of
17 the comments that are being made here today, all of the comments that were
18 made on the environmental document. There has been a lot of communication in
19 the emails that we sent to you, and some of the comments are with regard to
20 those comments may not have fully been considered by you guys. Well, we've
21 given you the opportunity to consider them, but they also need to be considered
22 by the City Council. There's also been some comments with regard to other
23 advisory bodies or committees or commissions that the City works with and why
24 this project may not have been taken to them. One in particular was some
25 comments that came in, I think it was today or yesterday, with regard to the
26 Environmental Historic Preservation Board. This project does not trigger the
27 need to go to the Environmental Historic Preservation Board, so it has been a
28 consideration but it was not necessary. There are projects that we are taking to
29 the Environmental Historic Preservation Board, which are typically the ones that
30 do have a full EIR associated with them or they are land uses that are dealing
31 with hazardous materials of some sort, and this does not qualify on either of
32 those accounts. Then, also in our Staff presentation, we missed to tell you that,
33 last night, we did actually go before the Recreation Trails Board and so we spent
34 about an hour-and-a-half. The Applicant made a presentation to the Recreation
35 Trails Board. Tony Hetherman from our Parks and Community Services
36 Department is here who can probably elaborate a little bit more on that
37 discussion, but the focus of that was to talk about the modification to the Master
38 Plan of Trails. It was a full discussion and, at the end of that, the Recreation
39 Trails Board has asked for that to come back to them so that they can have a
40 final determination before it goes to the City Council. Their final recommendation
41 does not need to come to this body because you're serving in an advisory
42 capacity. They are also serving in an advisory capacity to the City Council, so I
43 just wanted to let you know that we are working with that recommendation from
44 them last night. Tony Hetherman will be setting up a meeting. I think the
45 expectation was within about a 30-day period so I just wanted to make sure that
46 the Commission was aware of that activity. Thank you.

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

VICE CHAIR BARNES – Thank you. I think that concludes the Staff Report and the Applicant and Consultants presentation, so the next item on the Agenda is Public Comments. Before we begin that, it's 10 minutes to 10:00. There's almost 30 people wishing to speak. That's going to be an hour-and-a-half if everybody gets their three minutes plus the time between so we're looking at two hours of public testimony. What I'm suggesting, what I'm going to suggest and I'd like some input from the Commission, is that we hear the public testimony and then continue the hearing because that's going to get us close to midnight. We continue the hearing for our deliberation to the next available hearing. Does anybody have any thoughts on that?

COMMISSIONER KORZEC – I think it's a good idea because our deliberation is probably going to take a long time.

VICE CHAIR BARNES – I foresee us having a fair amount of discussion, so it seems reasonable. Rick.....what I'm saying is that you will be allowed to speak. We will take all your testimony. Then we will continue the hearing, and we will postpone our conversation until the next meeting.

COMMISSIONER SIMS – I mean, I would prefer to hear what has to be said. I mean, if we're in for a penny, we're in for a pound. Let's just power through it. Everybody's here. Let's just go through it.

COMMISSIONER KORZEC – Yeah, I want to power through it, but I want to make sure we do good deliberation on this and we don't slam it down.....

COMMISSIONER SIMS – I absolutely.....

COMMISSIONER KORZEC – I'm just being....I don't know. Are we going to be wide awake at midnight to have a good deliberation?

COMMISSIONER SIMS – Well we can see.

COMMISSIONER KORZEC – I'm looking at you.

COMMISSIONER SIMS – Whoa, whoa, mucho take it easy.

COMMISSIONER KORZEC– No because you're the one that said you're tired.

COMMISSIONER SIMS – I suggest we see how we feel when we get through the public comments.

VICE CHAIR BARNES – Reasonable? Alright.

COMMISSIONER NICKEL – Reasonable.

1
2 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Alright, reasonable.

3
4 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Compromised solution. Alright.

5
6 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Alright, we'll see how we feel.

7
8 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – We'll take a 5 minute break and then we will start
9 the.....we will open the Public Hearing for comments. Thank you very much.

10
11
12 **BREAK**

13
14
15 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – At this point, I'd like to reconvene the meeting.
16 Everyone can take your seats and thank you. Alright, so to continue the
17 discussion from prior to the adjournment, or the recess rather, we will now open
18 the Public Hearing portion of the meeting. Our standard practice is to allow three
19 minutes per speaker. As I said, we are going to be here very late so, if anyone
20 would like to co-mingle their comments or share their comments and have one
21 person speak for a group, it would save everybody's time. You're still counted as
22 a speaker, and it would get us to deliberation much quicker. The other question
23 that I was asked is, since it is getting a little late, if anyone has to leave would
24 anyone have any objection to someone moving to the head of the line? And, if
25 everyone is okay with that, could you raise your hand if we juggle the order
26 because some people have requested to speak early because they have to work
27 real early or.....

28
29 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Or they have young children.

30
31 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – So just raising of hands, are you okay with some
32 people moving to the head of the line? That appears to be a majority so, if you
33 have a compelling reason that you would like to speak.....

34
35 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – First.

36
37 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Early could you raise your hand and come forward
38 and line up there near the door. Okay. If you two guys could come forward and
39 be the initial speakers and then see if we can keep track of that.

40
41 **SPEAKER SUSAN ZEITZ** – Hi. I'm Susan Zeitz, 26386 Ironwood. I don't know
42 if we have to do that. Resident since 1984. I'm against changing the R2 zoning
43 at the northeast corner of Ironwood and Nason. The northeast area of Moreno
44 Valley Zoning should reflect the rural nature of our area by maintaining this R2
45 and larger properties. Rezoning this area would mean that other large properties
46 will want to rezone too, and it will bring us back here again and again to try to

1 retain our rural lifestyle. Draw the line. March 23, 2006, the City Council votes to
2 uphold original zoning and keeping with larger properties in the northeast and the
3 east end of Moreno Valley. Commissioner Geller said there is nothing wrong
4 with zoning the way it is. If it's not economical to build one house per acre, then
5 they won't be built. I don't see any reason to change the zone. Commissioner
6 De Jong said the current zone is fine. Commissioner Merkt agreed there was no
7 compelling reason to change the zoning. Vice Chair Riechers said the parcels
8 had a closer affinity to the parcels in the northeast and south than it did to the R2
9 parcels to the west. Commissioner Dozier pointed out that the line between R2s
10 and the R1s is the housing tract to the west referring to Vista De Cerros. He
11 said, well that's a good place to draw the line. I agree with my fellow
12 Commissioners. I don't see the need for a zone change, and I won't vote for a
13 zone change. Commissioner Geller made two motions. The Planning
14 Commission denied the change from R1 to R2 due to environmental impacts and
15 that the Planning Commission denied the change from R1 to R2 as incompatible
16 with the area. The vote was 7-0 in favor of denying the Zone Change on both
17 motions. I agree with them. The line dividing small parcels from larger ones
18 should be the west property line of the homes on Vista De Cerros in order to
19 maintain the rural nature of our area to the east of that line. Buyers shouldn't be
20 able to change a zoning to make their project fit. They should buy a property
21 that's zoned fit their project. We don't want urban lifestyle development HOA
22 closed to outside residents in rural Moreno Valley. The MND and Biological
23 Resources Report do not recognize this seep and until.....I'm sorry. The
24 northwest corner of this property has an increasingly rare natural resource water,
25 a seep. The MND and Biological Resources Report do not recognize this seep
26 and, until this is characterized in the MND, it's inadequate. I first saw this seep in
27 1984, but it could be as old as the hills. I don't know, and I was even there
28 during the drought, so a seep is a puddle or moist or wet place where water,
29 usually groundwater, reaches the earth's surface from an underground aquifer
30 and is important to wildlife, bird, butterfly habitats moisture needs. Natural seeps
31 help the local wildlife survive, especially as this one doesn't dry up during the
32 drought. As we continue to encroach upon our natural resources valuable to our
33 native plants and wild inhabitants, the fox, bird, bobcats, all of the mountain lions,
34 coyotes, rabbits; we have grey-horned owls, barn owls, hawks, and others that
35 live here and not only depend on this water to drink but for their prey who needs
36 that water to drink too. Any disturbance to this area will ruin this seep.
37 Disturbance in high-density housing will also prevent wildlife from using it. What
38 are the landscape and the hills and the rock formations? I believe a full EIR
39 would concur that parcels any smaller than R2 would be an atrocity to this
40 property. Since the beginning, the northeast areas in Moreno Valley have been
41 zoned for large properties in order to keep this area rural and unique from other
42 areas in our City. Doing so has made it a desirable and sought after place to
43 live. Here, there is plenty of room between homes. We can see the hills on the
44 horizons. We can see and hear the coyotes, and we share our environment with
45 all the wild animals who were here first. Draw the line. Once pristine land is
46 covered in cement, it's gone forever. I'd like.....

1
2 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Your three minutes are up.

3
4 **SPEAKER SUSAN ZEITZ** – Okay.

5
6 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you very much.

7
8 **SPEAKER CAROLE NAGENGAST** – Good evening and thank you for allowing
9 me to come to the front of the line. One of our earlier speakers when we first
10 arrived.....

11
12 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – State your name please.

13
14 **SPEAKER CAROLE NAGENGAST** – Sorry. My name is Carole Nagengast. I
15 live at 26410 Ironwood Avenue, less than a quarter-mile from this proposed
16 development.

17
18 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you.

