

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

5 **Thursday, February 9, 2017 at 7:00 PM**

6
7
8 **CALL TO ORDER**
9

10 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Good evening ladies and gentlemen. I would like to call to
11 order this Regular Continuation Meeting of the Planning Commission. There was
12 a typo on the Agenda. It says Special Meeting, but it is actually a Continued
13 Regular Meeting. Today is Thursday, February 9, 2017. The time is a little bit
14 after 7:00. It is 7:08 PM. I would like to call the meeting to order. Could we have
15 rollcall please?
16

17
18 **ROLL CALL**
19

20 Commissioners Present:

21 Commissioner Korzec
22 Commissioner Nickel
23 Commissioner Baker
24 Commissioner Gonzalez
25 Commissioner Sims
26 Vice Chair Barnes
27 Chair Lowell
28 Commissioner Ramirez - Excused Absent
29

30
31 Staff Present:

32 Rick Sandzimier, Planning Official
33 Paul Early, Assistant City Attorney
34 Erica Tadeo, Senior Administrative Specialist
35 Claudia Manrique, Case Planner
36 Michael Lloyd, Traffic Engineer
37 Eric Lewis, City Traffic Engineer
38 Chris Ormsby, Senior Planner
39

40
41 Speakers:

42 RD Hayes
43 Suzanne Potter
44 Susan Zeitz

1 Siegfried Dankreyier
2 Marcia Narog
3 George Hague
4 Kathleen Dale

5
6

7 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Gonzalez, could you lead us in the Pledge of
8 Allegiance, please?

9

10 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – I will.

11

12

13 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

14

15

16 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Would anybody like to make a
17 motion to approve tonight's Agenda?

18

19

20 **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

21

22

23 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – I so move.

24

25 **CHAIR LOWELL** – We have a motion by Commissioner Baker. Do we have a
26 second?

27

28 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I'll second.

29

30 **CHAIR LOWELL** – We have many seconds. All in favor, say aye.

31

32 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Aye.

33

34 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Aye.

35

36 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Aye.

37

38 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – Aye.

39

40 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Aye.

41

42 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Aye.

43

44 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Aye.

45

46 **CHAIR LOWELL** – All opposed, say nay. Any abstentions?

1
2
3 Opposed – 0
4
5

6 **Motion carries 7 – 0**
7
8

9 **CHAIR LOWELL** – The motion passes 7-0. Tonight's Agenda is officially
10 approved. That moves us onto our Consent Calendar items, which I do not
11 believe we have any.
12

13 **CONSENT CALENDAR**

14
15
16 *All matters listed under Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and all*
17 *will be enacted by one rollcall vote. There will be no discussion of these items*
18 *unless Members of the Planning Commission request specific items be removed*
19 *from the Consent Calendar for separate action.*
20
21

22 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

23
24
25 **None**
26
27

28 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Approval of Minutes is next, which, again, we don't have
29 any.
30

31 **PUBLIC COMMENTS PROCEDURE**

32
33
34 *Any person wishing to address the Commission on any matter, either under*
35 *Public Comments section of the Agenda or scheduled items or public hearings,*
36 *must fill out a "Request to Speak" form available at the door. The completed*
37 *form must be submitted to the Secretary prior to the Agenda item being called by*
38 *the Chairperson. In speaking to the Commission, member of the public may be*
39 *limited to three minutes per person, except for the applicant for entitlement. The*
40 *Commission may establish an overall time limit for comments on a particular*
41 *Agenda item. Members of the public must direct their questions to the*
42 *Chairperson of the Commission and not to other members of the Commission,*
43 *the applicant, the Staff, or the audience. Additionally, there is an ADA note.*
44 *Upon request, this Agenda will be made available in appropriate alternative*
45 *formats to persons with disabilities in compliance with the Americans with*
46 *Disabilities Act of 1990. Any person with a disability who requires a modification*

1 or accommodation in order to participate in a meeting should direct their request
2 to Guy Pagan, our ADA Coordinator, at (951) 413-3120 at least 48 hours prior to
3 the meeting. The 48-hour notification will enable the City to make reasonable
4 arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.
5
6
7

8 NON-PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

9

10 **CHAIR LOWELL** – That moves us onto Public Comments on Non-Public
11 Hearing Items, which I do believe we have a few Speaker Slips. A couple people
12 turned in duplicate slips. We're going to limit.....you're limited to one speaking
13 opportunity at a time so, if you have a slip, please turn it in now, and we will start
14 calling you up one by one. Also, since this is a continuation meeting, if your Non-
15 Public Hearing Item comments lean toward a Public Hearing Item that is on
16 tonight's Agenda, I will be cutting you off and asking you to withhold your
17 comments for the next time you can speak, which would be at the City Council
18 Meeting. The Public Comments have closed on this Agenda item and, if you do
19 start speaking towards this, it won't be on the record, so I would recommend
20 holding your.....I'm sorry, I'd recommend holding your opinions and desires and
21 wishes and comments until the City Council Meeting if and when this item is
22 moved onto City Council. With that said, who would our first speaker be?
23

24 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST**Darisa Vargas– Kathleen Dale.
25

26 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Ms. Dale, come on up. And who would the next one be?
27 Could you read off a couple of them?
28

29 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST ERICA TADEO** – George Hague and
30 R.D. Hayes.
31

32 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you.
33

34 **SPEAKER KATHLEEN DALE** – It's awfully high.
35

36 **CHAIR LOWELL** – You can bring it down.
37

38 **SPEAKER KATHLEEN DALE** – Good evening, my name is Kathleen Dale. I'm
39 a life-long Moreno Valley resident and retired from a 35-year career as a planner
40 and an environmental consultant. I wanted to just address you on three matters
41 that are relevant to your general authority and function. The first one is regarding
42 the information that comes to you in applicant presentations and staff reports and
43 Staff comments during your hearing matters, and I hope you are all listening
44 carefully to what's being said and that you're understanding when misinformation
45 is put into the record and striking that misinformation from your knowledge base
46 for your deliberations. I think also it's important that when misinformation has

1 been presented to you, and in fact this happens in your written staff reports as
2 well, that you should express to the public that there was misinformation in the
3 record and that you have not considered that in your deliberations. In your Rules
4 of Procedure, there is a requirement for disclosures and one aspect of those
5 disclosures has to do with a recused member and not having conversations with
6 that recused member about the project. So, if any of you have something to
7 disclose, I hope that you do that on a regular basis. The third item has to do with
8 your.....with one of your authorities, and I don't know if this has been explained to
9 you but, in the Municipal Code, Section that establishes the Parks Commission,
10 you actually have the authority to refer matters to the Parks Commission for
11 review. And so, if you have a project that involves a General Plan Amendment
12 that affects future park facilities, you really, before you take action on that, should
13 refer that to the Parks Commission for their recommendation before you take
14 action. Thank you.

15

16 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you. Mr. George Hague.

17

18 **SPEAKER GEORGE HAGUE** – Good evening, George Hague. Restating a few
19 of the things I said last time. Once again, the Planning Department is your Staff.
20 Do not let them treat you as if you are their subordinates. You need to realize
21 that you can and should direct them, and hopefully you will. This City does not
22 do the best job in preparing the Planning Commissioners. If you go online and
23 just Google Planning Commission responsibilities, you'll see cities that have fairly
24 decent documents that help Commissioners understand their role and functions
25 of what they should and should not do, and I would recommend that for
26 everybody sitting up there at this time. I, again, thank you prior to hearing a
27 project that involves historical or environmental perhaps damage that you should
28 have the input from that county.....or that committee here in this city. Same thing
29 goes with parks. You need to get the input from them first, and you should direct
30 Staff to require that. That's your job is to direct Staff to do that. We had quite a
31 few people here last time. We have quite a few people here this time. I was
32 promised, for example, that the tables along the side of the wall would be
33 removed that people are now sitting on and chairs would be put in their place.
34 As you can see, that was not done. So, once again, we have people standing in
35 the back so they can be in the main room. Now, I hope the Planning
36 Commission recommends to Staff that, during a City Council Meeting, something
37 needs to be done. Because, during a normal Council Meeting, this room is fairly
38 full. Add 100 people to that. So, what recommendation will this Planning
39 Commission make to Staff in order to make it so that people can be at the
40 meeting before the City Council and be able to sit and listen and not be turned
41 away at the door like last time because there were not enough chairs? If this is
42 not Special Meeting before the City Council, you're not doing the best by the
43 people in this city. So hopefully you will do that. I hope you will also, when you
44 have time, look further into the responsibilities of the Planning Commission. And
45 I will this time, and in the future, be watching to see if you do list those who are
46 associated with a project if you've been talking to them or anybody that is a

1 proponent of the project and that you list those people prior to your vote. That's
2 very responsible for the public to hear that from those who are making decisions.
3 And I thank you very much for your time this evening, and I appreciate you
4 having this hearing at this time when we can be here by ourselves without three
5 or four other items prior to the project. You probably appreciate that also. You
6 have a good evening.

