

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

5 **Thursday, November 12th, 2015, 7:00 PM**

6
7
8 **CALL TO ORDER**
9

10 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Good evening ladies and gentleman. I would like to call the
11 Regular-Scheduled Meeting of the Planning Commission to order. The date is
12 Thursday, November 12th, 2015. The time is 7:04 PM and rollcall first. I'm sorry
13 my brain just skipped a beat. Grace, could we have rollcall please?
14

15
16 **ROLL CALL**
17

18 Commissioners Present:

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

29
30 Staff Present:

31 Rick Sandzimier, Planning Official
32 Paul Early, Assistant City Attorney
33 Darisa Vargas, Senior Administrative Specialist
34 Grace Espino-Salcedo, Permit Technician
35 Claudia Manrique, Associate Planner
36 Gabriel Diaz, Associate Planner
37 Jeff Bradshaw, Associate Planner
38 Michael Lloyd, Traffic Engineer
39 Vince Giron, Traffic Engineer
40 Paul Villalobos, Fire Safety Specialist
41

42
43 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
44

1
2 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I am also here. I noticed that Ms. Espino-Salcedo is not
3 reading rollcall, so could you introduce yourself so I know who you are?
4

5 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST DARISA VARGAS** – Darisa Vargas.
6

7 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Vargas.
8

9 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – If I may, Chairman: Chairman
10 and Members of the Commission, with us assisting tonight is Darisa Vargas.
11 She is a Senior Administrative Specialist in our group. The reason she is here
12 tonight is we are going through a little transition. At the last meeting, I was going
13 to announce that Grace has been promoted to a new position as a technician, so
14 she will be working more with the public directly helping issue permits and taking
15 new applications in. She has done an excellent job for me over the years that
16 I've been here, and she has done a great job for the City, so we are glad that we
17 are keeping here. But she will be in a new capacity and that will be, it's already
18 effective, so that's why Darisa's here. We have also extended an offer to a new
19 administrative specialist to replace Grace and that person will be rotated in as we
20 get her up to speed on the systems and everything else, so we will introduce her
21 at that time. Thank you.
22

23 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much and welcome aboard. At this time, I'd
24 like to ask Commissioner Ramirez to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.
25

26 27 **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

28 29 **Approval of the Agenda**

30
31
32 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Would anyone like to motion to
33 approve tonight's Agenda?
34

35 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I'll move.
36

37 **CHAIR LOWELL** – We have a motion by Commissioner Van Natta and a
38 second by Commissioner Baker. I do not have the option to vote on my machine
39 yet, so should we just do a rollcall vote?
40

41 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST DARISA VARGAS** – Go ahead and
42 check again. You should have the ability now.
43

44 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Alright. Oh, I had to expend. There we go. So if we could
45 have Commissioner Van Natta motion and then Commissioner Baker second.

1 Perfect, now we can vote. Waiting on Commissioner Korzec. Perfect, thank you
2 very much. The Agenda passes 7-0. Awesome, we can have a meeting.

3
4
5 Opposed – 0
6
7

8 **Motion carries 7 – 0**
9

10 CONSENT CALENDAR

11
12
13 *All matters listed under Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and all*
14 *will be enacted by one rollcall vote. There will be no discussion of these items*
15 *unless Members of the Planning Commission request specific items be removed*
16 *from the Consent Calendar for separate action.*
17

18 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Which moves us onto our Consent Calendar. I do not
19 believe we have any Consent Calendar items tonight. Do we have any Consent
20 Calendar items?
21

22 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – There are none.
23
24

25 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

26
27 **None**
28
29

30 PUBLIC COMMENTS PROCEDURE

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

1 *hour notification will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure*
2 *accessibility to this meeting.*

3
4 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Perfect. That moves us onto the Public Comments
5 procedure. Before I jump into the Public Comments, do we have any Public
6 Comments as of yet?

7
8 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST DARISA VARGAS** – I haven't
9 received any Speakers.

10
11 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, then I will offer. If anybody would like to comment on
12 anything that is not on the Agenda, please do so by filling out one of the green
13 papers and give it to our clerk. But I don't think we have any, so I will skip that
14 formality. With that said, I would like to open the Public Comments portion of the
15 meeting. I don't think we have any Public Comments, so I would like to close it.

16
17
18 **NON-PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

19
20 **None**

21
22
23 **CHAIR LOWELL** – That moves us onto our Non-Public Hearing Items, which
24 again I don't think we have any.

25
26 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – There are none.

27
28
29 **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

- 30
31 1. Case: PA15-0000 (Conditional Use Permit)
32 Applicant: Verizon Wireless
33 Owner: Shinder Kaur and Parmjit Singh
34 Representative: SAC Wireless (Dail Richard)
35 Location: 14058Redlands Boulevard (Farm Market)
36 Case Planner: Claudia Manrique
37 Council District: 3
38 Proposal: Applicant request continuance of PA15-0009
39 (Conditional Use Permit) to the December 10th, 2015,
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1 Planning Commission meeting for a proposed new
2 Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) with a 60 foot
3 monopine.
4

5
6 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**
7

8 Staff recommends that the Planning Commission take the follow action:
9

- 10 1. **APPROVE** the applicant's request for a continuance of this item to the
11 Planning Commission's December 10th, 2015, public hearing agenda.
12

13
14 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Then that moves us onto our first Public Hearing Item, which
15 is Case No. PA15-0009, a Conditional Use Permit by Verizon Wireless, and the
16 Case Planner is Claudia Manrique.
17

18 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – On this particular one, the
19 recommended action this evening is actually to continue the item until December
20 1st, so what we're looking for from the Planning Commission this evening would
21 just simply be a request to support the continuance. The continuance came in at
22 the request of the Applicant. The Applicant is Verizon. This item was considered
23 by the Planning Commission back on October 8th, and since that time, Verizon
24 representatives have been working with Verizon to see if they can develop some
25 alternatives to the project to be brought back from the Planning Commission's
26 consideration. And they were just not able to get that done before this evenings
27 meeting, so they've asked for the continuance to one more meeting out, which
28 would be December 10th. Did I say 1st? Yeah, December 10th.
29

30 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Yes you did.
31

32 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay. We have a unique situation on this specific item.
33 One of our Planning Commissioner rules states that whoever is seated up here
34 for the original hearing of the item is the body that will hear the item throughout
35 all continuances and all subsequent meetings. So the question that I have that
36 we need to discuss amongst ourselves is do we need to have those seven
37 people up here to vote on the continuance, or can the seven people seated up
38 here vote to continue the item? So that's one of the questions that we have to
39 discuss. I consulted the attorney and he says that there is no precedence.
40 There are no rules stating what we have to do, so at this moment in time I'd like
41 to ask the Planning Commission if we have any comments or questions or what
42 we think we should do so we don't set our rules.
43

44 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Out of an abundance of caution, in this case it
45 may not make a difference, but on another case it might. So I think we should

1 stick with our procedure of allowing whoever was here when the case was
2 opened to vote on any continuances or anything to do with the matter.