19
20 **SPEAKER CAROLE NAGENGAST** – I have lived there for 44 years. I've seen
21 change in what we used to call Sunnymead. It used to be unincorporated
22 county, and change is not a bad thing by any means. One of our earlier
23 speakers made reference to the inevitability of change, and I certainly subscribe
24 to that view. But we ought to be careful about what we wish for. Change that's
25 planned. Change that has a long-term plan. You are a Planning Commission,
26 no? You are supposed to be looking at a General Plan that takes into account
27 the fact that Moreno Valley has different kinds of these land uses. We have
28 semi-rural use. We have urban use. We have and should have rental
29 properties, and we should and do have condominiums. But to let the camel get
30 its nose under the tent by not adhering to our General Plan, by setting aside our
31 General Plan just this once is to open the door to the possibility that there will be
32 no more or rural or semi-rural land left in Moreno Valley, and that would be a
33 shame not only for me, I live there, but a shame for all the people of Moreno
34 Valley past, present, and future. I strongly agree that we need a full
35 environmental report here, that it ought to take into account the biology of the
36 water seeps, of the Native American concerns. I am heartened to hear that four
37 Native American Groups have agreed to mitigation. I think that's a positive thing,
38 and I speak now as a cultural anthropologist of many years. That needs more
39 careful looking not just a rubber stamp by Soboba or by the other tribes in
40 question. I think it needs careful look, and it's up to the Planning Commission to
41 make the proper full and complete mitigation recommendations. I don't think that
42 yet has been done. Thank you.

43
44 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you. There was a gentleman who wanted to
45 speak. He had to leave due to work. Is he still here? Alright. That's not the
46 one, but we'll roll with it. Yes.

1
2 **SPEAKER JOE LOCKHART** – Good evening everybody, my name is Joe
3 Lockhart. I live directly across the street from this trail head. I look out every
4 morning for the last 26+ years, and I see those hills from my bed. I look out in
5 my backyard, I see those hills. I see that beautiful meadow. It's going to be
6 destroyed. The whole area. You start bringing in multi-density homes like they
7 are talking about. Why do they have this or that? It doesn't make any sense.
8 The high-density five per acre here and the three over there doesn't make any
9 sense. Okay? They want to bring in the sewer right down beside my house,
10 across the street, and under the freeway. That's going to open up the lot to the
11 east of me and also the lot from the Oliver to Moreno Beach Drive on the north
12 side and everything all the way down past Calvary Chapel, all those homes.
13 Everybody's got half acres for a reason, at least a half acre. Some have more,
14 right? How many are for the proposed plan? Okay, nobody. How many are
15 against development of that area at half acres? See, there we go. Nothing
16 wrong with that, right? It's.....I get what the developers want to do. I'm a
17 contractor myself. I want to make money. I'm estimating this has got to be what,
18 \$40 million to \$70 million, somewhere in that range, project overall. And they
19 were telling me about \$400,000 per home so that's about \$46,000 plus. They
20 want to make money. That's why you put more homes on smaller lots. That's
21 why we have so many two-story homes. It's cheaper to build a two-story house
22 than a one-story house. You have less concrete. You know, a lot of different
23 things. You have larger land, so you can put a lot more homes on a small lot and
24 you can just build them up. And then I don't want to look out of my bedroom
25 window and see a bunch of two-story stick-frame stucco boxes. We got tons of
26 them. Go down south of the freeway. They are everywhere. That's great. If
27 somebody wants to live in a postage stamp sized lot, that's perfect if they want to
28 do that. None of us that have these lots want that. That's why we bought here. I
29 bought 26 plus years. I've raised my family here, and I think a lot of other people
30 have so please consider the future. Thank you.

31
32 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you very much. At this point, I think we'll go
33 back to the list so, Darisa, if you could call the next speaker.

34
35 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST DARISA VARGAS** – Marcia Narog.

36
37 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Do you want me to call them? Okay.

38
39 **SPEAKER MARCIA NAROG** – My name is Marcia Narog, and I live in this
40 area, and I want to tell everybody here that we are not represented. We are not
41 represented by our council people. We did not vote in the council person that is
42 highly recommending that this be higher density property. I have a letter here
43 that George Price, our previous Councilman wrote, and he is in favor of this
44 shrinking of the property sizes. I worked with him over 15 years to build the
45 equestrian center so we could have agricultural rural areas and, right down the
46 street from this project, we need to have agricultural residential areas new people

1 can live. I've lived in this area.....I moved to Moreno Valley in 1977. It took me
2 15 years to be able to get out of the little postage stamp lots into a larger lot size
3 in a rural community. This area is renowned for its rural area, and I just received
4 a Re-Max request for buying our property saying you live in one of the last
5 neighborhoods in Moreno Valley with that country feel and rural setting. Not
6 many people know about your neighborhood and the great amenities it has to
7 offer. We get these again and again. We were told by the developer there is no
8 market for large lots. They are wrong. The lots are snatched up. I have
9 neighbors asking me all the time, do you want to sell? Do you know anywhere
10 that they want to rent because we have friends and family that want to move into
11 this area. It's highly regarded and highly sought after, and I would go for this
12 project because we need more development in this area of the large lots so
13 people can have a diverse choice in lifestyles. If we take away the large lots in
14 this area, there is not going to be any diversity in lifestyle in Moreno Valley other
15 than the R3, R5, R15. A lot of us don't want to live like we're in apartments
16 where we can hear the neighbors breathe next door. We would like to have a
17 little bit of space put in our organic gardens and have a lifestyle that's different
18 from an apartment-type style. One of the things I would like to say is this
19 developer says that he has a beautiful plan. Well, the one thing in real estate is
20 location, location, location. He can take his beautiful plan and move it
21 somewhere else. We want all those lots to be half acre or greater. We do not
22 want the high density. We want it consistent with what our values are and what
23 other people would like to have. We really need some more development in our
24 neighborhood. The few custom homes that come in, people that tell us they are
25 trying to develop both a half acre or an acre, say the City is giving them \$125,000
26 to \$150,000 taxation on one little parcel, so there's something going wrong that
27 we can't have more people coming into our community and sharing the lifestyle
28 that we embrace.

29

30 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Marcia, your three minutes.

31

32 **SPEAKER MARCIA NAROG** – Okay. I just want to say one last thing. The
33 first speaker today said that we have dreams. He did not say anything about the
34 citizen's dreams, and our dream is to keep it rural. Thank you.

35

36 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you. Next up we have Barbara McCarthy,
37 Kimberly Crow, Gary Middleton, and Barbara Baxter.

38

39 **SPEAKER BARBARA MCCARTHY** – Good evening, I'm Barbara McCarthy.
40 There is a reason why we have a General Plan for the City, and I oppose an
41 outside developer coming in trying to change the zoning that we worked so
42 diligently to develop for the goals and objectives for our City. R3 and R5 housing
43 is acceptable in LA, Orange County, and other parts of Moreno Valley, but the
44 northeast end has been designed for a needed alternative housing market; one
45 that preserves open space and the rural atmosphere and higher-end homes.
46 This is what the City paid consultants for. The professionals did an analysis of

1 the area and recommended for the proper zoning for the General Plan, in
2 addition to what the residents of the community desired. The Planning
3 Commission should value the much needed market for the larger lots and stay in
4 compliance with the current zoning. An R5 home may sell for between \$250,000
5 and \$275,000. A home on a half acre sells between \$400,000 and \$500,000.
6 The proposed plan calls for 181 homes on 70 acres. That would mean about
7 \$50 million if they sold at \$275,000 or, since they are new, might sell for
8 \$300,000, which would equal \$54 million for the developer. If they complied with
9 the current zoning plan, they would only need to build 108 homes, not 181
10 homes to make the same \$54 million since they could sell them for \$500,000
11 each or even possibly \$550,000 if they made one acre homes. That would be
12 \$60 million for 110 homes. And then, if they wanted to stick with a half acre, they
13 could build 140 homes on 70 acres making \$70 million. That's \$16 million more
14 than their proposal not to mention the millions of dollars that they would have to
15 spend for the sewer system. It does not make any sense to build smaller lot
16 homes in this area. They can be built without opposition in the other three-
17 quarters area of Moreno Valley, which they are many empty lots for, and they
18 could build those there. I would not oppose this project if they complied with the
19 zoning of RA2 and also the winding country road on Ironwood is not conducive to
20 the higher density traffic. I could see that there could be so many accidents on
21 that really nice country road where people just need to slow down and relax. We
22 don't need that high density rush, rush, rush traffic. There's a market for larger
23 lot homes, and we need to preserve the zoning and compliance with the General
24 Plan. The home right across the street on Nason from the project is valued at
25 over \$1 million. Do you think they really want to have these small postage size
26 lots right next door to a million dollar home? It does not make any economic
27 sense to change the zoning, so please listen to the residents in this area. Thank
28 you.

29

30 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you. Kimberly and Gary.

31

32 **SPEAKER KIMBERLY CROW** – Hi. My name is Kimberly Crow. I live at
33 28011White Sand Trail, bam, right in the middle. Looking from Moreno Beach
34 and Ironwood, I look out my kitchen window every day at the beautiful mountains.
35 All I'm saying, I heard somebody say, I think and believe that you should take
36 time and read every single one of these people's letter that they took.....I
37 believe there is a lot of great objection and do.....of why they don't want the
38 houses built. Little houses isn't what we're about on this side. Large lots is what
39 we want. That's what we moved in here for. That's what everybody wanted. It's
40 great. It's beautiful. People are great. It's just awesome, but I've never done
41 anything like this so I don't even know what I'm really saying but I'm saying I am
42 against all this going on, and I'm trying to speak for we the people and my
43 neighborhood because we all couldn't come. I believe that you should actually
44 take the time to read everybody's letters because they went out of their way to
45 show you all the things and tell you all the things I'm not even able to say right
46 because there's a lot of good information in there that.....we're not objecting to

1 the houses being built. We're just objecting to the lot size. We'd like to keep it
2 like it is on our side, and we don't want suburbia. That's why we moved away
3 from there. We came to the rural side to have nice big homes and peaceful
4 things where everybody can have more space, and it's just great. Thank you.