7
8 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you, Mr. Hague. RD Hayes followed by Suzanne
9 Potter followed by Susan Zeitz. That's fine. You can pull the microphone down.

10
11 **SPEAKER RD HAYES** – Thank you. I am here to speak to the general promise
12 that is here in the city that growth under these circumstances is good. I came to
13 this city in 1972 before it was a city. Twelve years before it was a city because it
14 was small like the town city county seat that I came from back East. It took off
15 with cancerous growth. And it has been studied and published in magazines of
16 state jurisdiction that, when a population becomes over 100,000, you're going to
17 become desperate to maintain the police and fire and basic services without
18 anything else. And the more you get larger, the more you're going to have to trim
19 everything off. And the only way you're going to be able to survive is by federal
20 subsidies. I looked today and you see all of the various small units around that
21 are going good that you would think would be supported by the City and instead
22 they are supported by the federal government rats. The senior center is one of
23 the items that I know.....I'm a member of the Friends of the Senior Center. The
24 growth is not necessarily good when it is choking the people. You are going to
25 run into the.....in fact, I think, perhaps now, they have already run into the
26 problem that the services cost more than really you can afford without taking
27 temporary things such as setting out new subdivisions and that sort of thing to
28 get enough funds to run the operations. I thank you for your attention.

29
30 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much, Mr. Hayes. We have Suzanne Potter
31 followed by Susan Zeitz followed by Marcia Narog.

32
33 **SPEAKER SUZANNE POTTER** – Good evening, my name is Suzanne Potter.
34 I'm a resident of the Sterling Ranch area of Moreno Valley. I'm also Rotarian and
35 as a Rotarian we have a four-way test that we....of the things that we think, say,
36 or do. First, is it the truth? Second, is it fair to all concerned? Third, is it
37 beneficial to all concerned? And, fourth, will it build goodwill and better
38 friendships? In light of that, I think I wanted to bring up a few things that I think
39 are facts, well-known facts, that when the Planning Commission, I'm sure, needs
40 to consider the benefit of the community not just of a few. A well-known fact,
41 California's Affordable Housing shortage of production has been more than
42 100,000 annually but not for the last 10 years, and Moreno Valley is no exception
43 to that. Home ownership in California is at the lowest level since the 1940s.
44 Another well-known fact, living in the same community you work in is one of the
45 most beneficial things economically and socially and educationally for the
46 residents of that community. Moreno Valley Unified School District is the largest

1 employer in the city and yet it is amazing that a large percentage of that staff do
2 not live in this community. As a retired educator, there is no single more
3 important factor for a child's success than to have their parents involved in their
4 education. If you don't live in the community that you work in, that's a hard thing
5 to do. One of the other things that is really important, I think, is our safety.
6 Improved streets, provide safe places to walk and to ride. Some areas you have
7 nothing but gullies and eroded hillsides, so I hope that you take these things into
8 consideration when you make your deliberations. Thank you.

9
10 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you, Ms. Potter. Susan Zeitz followed by Marcia
11 Narog.

12
13 **SPEAKER SUSAN ZEITZ** – Hi. Susan Zeitz, 26386 Ironwood Avenue. A
14 Moreno Valley resident for 34 years I believe it is. I hope that you take into
15 account the history of the planned usage for Moreno Valley. I hope that you
16 have done your due diligence in studying the land usage in Moreno Valley. I
17 hope that you take into the consideration the past rulings maintaining the current
18 zonings. I hope that you realize you work for us and the past....for the past 34
19 years, we have had many citizens who have come to a lot of the meetings to
20 ensure that the zonings stay the way that the zonings are and trying to maintain
21 the lifestyle that we have come to....that we came here for; that we have moved
22 here for. And that not everybody can afford to live in the areas that we live, but
23 you know, that's just how it is. I can't live at the beach. I can't afford it. I can't
24 live in Hollywood. I can't afford it. So trying to change zonings to make it more
25 affordable for people is not the answer. That doesn't benefit the majority of the
26 people who already live here. That only benefits the people who own the land
27 who want to do it for the money. They don't care about anything else. They
28 don't care about the people who have been here so thank you.

29
30 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. And Marcia Narog.

31
32 **SPEAKER MARCIA NAROG** – Good evening, my name is Marcia Narog, and I
33 live at 11475 Carrie Lane in the northeast sector of Moreno Valley. One of the
34 things I am here to talk about is planning. When I first voted for the City to
35 incorporate, we were hoping that it would be better planning than what happened
36 under the County's overview. So, in light of that, we all would like to be able to
37 plan on how the Planning Commission makes recommendations, and we'd also
38 like to be able to plan on how the City decides on what's going on. I have a very
39 specific item that I would like to bring to you tonight. It is able a FEMA grant that
40 was awarded for our specific private road where I live. I live on a private road
41 and a public road. I'm on a corner. I'm on a nexus of a low-lying stream where
42 drainages come from two directions. The FEMA grant was supposed to correct
43 the drainage in our neighborhood, and it was supposed to help improve the
44 streets that I live on so that the future 10- or 50- or 100-year floods wouldn't be
45 causing problems. I bring this up because I have been in contact with the City
46 previously, every three to six months, because I wanted to be involved in the

1 planning since it will involve my private property. So, in light of this, I would like
2 to be able to get some input on how I can expect the planning to go forward
3 because they have come out and they have identified where the utilities and the
4 water lines are again, and I haven't been contacted by the City as I had
5 requested for what the future plans are going to be. So, if any body could help
6 me out with this, and if anybody could help me out with being able to rely on the
7 City's plans and the General Plan and the FEMA money, I would really
8 appreciate it. So thank you very much.

9
10 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Mr. Chairman.

11
12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yes, Mr. Sandzimier.

13
14 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – I'll get her information, and we'll
15 get a hold of her and see if we can follow up on that.

16
17 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I'd appreciate that. Thank you. Last call for Speaker Slips
18 on Non-Public Hearing Items, going once, going twice....

19
20 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – Oh, that gentleman right there.

21
22 **CHAIR LOWELL** – If you could come up and state your name please and then
23 could you fill out a pink slip after the fact? You can just come on up, and we'll
24 take care of the paperwork when you're done.

25
26 **SPEAKER SIEGFRIED DANKREYIER** – I will fill out a sheet, and I didn't intend
27 to speak but nevertheless.....

28
29 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Can you state your name please?

30
31 **SPEAKER SIEGFRIED Dankmeyer** – My name is Siegfried Dankmeyer, 26992
32 Sandy Lane. I think that I have the only property, which is so to speak, cheek-
33 on-cheek, with the development. I have heard all kinds of comments. Of course,
34 I was at the last meeting with most of the statements about spreading your arms,
35 not listening even if the window is closed, not listening to the neighbors jukebox
36 or TV and all these things. We heard about technical things. I have not, and I
37 got my hearing aids in, I think I have not heard a word about money. And, as you
38 all know, money talks, and this is what I want to say briefly because I moved to
39 where we live in 1986. We have enjoyed the hillsides. Our kids grew up there
40 and the only admonishment I had to give them was watch out for the snakes.
41 So, and we still have snakes, but that's another issue. But, I also have told them
42 for the last 30 years, enjoy it while it lasts because, one of these days, the big
43 machines will show up and do a number on this piece of land. As you know,
44 there is not much land of that quality left in Moreno Valley, and I knew some
45 of.....the lady just mentioned when the City was incorporated. I knew some of
46 these people when the City was founded. There were people in there like Mr.