3
4 **CHAIR LOWELL** – We’ve heard from Commissioner Van Natta. Does anybody
5 else have any comments or weight on this?

6
7 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – I wasn’t here, so I completely agree with
8 Commissioner Van Natta.

9
10 **CHAIR LOWELL** – The item that I’m concerned about is that it’s just a
11 continuation and we’re not discussing the items, so there wouldn’t be any lack of
12 continuity. So, we have two people saying that the alternates should be seated
13 to vote on the continuation. Do we have any other input?

14
15 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – I would concur.

16
17 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – And we are the two people that weren’t here.

18
19 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Exactly.

20
21 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – I would concur. We should make the rules for our
22 alternate policy.

23
24 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Okay.

25
26 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – Just let’s stick to it.

27
28 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – I agree.

29
30 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, so we I guess let’s make a vote on that. Well before
31 we do that, we’ll have to motion on that. But the thing that I was going to add
32 onto that is that, if we’re going to have the alternates seated for every
33 subsequent meeting where there could be a continuation or any other discussion,
34 we need to also address the fact that what if those alternates are not here and
35 we have a full body here?

36
37 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Well then you have an alternate to the
38 alternate.

39
40 **CHAIR LOWELL** – We would just have a hold?

41
42 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – No.

43
44 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So we would just vote where it would be six people?
45

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – In that particular case, my
2 recommendation would be that you seat the Commissioner's that were here for
3 the hearing and, if an alternate is not present, that's just an empty seat because
4 you would still have a quorum.

5
6 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Right, correct.

7
8 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – So that way you don't introduce
9 anybody else to that.

10
11 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So that person would then, by default, just abstain?

12
13 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Right.

14
15 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – No they would just.....

16
17 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – No, no, no.

18
19 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – They would just step down.

20
21 **CHAIR LOWELL** – They wouldn't have the option to vote at all.

22
23 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – They just wouldn't participate in
24 that particular night of the meeting. If they came back another night, they could
25 resume their seat if it was still ongoing as long as they brought themselves up to
26 speed on whatever was discussed at the meeting by either listening to the tapes,
27 reading the minutes and those sorts of things, which we've talked about.

28
29 **CHAIR LOWELL** – We'd default back to our regular rules of getting them up to
30 speed.

31
32 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Right.

33
34 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Perfect. With that said, is there any specific language that
35 the City Attorney would like to see in this motion or do we just give general
36 direction to the attorney to come up with an item to present to us next time.

37
38 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Yes, it's just a procedural
39 matter. You can just give general direction right now as a motion to how you
40 want to handle continuances. In this case, it sounds like the consensus is
41 leaning towards treating them the same way as you would treat a hearing. And,
42 what I would do, is I would go back and formalize that into the Rules of
43 Procedure and bring that back to the later date for formal action.

44
45 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I believe it's already in the Rules of
46 Procedure.

1
2 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – The hearings are but how to
3 handle.....

4
5 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Continuations.....

6
7 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – A continuation.....

8
9 **CHAIR LOWELL** – But we're not actually discussing anything.

10
11 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – That's a unique situation we
12 have.

13
14 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Yeah but a continuation if, okay.....

15
16 **CHAIR LOWELL** – It's just.....

17
18 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – It's an action on the item.

19
20 **CHAIR LOWELL** – It's just something that's not specifically laid out, so that's
21 what we were just trying to put an (I) on that dot or cross that (T). That's all we're
22 trying to do.

23
24 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – It's not set forth in there, and it
25 doesn't go to the due process concerns that raised the original desire to have the
26 same Commissioner's sit throughout the hearing. I wouldn't have those legal
27 concerns if this body wanted to say that, for purposes of continuing a matter, it
28 could be any seven Commissioners. It doesn't have to be the same ones, but I
29 did have those concerns as far as substantively continuing a hearing to another
30 date. The actual substantive issues being heard wanting to be the same.

31
32 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Actually I think, if you're continuing something,
33 you could continue a meeting. You could've had a lot of discussion on it and
34 then continued it to another night, or you could have no discussion on it and
35 continue it to another night. It's still a continuance. It's still an action on the item.

36
37 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – I agree.

38
39 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – And that's what we're getting
40 direction from you as a body here for at this point.

41
42 **CHAIR LOWELL** – That's what we're trying to decide right now as how we want
43 to handle it, and I think we're all in agreement that.....

44
45 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay.

46

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I think we're all in agreement that whoever was seated
2 should be up here also to discuss any continuation.

3
4 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Um-hum.

5
6 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And, with that said, do we want to have the formality of
7 inviting the alternate Commissioner's up here to sit down just to make a vote to
8 jump back down, or can we....

9
10 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Yes.

11
12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay.

13
14 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Let's do that.

15
16 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And, with that said, during rollcall we didn't ask if they were
17 here. Could you ask rollcall of the alternates also please?

18
19 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST DARISA VARGAS** – Commissioner
20 Nickel, Commissioner Gonzalez?

21
22 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay they didn't speak into the microphones but they both
23 said present.

24
25 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Let me offer an alternative. Since
26 they are both seated behind us at a dais and they are participating in the meeting
27 with all the ability to communicate, it's up to just if you want to go through the
28 formality of.....

29
30 **CHAIR LOWELL** – It's just a formality.

31
32 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Of switching the seats, but they
33 are seated right at this point.

34
35 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I think I'm okay if they're okay just making a motion from
36 there and the two that are seated up here will just abstain and not discuss.

37
38 **ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – We're good.

39
40 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, so I think the City Attorney has directions to write up
41 some language and bring back to us next meeting?

42
43 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Yeah, I'll bring up some
44 clarification language at the next meeting.

45

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, with that said, would anybody like to motion on
2 continuing the item until next meeting? The motion is available if anybody would
3 like to click on it. So we have a motion by Commissioner Barnes. Would
4 anybody like to second that motion? And we have a second by Commissioner
5 Korzec, so we have the ability to vote. Now the question I have is they don't
6 have a computer in front so I think we might want to take a rollcall vote.

7
8 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Yeah, you have two. You
9 might want to take orally.

10
11 **CHAIR LOWELL** – This failed but it didn't fail yet.

12
13 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Yes

14
15 **CHAIR LOWELL** – For clarity, Commissioner Van Natta and Commissioner
16 Ramirez were not seated.

17
18 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST DARISA VARGAS** – Oh, those were
19 the two. Okay, got it. I'm sorry. I apologize for that. Okay, let's start that over.
20 So Commissioner Korzec was not at that meeting?

21
22 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – No, I was.

23
24 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST DARISA VARGAS** – You were at
25 that meeting? So Commissioner Ramirez was not?

26
27 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Ramirez was absent and Commissioner Van
28 Natta was absent.

29
30 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST DARISA VARGAS** – Got it, okay.

31
32 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Yes

33
34 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Yes

35
36 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Yes

37
38 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – Yes

39
40 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – Yes

41
42 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – Yes

43
44 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yes, so the item passes 7-0.

1 Opposed – 0

2
3

4 **Motion carries 7 – 0**

5
6

7 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And that was very confusing, but I think we have better
8 direction for moving forward.