5
6 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you. Brought her fan club. Barbara Baxter.
7 Then, Rafael Brugueras, and then Damon Allen

8
9 **SPEAKER BARBARA BAXTER** – Expeditiously, Barbara Baxter of 28010
10 Gerald Lane. The first guy spoke about the dream. I had a dream as a child. I
11 was raised in country New York, and I used to listen to the crickets at night and
12 the frogs chirping and hear the hoot of the owls. I lived just below Sunnymead
13 Ranch for 12 years until we realized the dream of being in a place where I can
14 hear the crickets at night, and listen to the frogs, and hear the hoot of the owls,
15 and see those crazy burros walking all over the place. I love it out there. We
16 moved out there so I didn't have to hear my neighbors yawn at night and their
17 dog scratching a flea in the afternoon. I moved out there so I could stretch out
18 and live my dream. I moved out there because I've got a horse named Un
19 Sogno Divenuto Realta. It's Italian for dream come true. I'm living out there
20 where my dream came true. I'm living out there on my big lot looking at my
21 mountain and my snow, and I am enjoying Moreno Valley. I'm living out there
22 where the dream is where my new neighbors that have just moved there, three
23 new families with children are out there saying we love it out here. It's so
24 country. My sister said, Barbara, you're out there in the boonies. I said, I love it
25 out here. I don't care if you build some houses out there as long as you ain't the
26 tail rag wagging that dog and you ain't changing things where we can't live that
27 country life and realize that dream that Moreno Valley has to offer. Thank you.

28
29 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Mr. Brugueras and then Damon Allen.

30
31 **SPEAKER RAFAEL BRUGUERAS** – My name is Rafael Brugueras and good
32 evening Vice Chair, Commissioners, Staff, and guests. You know, if the lots
33 were \$250,000 or \$300,000, that's cheap. I will go buy a house up there if they
34 were that cheap, but they are not going to be that cheap. Okay? Now, I went
35 over the Pacific Willow right here at Nason and Fir where they are building 3600
36 square foot houses, and I needed to learn how you're going to put a big house in
37 that neighborhood. He gave me a flyer, and said that the houses that are being
38 built there are on 8000, 9000, and 10,000 square foot lots because I have the
39 paperwork that shows me the lots. And I asked them, are the homeowners
40 happy living in a big house and a pool-sized lot? And he said yes. And I asked
41 him why? And he said because there's enough room for their kids to play, their
42 dog and their kids to play in the backyard to have the pool, the patio, and the
43 barbecue at this point in time, and they said people like it like that because they
44 don't have to maintain a big lot because they work far enough to drive every day
45 outside of Moreno Valley. Anyone that owns a home over \$400,000, whether
46 you're paying for cash, and very little do that, you have to go outside of Moreno

1 Valley because there's no job in this city that's going to give you \$35 an hour
2 unless you go to Irvine and now you're driving for hours. But I applaud this group
3 right here because this is the last of the Mohicans that work hard. They are the
4 ones because their children and grandchildren are not going to be like them, not
5 all of them. Not all of them. No, no. No, no. You got to be true because your
6 grandkids are playing with a net. They are doing just more than working in your
7 backyard. Please. Now, I went up Nason, up that little hill, and I looked at those
8 one acre lots, and a lot of them got junk cars, trash, not taken care of. They just
9 let it go. Imagine another 108 lots like that in the future so, the good thing about
10 the developer, they are thinking about the future. The future generation that do
11 not want to work hard or lust to have big houses. Okay? That's the generation
12 that they are thinking about. This generation is lucky to have what they have.
13 Okay? That's the beauty part about it. Okay? So the developer is thinking the
14 right way, okay, for the future. That's what they are doing. You can hear the
15 voices. I must be saying something right because they are saying something.
16 So you think about the future. I'd rather see a developer develop everything and
17 have the sewage than have the raw stuff.

18
19 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Let's, let's give everyone their three minutes. Please.
20 It's only going to make things drag out a little longer so let's respect everybody's
21 time. Appreciate the process. Mr. Allen.

22
23 **SPEAKER DAMON ALLEN** – My name is Damon Allen. I've been in Moreno
24 Valley for 14 years. I am here representing the Southern California
25 Environmental Justice Alliance. It's kind of hard to follow all of these emotional
26 pleas for the property, but I just want to make a little report and get out of the
27 way. Regarding the air quality, the MND and Air Quality Analysis do not present
28 any analysis of impact potential Mitigation Measure for potential overlap of
29 construction phases. There is no statement that the construction phase will not
30 occur concurrently. Also, there is no requirement that the project be completed
31 over a certain number of days. Construction may occur faster as well, which
32 results in a significantly greater daily impact. Further, Section 118003,
33 Construction Hours Limitations of Moreno Valley Municipal Code indicate that the
34 legal hours of construction are from 8:00 AM to 10:00 PM. The Air Quality
35 Analysis does not present the worst case scenario of construction equipment
36 emitting pollutants for the legal 14 hours daily. The air quality model must be
37 revised to account for these legally, possibly longer construction days. The MND
38 uses the LFT modeling for 5 acre site is not appropriate as the proposed project
39 site is 75 acres. As stated by CEQA, the LFT math rate lookup table only applies
40 to projects that are less than or equal to 5 acres. In the event that the project
41 equals.....the project area exceeds 5 acres, they recommended that the LEED
42 Agency perform project-specific air quality modeling for the larger project. The
43 assumption that 5 acres a day may be distributed is in material. The MND
44 states, on page 8-14, be respective of a sites land use designation.
45 Development of the site to its maximum potential would likely occur with
46 disturbances to the entire site occurring during constructions activities. This is

1 contradictory to statements of the Air Quality Analysis. Project specific modeling
2 must be prepared for this potential impact, particularly where sensitive receptors
3 are. Nearby residential, Calvary Chapel School, etc. are located in close
4 proximity to the protected site. Further, the MND does not inform the public or
5 decision makers where exactly the sensitive receptors are placed for analysis
6 other than to say they are within 25 meters. The analysis is un-dually optimistic
7 that this does not place sensitive receptors at their property lines closer to the
8 project. Conservative modeling should be assessed. What might have
9 happened to the receptors given the exposure to the property line? The MND is
10 also inadequate as it does not mention where sensitive receptors, children at
11 Calvary Chapel School, were located for modeling or if they were analyzed at all.
12 I thank you for your time.

13
14 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you, Mr. Allen. Next up, we have Leroy
15 Thomson, Jr., Robert Then, and David Carlson. Leroy Thompson. Thompson is
16 not here. Robert Then.

17
18 **SPEAKER ROBERT THEN** – Good evening and thank you very much. I, like
19 several of my neighbors, attended a meeting with the developer, and I am
20 confident that his goal is to create a quality project. My concern is that it is not
21 the right project. Homes on 7000 square foot lots or 7200 square foot lots is not
22 for this area of town. They also mentioned that this will be a template, a template
23 that will be used in the future for other developments in this area of smaller
24 homes on smaller lots. Once again, not what we're looking for. There are plenty
25 of homes available in Moreno Valley for those who wish to live on smaller lots. In
26 checking today, and bare with me, I'm going to cut this down as fast as I can,
27 there are 277 single-family residents; 244 of them are standard sales of which
28 129 are on lots of 7405 square feet or less. That's a standard size lot in Moreno
29 Valley, 7405 square feet. That's 53% of the homes that are on the market today
30 in Moreno Valley are on small lots. We don't need additional lots in this area of
31 town, small lots additional in our area of town. If someone wishes to not cut their
32 grass or just wants to live on a small lot, there's plenty of opportunity for them in
33 Moreno Valley to find a house. The same cannot be said for those who wish to
34 live on larger lots. I have all these other figures, but I'm going to cut it down to
35 one because I think it's very startling. In doing my check today, if somebody
36 came into Moreno Valley and wanted to buy a 2400 square foot single-story
37 home on a half acre lot, they have the choice of three homes. That's all that is
38 available in Moreno Valley today, 2400 square foot single-story half acre.
39 There's three of them. There is a market in Moreno Valley for larger lots and
40 single-story homes. That's what should be built in this area of town. Is there no
41 area of town that we can say that we can protect and say this is for larger
42 homes? I've already told you how many homes are on the market today and just
43 a few minutes ago you approved or you voted on another project for 220 more
44 units that are on less than 7000 square foot lots that are on from 5000 to 6000
45 square foot lots. There's plenty of opportunities for people who want smaller lots.

1 They are very few opportunities for those people who want to buy on large lots,
2 and I think you need to take that into consideration.

3
4 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Mr. Then, your three minutes are up.

5
6 **SPEAKER ROBERT THEN** – Rafael, his very first speech tonight said dream
7 big. Well I want to dream big. I want to dream big lots. Thank you very much.

8
9 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – David Carlson. Then, Madeline Blua.