1 Scott who had his interest, and then there were people like Judy Nieburger,
2 which were kind of idealistic in that, hey what we can do if we take that away
3 from the County? The County didn't have any interest, so, they said, well okay
4 it's another project. So the planning and the administration from that time on has
5 gone steadily downhill. And I don't come to all these meetings, very, very
6 seldom. I used to be, in the early 90s, I used to be on the Design of Review
7 Board, which the City had, and the Planning Staff came and brought a stack of
8 envelopes a couple of feet high, and I would study that stuff and look over it. I'm
9 a design professional, so I would make overlays and how it could make better
10 and well, in fact, my wife didn't know I was like that but I spent all weekend trying
11 to make something better.

12

13 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much.

14

15 **SPEAKER SIEGFRIED DANKREYIER** – That's my nature, but we have these
16 meetings and these so-called developers who.....

17

18 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Your three minutes are up. If you could rap it up.

19

20 **SPEAKER SIEGFRIED DANKREYIER** – How many minutes I have left?

21

22 **CHAIR LOWELL** – You're over now.

23

24 **SPEAKER SIEGFRIED DANKREYIER** – Okay.

25

26 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I appreciate it.

27

28 **SPEAKER SIEGFRIED DANKREYIER** – Thanks.

29

30 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you.

31

32 **SPEAKER SIEGFRIED DANKREYIER** – Because I have all kinds of things to
33 say.

34

35 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. If you could provide your Speaker
36 Slip to the Staff, I would appreciate it.

37

38 **SPEAKER SIEGFRIED DANKREYIER** – Pardon me?

39

40 **CHAIR LOWELL** – If you could provide that pink slip to the Staff.

41

42 **SPEAKER SIEGFRIED DANKREYIER** – I did not.

43

44 **CHAIR LOWELL** – If you could do that, I would appreciate it.

45

46 **SPEAKER SIEGFRIED DANKREYIER** – I will do that and give it to 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

CHAIR LOWELL – Thank you very much.

SPEAKER SIEGFRIED DANKREYIER – Okay, so obviously.....

CHAIR LOWELL – Thank you.

SPEAKER SIEGFRIED DANKREYIER – But.....

CHAIR LOWELL – Have a seat please. Thank you.

SPEAKER SIEGFRIED DANKREYIER – Obviously.....

CHAIR LOWELL – Can you have a seat please? You're times up. Thank you.

SPEAKER SIEGFRIED DANKREYIER – I just was asking you.....

CHAIR LOWELL – Yeah, times up.

SPEAKER SIEGFRIED DANKREYIER – Well I have a lot more to say. Can I give you two pink slips?

CHAIR LOWELL – Thank you very much. With that, I would like to conclude the Non-Public Hearing Items, and that moves us onto our first Case item, which is a continuation from last meeting, and I do have to recuse myself from it from a conflict of interest. So, with that, I would like to turn the meeting over to Vice Chair Barnes.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- 1. Case: Ironwood Village - General Plan Amendment, Change of Zone, Tentative Tract Map 37001, and Design Guidelines for a 181 lot Single-Family Residential Development
- Applicant: Global Investment & Development, LLC
- Owner: Ironwood 8 Properties, Inc.
- Representative: Anderson Consulting Engineers, Inc

1 Location: Ironwood Avenue, east of Nason Street
2 and west of Oliver Street (APN: 473-
3 160-004)
4
5 Case Planner: Claudia Manrique
6
7 Council District: 2
8
9 Proposal: Continuance of Ironwood Village -
10 General Plan Amendment, Change of
11 Zone, Tentative Tract Map 37001, and
12 Design Guidelines for a 181 lot Single-
13 Family Residential Development
14
15

16 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

17
18 Staff recommends that the Planning Commission take the following action:

19
20 **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2017-15, 2017-16, and 2017-17 and thereby
21 **RECOMMEND** that the City Council:

- 22
23 1. **CERTIFY** a Mitigated Negative Declaration, pursuant to the California
24 Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines; and
25
26 2. **APPROVE** the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared for
27 General Plan Amendment Application No. PEN16-0077 (PA15-0037),
28 Change of Zone Application No. PEN16-0078 (PA15-0038), Tentative
29 Tract Map 37001 Application No. PEN16-0079 (PA15-0039) and Plot Plan
30 Application PEN16-0080 (PA15-0040) for the Ironwood Village Design
31 Guidelines pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
32 Guidelines; and
33
34 3. **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2017-05 and thereby **APPROVE** General Plan
35 Amendment Application No. PEN16-0077 (PA15-0037); and
36
37 4. **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2017-06 and thereby **APPROVE** Change of
38 Zone Application No. PEN16-0078 (PA15-0038); and
39
40 5. **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2017-07 and thereby **APPROVE** Tentative
41 Tract Map 37001 and the Ironwood Village Design Guidelines, subject to
42 the attached Conditions of Approval included as Exhibit A and attached
43 Design Guidelines included as Exhibit B to Resolution 2017-07.
44
45
46

1 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you, Chair Lowell. As you know, the Staff
2 Report and discussion with the Applicant and the Public Hearing portion of the
3 meeting took place at the previous meeting. We are here this evening.....I
4 apologize. We are here this evening for the deliberation portion of the case. Mr.
5 Sandzimier, should we have a brief summary or anything or do we just wade in?
6

7 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – We’ve completed the Staff
8 presentation. You guys concluded the deliberation so the only thing we should
9 have is, Commissioner Gonzalez who was not here at the last meeting.....I
10 know I did receive an email from him but, if he could just disclose, for the record,
11 how he has brought himself up to speed on this particular item, that would be
12 appropriate. And then you guys can go into your deliberations.
13

14 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you.
15

16 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – Good evening. I listened to the meeting, to the
17 Public Comments portion of this item. I read over the various correspondence
18 and emails of our residents who have concerns regarding the project, and I did a
19 thorough review of the documents as I do on every project that I sit on. So that’s
20 how I brought myself up to speed. Thank you.
21

22 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you, Commissioner. Alright, with that being
23 said, deliberation is open. Would anybody like to make the initial comments?
24 No, I don’t have the magic button, so Commissioner Sims.
25

26 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – I have questions of Staff. I have some questions of
27 Staff, so on.....it’s my understanding that there’s a certain limit on the number of
28 General Plan Amendments that the City can approve every year. Is that true?
29

30 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – That is true. We can approve any
31 particular element of the General Plan four times per year.
32

33 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Is the four times a year, is that on a fiscal basis or on
34 a calendar year basis?
35

36 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – It would be on a calendar year
37 basis.
38

39 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – So I think we did one. We’ve done one so far this
40 year then. Is that correct? I believe there was a fringe. At the last meeting,
41 there was a fringe.
42

43 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – You guys have considered one
44 project that does have a General Plan Amendment. This item is a second one.
45 The City Council is the formal approving body on any legislative action so the
46 item’s not technically approved yet because it still needs to go to the City

1 Council, so there have been no General Plan Amendments approved this year,
2 but you guys gave considered one other one. That is true.

3
4 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Okay and then my next question is on this primary
5 animal keeping overlay that was done for the, kind of the northeast quadrant of
6 the city. Is there any other besides the one that’s directly south of the 60, you
7 know, from Redlands, between Redlands and generally Nason? Are there any
8 other primary animal keeping overlay areas within the city?

9
10 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – No. I believe the exhibits that we
11 gave you in the previous Staff Report showed all of the PAKO. Do we have that
12 exhibit still? We can put that exhibit back up.

13
14 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – I have it in front of me. So this exhibit right here is the
15 extent of the entire animal keeping areas?

16
17 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Yes.

18
19 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Okay. That’s mine.

20
21 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Alright. Anyone else? Alright, while you guys think
22 about it, I have some questions for Staff but it has to do with the regulations that
23 govern half-acre lots. One question pertains to septic. Are there any rules or
24 requirements, or pending rules or requirements, that would affect the viability of
25 half-acre lots on septic as moving forward?

26
27 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – No. The provisions for using a
28 septic system is, if you need a private sewage system with your development,
29 you would make a proposal for that. If you are in proximity to an existing sewer
30 system, then the expectation is that you would tie into that existing sewer system.
31 In this particular case, there is no existing sewer system for the loss to tie into, so
32 it would be.....I don’t know if that answers your question.

33
34 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I think so. So, at this point, half-acre lots with septic
35 are perfectly viable. Is that the minimum size for septic?

36
37 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – That I don’t know.

38
39 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ**– Yes, yes.

40
41 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Okay, alright.

42
43 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – I think that we should have the
44 Staff answer the question. I know that there’s some other noise in the
45 background but I’d prefer for the record that the Staff answer the questions.
46 Thanks.