9

10 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Now one more last formality,
11 before you go to the next item, you want to indicate on the record that you're
12 resuming the original two Commissioner's back up and now the alternates are
13 excused.

14

15 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, so as Mr. Sandzimier said, that the alternates are no
16 longer seated and we are now back to our original body with Commissioner Van
17 Natta and Commissioner Ramirez. That was very confusing, but I think we're on
18 track now. So we're going to move to Item No. 2. So, just for clarification, the
19 PA15-0009 Conditional Use Permit has been continued to the December 10th
20 meeting.

21
22

23	2. Case:	PA14-0038 General Plan Amendment
24		
25	Applicant:	City of Moreno Valley
26	Owner:	Not applicable
27		
28	Representative:	Planning Division
29		
30	Location:	City-wide
31		
32	Case Planner:	Gabriel Diaz
33		
34	Council District:	City-wide
35		
36	Proposal:	Energy Efficiency General Plan Amendment
37		

38
39

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

40

41 Staff recommends that the Planning Commission **APPROVE** Resolution No.
42 2015-30 entitled

43

44 A RESOLUTION OF THE Planning Commission OF THE CITY OF Moreno
45 Valley RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF A
46 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (ENERGY EFFICIENCY GENERAL PLAN

1 AMENDMENT) (PA14-0038), WHICH IS INTENDED TO ASSIST THE CITY IN
2 ACHIEVING COMPLIANCE WITH ASSEMBLY BILL 32 AND SENATE BILL 375,
3 BOTH STATE INITIATIVES AIMED AT REDUCING GREENHOUSE GAS
4 EMISSIONS IN CALIFORNIA

5
6 and thereby:

- 7
8 1. **CERTIFY** that the proposed General Plan Amendment is exempt from
9 the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
10 Guidelines, per Section 15061 (b)(3); and
11
12 2. **RECOMMENDS CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL** of General Plan
13 Amendment PA14-0038 based on the findings contained in Planning
14 Commission Resolution 2015-30.
15

16
17 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And that moves us onto Item No. 2, which is PA14-0038, a
18 General Plan Amendment. The Case Planner is Gabriel Diaz.
19

20 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Yes, I'd like to introduce Gabriel
21 Diaz. Gabriel is an Associate Planner here in the Community Development
22 Department. Gabriel has been working on this project for the last couple of
23 years, so he is well versed in the item and we are pleased to have him here
24 tonight. Thanks.
25

26 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – Thank you Chairman and
27 Commissioner's. We are here to present the Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan
28 Phase 3 Task for a General Plan Amendment. This consists of an update to the
29 conservation element of the City's General Plan to include a detailed discussion
30 of energy efficiency. The proposed General Plan Amendment Task provides an
31 overview of larger context of energy efficiency policy and the City's approved
32 Energy Efficiency Climate Action Strategy and Greenhouse Gas Analysis. The
33 Final General Plan document will provide useful information that can be
34 integrated into the planning efforts used by the general public, private
35 developers, City Staff, or other governmental entities. In the development of the
36 Proposed General Plan Amendment, City Staff researched other cities that
37 incorporated energy efficiency into their general plans. The local cities included
38 the City of Chula Vista, Palm Desert, Riverside, and City of Perris were all
39 researched. Each of these cities approaches their General Plan framework
40 differently, so Planning Staff developed Section 7.6.3 Energy Efficiency within the
41 existing framework of the City's General Plan. Staff identified various past,
42 current, and potential policies and practices that further energy efficiency and the
43 reduction of greenhouse gas in the Proposed General Plan Amendment. We did
44 conduct public outreach. We presented this to the Environmental Historical
45 Preservation Board on November 9th and held a public outreach meeting on
46 November 2nd. We tried to obtain input from the public. Staff explained the work

1 that has gone into this General Plan Amendment. There was some public there,
2 and there was positive feedback on energy efficiency. The direction was given
3 by the public for the City to use energy efficiency on the City's webpage as a
4 marketing tool and that it would be more prominent on the City's webpage.
5 Outside review agency, this is funded through Southern California Edison, so this
6 General Plan Amendment language had to be reviewed by them. And, as
7 reviewed and proposed, they approved. There was also public notification on
8 this public hearing item. We put this in the Press Enterprise on October 31st in a
9 one-eighth placement because it's for the entire City. No public comment to
10 report. Nobody has called. Environmentally, Planning Staff has reviewed the
11 request in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines
12 and has determined that the activity does not have the potential to result in a
13 significant effect on the environment. Therefore, it is exempt from CEQA as
14 provided for in Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines. Staff
15 recommendation is that the Planning Commission **APPROVE** Resolution 2015-
16 30 and therefore **CERTIFY** that the Proposed General Plan Amendment is
17 exempt from CEQA and recommend that the City Council **APPROVE** the
18 General Plan Amendment PA14-0038 based on the findings within the Planning
19 Commission Resolution. This concludes Staff presentations, and we're open for
20 any comments.

21
22 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Since we don't have an
23 applicant.....well let me back up. Do we have any questions for Staff before I
24 move onto to comments? Since we don't have an applicant, we're just going to
25 move onto the public hearing I guess. Do we have any Public Speaker Slips on
26 this considering we have a packed audience? Okay, so the Public Comments
27 portion is now closed. That moves us onto Commissioner Discussions. Do we
28 have any questions, comments, or concerns? Don't everybody jump up at once.
29 It seems pretty cut and dry, but one of the questions that I do have is that it says
30 that this is for environmental or greenhouse gases and LEED certification. But
31 I'm reading through the document and it just looks like a history of the City. What
32 specific items are changing or being added that I'm missing out on?

33
34 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – Well the new section I believe is
35 supposed to be highlighted in red, which is Section 7.6.3 (Energy Efficiency).
36 That's the part that we're adding to the General Plan.

37
38 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I got a black and white copy, so I didn't see that. Let me
39 check it.

40
41 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER GABRIEL DIAZ** – And I guess we did forget.

42
43 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And then one of the other question's I have is that we're
44 being asked to certify that this is exempt from CEQA. I don't see how this is
45 even a CEQA issue.