10
11 **SPEAKER DAVID CARLSON** – How are you doing? Thank you very much.
12 I'm David Carlson, and my property backs directly up to the proposed project. I
13 do want to say thank you to Claudia who took my phone call and answered all of
14 my questions, which just highlighted my concerns. I'm just a youngster coming
15 to this area. I've only lived there 15 years, and we looked for that home. When
16 we found a home in that area, we literally made our decision to purchase that
17 house in 5 minutes because of the location. Our two lots are very important to
18 us. I understand a developer wanting to come in, and what I see is good. But
19 R2 is the main thing. One of the things I noticed this evening that was just
20 startling to me, Item 3 took into account all the areas around them before they
21 brought your proposal, and there was absolutely no one to question what they
22 were doing. That's because it was all done with the area surrounding them that
23 was around them. They took into account for this. I'm sorry, our developer that
24 wants to come in here has not taken into account to that area, which brings me to
25 the environment. I don't know if you guys know this, but I see the burros outside
26 the back of my house on a regular basis. I would say they have been there,
27 what, 30 times in the last six months. A herd of about 30 of them. I don't know if
28 you guys even know this or if anybody has ever considered this, as far as the
29 drainage, wow, we had three inches of rain and man it flooded into Ironwood a
30 whole foot-and-a-half. I don't know where they are getting this drainage idea and
31 the problem we have. The City came by that day and just cleaned it up real
32 easy. I could have done it with my shovel in 20 minutes, but I'm an old fat man.
33 Also, as part of the environment, it's very important. How about the environment
34 of these people and the homes that they live in and the place that they live? I
35 hope you take human environment and the place that we have chosen to live into
36 consideration. I am also concerned about the street layout. From what I
37 understand, and I may have just misunderstood with just a phone conversation,
38 the south side of Nason Street is going to remain that width, but it's still only
39 going to be one lane going in that other direction. I don't know if that's true. If it
40 is, I'm concerned about that. From what I understand, there's no parking on that
41 side so it's going to be great that all those people that want to use those hiking
42 trails park in front of my house, and that would be great. Appreciate that. So I
43 really want you to consider this. Also, if you postpone this discussion tonight like
44 you're talking about in discussion, will we be notified and will we be invited back
45 to hear these discussions or is this going to be something you guys do privately?
46 I really.....I'm not opposed to having homes there. I understand that, but you've

1 got to keep it to R2, and I would really appreciate that. I'm fine with nothing
2 being there but R2 would be great. Thank you.

3
4 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Madeline, would you mind if Allison G. stepped up?
5 Apparently, she has small kids and has to leave so. Thanks Madeline.

6
7 **SPEAKER ALLISON GEE** – Hello. Can you hear me?

8
9 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Yes.

10
11 **SPEAKER ALLISON GEE** – Okay. I have three little kids outside that are really
12 sleepy, so I am going to try to make this quick. My husband and I grew up here.
13 I moved here in 1991 when I was four. I lived off of Box Springs Road in a tiny
14 little tract home. I can't tell you how many square feet the lot is, but it's tiny. My
15 husband grew up in Sunnymead Ranch, again, in a very, very small lot and also
16 in Hidden Springs. So both of us grew up on a tiny little lot and, when we wanted
17 to buy a home, we knew we wanted to buy in Moreno Valley to keep our kids
18 here and grow up here like we did. We looked for six months at at least 20 or 30
19 houses every weekend. My husband had Sundays off. Every Sunday, from
20 sunup to sundown, we were looking at houses, sometimes even late throughout
21 the night. We ran into this house on accident. It had been listed for two days,
22 two days, three days. We live across the street at Nason and Ironwood on Pam.
23 We live right on the corner. We're elevated higher than some of our neighbors,
24 and we can see right across to the lot, and it's beautiful. The same day, we
25 wrote papers. We put our request to buy the house, and we got the house six
26 years ago so we've stayed in Moreno Valley now for 24 years. We don't want to
27 move. We love where we live. Our kids run around up there. They collect rocks
28 up there. I mean, it's kind of silly. My daughter likes to go up there and look at
29 the donkeys. Although she wants to pet them, I won't let her pet them, but I don't
30 want....I oppose it because I don't want a housing tract over there that is going to
31 take that away. I don't mind big houses because I would assume that there
32 would be property for horses and areas to walk around or still do what all of us
33 probably do when we go over there. Also, if there is 181 homes, let's say one
34 car per home, that's 181 cars that are going to try to avoid the light at Nason and
35 Ironwood. They are going to cut right through my neighborhood, and there is
36 already enough few people, visitors I assume that don't live in the area, that
37 zoom down that street. It's going to get a lot worse, and there's going to be
38 people who are going straight across Ironwood to get into our neighborhood that
39 are going to end up t-boned. We can't afford another light there because there's
40 already two, two intersections so that's kind of it. This was more of a last minute
41 thing. So I do oppose it. I don't want a lot of homes there. A few tract homes,
42 I'm sorry, not tract homes but big properties like we live on would be nice. But,
43 again nothing there would be nice too. Thank you for your time.

44
45 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you, Allison. Madeline Blua, Kathleen Dale,
46 and Joe Lockhart.

1
2 **SPEAKER MADELINE BLUA** – I’ve lived in Riverside County all of my life, and
3 I just moved onto Steeplechase Drive actually this summer. I’m 24 years old
4 and, even in this short amount of time that I have been on this planet, I have
5 noticed an incredible amount of development in rural areas, and we need to stop
6 putting developments above everything else. I looked at the initial study, and it
7 seemed to kind of gloss over so many issues that should’ve been part of an EIR.
8 I am an environmental scientist, that’s my major. I took an Environmental
9 Assessment Class so some of the issues I have are the esthetics. It was not
10 discussed at all how it’s going to affect the neighbors. Traffic, I’m scared of
11 pulling out onto Ironwood from my street. It’s a curb. People drive so fast. I
12 can’t imagine doubling the amount of traffic, and there’s no mitigation for that.
13 People, you know, there’s accidents there all the time. And another issue is, if
14 you’re putting all these houses in, all those people who don’t really appreciate
15 and respect nature because they want those small lots, they are going to be out
16 there in those trails off-roading and littering. And it’s already kind of that way, but
17 I don’t want it to be worse I guess. And, that’s it, thank you.

18
19 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you. Kathleen Dale.

20
21 **SPEAKER KATHLEEN DALE** – We have another resident who needs to leave.
22 Can we take her out of order?

23
24 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Certainly.

25
26 **SPEAKER DAISY FRANCO** – Good evening.

27
28 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Your name?

29
30 **SPEAKER DAISY FRANCO** – Oh, I’m sorry. My name is Daisy Franco and my
31 husband Joe Franco, we live on 2, we just moved there so bear with me, we live
32 on Pam Place. This development is going to be right behind our house so I have
33 to give a lot of credit to the individual that was before me because she just nailed
34 it on everything that I wanted to say. However, I wanted to just bring to your
35 attention that I moved from West Covina. I was in a crowded residence as well.
36 We lived next to a high school stadium and there was the football lights and a lot
37 of traffic, and it was just really hard for us. And we have three kids, and we
38 wanted to move out here. And we just really enjoy the scenery, and it was just
39 overwhelming with us because we searched everywhere. We looked in Rialto,
40 Riverside, Reche Canyon, Perris, Hemet, and we fell in love with Moreno Valley
41 right here. We’re just right there on Nason and Ironwood. We searched for
42 months day and night. We came during the day. We checked schools in the
43 surrounding areas, API scores and everything. We also got the attention from
44 just the roaming donkeys and the peacocks. Oh, I can’t even tell you. That
45 was...it was beautiful. As far as checking out reasons why I am against this is
46 just the increased traffic noise that would happen, possible graffiti, street racing,

1 increase in population resulting in overcrowding in schools, not to mention we're
2 going to have the new high school. It's going to be overcrowded, unhappy
3 residents probably selling their homes because they are just unhappy now. And
4 reasons that we should just leave it alone, keeping the peaceful atmosphere,
5 schools are distant resulting in not overcrowding. Donkeys can have their natural
6 habitat. The peacocks can enjoy a quiet neighborhood and peaceful streets, no
7 trash. We could have amazing scenic trails for us to go ahead and walk right
8 now. I estimated the approximate location for a park for us is 2.9 miles of
9 walking and 1.3 miles south of the 60 so, for us, it's really hard. Maybe the
10 Planning Department can consider looking at the Badlands Landfill. If you're not
11 familiar with that, I have the location here. It's flat. It's already ready. You can
12 move in. Right? Do you agree? Yes. If you need some help, the City of Azusa,
13 they did it over there at the landfill. There's a Target. There's a stadium.
14 There's Home Depot. You can build your stuff there, okay? Thank you.

15

16 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you.

17

18 **SPEAKER DAISY FRANCO** – Have a good night.

19

20 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Kathy.

21

22 **SPEAKER KATHLEEN DALE** – Before the timer starts, can I just ask for
23 clarification about your direction about people consolidating their comments
24 because two of the speakers have asked to yield their time to me, and I wasn't
25 sure if that's what you meant?

26

27 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I didn't want to particularly give away the time
28 because that doesn't save us any time.

29

30 **SPEAKER KATHLEEN DALE** – Yeah, I don't think I would need 9 minutes, but
31 I might like 6 minutes or 5 minutes.

32

33 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – We recommend that you stay
34 consistent across the board with all of them, Jeff.

35

36 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – We'll stay with the three minutes.

37

38 **SPEAKER KATHLEEN DALE** – Well, I'll see what I can do, and I guess, if you
39 guys want to speak.....

40

41 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – It's not an auction folks. If you want to speak, you're
42 entitled to. Go ahead, Kathleen.

43

44 **SPEAKER KATHLEEN DALE** – Alright. Well, now I've got to regroup, so
45 anyway you did get some written materials from me as well, which you know
46 rushing here from the copy place was the quickest I could do with the packet

1 coming out on Friday afternoon. There also, as part of that, is a copy of this Re-
2 Max letter that all of the residents out there have received. There are numerous
3 procedural and substantive requirements that haven't been met for you to take
4 any affirmative action on this project. The deficiencies relate to the disparity
5 between the entitlement requests that are before and the applications that are on
6 file, lack of evidence of authorization from the property owners, inadequate and
7 improper noticing, inadequate CEQA documentation, and outstanding input from
8 the Trails Board. I don't understand the Planning Official's position that you can
9 make a recommendation about the General Plan Amendment and consistency
10 with the General Plan and make a recommendation about the CEQA document
11 when you don't have all of the Mitigated Negative Declaration Comments and
12 when you don't have the input from the Trails Board. The City is really
13 approaching this evaluation backwards. The City record focuses on the
14 subdivision and the design guidelines, which you don't even have the authority to
15 approve. And then you backfill the record to detail all the changes you've got to
16 make and the justifications you need to make in order to justify the proposal that
17 doesn't fit with the plan. Really, what you have to be doing is looking first at the
18 General Plan Amendments and deciding whether or not there's a compelling
19 reason to change the General Plan. If you think there's a compelling reason to
20 change the General Plan, then look at the Zone Change and the subdivision, the
21 Design Guidelines. You don't have the authority to approve those. They can
22 only be part of the Specific Plan or a PUD. I wanted to ask, before I lose track
23 because these people are doing a great job tonight, your Rules of Procedure
24 allow you the option to give the public a chance for rebuttal as well, and I would
25 hope that what you said earlier about keeping the Public Hearing open that you
26 will also as part of that allow the public a chance to rebut after the Applicant
27 rebuts everything that the public has said. Basically, this project is an
28 encroachment into the heart of the city's rural community. It threatens the health,
29 safety, and welfare of the immediate residents, as well as the health, safety, and
30 welfare of the entire city that benefits from this housing-type opportunity and the
31 open space benefits that are inherent in the longstanding General Plan Policies
32 for this area. Just very quickly, remember the Empire Homes project?
33 Subdivision 75 acres in the north of this. It was approved by the City with a
34 Mitigated Negative Declaration. The residents sued. They prevailed in court,
35 and the City was required to rescind that approval and Empire Homes never
36 came back. That was 2004 to 2008. Thank you.