1
2 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER MICHAEL LLOYD** – Good evening, Vice Chair, Michael
3 Lloyd with Land Development. To answer your question, half-acre lots are the
4 minimum size. That’s per county health requirements. As of October of last
5 year, they approved a local agency management program that deals with septic
6 and, within that document, that provides the rules for the city, as well as the
7 county. It does establish half acre as the minimum.

8
9 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Okay, and no discussion of any possible change to
10 that moving forward?

11
12 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER MICHAEL LLOYD** – I’m not aware of any.

13
14 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Okay. Thanks very much. Another question I had, as
15 it relates to half-acre lots, is water usage for landscape and irrigation. Being in a
16 drought, or coming out of a drought, I know water usage is critical. Are there any
17 conflicts between the goals of reducing water usage and the Municipal Code,
18 Code Compliance issues with maintaining your property landscaped? Any
19 conflicts in that?

20
21 **CASE PLANNER CLAUDIA MANRIQUE** – No. There’s no conflicts, and we
22 have chapter 9.17.070, which addresses some water efficiency requirements for
23 all landscaping of all single-family homes, as well as the development standard
24 section chapter 9.030.040, which talks about front yard landscaping. It’s now
25 required in lots of half-acre size as long as there are five or more units. That was
26 one of the latest Code Amendments that you approved last summer. Previous to
27 that, only street trees were required for the half-acre lots, but now there’s no
28 difference in the landscape standards for half acre or the proposed R3 and R5.

29
30 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Okay, alright. Thank you.

31
32 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Jeff, just as a note on the water....regardless if they
33 are half or whatever these, the R5, R3, the...Eastern is the water purveyor, and
34 they have water budget based rates and so each of the lots, assuming I don’t
35 think this project met the threshold for water supply assessment but Eastern
36 would have, in their Master Plan, would of course had supply consideration.
37 Each of the lots, whether, whatever size that they ultimately are, there would be a
38 specific water-based budget for each of the houses.

39
40 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Okay. Thank you. That’s all my questions at the
41 moment. Anyone else? This is deliberation so we’re....you’re welcome to.....

42
43 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – I.....

44
45 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Putting forth your opinion.

46

1 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – I had my.....

2
3 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Oh, I'm sorry. Next up, Commissioner Gonzalez.

4
5 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – And this question is for Staff. When is the next
6 scheduled General Plan update for the City of Moreno Valley? I know it was
7 done in 2005 or 2006.

8
9 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – It was approved in 2006 so we're
10 actually in the midst of initiating that effort already. The item that came to you at
11 your last meeting was a General Plan Annual Report and, during that Annual
12 Report, our Senior Planner, Mark Gross, had indicated in that report that we have
13 already establishing an AD HOC Committee to start compiling some
14 recommendations for the scope of work for the General Plan update and then the
15 Adopted Strategic Plan, Momentum Moreno Valley, there and specific initiatives
16 already outlined in there. I believe they are initiatives 1.9.1, 1.9.2, 1.9.3, and
17 1.9.4 that outline four specific strategies that are going to be carried out over a, I
18 believe most of them are a one-year timeframe, but the overall General Plan
19 Update is expected to take place within a three-year period. In addition to that,
20 the Staff has already put together one grant request to see if we can get some
21 outside funding for that outside effort, and we're continuing to pursue that grant
22 through SKAG, and we will look for other opportunities. Then, in our budget
23 development that is currently under way, one of the initiatives specifically talked
24 about putting some money in place to actually fund it. So those are the efforts
25 that are under way. The General Plan should be updated within three years as a
26 result of that effort.

27
28 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – Okay, thank you.

29
30 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Commissioner Nickel.

31
32 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Yes, I would really like to see this project go back
33 to the Parks and Recreation Commission and the Multi-Use Trails. I did attend a
34 small presentation on your map here and, having done the City's Original Master
35 Plan and been a grant reviewer for RCTC on SD821 funds, there's a whole lot of
36 problems with their trails here. And what I didn't like was, you know, people
37 volunteer and give their time to Commissions and Boards, and a lot of the
38 Commission and Boards do not get stipends. And they should be treated with
39 the upmost respect. Sometimes our volunteers are worth more than Staff
40 because they are there because they want to be there. And this was just
41 basically dumped on the Trails Committee without really them being able to
42 address what their needs are. After all, if you have equestrians on that
43 committee, then they understand. Because I look at this map, and it's like I don't
44 think horses can jump that far from Oliver over to that fire run. I'm just saying I
45 don't think they can, so that's one of my big concerns. And then, even with the
46 Applicant, we're talking about private park, community park....what is it? Is it

1 going to be open to the public? Because I can guarantee you the minute they
2 start putting bicycles and things like that of nonresidents down through those
3 tracks that HOA is going to have a fit. And, to encourage a trail pathway that
4 runs along people's driveways, that's a liability I don't even think HOA's could
5 even be insured for. So that's why I have a lot of concerns about that
6 and.....but I really do believe it is in our purview to have Parks and Recreation
7 review this projects on this, and as well the Multi-Use Trails. I don't know where
8 bicycles are at now. Are they with Traffic Safety Committee, Eric? Or are they
9 with multi-trails if they are on the roadway?

10
11 **CITY TRAFFIC ENGINEER ERIC LEWIS** – It's a combination of both. Public
12 Works is typically taking the lead on the bicycle facilities and trails remains with
13 the Trails Board.

14
15 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – So we're dealing with bicycles that are actually
16 considered motor vehicles when they are on the roadway, correct?

17
18 **CITY TRAFFIC ENGINEER ERIC LEWIS** – That is correct.

19
20 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Okay, so none of that was addressed in the Traffic
21 Study as far as I could see so those are concerns that I have there. That's my
22 comments for right now.

23
24 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Thank you. Commissioner Korzec.

25
26 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Well my comment is pretty basic, and it's
27 basically I still don't see the compelling reason to change the zoning. I don't
28 understand, maybe I'm misunderstanding, but I drove through our neighborhoods
29 and I looked around. And we heard figures that 53% of the housing on the
30 market right now is R5 housing. I don't understand what the compelling need is
31 to put more R5 housing in right now and go into a community where people
32 bought their homes in good faith that it would be R30 zoning without a valid
33 reason other than someone just wants to build it. Just because somebody wants
34 to build it doesn't mean it's the right thing. My suggestion would be to the
35 developer maybe find a different property here with that zoning and build it but,
36 until someone can prove to me why we need more of this in that neighborhood,
37 I'm just not going to get it.

38
39 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Anyone?

40
41 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – I have comments. Or is there already somebody else
42 ahead of me?

43
44 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Go ahead, Jeff.

45

1 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Well I have a question for Commissioner Korzec. Just,
2 for point of clarification, is your issue with the lot sizes or the density?
3

4 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – It's actually with both. It's changing the General
5 Plan and making this decision when there's such a public outcry on this and, if
6 we're not listening to the people that are here and all this paperwork, we're not
7 doing our job. They bought their homes here. I don't live in that neighborhood
8 so I have no vested interest. I'm a city girl, so I won't be living in your
9 neighborhood. But I think, to me, it's an intrinsic problem in this community that
10 we don't listen to our people. We have an area that's one of the last areas that is
11 very pleasant to drive through. They are not saying they don't want a
12 development there. They just don't want this type of development, so they are
13 not against it. They bought those homes with that....with it being R30 housing.
14 And, yes, if we had a pressing issue that we could bring here why we needed to
15 add this, then I would consider it. I don't see the pressing issue with 53% of our
16 housing right now that's for sale being this type of housing. Why are we going to
17 ruin a neighborhood when there's no need for it at this time?
18

19 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Alright, if we could limit the applause. I think everyone
20 knows where your leanings are so.....
21

22 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Mr. Chair....
23

24 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Let's move this along as quickly as possible.
25

26 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – If I may just clarify one thing.
27

28 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Yes.
29

30 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – I'm sure Commissioner Korzec, in
31 your reference to R30, it's actually zoned R2A, which is two dwelling. Your
32 reference to R30, just so the public doesn't hear it wrong.....
33

34 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Okay.
35

36 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – R30 would mean 30 dwellings per
37 acre. I don't think that's what you're intending.
38

39 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – I'm looking at the paperwork that I have, and I
40 took it from the paperwork.
41