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Right, that’s precisely the point.
2 The section that Mr. Diaz read off is actually a General Rule Exemption. The
3 General Rule is, if the project doesn’t qualify as a project, then it’s exempt.
4

5 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, so that’s what we’re saying is that it’s not a project.
6 We’re not doing anything but we’re just, hey it’s exempt, and it’s a formality.
7

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

10 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, with that said, I don’t see anybody else raising their
11 hands for questions or comments.
12

13 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – Yes, the way I understand there was grant money the City
14 received for this \$109,000?
15

16 **ASSOCIATE ENGINEER GABRIEL DIAZ** – Yes.
17

18 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – So there is some more product than this one added to the
19 General Plan?
20

21 **ASSOCIATE ENGINEER GABRIEL DIAZ** – Yeah.
22

23 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – It sounded as if the utilization of the funding went toward
24 creating of collateral information being used for customers or citizenry to
25 understand how to implement energy efficiency in their homes, correct?
26

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

29 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – Okay. Well I just think that’s important for the public that
30 watches this that there was \$109,000 and there was a couple of years of work
31 that went into it and there are very minor modifications in red if you were just to
32 look at what this is. So you may just want to expand on the four points of what
33 the money actually went to.
34

35 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I agree.
36

37 **ASSOCIATE ENGINEER GABRIEL DIAZ** – Alright, Task 1 was a redesign of
38 forms and handouts to create new informational material for Energy Efficiency
39 Code Requirements and we’re planning on redoing our building forms trying to
40 put some Green Code in there. And then Task 2 developed standards for City
41 structures to match LEED certification. We’re working on that. We’re trying to
42 make new City structures try to meet the LEED certification, which is the above
43 the normal Title 24 items and Chris Ormsby is working on that one. The update
44 to the General Plan is actually Task 4, and I’m working on that and that’s what
45 we present to you. And, along with that, we are working with Southern California
46 Edison because they have to approve all our work and we are getting reimbursed

1 for the hours that we are spending on these energy efficiency items. And we're
2 also going to develop a new Municipal Code Amendment for density bonuses as
3 just another option, and I think it's for residential developments that exceed State
4 Energy Codes. And we're looking at multifamily and that was actually one of our
5 public hearing items or outreach items that we had last week and then this week.
6 Both Chris and I worked on those two tasks.

7
8 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – Yeah and so I just, you know, I'm glad you kind of clarified
9 what the things were. Out of the tasks that went into this, you know, having gone
10 through the LEED certification on some buildings we had that's not a small
11 undertaking. So I don't know how that's going to be implemented if that's going
12 to be a requirement for new structures to meet a minimum LEED certification
13 because that's a cost implication for new development. So I don't know how that
14 factors in.

15
16 **ASSOCIATE ENGINEER GABRIEL DIAZ** – Right. The LEED certification we're
17 using now is for just City buildings.

18
19 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – Okay.

20
21 **ASSOCIATE ENGINEER GABRIEL DIAZ** – We're not asking developers to go
22 that route.

23
24 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – Okay.

25
26 **ASSOCIATE ENGINEER GABRIEL DIAZ** – The density bonus, that's another
27 option that people have. We're not asking them to do energy efficiency to get
28 you know, it's just like low-income housing. You get that extra density or senior
29 housing you get that extra density and multifamily. So the third option will be
30 adding to that section.

31
32 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – So is that going to be, I mean, and that seems one of the
33 other the density bonus. Is that going to be like a subcategory of a Code where it
34 says you're supposed to have X number of units per acre or something like that?
35 And if you do X, Y, and Z on the energy efficiency you can get an additional unit
36 or how does that work?

37
38 **ASSOCIATE ENGINEER GABRIEL DIAZ** – Yes, we're going through the
39 process. That's one of the items that will come before you, so when we get to
40 that point, we'll know a little better.

41
42 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – Okay.

43
44 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Let me try and provide some
45 clarification. Of the tasks that Mr. Diaz has indicated, the update of the forms is
46 an administrative task so that will not be coming back to the Planning

1 Commission. It is done administratively. With regard to the standards for what
2 development regulations would apply to City facilities or City structures to try to
3 bring them up to a LEED certification, that would also be on the administrative
4 side in terms of regulatory documents so that would not come to the Planning
5 Commission. The General Plan Amendment that you're hearing this evening is a
6 document that comes through you for a recommendation as an advisory body to
7 the City Council. From here, it will go to the City Council and then, as Mr. Diaz
8 has indicated, Mr. Ormsby is working on the Municipal Code or the Development
9 Code Amendment, which is the regulatory framework that does goes into our
10 Zoning Code which is required to be reviewed by the Planning Commission. So
11 we will be coming back to you with a separate item on that, and then that will
12 ultimately go to the City Council for their approval. The other tasks that weren't
13 touched on but are funded through the grant are the administrative procedures in
14 terms of the monthly meetings and coordination of what's going on between the
15 Staff and Edison. Then also we have an obligation to complete this effort before
16 the end of this calendar year, but then we have a period of time to actually
17 complete the document and report it out. And I believe that extends until March
18 31st. Is that correct? So that kind of completes the rest of the task, but you will
19 be seeing the Development Code Amendments and the density bonus issues
20 we'll have that spelled out for you in an actual Staff Report. We haven't finalized
21 that yet, so I don't have anymore details at this time.

22

23 **ASSOCIATE ENGINEER GABRIEL DIAZ** – Thanks.

24

25 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Barnes.

26

27 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Yeah, just so I'm clear on this, this is the first step
28 in the process that will make some changes to the Municipal Code. Ultimately,
29 will we be requiring a higher standard of development than we currently require?
30 Is that the ultimate result of this multistep process?

31

32 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Well the ultimate objective is to
33 provide some incentives to actually have a higher standard, but it's not going to
34 be a mandate at this point. There will be certain things where the developer has
35 a choice. Such as, right now, affordable housing has density bonus provisions
36 but it only applies if somebody wants to try and take advantage of the density
37 bonus provisions in the Code. It's not a mandate. It's a framework that allows
38 people the options. But our overall objective in working in a program like this and
39 putting the policies into the General Plan is because we want to be a more green
40 or sustainable community, and we want the infrastructure that's developed and
41 the facilities that are developed to actually follow that goal and so.....

42

43 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Okay so we're not, we're not.....

44

45 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – We'd like to achieve that but it's
46 not strong armed.

1
2 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – We’re not changing the baseline, we’re adding
3 incentive potentials that would allow them to get some gain if?
4

5 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Yes.
6

7 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Okay, alright.
8

9 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – Yeah, it’s like the way I would understand it, you would
10 get enticed. Either there is an incentive to.....
11

12 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Right.
13

14 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – To go ahead and spend extra bucks to get the energy and
15 by covering that cost you’d get another unit to spread your cost down.
16

17 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Yeah, you spend extra money, you get.....I
18 understand. Alright, thank you.
19

20 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other questions or comments? No? Would somebody
21 like to motion? We have a motion by Commissioner Van Natta and we have a
22 second by Commissioner Korzec. Now, I know it’s a formality, but do we need to
23 read the motion?
24

25 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – There is no need to read the
26 whole motion, but there should be some indication by the original mover what
27 their moving. If they are moving to approve the stated recommendations of the
28 Staff Report, that would be sufficient, but we do need to know what is being
29 moved.
30

31 **CHAIR LOWELL** – It’s right there if you want it.
32

33 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I’m moving that we **APPROVE** Resolution No.
34 2015-30 as recommended by Staff.
35

36 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Is that sufficient? Okay, so we have a motion to approve by
37 Commissioner Van Natta. Do you still second that motion?
38

39 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – I second it.
40

41 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, so let’s continue the vote. You’re too early.
42

43 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – I would have changed it if I would’ve known that.
44

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Oh, man. We are waiting on Commissioner Baker. There
2 you go. Try it again. All votes have been cast. Perfect, so it looks like the item
3 has passed 7-0. Do we have a Staff wrap-up on this item?