37
38 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you, Kathy. Joe Lockhart is next. Then, Jack
39 Ergish.

40
41 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Joe Lockhart is gone.

42
43 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – You, you, you can speak.

44
45 **SPEAKER THOMAS ROSS** – My name is Tom Ross, and the view right out the
46 front of my house is exactly the land we're talking about right out here, and I want

1 to tell these guys right here that told you about all these studies they did. I don't
2 know how they even got a map of that thing. I haven't seen a surveyor out there.
3 Not one, and I look out there probably 100 times a day. And I've never seen
4 anybody do any study down at Nason and Ironwood. There's been no rubber
5 hoses across the road. Nobody has counted cars. Nobody sat there and
6 counted cars or nothing. You better get your money back because somebody is
7 screwing you. And the next thing is, if you're not going to put a fence around that
8 thing, you better put a wall around it, because you've got bobcats, you've got
9 mountain lions, you've got coyotes, you've got raccoons, you've got skunks, and
10 best of all you've got rattlesnakes. And, if you don't believe it, I can show you a
11 picture right on my phone one about three months ago. I opened my garage
12 door and here's a 4 foot rattlesnake in it, and I don't live a quarter of a mile from
13 where they are going to build houses. And, I'll tell you, if they build houses, I'm
14 going to be down there every day and every guy that comes in there to buy a
15 house, I'm going to tell him about all this stuff. And I do not believe that they
16 have talked to the Indians, any of the Indians, because you don't screw with
17 those Indians. If they think there's a dead Indian on that property, you're not
18 going to build nothing. I've got places on my property that I can't even stick a
19 shovel into it because they think there is a dead Indian buried there so that's
20 about all I got to say, and I'm not for building bigger houses down there. I'm for
21 building none of them. If this City wants to do something, raise our taxes a little
22 bit and buy that cockeyed property and leave it a natural place. You go out there
23 every morning and every afternoon and see the people that are out there walking
24 their dogs. And, if you can survey with a dog, well maybe they did survey it.

25

26 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you. Has Joe Lockhart spoken?

27

28 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST DARISA VARGAS** – Yes.

29

30 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Jack Ergish is next.

31

32 **SPEAKER JACK ERGISH** – Yeah, my name is Jack Ergish, and I am a Land
33 Development Engineer so I'm going to talk about things that I know about. And
34 I'd like to refute some of these things this gentleman said earlier about the
35 reasons why he's building R5 lots in an R2 subdivision. He said that, building R5
36 lots would solve the drainage problem. R5 lots increase drainage so that is not a
37 valid point. And you said you reduced the flow rates. Well, if you reduce the flow
38 rates with an R5 development, you can reduce the flow rates with R2
39 development just as well. And, the basins, that's their function is to reduce the
40 flow so you could do that with an R2 development just as well as you can with an
41 R5. Another issue that was brought up was safety. I looked at the street layout,
42 and it has a 1500 foot curved cul-de-sac. Now, if I was in the Moreno Valley
43 Police Department, I would be scared to death to go up that cul-de-sac. It's an
44 ambush waiting to happen. So I think the layout is terrible. These long cul-de-
45 sacs, they are just terrible. The other thing is fire. Fire has to go along 1500
46 feet. A lot of cul-de-sacs that I've designed 600 feet was the maximum so I don't

1 know where you can get 1500 feet on your cul-de-sacs. As far as the grading,
2 the grading that you're doing on that plan is far more extensive than it would be
3 for an R2. There is no difference. You just take those two lots and make them
4 level. It's the same grading. I've done it a million times. I know from what I
5 speak. One of the issues he brought up is the fact that the high school is just
6 down the street. Well, I don't know if the high school has ever decided where
7 they want to build the other high school. They change every other week. First,
8 it's going to be here. Then, it's going to be there. Then, it's going to be way
9 down in Redlands. So I don't know if you can believe what the School District is
10 saying about where they are going to build that high school. And it's too
11 close.....if they do build it there, it's too close to the existing high school, Valley
12 View. One of the things that I saw in the plans was a proposed 12 inch sewer. A
13 12 inch sewer will feed a lot more than 108 houses. So what does that tell me?
14 That tells me that there's more coming; a lot more coming. And, lastly, I would
15 say that this is Councilman Coe's dream.

16
17 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you. Next up, Bill Waulters, David Zeitz, and
18 Don Wilson. Mr. Waulters, alright. Waulters is a no show. Mr. Zeitz.

19
20 **SPEAKER DAVID ZEITZ** – Hi, my name is David Zeitz. I live at 26386
21 Ironwood. I've lived in this area before you guys even thought about being a city,
22 okay? They talk about, we've had people talking about a dream, okay? You saw
23 my little girl there. Her dream was to have a pony. She has one because we live
24 on a large property. You're going.....it's frustrating, very frustrating. Okay,
25 number one, they are talking about the traffic. Well, the traffic going west on
26 Ironwood is going to increase. They tell me, oh, they will go down Nason.
27 Where are the elementary school and the middle schools? On Ironwood, so
28 every one of those moms is going to hop in their car with their little kids down
29 Ironwood through the curves. Nobody honors the speed limits through there.
30 They'd be the first one to complain if somebody went 3 miles an hour in there 25.
31 It's 45 miles an hour through those curves, and I can bet you 80% to 90% of
32 those cars are doing 55 and 60. Okay? I've lived there since 1984. I believe
33 there have been at least six fatalities on that curve, and I can't tell you how many
34 accidents that we hear in the middle of the night because you can hear them
35 coming. All that's going to do is increase our traffic, increase our problems.
36 People that live in this style of house have no respect for other people's property.
37 They talked about wanting to work and come home and be lazy. That's what I
38 heard out of the other speaker. People that own these properties, they work at
39 them. They care for them. They like the land. They have the animals. It's just
40 ridiculous to change this. My wife was the first speaker tonight. She mentioned
41 that the other council members, on two occasions, have struck down zoning
42 changes. It needs to happen again. Why are we messing with this? It's that
43 simple. Everybody talks about the dreams. What about the dreams of the
44 people that want to get out of patchwork houses? They want to be able to
45 stretch their legs, walk around their property, watch their dog run across the yard,
46 look at the bobcats wandering through their yard. January 1st, I had a bobcat in

1 my house. He got into my chicken coop and killed a couple chickens. I turned it
2 loose. Everybody asked me why? Because he was here before me or his
3 predecessors were, and that's the way we need to leave it. R2 or better. Other
4 than that, leave it alone. Thank you.

5
6 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you. Don Wilson. Then, Daizy Zavala, and
7 Shelly Lindekugel.

8
9 **SPEAKER DON WILSON** – Good evening. I'm Don Wilson. I just moved into
10 Steeplechase in July. I moved here, moved up there because I lived on
11 Cottonwood and Perris and, last year, I had a car drive into my living room. I had
12 my truck stolen and my wife held at gunpoint, and I said I've had enough. So
13 we moved. We searched for six months, for a year. We saved and scrimped
14 and got out of that neighborhood so I could have some elbow room, so my kids
15 could ride their bikes without getting run over or highjacked just to be honest. So
16 we moved up there. To me, this issue is what I've been coming to the City
17 Council Meetings off and on for a year now trying to understand the City and
18 trying to get the know the Council and see what's going on here in Moreno
19 Valley. To me, there's an issue here, old versus new. And it's an emotional
20 issue, and I understand that issue. We have a rural community represented
21 here, and they want to keep it rural. I heard a lady a minute ago say rural versus
22 city. Well, it is city. It's Moreno Valley. It's not rural anymore. Whether we like it
23 or not, it's the case. But I think they have a point in saying let's keep an area
24 rural. The rest of it is going to be R5. It's going to be all that kind of stuff. My
25 question is what do we gain besides profit? I'm a pastor in the area, and the
26 spiritual impact, and when I get to get away to my half acre and have my elbow
27 room and my space that's what I need. And I think that's what these people are
28 saying they need. And that's why they got out of wherever they were and so let's
29 not change the development. That's all I have to say tonight. Thanks.

30
31 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you. Daizy Zavala. Oh, okay. Thank you.
32 Shelly Lindekugel. I apologize if I did not pronounce that correctly.