42 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – That somebody's proposing R30?
43

44 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – No, that we're not....that they....let me find the
45 paperwork. Oh, I've got it wrong. R3. No, right here, what does that say?
46

1 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – R30.
2
3 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Yeah, it does say R30 on my paperwork.
4
5 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – So a typo?
6
7 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Well I’m going from the typo.
8
9 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Is it, is it a Staff Report?
10
11 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Yeah. It’s right on the first, it’s right on the first
12 page of the Staff Report, so I was preparing.....
13
14 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – It’s page one, page one.
15
16 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – In preparing my notes, I took it directly off of the
17 paperwork we were given.
18
19 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Fair enough.
20
21 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Yeah.
22
23 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – A typo is a typo.
24
25 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – So I will stand corrected if you correct it on the
26 paperwork.
27
28 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I think we all.....we’re clear now.
29
30 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – I believe what I read. Yeah, you understand the
31 point that I did take it directly off the Staff Report that was given to us on the first
32 page.
33
34 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Well, while they look into that, to go back to my
35 question, I would lean....I would be more likely to consider a development that
36 didn’t necessarily have a density increase but did vary from the lot size because I
37 could see the benefit, in some cases, for smaller lots clustered on a property of
38 that size with more open space around them, so the density, the impacts, be they
39 traffic, smog, whatever are no different so.....
40
41 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Wait a minute. Tell them, if they can’t be quiet,
42 we’re going to take a break.
43
44 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Yeah, yeah.....
45
46 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Because I can’t hear.

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

COMMISSIONER KORZEC – Okay, I had that wrong. I was on the wrong page.

VICE CHAIR BARNES – Okay. So that we can hear each other speak, please limit the public comments.

COMMISSIONER KORZEC – Okay, I will correct this. I had all this paperwork. I was on the wrong page.

VICE CHAIR BARNES – Okay.

COMMISSIONER KORZEC – Okay, so I do correct that but my point is still the same. I don't understand why we need a zoning change.

VICE CHAIR BARNES – Alright.

COMMISSIONER KORZEC – You can ask me all the questions you want, but I don't see the need for it at this time in that neighborhood.

VICE CHAIR BARNES – Okay. I just wanted to clarification as to what you're.....

COMMISSIONER KORZEC – Because I was reading.....

VICE CHAIR BARNES – What your concerns were.....

COMMISSIONER KORZEC – Off of the wrong page. My concerns were that we have a lot of housing already on the market of this type. We're going into a neighborhood where people bought homes in good faith that there would be a certain expectation of the land use, and we're going to change it when I don't understand why, at this point, it needs to be changed. This is a General Plan, and I just can't see us coming back each time a developer or somebody wants to do something different and us.....we can consider it, but my point is I feel for all the people in this book that have come here that have spoken up and said they don't want this change. That's as simple as I can be.

VICE CHAIR BARNES – Anyone else? Commissioner Sims.

COMMISSIONER SIMS – So I'm a civil engineer by trade. I used to do subdivision work, and I have to compliment the developer. I think they did, and his team, I think they did a really nice job on....for a layout. However, I have pondered on this for quite some time and, for full disclosure, I live on a tract with half-acre lots. I'm on the south side of the freeway. And I remember, I remember 10 years ago or so, Richmond American came in and they wanted to put in R3. And there were 64 lots in my subdivision, and our neighborhood got all wound up and they said, oh, oh we can't have R2, or we can't have R3. So,

1 anyhow, and I was the only person out of the 64 that said no. You know, I
2 supported the R3 for that particular subdivision that went in. And my reason was
3 I've lived out there since 1994 and there's probably, out of the 64 lots, there's
4 probably 10 that have a front yard and probably five that have a back yard. It's,
5 you know, we have curb gutter. We have street lights, but we don't, you know,
6 people have a half acre and its in....I tend to have a fundamental belief that
7 people have a hard time keeping up to a nice maintenance of a half acre. That's
8 just my fundamental belief because I've lived in it for 22 years. However, when I
9 drive every day through the R3 lots, they are really nice. They have an HOA.
10 They are well maintained. They have CCR's. It's nice. So that's how I preface
11 it. I struggled with this situation. I tend to believe, though, over the last several
12 years, this City has worked very, very hard at what's good for the City. So a big
13 decision was made to do a General Plan Amendment and a whole quadrant of
14 the City east of Redlands got converted from an agricultural thing and got moved
15 into industrial logistics. That was a huge decision for the city. Some people like
16 it. Some people don't, but that decision was made. Here we have a
17 general.....now we're going to the last remaining kind of undeveloped area in
18 the city, the northeast quadrant where there is some development, but this is
19 primarily R2. It's a primary area for keeping animals with the overload, and I just
20 think we're.....I personally believe it's asking the City to a fatigue point of
21 wholesale changes because this is one of those, once the nose of the camel gets
22 under the tent, this it'll keep going. And so I guess my fundamental belief is I'm
23 not opposed. I think it is a well-designed tract. I personally like the tract. I think
24 it was well done. I don't agree though with not doing.....I think, if we're going to
25 start doing more General Plan Amendments, this area is the last kind of bastion
26 of the city that can have people that want to have animal keeping and have a
27 rural lifestyle. And, if we're going to do it, we should do a comprehensive look at
28 the General Plan rather than piece mail one piece at a time. That's my two
29 cents.

30
31 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – I agree. Can I speak?

32
33 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Yes, of course you may.

34
35 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Can I go first?

36
37 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Commissioner.....

38
39 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – No, it's okay.

40
41 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – He's next on the list. Commissioner Gonzalez.

42
43 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – I also want to provide some comments and
44 feedback and also disclosure. I also live on a half acre. I live on the south side
45 in the, actually in the southern part of the PAKO. And, you know, I moved to an
46 area where the reason I moved out there was to spread my wings, and not

1 actually hear my neighbors, and my family can grow, and my kids can play and
2 whatnot but I also understand the every community, every section of the city
3 needs a variety where all of us can enjoy the area. We all need multi-family
4 housing. We all need single-family homes. We all need half-acre homes.
5 Different strokes for different folks. I fundamentally believe that. But, in echoing
6 Mr. Sims comments, I kind of prefaced to Planning Director, Rick, that I think that
7 we, if we're going down that path, we really need to wait and see what the true
8 General Plan Update will say. What's a comprehensive look at what the
9 community? Because everyone is going to have input on that and that's going to
10 be in a few years so I think, and, maybe at that point, there will be a shift and the
11 community will decide otherwise. But, at this time, I think that the plan in place is
12 suitable. And, another thing, if the developer is willing to relook at this site for
13 maybe an R2 perspective, that's always welcome. But I want to say that the
14 General Plan Update is coming. It's right around the corner. I think that a
15 comprehensive look will have a better product at the end versus, you know, if we
16 look and approve this one, what stops someone else from proposing something
17 in the area that will require another General Plan Amendment so those are my
18 comments for now. And I will wait to hear further ones.

19

20 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Commissioner Nickel.

21

22 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Well I only live on a 7300 square foot lot, but I like
23 it. Okay, I have a question for Staff. Why is San Manuel not included in the
24 Native American contracts out of curiosity? Can anybody explain?

25

26 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – AB52 requires us as a city to send the
27 notice to certain tribes, and there is a list of tribes. I believe that is one of the
28 tribes we send to but, if they don't respond within the 30 days, then they didn't
29 ask for consultations so there would not be that formal consultation with them.

30

31 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Okay and my other concern is nowhere did the
32 Applicant make, in any of these documents, unless I missed it, did not mention
33 the burrows that are in the area. There is no mention, and that's a big issue.
34 And I think they are still protected aren't they?

35

36 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I can't answer that. I don't know.

37

38 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – I mean, unless you run into them because they are
39 not crossing at a 45 degree angle.

40

41 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I don't know.