4
5 Opposed – 0
6
7

8 **Motion carries 7 – 0**
9

10
11 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – This is a General Plan
12 Amendment, which is a legislative act which requires the City Council's ultimate
13 approval, so this will be taken before the City Council in the coming month.
14

15 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Perfect.
16
17

- 18 3. Case: PA15-0004 – (Conditional Use Permit)
19
20 Applicant: El Pollo Loco, Inc., c/o Armet, Davis, Newlove, &
21 Associates
22
23 Owner: Professor's Fund IV, LLC
24
25 Representative: Armet, Davis, Newlove, & Associates
26
27 Location: West side of Perris Boulevard and approximately 550
28 feet south of John F. Kennedy Drive
29
30 Case Planner: Jeff Bradshaw
31
32 Council District: 4
33
34 Proposal: Conditional Use Permit for El Pollo Loco drive-through
35 restaurant
36
37

38 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**
39

40 Staff recommends that the Planning Commission **APPROVE** Resolution No.
41 2015-31, and thereby:
42

- 43 1. **ADOPT** a Mitigated Negative Declaration for Conditional Use Permit
44 PA15-0004, pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
45 Guidelines; and
46

1 2. **APPROVE** Conditional Use Permit PA15-0004 based on the findings
2 contained in this resolution, and subject to the attached conditions of
3 approval included as Exhibit A.
4

5
6 **CHAIR LOWELL** – That moves us onto Item No. 3, which is PA15-0004, a
7 Conditional Use Permit for El Pollo Loco. The Case Planner is Mr. Jeff
8 Bradshaw.
9

10 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Well I'm happy to introduce
11 Associate Planner Jeff Bradshaw for this item. This is an important project to the
12 City. It's an important project just for us because it provides the opportunity for
13 additional job creation, also some retail development, and the retails sales is an
14 economic development interest of the City. So, with that, I'd like to introduce
15 Jeff.
16

17 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – Thank you. Good evening Chair
18 Lowell and Members of the Planning Commission. Conditional Use Permit
19 PA15-0004 proposes the development of a 2995-square-foot fast-food restaurant
20 with a drive-through on a 0.66 acre parcel. This is the site located on the west
21 side of Perris Boulevard and approximately 500 feet south of John F. Kennedy
22 Drive. The site, let me back up. An aspect of the project includes a proposal by
23 the Applicant to modify two existing parcels that total 4.54 acres and that would
24 be done via a lot line adjustment. And, with approval of the lot line adjustment,
25 the two new parcels would be.....the lot line adjustment would result rather in a
26 3.88 acre parcel and the 0.66 acre parcel, which is proposed as the site for the
27 restaurant. The development of this proposal would require the installation of a
28 new driveway, which would be located at the southernmost portion of the site, as
29 well as the undergrounding of overhead utility lines and the construction of the
30 detention basin that would be located on the adjacent 3.88 acre parcel. So, as
31 you refer to your Site Plan, the basin is located immediately adjacent to the
32 restaurant site but on the adjoining parcel. The Staff had an opportunity to work
33 with the developer on the layout of the restaurant and the project is designed and
34 conditioned and satisfies all of the municipal requirements for this type of
35 development. It satisfies the requirements for commercial development, as well
36 as the specialized or unique standards for fast-food restaurants. It satisfies our
37 requirements for circulation, parking, landscape, and setbacks as well. So, as a
38 conditional use, this project has been reviewed by Staff and satisfied in most
39 instances exceeds the standards required for this type of development. On initial
40 study, a Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for this project to examine
41 the potential for this project having impacts on the environment. Public notice of
42 the document was published in the newspaper 20 days in advance of tonight's
43 hearing and made available to the public. As of this evening, Staff had not
44 received any comments, phone calls, any kind of a response at all from the
45 public about this project. And that would include notification going to those
46 homeowners located immediately adjacent to the site. Through the preparation

1 of the initial study, it was recommended that two Mitigation Measures be
2 implemented for this project to address potential impacts under the category of
3 traffic and circulation and Staff has had an opportunity to work with the consultant
4 that prepared the Traffic Analysis in the weeks and days leading up to tonight's
5 hearing. And there's two memos provided to you this evening that are specific to
6 some new information that Staff was able to review. With this additional
7 information, it was determined that the project does not have a direct impact on
8 the northbound Perris left turn-pocket as originally described in the initial study.
9 So no direct impact but it was determined that there is still a cumulative impact to
10 that left turn-pocket. So, what's recommended to you this evening, is a change
11 to the Mitigation Measure to require a fair share contribution from the developer
12 towards addressing the impacts examined in the Traffic Study and that would be
13 different than what was originally proposed to you. But Staff has had a chance to
14 look at this new information and feels comfortable making that recommendation
15 to you and so what's presented to you as changes to Condition P29, which also
16 results in similar changes to Condition TE8 and the deletion of Condition TE12,
17 as well as a revision to Mitigation Measure TRA1, which is in the Mitigation
18 Monitoring Program. So we had an opportunity to again work with the consultant
19 in the analysis of this new information. At the same time, we were also able to
20 work with the developer and in conversations with them this afternoon they were
21 comfortable with the revised language. They are here this evening, so they'd be
22 prepared to speak to you about that as well. And, just for the record, I was going
23 to read in this revised language. The condition would now read to accommodate
24 additional u-turn traffic contributed by the project at the intersection of Perris
25 Boulevard and John F. Kennedy Drive. The project applicant shall pay to the
26 City their fair share contribution of 15% of the total cost to increase the
27 northbound Perris Boulevard and John F. Kennedy Drive left turn-pocket lane.
28 The total cost is estimated at \$100,000, which covers all soft costs as well as
29 construction costs. Again the noticing efforts for this project were standard and
30 consistent with our requirements of the environmental documentation, the
31 availability rather of the initial study was published in the newspaper 20 days in
32 advance of this meeting. The site was posted and notices of tonight's hearing
33 were provided to the public 10 days in advance of the meeting and no response
34 at all from the public to any of those efforts. With that, Staff would recommend
35 that the Planning Commission **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2015-31 adopting a
36 Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project as amended and **APPROVE** the
37 Conditional Use Permit subject to the attached conditions of approval as
38 amended. That concludes my report, and I'd be happy to answer any questions
39 that you might have.