33
34 **SPEAKER SHELLY LINDEKUGEL** – That was pretty good. It took me a while
35 to learn how to pronounce it too. I've been a Moreno Valley resident.....my
36 name is Shelly Lindekugel. I live at 26180 North Shore Drive. I've been a
37 Moreno Valley resident since 1982. My husband and I moved out here when we
38 got out of the air force. We bought our sixth house across the street from
39 Moreno Valley High School. I think we all know what that neighborhood looks
40 like now. I've been a realtor here since 1989, and I've lived in northeast Moreno
41 Valley since 1998. I'm gratified that so many people have read my letter
42 because I really do have people looking for homes in the northeast end of
43 Moreno Valley. Moreno Valley doesn't have much of a higher end. The highest
44 priced home that sold in Moreno Valley in 2016 was less than half a mile from
45 this proposed development. It sold for \$690,000. Riverside \$690,000 isn't too
46 much but, in Moreno Valley, it's one heck of a lot of money because a lot of our

1 owners are working class people. There are 280 homes currently for sale in
2 Moreno Valley, 13 of them are in northeast Moreno Valley and, when I say
3 northeast Moreno Valley, I pretty much mean from about Lassalle all the way
4 down to the end of town above Ironwood and then just slightly east of that south
5 of Ironwood from maybe Vista De Cerros. Almost all of those homes without
6 exception are half acre properties. There are, as I said, 13 homes in northeast
7 Moreno Valley currently for sale. That's 2.1% of the homes for sale in Moreno
8 Valley are in that area of town. If I had, if I had three times as many half acre
9 homes in northeast Moreno Valley, I could sell every single one of them because
10 there's that much demand for them. So I would beg the developer to look at
11 putting half acre homes in there so that it confirms with that end of town. Not
12 that.....one of the things that he said that made the hair stand up on the back of
13 my neck was that it would be a template for other housing coming in that end of
14 town. Well, let's destroy the highest housing values that we've got in town by
15 letting these kinds of homes come in. That's not why the people, myself
16 included, that live there moved there to begin with. So I don't think anybody here
17 is against profit or progress or building homes or growth. I think we're all for that
18 but let's so it sensibly. And why have a General Plan if, every time somebody
19 wants to build something counter to the General Plan, we change it. So, anyway,
20 thank you for your attention.

21

22 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you. George Hague, Deborah Johnson, Glen
23 Jacobs. Is George still here? Alright. Deborah Johnson.

24

25 **SPEAKER DEBORAH JOHNSON** – Can ya'll hear me? My name is Debbie
26 Johnson. I've been living and teaching in Moreno Valley for more than 25 years.
27 First, in response and respect to the notification of current owners and proposed
28 projects, it's disrespectful to current residents and insufficient notice to owners to
29 simply provide mailers to residents within 300 feet. Insult to those not within the
30 300 feet guideline not to inform them, which was my residence, my neighbors
31 right across the street from me. The newspaper mailers and signs are okay but
32 are insufficient as most receive news and information using the current
33 technology of today. As Commissioners and Custodians of our fine City, you
34 should attempt to enhance the quality of life for current and future residents of
35 Moreno Valley, and it's your duty and obligation to preserve the quality of life
36 already afforded us. I understand the need for additional housing in Moreno
37 Valley, but rezoning one of the last two areas with rural settings is a huge
38 mistake. I concur with previous people in regards to the view from our homes,
39 the extensive wildlife on the same lands as the proposed building, the wild
40 animals such as squirrels, rabbits, raccoons, skunks, coyotes, donkeys, etc.
41 Clearly, the traffic in our area will increase substantially, which will make it nearly
42 unbearable due to the number of houses in a small confined area, and I will tell
43 you that, if this happens, I am putting my house of for sale and you can sell it
44 because I won't want to live here anymore. All three of my sons went through
45 Moreno Valley Schools and, unfortunately, they moved out of Moreno Valley,
46 which is not what I wanted because they didn't find what they wanted here. One

1 thing that I'd like to have the Commission consider, and the builder consider, is
2 the fact that there are property values and crime rates to consider. The average
3 sale price of R5 zoning in the last year is \$268,764 while the R1/R2 average sale
4 price is \$396,723. I've pulled the Zoning Map along with the Crime Rate Map for
5 the City, and there is a direct correlation to the zoning density. Looking at both
6 maps, it's basically a paint by numbers having the least crime with R1 and R2
7 and the R5 zoning having the most, which would be commonsense. As far as
8 our Environmental Impact Report, that would definitely be necessary along with
9 addressing potential new taxes.

10
11 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Debbie, your three minutes are up.

12
13 **SPEAKER DEBORAH JOHNSON** – Oh, thank you. Let me just finish.

14
15 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Quickly.

16
17 **SPEAKER DEBORAH JOHNSON** – Quickly. I sat here a long time just to
18 speak.

19
20 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – As have we.

21
22 **SPEAKER DEBORAH JOHNSON** – I strongly urge the Council and the
23 Commission to keep the current zoning. I am opposed actually to having
24 anything built there because I go running. I'm a runner. In conclusion, as a
25 teacher, I ask my students to make good respectful decisions and as Council
26 Members and Staff, I ask you to do the same and be visionaries and exemplary
27 leaders.....

28
29 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Please conclude.

30
31 **SPEAKER DEBORAH JOHNSON** – And guardians of our City. Thank you.

32
33 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you. George.

34
35 **SPEAKER GEORGE HAGUE** – Good evening. I'm glad you're hanging in
36 there after 11:00.

37
38 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – We're troopers.

39
40 **SPEAKER GEORGE HAGUE** – All of you. I went out there. There are people
41 out there, as you know, you hear there applauds. They signed the clipboard with
42 information. If anybody here has yet to sign the clipboard, please do so. And
43 please come back. It will be very sad if this chamber is empty when this
44 Commission makes a decision on this. It is very important that we are here to
45 watch what is being done. You received a 17 page letter from the attorneys back
46 in December. You should've read those. You received, late today, a followup

1 four page letter basically saying the seven page letter was not addressed, not
2 thoroughly, not completely. Hopefully, you've read that. I would appreciate
3 being able to read the responses from the developer on those and being able to
4 respond back to what the developer said. That hasn't happened. I hope this
5 doesn't have to go to court but it may. And, if it does, hopefully some people in
6 the audience will help pay for an attorney to follow this through to the end. But,
7 hopefully, the developer will sit down with some of us and come to the decision
8 that a half acre is the best way and opposition disappears, and he has a
9 wonderful project; one that we would all appreciate having in the neighborhood,
10 except maybe one runner. So please continue this hearing not for yourself,
11 continue the hearing for the public. When I leave here and Friday and early next
12 week, I'm going to try and get my hands on the packets that were dunked in front
13 of you by the developer trying to answer these 73 emails and documents from a
14 couple of different attorney's. And I want to read those responses, and then I
15 want to give you additional input. I'm afraid you're not going to allow me to do
16 that at the next hearing, and that's wrong. You have the right to allow me to
17 speak again after I gain more knowledge that I haven't been able to gain at this
18 point. I should be able to, once again, address you and so should other people
19 behind me if they are able to gain more knowledge that was not given to them to
20 this point. Now, that doesn't mean the hearings will go on for ever and ever and
21 ever. You just need to allow some of us, or as many of us as possible, to be able
22 to speak on this issue. This project will be growth inducing. You've heard that a
23 couple of times this evening. They are going to put a huge sewer system under
24 State Route 60, even probably larger than what you just heard somebody else
25 speak about. They are going to bring it up Moreno Beach. That's going to
26 basically open up the entire area for small lot development. We're totally against
27 this.

28

29 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Your three minutes are up, George.

30

31 **SPEAKER GEORGE HAGUE** – I thank you very much, and you have a good
32 evening.

33

34 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you. Next up, Glen Jacobs. Then, Lindsey
35 Robin. Then, Michael Brown.

36

37 **SPEAKER GLEN JACOBS** – Alright, good evening Commissioners, people in
38 attendance, and those still watching at home. I'm Glen Jacobs. I live in District
39 2. However, I live in Hidden Springs, and I feel for my larger community, and I
40 thank them for taking the time out of their lives to be heard in regards to the
41 Ironwood Village Project. I'm here for more than four hours. That's crazy. I
42 don't know how many people that really had a cause would stand for that amount
43 of time but, as watching people, some of them were standing for over three
44 hours. Bravo. I understand this is a process but, all this time spent, I think
45 Commissioner Korzec said it best. No Zone Change, no problem. You know, I
46 challenge others to stand for this amount of time or just come to these types of

1 meetings to advocate for things that they care about in their lives. You know, the
2 old Ralph's, the Sunnymead HOA, they can't help that vacant center. You know,
3 the golf course south of town, they can't help the fact that they look to dead grass
4 when they butted up to a golf course. The east side, south of the freeway, alright
5 man we took on the World Logistics Center, and we rezoned all that. But come
6 on now, the upper north side going R2 to R5. You can plan for this, and you can
7 prevent this. Yet, tonight, I met Tom and Mary who lived in this land and this city
8 way before it was a city. The General Plan was adopted in 1988. They checked
9 it to make sure it stayed R2. The City revisited in 2006. They checked that
10 Strategic Plan again to ensure the rural lifestyle. And, again tonight, I see 30
11 people in the hallway, 30 people standing outside, 100 people in attendance
12 voicing concerns. I never saw anything like that when I ran for City Council in
13 2014. These people are walking the walk not talking the talk. This is a huge
14 pushback. No HOA, no clubhouse, just residents passing out information, and
15 look at this turnout. They passed out this to doorsteps, and we got all these
16 people here. This is wild and crazy. Again, all these people here to be heard
17 and seen. I don't believe in bait and switch. I'm not sure how you rate pushback
18 but, on a scale of residents fighting this Ironwood project, it seems to me this
19 might just be the first wave. This was due to the papers being left at the houses
20 and the bottom line this is proof that these residents are ready to fight to retain
21 their lifestyle. These neighborhoods are the rural area that we have left. I mean,
22 this looks like a City Council nightmare. My advice, do not approve. Stop it here.
23 It's not moral. It's not ethical. And I can just imagine the reason you were
24 appointed or, in some cases, elected was to stop these types of things before
25 you take up their time there. So best of luck. My vote is no, but good luck
26 people.

27

28 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you. Next up, Lindsey Robin. Then, Michael
29 Brown.