42

43 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Yeah, no, my husband informed me they don't
44 cross the street at 45 degree angles. I was like, really? Okay. After a near miss,
45 so that's a concern. I'm not comfortable, again, I'm not comfortable even
46 forwarding this up to Council because it's missing a lot, and I feel a lot of the

1 work hasn't been done. And everybody is always talking about eliminating the
2 need for a commute. Well, you know, we have a hospital in town, and I could
3 wager that most of the doctors do not live in town because we do not have the
4 high-end housing. When Anaheim Hills was created, that's mostly where all the
5 Orange County doctors moved to unless they were at the beach, and we're in a
6 really difficult crisis with getting doctors to stay in this region. Loma Linda cannot
7 even keep their med students in this region. And, right now, the big place for
8 young doctors to go with families is Temecula. There's five hospitals down there.
9 It's wonderful if you're a trauma doctor on call. And the way I look at this is we'll
10 never get to a level one trauma center from a level two unless we start getting
11 some high-end homes for the professionals within the hospital. And the
12 difference between a level one and a level two is whether you live or die if you
13 have a dissecting abdominal aneurysm. And being an old critical care nurse and
14 having a husband who does blood banking, that's important. And some of us
15 here are approaching the age where we really might need those services. Yeah,
16 I can't, yeah.....I mean, the county hospital does not do open heart surgeries. A
17 lot of people don't realize that, so that's the other reason I look at it. You know,
18 you've got to start having high-end housing to attract those professionals to stay
19 here and not leave and stay in town. And the fact that the lack of healthcare is
20 basically what I cut my teeth on when my family first moved here was the
21 concern of children being hit by cars and there was no access, immediate
22 access, to healthcare. So that's the other thing why you have to have something
23 to entice the doctors to stay.

24
25 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Anyone else? Mr. Sandzimier.

26
27 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – May I ask a clarification because
28 we will be going ultimately to the City Council? If I could just ask Commissioner
29 Nickel to elaborate a little bit on what you mean by high-end housing? Are you
30 talking about the price point? Are you talking about the amenities or both? Can
31 you just kind of describe that for us?

32
33 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Both, both. Open Space, kick back and relax. Are
34 we talking about making all of these affordable housing? We can't do that.

35
36 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – No. I was just asking if it was a
37 price point issue or if it was an amenity issue because there is a difference. You
38 can have.....

39
40 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Both.....

41
42 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Okay, so I just wanted
43 clarification. Thank you.

44
45 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – I have a question.

46

1 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Commissioner Gonzalez.

2
3 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – I have a question follow Staff. Does the
4 current General Plan have reference in going back to high-end housing to an
5 executive housing area component of the City? Is there language that tailors an
6 area to a certain type of housing, or is it strictly R1, R2, R3 in kind of the zoning
7 description? Or is there an area where the City can say, hey this is where, you
8 know, executive housing.

9
10 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – The General Plan and the Zoning
11 Code don't specifically talk about high-end housing or not. It's really incumbent
12 upon the developer or in the custom home areas. The people that build those
13 homes, they build to a certain standard that they want and that will start driving
14 the price. You can have small compact houses that are high priced, highly
15 amenitized. You can have large estate lots that....I have seen some come in that
16 have modular units that they want to put on it. It just depends on how people
17 want to use their property. In this case, when we're looking at a larger tract, it's
18 my understanding in talking with the Development Team, that they were looking
19 at the amenitized larger lots. And they were still looking for a higher price point.
20 It wasn't intended to be affordable. It wasn't going to be low-end housing. It was
21 going to be a higher price point. That's why I was asking for the clarification. So,
22 what we were working with them on, we were looking at the trail connections,
23 and we were looking at what the streetscape looked like and what they were
24 going to do with the bridges that crossed over the detention basins. Those were
25 cost items and so they were going to drive the cost of that development a little
26 higher but, in the end, it was intended to be feel-good amenities that helped drive
27 the price point and the quality of the homes up. And, ideally, they would start to
28 cater to those people, to those professionals, who maybe don't have that
29 opportunity today here in the community. So that was a consideration, but it
30 wasn't something that we were looking at specifically in any section or chapter of
31 the General Plan.

32
33 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – Thank you.

34
35 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – I have just kind of philosophically, you know, I got on
36 the Planning Commission several years ago, and I live in....I came from
37 Riverside. Riverside is a different city. Riverside has different amenities.
38 Temecula has different amenities. The coast, you're going to have a different
39 vibe and different setup. Moreno Valley inherently has an Achilles heel because
40 it was a series of small townships within the county that had desperate planning.
41 There was, you know, what went down was what you got and so we have parts
42 of the City that are old. Some are older, some are newer. I think the City has,
43 since it has incorporated, has had more logic and more attempt at trying to
44 consolidate the best of what it can do with what it is. And I think, and I think
45 regardless, for instance, the World Logistics people.....that was quite the uproar.
46 But, there is a desire like the one lady mentioned, being able to work close to

1 home is a very, very good thing. I think Moreno Valley is doing a good job
2 attracting jobs and trying to provide the opportunity. We probably will never have
3 the million dollar home brackets that you can get the high dollars. There just,
4 there's just not enough here. So at the end of the day, for me, what's driving a
5 decision, I will probably vote no for this General Plan Amendment. And
6 associated other things, I think this is the last part of the city where people that
7 do want to have a reasonable chance to have an upscale-type living and have
8 primary area to keep their animals and that kind of lifestyle. That's it for Moreno
9 Valley. There's no other places, and we should respect that. And my only last
10 thing is, with the trail, you're....Commissioner Nickel when you said I don't know
11 about having horse trails going down next to driveways, I don't know. I have
12 friends in Norco. You go through Norco and there are trails everywhere, but here
13 you're setting yourself up for a subdivision that has no animal keeping but you're
14 going to have horses walking and pooping in your front yard. So people that live
15 outside of the tract are going to say, that's great, my horse left you a gift. You
16 can use it to make your flowers, but the people that are in the tract are going,
17 hey, thanks. You know, anyways, so yeah.

18

19 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Anyone else. Commissioner Baker.

20

21 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Yeah I'd like to kind of just chime in on this a little
22 bit. Ever since I've been on the Planning Commission, I keep hearing about the
23 hillside housing, which it would be nice, but the problem we've got with that is
24 these people that want to spend a million dollars for hillside. They want the
25 amenities to go with it, and I'm talking not a septic tank. That want, you know,
26 curb and gutter and the sewers and everything else and street lights. And I
27 totally understand that, but I don't know how we're going to get the horse in front
28 of the cart to get this done because it takes money. We don't, in this part of
29 town, we don't even have sewage system. I think most of that north of 60 is on
30 septic, correct? For the most part? But I think this is a good product they are
31 putting it. It's probably just in the wrong location, but what I'd like to know is why
32 we aren't having developers come in here and doing the half acre deal? Is that a
33 monetary deal or? I mean, I've been on here eight years, and I've not heard one
34 project come in with a half-acre development. I totally understand that, and I
35 think we need it. But I don't know if this particular developer it has to do with the
36 land, and I don't know particularly who, I guess it's Ironwood 8 Properties that
37 owns this property. But it seems like we need to work with this owner to see if
38 we can get a developer to do some half-acre lots up there, and it's a great area.
39 But, you know, to put this in here, it's going to be tough. One question I've got of
40 Staff here, and you know we've got R3 and R5. Is there an R4 zone in our
41 Planning Department or in our plan or not?

42

43 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – No.

44

45 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Okay there isn't, and why isn't there one?

46

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – The ranges of housing density.....

2
3 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Okay.....

4
5 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Allow for.....

6
7 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – And I understand R3 is three units an acre and R5
8 is five units an acre. Is that correct?

9
10 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Up to five.

11
12 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Up to five. Okay, got it. The other thing is....the
13 thing I was asked, on this 12-inch sewer line, that's the developer....if that were
14 to come forth, he'd have to pay for that, right? That infrastructure under the 60.
15 Is that correct or not?

16
17 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER MICHAEL LLOYD** – Michael Lloyd with Land
18 Development. The developer would work with EMWD to get that installed and
19 would work out that cost with EMWD.

20
21 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Thank you. From the Planning Department, has
22 there been any inquiries to you guys either in the past or coming forth, is
23 anybody interested in developed half-acre lots up there? And what's the big
24 holdup on that if.....why they haven't. Is it due to the utilities or the expense of
25 doing that or is it just not cost prohibitive?

26
27 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – Rick may have some comments on the
28 last part of the questions but.....

29
30 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Okay.

31
32 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – But, before 2008, there were a number
33 of projects. Some of those are still valid approvals for half-acre lots. In fact,
34 we've done some extensions of time. So there was activity. There haven't been
35 many new projects since 2008 in that regard.

36
37 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – That's an economic issue, right? Trying to drive
38 that I imagine or somewhat?