40
41 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Does anybody have any questions
42 for Staff before we move on?
43

44 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – No I think my question is probably better
45 directed at the Applicant. I'll wait.
46

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – One of the questions I do have is could you expand upon
2 how you came to the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the CEQA?
3

4 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – Yes. The results of the Traffic
5 Study, I'll give you my layman's version and then I'll ask Michael Lloyd to maybe
6 provide a more technical answer. The results of the Traffic Study indicated the
7 potential for an impact at that left turn-pocket and so the initial recommended
8 mitigation was the requirement of lengthening the median, and in addition to that,
9 the payment of DIF and TUMF fees. With the new information, it was determined
10 that there was no direct impact and so that requirement for the full median at this
11 time (at the operational stage or occupancy of the project) was no longer a
12 requirement. But, more appropriately, the cumulative impacts were more
13 appropriately mitigated with this revised Mitigation Measure. And I probably
14 muddled that enough, but I'll turn it over to Michael.
15

16 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER MICHAEL LLOYD** – Good evening Chair and
17 Commission Members, Michael Lloyd with Public Works Department. I really
18 don't have a whole lot to add to what Jeff said. He was accurate in his
19 description. The initial submittal of the Traffic Study, Staff deemed that we felt
20 there was a direct impact so we placed the Mitigation Measure and condition of
21 approval for the project applicant to reconstruct the northbound left turn lane.
22 Subsequently, we received additional analysis and information from their traffic
23 engineer, and we agreed with the findings and that changed our assessment and
24 felt it was more appropriate that it was a cumulative impact not a direct impact.
25 Therefore, a fair share contribution was the appropriate means to mitigate. The
26 reason we felt a fair share contribution was appropriate is payment of DIF and
27 TUMF do not take care of retrofitting or reconstruction modification of raised
28 medians.
29

30 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much.
31

32 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay I do have a question then. Sorry. In
33 what I was reading, it was saying that there was going to be just a right in/right
34 out because of the median. So is that, are you saying that's not going to be the
35 case?
36

37 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – No. That would remain the case.
38 The concern raised in the analysis was that the length of the left turn lane wasn't
39 sufficient under the cumulative analysis when the project is operating and all the
40 other additional traffic at General Plan Build-out would be factored in as well.
41 The current lane length would not be adequate at that point, so the access to that
42 driveway for northbound traffic would require a u-turn at the intersection and that
43 has not changed.
44

45 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay because that was the other part of that.
46 That means that, if you're going north on Perris, you can't turn in there.

1
2 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – Without going all the way to the
3 intersection and taking advantage of the light and making a u-turn to go back.

4
5 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Going back down.

6
7 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – That’s correct.

8
9 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay and the entries, I’m seeing two
10 driveways here.

11
12 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – Yes.

13
14 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Either one is an entry for the drive-through?

15
16 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – There is an existing drive. This
17 is oriented to the side, so north is the right-hand-side of the Exhibit.

18
19 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Right.

20
21 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – There is an existing driveway
22 that would be a shared access with the O’Reilly’s that is under construction that
23 would give access to the entry to the drive-through.

24
25 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay.

26
27 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – The traffic would circulate
28 around the building and have the opportunity to exit either at the new driveway or
29 the existing driveway to the north.

30
31 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Or they could also come in through the new
32 driveway and go through the parking lot to.....

33
34 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – That’s correct too.

35
36 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – To access it.

37
38 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – That’s correct.

39
40 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay. I think my concern here is backing up
41 either into O’Reilly’s parking lot or stopping on Perris Boulevard because of the
42 line to the drive-through much like what we have with In-N-Out north of the
43 freeway.

44
45 **CHAIR LOWELL** – What do you mean? In-N-Out is so speedy.
46

1 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Yeah.

2
3 **CHAIR LOWELL** – There is never a line there.

4
5 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – You can't even drive through there, yeah.

6
7 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – We looked at the City's
8 requirements for stacking distance at all those points. It is in very close proximity
9 with the two uses next to each other. But, I believe following the review, we were
10 able to satisfy the City's requirements for both stacking within the drive-through,
11 as well as the stacking that might be required as you enter the site at both
12 driveways.

13
14 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Well I have a question. Doesn't In-N-Out also
15 meet the City's requirements?

16
17 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – I don't know about that approval
18 given the age of it.

19
20 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Well let me attempt to answer that
21 one. In-N-Out was built a while back but you should be aware it won't be coming
22 to the Planning Commission, but we are actually working with In-N-Out on a fix to
23 that particular condition off of Hemlock at Pigeon Pass. The age of In-N-Out, I'm
24 not sure exactly of when it was approved. It's likely that it was approved under
25 the standards that were in place at that time. Also, In-N-Out was developed on
26 one parcel in which they don't have enough room to extend the drive-through and
27 now they've acquired the land to the....

28
29 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – West.

30
31 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – To the west and so now they have
32 the ability because of the additional land to fix that condition. In this particular
33 situation, El Pollo Loco the analysis that was conducted was reviewed by our
34 Transportation Staff. It has been reviewed by us. We look at the length of the
35 drive-through and for us in that analysis it did not present the same sort of impact
36 that you'd experience at In-N-Out. But In-N-Out is notorious for the long drive-
37 through. So every In-N-Out I've ever been to in every community seems to be
38 exactly the same, so it's just a different demand. And they also, I believe, have
39 smaller dining facilities at many In-N-Out's. The one we have here actually has a
40 nice sit-down restaurant component, so maybe that's not why but I just know that
41 In-N-Out is operated differently than other drive-through.

42
43 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – So for the stacking on this, they can come in
44 through either driveway?

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – The expectation, as Mr. Bradshaw
2 has indicated, would be they would come into the first driveway, which is the
3 shared driveway between O'Reilly's and El Pollo Loco and then they would make
4 their move over into the drive-through. But they could go down to the other
5 entrance and then switch back and come into the drive-through. I think that
6 would be counter intuitive for the driver, but if there was a condition as you've
7 identified, it's likely that would be the result if they saw the traffic was backing up.
8 They may and then we'd have to monitor that. I'd like to ask Michael Lloyd if he
9 has any additional thoughts on this and then the Applicant when they come up
10 may also be able to shed some light on what they were thinking as they laid it
11 out.

12
13 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER MICHAEL LLOYD** – Michael Lloyd again with Public
14 Works. No, Planning covered anything I could've added.

15
16 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Well I know from my experience that El Pollo Loco that their
17 drive-through is pretty quick, so I don't think it should be too much of an issue. I
18 know we have two more people waiting to speak, but I had a question. There is
19 a 100 foot speaker setback for the drive-through speaker to the south.

20
21 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – Yes.

22
23 **CHAIR LOWELL** – But there is not one to the west. What was that property to
24 the west zoned? Is that commercial?

25
26 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – It's also neighborhood
27 commercial.

28
29 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So neighborhood commercial?

30
31 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – Um-hum.

32
33 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And there is no required setback for that because it could be
34 another store or something else?

35
36 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – Yes.

37
38 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay.

39
40 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – The 100 foot separation is from
41 residential zoning.

42
43 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Similarly, the drainage basin to the west of the property line
44 looks like some of the portion of the property is draining to the west into that
45 basin. Is there an easement recorded or a joint agreement that they are allowed
46 to drain across the property line?

1
2 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – I believe with the lot line
3 adjustment, the easements are being recorded as an extension of that process
4 but I'll defer to Vince Giron on that one.

5
6 **CHAIR LOWELL** – That was actually one of my next questions that it says the
7 lot line adjustment says future, so I was curious was that meant.

8
9 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – It is but the lot line adjustment is
10 not a requirement for this development. They could come in and develop and
11 only develop this portion of the site and the rest could remain just a remainder of
12 undeveloped area. But the owner, I believe, is motivated to build to create the
13 separate ownership, be able to offer the transaction of this site and still have the
14 other area available under separate ownership. I'll defer to....

15
16 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Can we put the Exhibit up that
17 shows where the existing lot lines are? There is another Exhibit that shows the
18 whole.....