30

31 **SPEAKER LINDSEY ROBIN** – Lindsey Robinson. Is that close enough?

32

33 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Sure.

34

35 **SPEAKER LINDSEY ROBIN** – My boots are muddy. I've been to that site. I
36 went to Ironwood and Moreno Beach when that was denied. I went to Ironwood
37 east of Vista De Cerros when was denied. We have a General Plan. We lost
38 trails, we lost large lots, and we lost the PAKO when the World Logistics was
39 stupidly zoned for down there. We need to keep the PAKO. We need to keep
40 the large lots. You need to respect the residents, and I'm very disturbed when I
41 asked Claudia to verify that the City Staff has read about the other denials and
42 what the Councils said then and what the Planning Commissioners said then.
43 They made promises to use that we would not keep having these battles. She
44 could not verify, they could not find these reports, and she could not verify that
45 the Staff studied and read those. I think there's something really wrong when our
46 Staff can't produce those and can't verify because we have fought this fight, and

1 we have won twice before. It shouldn't come up again. It's a nice project, yes,
2 but keep it at R2. Keep is PAKO. We need to retain that area. Thank you.

3
4 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you. Michael Brown. Then, Tom Jerele, Sr.
5 David Cortez batting third.

6
7 **SPEAKER TOM JERELE, SR.** – I think Mr. Brown may have left. I'll stand
8 outside if he does show up. Tom Jerele, Sr. speaking on behalf of myself. Vice
9 Chairman Barnes, Commissioners, Planning Commissioners, Members of Staff
10 and the public both here in the chamber who are toughing it out until 11:30 at
11 night and those who are watching at home on MVT3 or on the internet, I
12 commend Chairman Lowell for stepping out. That was a very honorable thing to
13 do, and I really thought that was a neat thing. And one comment, I really
14 should've spoken earlier, but I really believe with the larger notice, it's something
15 you need to look at in the City. Three hundred feet is effectively across the street
16 sometimes, and it's just not fair to the community at large. So I think it should go
17 a quarter-mile, even a half-mile. I know it's extra cost, but it's not that much with
18 computers, extra postage, and extra mailing, and I don't think it's that bad. So I
19 just think it is something you should look at in our City. And then, finally, I think it
20 was just an oversight, we should've moved this hearing to the beginning of the
21 meeting. I mean, there are over 100 people here and obviously they have grave
22 concerns and strong feelings and to be hearing testimony at 11:00 at night is
23 pretty rough. It's rough on you. It's rough on Staff. It's rough on them. And I
24 pray that when you reopen the hearing that there are additional people who
25 come forward and are given the opportunity to speak. All that being said, if you
26 noticed my slip, it doesn't say for or against because I came here with an open
27 mind. I wanted to see it. I'm familiar with the area. I've lived in Moreno Valley
28 since 1981. I built custom homes just east of here on Steeplechase, or west of
29 here, excuse me. And I built some development just to the east of here. In fact, I
30 got some of the first half acre lots approved out there on tract one, 7544. And,
31 like people were talking about, that was a project that opened up for about 400 or
32 500 homes to be built on half acre lots, probably some of the people here tonight.
33 And, at that time, there were certain council people that wanted that area to be 5
34 and 10 acre zoning. Well, do the math, that's 90% of the people. Eighty percent
35 of the people wouldn't be able to live here right now because there is not a lot
36 created for them. So density is not an evil unto itself. Good planning with good
37 designing features and amenities is the key to a cohesive and quality
38 development. I've been, because of my bank relocation, driving past Canyon
39 Crest quite a bit in recent days, and I've seen it many times before. I think it's an
40 incredible example of a high-density area, which has probably got just as some
41 of the people are concerned here with more than a million dollar plus homes, \$2
42 million/\$3 million homes in the same radius area so you can't integrate a density
43 project in an area. I mean, they are aggressively building apartments in the
44 immediate area and you go a half mile away and you've got some of the most
45 expensive homes in Riverside so you can do good things so the density isn't,
46 unto itself, the issue. It's how the project is implemented. I'm also a 20 year plus

1 member of the Director Slawson’s Advisory Committee for EMWD, and I like the
2 idea of bringing the sewer up because they are going to need it in that part of
3 town sooner or later. Am I out of time? Okay, well I thank you, and I love the
4 feeder trails. I think they are very innovative, and I think detention basins are
5 going to screen the project very well. Thank you.

6
7 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you, Tom. Next up, David Cortez and Huda
8 Kaoud.

9
10 **SPEAKER DAVID CORTEZ** – Hello. My name is Dave Cortez. Is it okay to
11 speak now?

12
13 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Yes, go.

14
15 **SPEAKER DAVID CORTEZ** – Hello. My name is David Cortez. I live at 2839
16 Black Oak right there on Quincy and Cactus, and I came here to be a part of this
17 so we don’t change our zone area. I like it as it is. I moved here about 20 years
18 ago. When I lived up there in Victor at the south end of the City, I moved over
19 here for my family so they could have room to grow and see how it is to have a
20 good environment instead of being crowded. Because I was raised over there in
21 LA, and it’s pretty crowded over there with the homes. You can hear the next
22 door neighbors yelling at each other. And here where I live, you can hear
23 nothing but the animals in the back of your yard. Like I said, there are snakes
24 here. A rattlesnake came into my yard about two months ago and also.....we
25 also have the coyotes that holler at night and the donkeys that come. That is
26 something my family had never seen. Only my wife had seen it because she
27 came from Mexico, and she talks about her past and her history and traditions
28 that they have there are their family of things that occur in their homes. And I
29 explained to my son this is how it is to live in the United States and California to
30 have an open place for your family to grow, not to be stuck in the city. That’s
31 why I’m here. I don’t want to be in the City. I just want to be in the open country,
32 and you are here. You are not up in LA or anything else. You’re here in this big
33 place here, and I’m a resident, and I want you to hear our voices. We’re hoping
34 you hear our voices that we don’t want it to grow here. We like it as it is now.
35 We like the things that are open, and we like change. You want to change and
36 put more residents but make it an acre. I live on 1.18 acre, and my son bought a
37 house about a year ago. And he’s 24 years old. So, if my son can do it, a lot of
38 people can buy homes here. So a lot of people say they can’t but they need to
39 apply and do hard work for it as many people did here. And I know the people
40 are here to help us, I like their help but make the homes bigger. Give us an acre
41 property because smaller is not going to help us. We like a big room and the free
42 environment where we’re at. And I thank you for whatever you’re doing for us,
43 and thank you for being here late for us so you can hear our voice. And, our
44 voice, I would like you to hear us and vote for us please. Listen to us. That’s all I
45 have to say. Thank you.

1 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you very much. Huda Kaoud, and I apologize
2 if a butchered that.

3
4 **SPEAKER HUDA KAOD** – It's Huda Kaoud. Thank you so much for letting
5 me speak. I'm actually fine to speak in public, but this issue is very frustrating to
6 me and I am presenting my family, my parents especially who moved here about
7 12 years ago. In particular to this house because, my mom, she wakes up early
8 in the morning and the only she does is planting and taking care of the house
9 and us, and I want to say that.....I have a lot of things to say, but I work in LA,
10 and I wake up so early in the morning, and I drive just to make sure that I beat
11 traffic over there. I'm renting half an apartment in LA, but still I can only.....I stay
12 there maybe four times in a month because I cannot sleep there. It is always
13 loud and the neighbors are always loud and I always hear the sirens, and I find
14 myself always driving after work. I don't even go to my apartment in LA. I just
15 drive to my parent's house in Moreno Valley, and sometimes I just get my
16 sleeping bag and sleep in the front yard because it's so calming honestly. This
17 project is very smart, and I know it's bringing a lot of.....it could bring a lot of
18 money, but honestly it is disrespectful to our choice of lifestyle, and it just doesn't
19 put the neighbors first. It just puts their, like their need of making money, which
20 is not bad, but we have needs as well. And this project just doesn't meet our
21 needs. Also, because I work in LA, I know the frustration of traffic and just
22 thinking of 180 houses and all of the cars that it's going to bring and the kind of
23 traffic that it's going to cause. Also, it will add a lot more to the frustration and, I
24 don't know if you know that area, there is already a little bit of traffic during rush
25 time and just thinking of all the extra traffic that's going to happen. It's just going
26 to not make.....it's not going to make it even easier. That's all, and thank you
27 for listening to us. Thank you.

28
29 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you very much. John Myers, Robin Ross, and
30 last but not least, Thomas Ross.

31
32 **SPEAKER JOHN MYERS** – Good evening. Thank you for listening to all of us.
33 My name is John Myers. I moved to this City in 1989 and looked forward to
34 looking at the stars at night. They have disappeared. With the onrush of traffic
35 and people, the city has changed. But this is my city, and so I fight for it, and I
36 fight for it to remain a good city. And it has to evolve, but it has to also follow a
37 plan so those are three areas that I'm talking about. We have a plan. It is our
38 city. Secondly, we have safety issues and, third, we have an environmental
39 issue. Though I oppose the project as presented, not because it's not well
40 thought out, but because it doesn't fit. Our City has a plan. It has a good plan to
41 keep the rural area there. This is what we need to keep. Secondly, with more
42 houses, you get more traffic. We've talked about that, but it harms our
43 environment for the plants and trees and all the exhaust of the cars. It harms the
44 lungs of the people. We have infrastructure that is going to be stretched. The
45 fire and the police are going to be stretched. City schools are planning on a
46 certain amount of children there by using the General Plan. If you start changing

1 that, you're going to throw everything off. And, as a 37 year teacher, I can tell
2 you there are many times we have way too many kids because we can't
3 adequately take what's coming because of the growth. Basically, the third thing
4 is, if you build, you cover ground with asphalt and concrete and roofs. And you
5 have water running off that does not seep back into the soil. California is in a
6 drought. If we continue to pave over this state, we will not only pay for it, but the
7 rest of the world will pay for it. Stick to the General Plan. Half acre lots make
8 much better sense. That which is planned can be made to have runoff go right
9 down to where it can be seeping back into the soil. So we go back, plan. If we
10 plan, then my city will remain a good city and can become even better, and we
11 can plan for the safety issues, and we can plan to save the environment. Thank
12 you.