39
40 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – In the almost two-and-a-half years
41 that I've been here, we haven't had anybody inquire with me that wants to build
42 half-acre lot subdivisions.

43
44 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – I don't totally understand that because that's a
45 great area up there. If I had the money, I'd go up there and do one. There's a
46 whole lot, but I don't have the cash to do it. But it seems like, if you could put a

1 group of people together that would want to promote that, if you really believe in
2 that area, which I think you do, we need to get our heads together and figure out
3 a way to develop that.

4
5 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – I can tell you that, I call tell you
6 that I have worked in other jurisdictions where I have seen them come in and a
7 lot of times they come in because there are lots of larger neighborhoods. We
8 work on a 400 acre or 600 acre development and you look at building a
9 neighborhood. And you're working with one major land owner who has the wear
10 with all or has the opportunity to create the smaller lots, the medium lots, and the
11 larger lots, and they create that as a concept. Here, this is a fairly large
12 development, but it is not.....

13
14 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – It's 50 acres, right?

15
16 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Right, but I'm talking about 100's
17 of acres of land in other areas. I worked with a developer that had 23,000 acres
18 of land.

19
20 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Wow.

21
22 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – And so it can be done, but
23 it.....you have to have the wear with all. You have to have a starting point, and
24 it is economics. There have to be certain things that starting driving the stuff.
25 The infrastructure needs to be in place and you have to start somewhere. Those
26 are some of the challenges out on the east end. I appreciate the tranquility you
27 have out there. I have driven out there. It is very nice. So it's really what the
28 vision of the City would be. We'll be looking at that stuff in the General Plan
29 Update.

30
31 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – The only thing I'd say is, as your group out here, I'd
32 be going and finding who that property owner is and start twisting some arms to
33 get something done, what you want done, because that's the only way it's going
34 to happen guys. You've got to get that land owner in your back pocket and get
35 him to develop half-acre lots there. I mean, we can sit here and talk about this all
36 night but, until we can find out who controls that property, and I understand what
37 the developer is doing, and I'd like to see that developer hop in too and maybe
38 consider some half-acre lots there or something different than this zoning that
39 we've got going now. That's just my thoughts on it. Okay. That's it.

40
41 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Yes, my other concern about this is that, of course
42 there is animal keeping up in that area, and that has another impact to that. I
43 don't see these homes necessarily being appreciative of the animal smells. You
44 know, I mean, it's okay for the people that have their animals and all, but I can
45 actually see residents in a new tract like this calling the City and wanting to get
46 that changed and stop having chickens, goats, horses.....that's where it starts.

1
2 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – If I may, I want to make some points, and in no
3 particular order so bear with me a bit. First of all, I think Commissioner Sims
4 summed up many of my feelings very well. The City has been through a very
5 contentious battle over the east end of the City, and we made some pretty
6 substantial changes to the General Plan. As he said, the northeast corner seems
7 to be kind of the last bastion of the larger lots and, given what we just went
8 through, I'm not in a big hurry to chip away at that also. Now, that being said, I
9 also think that the project, as proposed, is a very good project. And it's probably,
10 and this is just my personal opinion, it's probably more likely to provide the high-
11 end housing that a lot of people are wanting than going out there and doing half-
12 acre rectangular single-story lots on that 80 acres. Because I think it is a very
13 good project. It is very creative. It's got amenities, and I think it has a lot of
14 potential. But, as I said, I agree with Commissioner Sims that that's kind of the
15 last bastion, and maybe it's too soon. The other thing that...the other point I
16 want to make is I don't think we, as a body, or the City generally, as a Staff, want
17 to get in to trying to decide where high-end homes are going to be. None of us
18 are that smart. The last 10 years has shown us that a lot of people make
19 mistakes. So I think our goal is to protect the local residents, the homeowners,
20 protect the landowner and his ability to do something with his land, and we have
21 to walk a fine line between those two. And, in this case, as the other
22 Commissioners have said, with the General Plan coming out and what we've just
23 been through, I am probably not ready to pull the trigger on this. And then the
24 last thing I wanted to say is, we all live out here in Moreno Valley and some
25 developer somewhere to the guys that are proposing this, came forward and
26 proposed the build the home that we live in and that we like and that we're here
27 trying to protect. And I'd be willing to bet at the Hearing for the homes that you
28 guys live in, there were people just as passionate as yourselves fighting to
29 protect what they, at the time, felt was something that shouldn't be changed. So
30 let's not forget that we're here through the benefit of somebody who took the risk
31 and put their checkbook on the line to build homes for all of us so just remember
32 that, you know, we don't live in a vacuum so that's.....okay, that's the end of my
33 speech.

34
35 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Well, Commissioner Barnes, before I became a
36 Planning Commissioner/alternate, I came to do battle for a project that was going
37 behind my house and, the _____, and the project was approved by the
38 Commission, which I appealed with my husband. And, the funny thing is, the
39 developer actually listened to everything I had to say. We sat over the kitchen
40 table, and we did the project. Claudia worked very hard on that, and we had it all
41 worked out by the time it got to Council. And I think they said Council approved it
42 in about 23 seconds because both sides were happy, so you can work it out. I
43 don't understand why the developer hasn't worked with the community.

44
45 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Question on that project. Why hasn't that project
46 been built? Do you know? I didn't know. I thought.....

1
2 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – I know. Their.....

3
4 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Commissioner Sims.

5
6 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – I agree with that you said about your soapbox you got
7 on. I like it. Anyhow, I do, from Design, I do have to take my hats off. I do think
8 it is a great design for the project for that and I.....hopefully when the Council....
9 this will probably go to an appeal to the Council and whatnot and who knows
10 what's going to happen at that. But, at the end of the day, when a General Plan
11 Amendment goes through, hopefully there is flexibility when the General Plan
12 Amendment goes through that there can be a way to do like clustering and things
13 in some of these areas where you can get a desirable finished project and leave
14 a lot of open spaces. Because I personally, a few years ago, designed a
15 few.....if you go up Canyon Crest between Country Club, up to by Ransom by
16 Canyon Crest right there, there is hillside development. I personally designed
17 that, and we worked very, very closely with the City and it's, it's.....they are all
18 nice-sized lots, and those are million dollar homes up there. So you can build on
19 hillsides and do that stuff but.....anyhow, I guess the long story short is I think, if
20 the City does go through a General Plan Amendment, hopefully the Council will
21 push towards doing that with the City and all of the folks that are out here and the
22 northeast area comes up for that. People own property, and people should be
23 able to develop the property, and there are economic challenges to that. Not
24 just, not for just grading and putting in a piece of pipe. There are school fees,
25 water district fees, all these different fees and stuff so there are economic
26 barriers that have to be climbed over for a developer to do something with the
27 property. So I think, I tend to agree that there needs to be a rational approach
28 when the General Plan Amendment goes so that some of this area can get
29 cluster lots and things like that where you can get large open space and stuff like
30 that. But that's another thing for another day.

31
32 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Just out of curiosity, on that development you did
33 up there on Canyon Crest, how did you get the utilities up there? Was that a big
34 deal? I mean, those people didn't build those houses on....they didn't build those
35 on septic tanks, right? Did you get sewer up there?

36
37 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – No, there's sewer, there's sewer in that area.

38
39 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – And that was a capital improvement on
40 somebody's part, right?

41
42 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – The developer paid for it.

43
44 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – They paid for it. Okay, got it.
45

1 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Anymore comments? Most people seem to have
2 made their position fairly clear. Unless somebody has something earth
3 shattering, I would suggest maybe somebody make a motion.
4
5 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – I'll make a motion.
6
7 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Alright.
8
9 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – I make a motion that the Planning Commission not
10 approve the Staff recommendation Items one through five.
11
12 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Second.
13
14 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I have a motion by Commissioner Sims and a second
15 by Commissioner Nickel.
16
17 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – And my vote's not coming up.
18
19 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I don't.....
20
21 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – So we're going to have to actually show our hands?
22
23 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Yeah, yeah we actually have to push a button guys.
24
25 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Well it's not coming up.
26
27 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Yeah, I think we may have to take a.....
28
29 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Rollcall.....
30
31 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Verbal vote because I don't know how to work this
32 thing to put it bluntly.
33
34 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Could you just repeat what we're voting on
35 because we're not voting on this. We're voting to negate this.
36
37 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – The motion was to deny.....
38
39 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Okay.
40
41 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – The Staff recommendation.
42
43 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – So then we vote yes or no on that, right?
44
45 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Yeah. There's no final action
46 being proposed for the Planning Commission. It's simply a recommendation to

1 the City Council. So the motion that I heard what that you make a
2 recommendation not to approve this project, and Staff will prepare a revised
3 resolution document that's much shorter and simply says that.