19
20 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – Oh, you want the aerial
21 photograph?

22
23 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Yeah, the aerial will probably be
24 fine. Just for the benefit of those Commissioner's that may not have the same
25 engineering background as some of the other Commissioner's I just wanted to be
26 able to show you. If you look at the red area on the site, that's where the El Pollo
27 Loco is expected to be built. The dark black lines that you can see are the
28 configuration of the underlying property lines. It's the one line, probably if I went
29 up there and pointed at it, or maybe Jeff can point at it in which the lot line
30 adjustment is being considered. So essentially you move this lot line, you put
31 your finger on the lot line that exists. Jeff, go up further a little higher. The one
32 that's going, yeah, right there. The lot line that goes from the point where his
33 finger is across is the lot line that will be moved down to form a new border for
34 the red parcel. That's not required because El Pollo Loco would still be built on
35 an existing parcel that's a legal parcel. It's just the lot line helps the underlying
36 property owner for other reasons, and so I just wanted to add in that additional
37 clarification.

38
39 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, in drilling down that a little bit further, this basin off to
40 the west I don't see any overflow. Where would that overflow go should we have
41 a 100-year storm or a flash flood? Would it just inundate the parking lot? Is
42 there some sort of a structure or maintained outlet to prevent things from eroding
43 away or getting flooded?

44
45 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER VINCE GIRON** – Good evening Chair and fellow
46 Commissioner's, Vince Giron with Land Development Division. There is a

1 requirement for a spillway emergency overflow and the site generally drains
2 southwest/southeast currently. Down at the southerly end of the I guess the
3 vacant parcel, what will be the vacant parcel, there will be a spillway where that
4 is required and it will travel along the southerly property line of the El Pollo Loco
5 site. There is also a proposed storm drain that will be coming from the detention
6 basin and tying into the storm drain on Perris Boulevard.

7
8 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Is that an existing condition? Is that emergency spillway is
9 that something that needs to be conditioned or is it already in here or is that just
10 a general requirement?

11
12 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER VINCE GIRON** – That’s a very standard requirement for
13 any kind of detention basin that there is an emergency spillway.

14
15 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I was just double checking on the plans. It shows that area,
16 that strip of land, but it didn’t say spillway so I was just trying to clarify that.

17
18 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER VINCE GIRON** – There’s a couple ways to handle it too.
19 They can put another storm drain and overflow within their top of the storm drain
20 like a hat to the whistle, so there’s a couple ways.

21
22 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Perfect, I appreciate it.

23
24 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER VINCE GIRON** – Yeah.

25
26 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And let me see who else is ready to speak. So we have
27 Commissioner Sims, Vice Chair Sims please.

28
29 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – I had the same concern that Commissioner Van Natta had
30 about the stacking between the more northerly entrance. Could that one just, do
31 we actually even need that one? So you just have the one southerly entrance.
32 You don’t have the approach coming in between O’Reilly’s and El Pollo?

33
34 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – It is an existing driveway already
35 approved with the prior development that’s occurred out there. And so, in this
36 case, the lower half it’s a shared access. It’s existing and would be reciprocal of
37 shared access between this site and the O’Reilly’s site to the north.

38
39 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – Well I understand that but that doesn’t mean it does have
40 to be like that. I guess I tend to believe that Perris is a major north/south
41 thoroughfare through the City, and that could be a real potential cluster. It could
42 be an irritant to the people coming in O’Reilly’s or leaving O’Reilly’s, people trying
43 to go down Perris Boulevard, if you cued up everybody trying to make a right turn
44 into the driveway there. At least if you would direct them, and I agree it might be
45 a little counterintuitive, you’d have to have some additional signage in one of
46 these landscaped areas. But, if you could get folks to come in at the southerly

1 entrance, then you'd have more off street queueing to get into the
2 driveway....into the what do you call the thing where you go?
3

4 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Drive-through.
5

6 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – Drive-through, yeah.
7

8 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – The short answer to
9 Commissioner Sims question is absolutely there could be some consideration to
10 close that driveway and look at a different alternative. The impracticality we
11 would not want to do that without some consideration of all the other
12 stakeholders, O'Reilly's and the property owner and CVS and Family Dollar.
13 That has not been a consideration up to this point, and I think looking at it I think
14 it may actually present some additional challenges if we did close it off because
15 we may be looking at unintended consequences where the folks that want to
16 leave O'Reilly would now be crossing over the parking lot that is El Pollo Loco.
17 And, if people were coming into the south entrance, they would be backtracking
18 to get to the drive-through and now you have an inherent conflict of two cars
19 going in a different direction. So we would have to look at it, but those are the
20 things that we'd want to consider. At this point, I'd also like to get the input from
21 the Applicant. The way the parcel is developed is the Applicant is entitled to this
22 smaller portion of the site, and I'd have to understand what his negotiations have
23 been with the overall property owner and the other businesses at the time. So
24 they may be able to shed some additional light on this.
25

26 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – Yeah just at Iris and Perris, which is another commercial
27 center just south of here, there is Carl Jr. There is a Del Taco. There is a KFC,
28 but it's all internal. All the queueing has all stacked up and you don't.....all the
29 queueing to get into those things are all internal. It's a different setup of course.
30 This is a one off development, but you know it would be not good to create
31 another In-N-Out situation right here at a major intersection.
32

33 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – One of the additional design
34 challenges, if you will, is our Code. Specifically the section for fast-food
35 restaurants requires two points of access for this type of development and so that
36 was one of the challenges as we worked here was how to satisfy that
37 requirement. And then I didn't know if Michael had anything he wanted to add
38 from transportation.
39

40 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yeah and then you also have to figure out that these
41 applications are independent of one another. So, should O'Reilly fail, we still
42 need two points of access for El Pollo Loco and vice versa.
43

44 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW** – That's correct.
45

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So it might be something we want to look at later on down
2 the line when the site gets a little bit more developed like with another parcel
3 being developed. But I completely agree with everybody up here and I
4 completely agree with Staff, so it's kind of a quandary. I know we're getting a
5 little off topic but Commissioner Barnes you still have some questions. Are you
6 done?

7
8 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – No. The points of access were addressed so.

9
10 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Van Natta, do you have a question for Staff
11 or can we move to the Applicant? If you have a question for Staff, the floor is
12 yours.

13
14 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Yes I have just one additional question here.
15 Isn't the problem going to be with them coming in from Perris Boulevard on the
16 northbound entrance. When that's also an exit, where are they going to que that
17 isn't going to block people who are exiting?

18
19 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Do you want to take that one,
20 Michael?

21
22 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER MICHAEL LLOYD** – I guess I'm not following the line of
23 thought. Could you repeat it one last time for me?

24
25 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay they are coming in on the northbound
26 entrance.

27
28 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER MICHAEL LLOYD** – Um-hum.

29
30 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay, they have to cross over the exit?

31
32 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER MICHAEL LLOYD** – Correct.

33
34 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – To get to the drive-through.

35
36 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER MICHAEL LLOYD** – Yes.