13
14 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you. Robin Ross. No Robin? Thomas Ross.
15 Oh, we do, oh. Thank you. So I think that concludes the public speakers so, at
16 this time, we will close the Public Hearing.

17
18 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – If I may, just to, if you want to
19 follow the procedures that are in your Planning Commission Guidelines, the order
20 is you've taken the public comments. There's an opportunity for rebuttal from the
21 Applicant, and they you do have the discretion, if you'd like, to invite back any
22 speakers. That's not typically what we do here, but it is written into your rules.
23 But we usually do allow rebuttal from the Applicant before you close the Public
24 Hearing.

25
26 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I apologize. I'm new to the gavel. So would the
27 Applicant like to give a statement or no?

28
29 **URBAN CROSSROADS HASEEB QURESHI** – First and foremost thank you
30 for the time and thank you for staying so late. We respect your time, and we
31 don't have any comments. We believe that the study and everything that we
32 provided with Staff and Staff's recommendation to move forward is sufficient.
33 Thank you.

34
35 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you. Alright. I think I need some direction
36 here. Any suggestions as to how we proceed?

37
38 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Do we close the Public Comments or should we
39 continue it so.....or for the public.....

40
41 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Yeah, I really could use some advice here, some
42 suggestions.

43
44 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – If you...you accommodated all of
45 the speakers this evening. We've allowed the traditional three minutes per
46 speaker. You've gone out of your way to stay the late hour. We do have

1 provisions in the rules that say you could've closed the meeting at 11:00. We've
2 gone past that. You've allowed the Applicant to rebut. If you close the Public
3 Hearing now, you give yourself an opportunity to continue with the dialogue this
4 evening between the Commissioners yourself, and you could take an action. Or
5 you have the option to close the Public Hearing and then reconvene at a
6 continued meeting date to have the dialogue then if you think the hour's too late.
7 Those are some of the options. We typically, while your rules do allow for you to
8 allow for rebuttal from the public, that's not typical. It's a slippery slope because
9 it could go on so that's just the one option.

10
11 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – And the Applicant didn't offer
12 a rebuttal so there wouldn't really be anything to rebut but public.

13
14 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Alright.

15
16 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – If I may, with regard to the
17 materials that you got tonight, I know that's a common problem from the back of
18 the room, all the materials that are provided to you were provided by the public.
19 We've made extra copies available at the back of the room. They were clearly
20 marked that they were available for review. A lot of that stuff has been coming
21 in. Some of the speakers have dropped information here before us this evening.
22 You have everything that we have and so you're, in this capacity, an advisory
23 body to the City Council. You have all the information you need to make a
24 decision if you feel fit. At the end of the day, we're also going to take this
25 information to the City Council who is the final decision maker on this.

26
27 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – That being said, I think I'm in favor of closing the
28 Public Hearing, continuing the meeting, having time to digest this additional
29 information, and incorporate it in our deliberation at the next meeting. Thoughts?

30
31 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – That's the 23rd of February.

32
33 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I'll take your word on that. Next meeting?

34
35 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – The next regular meeting. You
36 could have.....it would be on February 9th. We would not be opposed to coming
37 back on February 9th if you think you could have a quorum. The one rule you do
38 have in your rules is that, whoever is sitting up there, continues on there. So, if
39 everybody here can commit to being back on February 9th, that would be the
40 soonest. Then, the next meeting is February 23rd.

41
42 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – February 9th?

43
44 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – I'm good for that.

45
46 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Alright, well.....

1
2 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – You would accomplish it
3 through a motion and a vote.

4
5 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – You read my mind. Thank you, Sir.

6
7 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – One thing I do want to point out,
8 with regard to a quorum, Commissioner Sims, Commissioner Baker, yourself
9 (Vice Chair), and Commissioner Korzec are the four that do need to be here to
10 constitute a quorum because the alternate doesn't count towards the quorum so,
11 if any of those four cannot make it on the 9th, that should be known now. That's
12 the only thing I would, for sure, point out.

13
14 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Another question. We discussed this going through
15 this alternate Commissioner process, and Commissioner Ramirez, if he has
16 viewed the meeting, come back and sit, that was.....

17
18 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Yeah, so he will want to
19 disclose that he has watched the meeting in its entirety if that was the case.
20 That's a different set of facts, but we'll verify all our rules, and we'll make sure
21 that whoever we have is appropriate for that meeting at that time.

22
23 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – I'm free.

24
25 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Well, in that case, then I think we'll entertain a motion
26 to.....

27
28 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Before you entertain that
29 motion, you should take formal action to either close or keep the Public Hearing
30 open.

31
32 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – That's what I'm going to do. Do you want to close the
33 Public Hearing? Yes, alright. We gave people the option to speak first and
34 everybody who wanted that opportunity did that.

35
36 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – In that case, it was only
37 people who had signed up on the first day and were here and present the first
38 day. We made a Council special rule for that situation.

39
40 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – So anybody who was on the list and did not
41 speak.....

42
43 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – You certainly have the
44 discretion to do that, and I'd caution that stepping outside of that could open it up
45 to.....

1 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I wouldn't want to step outside of that.

2
3 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Everybody speaking again.

4
5 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Alright.

6
7 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – My advice would be, if they
8 left, they left. They chose to leave. And, if you're going to close the hearing,
9 close the hearing. If you want to keep the hearing open and let people speak
10 again....

11
12 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – No. I'm not suggesting we let people speak again.
13 I'm saying.....

14
15 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – That's why I'm suggesting the
16 cleanest way is, if you don't want people to speak again at all or open up the
17 challenge to being able to speak again, I would.....my advice would be to close
18 the Public Hearing completely.

19
20 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Do we agree? We have the list, correct? We know
21 who did not speak and who did speak, correct?

22
23 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Yes, yes. We have a list. The
24 recommendation for the Staff here is to close the hearing and then you'll open
25 back up for deliberation. You're not opening up the Public Hearing again. Those
26 people that are shouting from the back that you're going to have a meeting on
27 the 9th, for them to come back and continue the Public Hearing, that's.....if you
28 close the Public Hearing, unless you find some circumstances to reopen that
29 Public Hearing, they won't have an opportunity to speak.

30
31 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – The other.....

32
33 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – The other thing is, with regard to
34 the Items that would be on the February 9th Agenda, at this point, this would be
35 the only item on that Agenda, so I can assure you of that because we don't have
36 any other items that we're ready to bring.

37
38 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – I'd like to hear from Paul.

39
40 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – I was just going to say, the
41 other.....along those lines, if you were to allow more speakers next time, even if
42 they were the same ones from tonight who didn't speak tonight and went home
43 early, you're opening up the door to new facts, to new arguments, to new
44 rebuttals. There's a domino effect that would be involved with that as well. If you
45 close it and you continue it just for deliberation, you're just coming in for
46 deliberation.

1
2 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I'd like some feedback guys.

3
4 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – We have to deliberate.

5
6 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – I would suggest closing it. We've heard two-and-a-
7 half hours of opposition of it. I think, I mean, I certainly respect the viewpoints of
8 the people we haven't heard, but we all took the time to be here and so I think, I
9 think there was an opportunity.

10
11 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – No, I don't think we need a motion to close the Public
12 Hearing. We can do that.

13
14 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Right. As Chair, you would
15 just close the Public Hearing, but you would need a motion to continue.

16
17 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Alright, at this point, we're going to close the Public
18 Hearing. And I'll entertain a motion to continue the action until the meeting of
19 2/9/17.

20
21 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Yeah, I'd like to make a motion to continue this case
22 number. Do I need to repeat the case number?

23
24 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – No.

25
26 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Okay. Continue the hearing on Ironwood Village,
27 track 37001 until 2/9/2017.

28
29 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – I'll second.

30
31 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – We have a motion from Commissioner Sims and a
32 second from Commissioner Nickel. Roll call vote or electronic if we can.

33
34 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST DARISA VARGAS** – You can do
35 electronic.

36
37 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Alright, mover, do you want to hit it?

38
39 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Mine's not up for some reason?

40
41 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Lori, can you hit the second? And then, alright, we
42 have a motion and a second. Let's.....

43
44 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – I can't vote.
45

1 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST DARISA VARGAS** – Sorry. You're
2 going to have to do it verbally.

3
4 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Let's do a roll call vote.

5
6 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Yes.

7
8 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Yes.

9
10 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Yes.

11
12 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Yes.

13
14 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Yes.

15
16
17
18 Opposed – 0

19
20
21 **Motion carries 5 – 0**

22
23
24 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Alright, I think that concludes the action on that case.
25 Do we have additional comments by the Staff?

26
27
28
29 **STAFF COMMENTS**

30
31
32 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – The only additional comments I
33 would say is, all the information that you have available on your dais this
34 evening, is the information that you should be taking with you to consider before
35 your next meeting. You have the deliberations. We will not be introducing any
36 new information the record. What you have is what you will be deliberating on.

37
38 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you, Mr. Sandzimier.

39
40
41 **ADJOURNMENT**

42
43 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – With that being said, we will adjourn until the meeting
44 of 2/9/2017. Thank you for your patience and your persistence for staying so
45 late. Good night.

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

NEXT MEETING

Next Meeting: Planning Commission Special Meeting, February 9, 2017 at 7:00 PM, City of Moreno Valley, City Hall Council Chamber, 14177 Frederick Street, Moreno Valley, CA 92553.

Richard J. Sandzimier
Planning Official
Approved

Date

Brian R. Lowell
Chair

Date