4
5 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – And so a yes vote would be in support of that.....

6
7 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – That motion to deny it.

8
9 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – For lack of, okay.....

10
11 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Yes.

12
13 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Rather to recommend denial.

14
15 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Okay.

16
17 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Yeah, okay. Are we ready to vote? No other
18 comments? No further motions, anything? Alright, Darisa if you could.....

19
20 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – Yes.

21
22 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Yes.

23
24 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Yes.

25
26 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Yes.

27
28 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Yes.

29
30 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Yes.

31
32
33
34 Opposed – 0

35
36
37 **Motion carries 6 – 0**

38
39
40 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – It ain't over yet.

41
42 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – No.

43
44 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – With that, Mr. Sandzimier.

45

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – I was going to say that the wrap-
2 up will be that this will be scheduled to go to the City Council. But, before we go
3 to the City Council, we'll bring back at your next regular meeting, that Resolution
4 for you to look at. So we're going to put that Resolution on the Agenda for the
5 next meeting. Are we going to see it, or are we just going to take it to them for
6 signature?
7

8 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – No. I think we can put...we'll
9 put...just bring a Resolution for your signature that'll be exactly worded as same
10 as the motion.
11

12 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Right, okay.
13

14 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – It doesn't have all the other
15 information in it so I don't think.
16

17 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – So we'll just bring it for a
18 signature.
19

20 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Okay. Now, does that conclude this case, and I can
21 recall Chair Lowell?
22

23 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Yes.
24

25 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Alright. Thank you everyone for your attendance. We
26 appreciate your involvement.
27

28 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Can we take a break? We've got to get Lowell.
29

30 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I would like to take a five minute break and recall Chair
31 Lowell if he's in earshot.
32

33 **MEETING BREAK**

34
35
36

37 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Well welcome back ladies and gentlemen. With Public
38 Hearing Item No. 1 that was continued and now voted on. We're now onto Other
39 Commissioner Business, which I don't think we have any. I'm hearing nothing
40 over there, so I think we're good.
41
42
43

44 **OTHER COMMISSIONER BUSINESS**

45
46

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – That moves us onto Staff Comments. Do we have any
2 comments from Staff or for Staff?

3
4
5 **STAFF COMMENTS**
6

7
8 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – I was just going to say that our
9 next regular meeting will be on March 23, 2017, I believe.

10
11 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Not February 23?

12
13 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Oh, February 23, 2017. I'm sorry.
14 I'm already thinking March. February 23, 2017. Yeah, see you in two weeks.

15
16 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Alright and that moves us onto Planning Commissioner
17 comments.

18
19
20 **PLANNING COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**
21

22
23 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I have one. In the Planning Commissioner Rule of
24 Procedure, I would like to at least discuss clarifying whether or not who can seat
25 on what so basically how the alternates or vacant seats are handled. So maybe
26 we can bring that up on an item next go around just to kind of put a dot on every I
27 and cross every T to make sure everything is clear.

28
29 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Alright. We'll put that on the next
30 Agenda then for the 23rd.

31
32 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Please.

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

35
36 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you.

37
38 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Are you guys going to send out the rules again?

39
40 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – We will include them.

41
42 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – I think we cleaned those up pretty good.

43
44 **CHAIR LOWELL** – We did.
45

1 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Well I think the clarification that he is asking for is that
2 we started the hearing with an empty seat and it wasn't crystal clear that, when
3 you start with an empty seat, you can then fill it on the second hearing. Because,
4 when we went through this before, most of the discussion centered around
5 missing the second meeting and then coming back for the third, but we didn't
6 really hone in on missing the first one coming in for the second.

7
8 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Specifically Section 1, Subsection G, No. 4.

9
10 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I know.

11
12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – It's just one of those things I would like to at least talk about
13 next go around, just briefly, to make sure that it's all dotted. I talked to Paul a
14 little bit about it and also the rules are.....they do make a decision. They do tell
15 us what to do and how to handle the situation. I just think it could be a pinch
16 more clear for next go around. That's it.

17
18 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Would it be a good idea to put the alternates name
19 at the top on the Agendas so that the public kind of is aware of what's going on?

20
21 **CHAIR LOWELL** – That was an item we were talking about earlier, so yeah I
22 agree. It's something we can look into.

23
24 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – And also to be included in the quorum. I think
25 that's important.

26
27 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – The alternates are getting feisty.

28
29 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yeah, we can bring all of our, all of our.....

30
31 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – We're making our demands.

32
33 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, any other Commissioner Comments before we
34 adjourn?

35
36 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – I have two. I wanted to thank Staff on the work they
37 did do with the developer. I personally thought that it was a well-designed tract
38 and conditioned well and so forth. So that doesn't fall.....it's not that there was a
39 lack of good work that was done there, that wasn't what was driving me.
40 Anyhow, don't forget there's a Valentine's Day coming up here so....

41
42 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Don't worry, I'll buy you flowers.

43
44 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Plan accordingly.

45
46 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I'll buy you flowers, Jeff.

1
2 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – Some people who are forgetful.

3
4 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – I just want to say thank you to my colleagues.
5 I know sometimes it's.....these are tough decisions, and they are passionate and
6 emotionally driven so but I appreciate everyone's coolness under fire. And,
7 especially at the previous meeting, you guys handled yourselves in a very
8 professional and equitable manner so thank you, thank you for that and Staff as
9 well. Thank you for all your hard work and putting in and being here. You know,
10 it's already 8:35 so thank you.

11
12 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I have a question on a different subject.

13
14 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Vice Chair.

15
16 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Mr. Sandzimier, what.....as the General Plan
17 Amendment moves forward, what will be the Commission's involvement in that
18 process if any?

19
20 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – It hasn't been fully defined yet in
21 terms of how the process is going to go. What we're doing right now is we
22 assembled an AD HOC Committee of Staff. So that means that we've got people
23 from each of the departments and divisions looking at every objective and basic
24 policy in the General Plan and identifying areas where we think we should be
25 making some recommendations for revisiting it. Depending on the full scope, we
26 have to figure out the cost, and then we have to figure out what the process will
27 be to engage the public, and then how to use the Commission's, how to use the
28 City Council. There are a variety of ways of doing it. If we formed a different
29 committee or a policy committee, say, it may be with a representative from the
30 Commission, maybe representative from the City Council. But we haven't got
31 there yet. So we'll keep you posted, but we just got the process rolling. It will be
32 a three-year effort. We'll probably see a lot more activity in the first six months of
33 the new fiscal year depending on budget and then we'll know a little bit better
34 how we're going to go.

35
36 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – It seems like since the Commission will be obviously
37 reviewing and addressing projects that are affected by the General Plan that
38 somebody from this group or the future group, whatever that looks like, should be
39 involved maybe sooner rather than later to get incorporated things that might be
40 important to the Commission as a general statement. I know I would like to be
41 involved in some way or somebody from this group.

42
43 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – I mean, even the other Boards and Commissions
44 like Parks and Recreation and Trails. Those types of Land Use Commissions
45 other than us.

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Your comments are all noted.

2
3 **COMMISSIONER SIMS** – I appreciate it.

4
5 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – I know we’ve got a long time.

6
7 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – You want to see it done, right?

8
9 **VICE CHAIR BARNES** – Okay, thank you.

10
11 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other questions or comments? Nope? Going once,
12 going twice.....perfect, I would like to adjourn the meeting to the next Planning
13 Commission Regular Meeting on February 23, 2017, right here in City Council
14 Chambers at 7:00 p.m.

15
16
17 **ADJOURNMENT**

18
19 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Have a Happy Valentine’s Day, and
20 have a good night.

21
22
23 **NEXT MEETING**

24 *Next Meeting: Planning Commission Regular Meeting, February 23, 2017 at*
25 *7:00 PM, City of Moreno Valley, City Hall Council Chamber, 14177 Frederick*
26 *Street, Moreno Valley, CA 92553.*

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 _____
40 Richard J. Sandzimier
41 Planning Official
42 Approved

_____ Date

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

Brian R. Lowell
Chair

Date