37
38 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay, so that's where they are going to que
39 up in the exit blocking people from either parking lot?

40
41 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – If two or three people were exiting, you couldn't
42 get into the drive-through because the exiting people would.....

43
44 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER MICHAEL LLOYD** – Right.

45

1 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Essentially block your access to the drive-
2 through.

3
4 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER MICHAEL LLOYD** – Right, right.

5
6 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – And if you're queued up to drive-through.....

7
8 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – You couldn't get out.

9
10 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Then people there wouldn't be able to get out.

11
12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Well, if you look at the map, there are places for seven cars
13 to que before you get to the speaker. And, the eighth one, will be sitting at the
14 speaker. So, unless you're anticipating having 12 people waiting to order, I don't
15 think we're going to run into that issue.

16
17 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – I see it everyday at In-N-Out.

18
19 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER MICHAEL LLOYD** – Correct.

20
21 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Well In-N-Out is a totally different piece.

22
23 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – No it isn't because the El Pollo Loco that used
24 to be up there on Sunnymeade Boulevard, I'd go there quite often and be waiting
25 in line 20 to 30 minutes to get through and there would be 10 to 12 or more cars
26 queued up there to go through. And that was one where you actually get off the
27 road down and through the parking lot and come back in around to que.

28
29 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – I appreciate Commissioner Van
30 Natta's concern. And, if we look only at the drive-through which does have
31 adequate que, that's not going to be the critical factor. The critical factor will be
32 the people exiting from O'Reilly. So, if you get two or three cars, it's only two or
33 three cars that keep the incoming cars from getting into the drive-through. So
34 you can have a completely empty drive-through and still have people that can't
35 get there because of them exiting from O'Reilly. I think it can be fixed if we look
36 at it with the Applicant during the development stage. I don't think it has to hold
37 up the approval tonight if the inclination is for the Commission to support it. It
38 may be designating a no stopping or something on the site like you see in the
39 front of fire stations where it just says keep this area clear. There may be a need
40 to do something like that. So we can look at it. I'll ask Michael if he has any
41 thoughts on it, but I do appreciate the concerns you're bringing up.

42
43 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER MICHAEL LLOYD** – The only thing I can add is, typically
44 for a auto-parts store such as O'Reilly which is going in, the traffic generated is
45 very low. That's just what we find based upon trip generation studies for this type
46 of use. So I would not anticipate a large number of vehicles at least from the

1 O'Reilly trying to exit and interfering with vehicles trying to enter and patronize
2 the El Pollo Loco. I have a hard time envisioning that with the use, the auto-part
3 store. The Dollar Store that's located to the north of that has a shared driveway
4 with the CVS that they would take advantage of. So I understand the concern,
5 and I don't want to give the impression that it's not legitimate. It is. But, in our
6 assessment of the site the way we tried to lay it out, this was the most efficient
7 because we did go through some iterations in terms of how things should line up
8 and this was the most efficient.

9
10 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Do we have any other questions for Staff? Okay, I'd like to
11 invite the Applicant up.

12
13 **APPLICANT STEVEN SHAW** – Good evening, I'm Steven Shaw with Armet,
14 Davis, Newlove Architects. Rather than my usual sales pitch, I'll probably focus
15 on some of the issues you guys raised but first I'd like to thank Jeff. In more than
16 15 years of doing expediting and permitting, he has been one of the more helpful
17 planners I've ever worked with. The development and creation of the parcel
18 added a little additional work to this job, and he has been a big help pushing it
19 through and getting everything moving. One concern, we talked about the
20 driveways for quite a while. We went through a number of Site Plans because
21 originally we looked at one driveway and there was the requirement for the two.
22 The other problem is, at the top on the west side, you can see a driveway shown.
23 The back is an empty dirt lot, and I think it's going to be an easement that'll be
24 recorded that that will be for access to that back lot in the future. So you can see
25 there, so the dirt part to the left as you look at it there, that driveway (our
26 southern driveway) will handle traffic that goes to that back lot down the road. So
27 that driveway would be the only point of access and we're the only driveway
28 serving the El Pollo Loco to the restaurant and to the back. So that was one of
29 the concerns when we came up with this two driveway solution. And also a
30 delivery truck with the two driveways makes it easier for a delivery truck to come
31 in. I know transportation had a question about that, and I'm thrilled to hear that
32 there were 12 cars in a queue at an El Pollo Loco. We would absolutely love to
33 have In-N-Out's business but that's very atypical. The most I've seen is 10, so
34 12 is a record number for us. So I can say it's funny. Every time I go to these
35 now, the In-N-Out question comes up because they've set the precedence now
36 for drive-through queueing, and there store in Palm Desert has more than 26
37 queues and they are still backed up. So I understand if you've seen that, and I
38 appreciate the concern but we've found 8 to 10 cars is the most that we've ever
39 seen. So we felt with the number of iterations we did with the Site Plan that this
40 kind of addressed everybody's concerns.

41
42 **CHAIR LOWELL** – What's your typical wait time from person driving on the
43 property to person driving off property?

44
45 **APPLICANT STEVEN SHAW** – There are numbers. Having been to both, my
46 personal experience is we're about half of what In-N-Out usually is. I probably

1 eat at In-N-Out more than I do at El Pollo Loco. Don't tell anybody there. They
2 do serve, I think it's...there's numbers. I think it's in the three minute range and
3 In-N-Out depends. What they've started doing is the little portable menus at the
4 drive-through because they've had so many problems at all their locations with
5 the queuing and that speeds up their service quite a bit. But you're still talking
6 about 15 to 20 cars, so even at half the time if we have 10, it's about the same.
7 So it is a faster service and I was actually just at the trade show out in the desert
8 and they've got new headsets coming. They've got new ordering. There's a lot
9 of things being employed to even speed up service because that's become an
10 issue at all these restaurants is speed of service. Everybody wants it faster, so
11 they are employing a number of techniques right away (new technology and
12 things to get things moving even faster).

13
14 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Does anybody have any questions for the Applicant?
15 Commissioner Ramirez.

16
17 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – What about the possibility of having two
18 windows? One for paying and one for pick-up?

19
20 **APPLICANT STEVEN SHAW** – We don't have the space. It's a prototypical
21 restaurant. Doing a pay window would take up quite a bit of room in the back of
22 house where the kitchen is, and we just don't have the floor space for it. And, in
23 terms of the speed, it's the preparation of the food. The paying for us really
24 wouldn't increase, it wouldn't get the customers through much faster.

25
26 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other questions for the Applicant?

27
28 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Not really a question but an observation. It's not
29 a perfect solution, but I think to a certain degree the market place punishes In-N-
30 Out for their long lines. I mean, I don't go there.

31
32 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I second that.

33
34 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – You know, so again.

35
36 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Twenty-two minutes for a hamburger is way too long.

37
38 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Yeah, so again it's not a perfect solution. But I
39 think there are some market forces that probably make this okay.

40
41 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Market yeah.

42
43 **APPLICANT STEVEN SHAW** – The other thing too that I've seen when they get
44 busy, you know especially at lunch and most especially at dinnertime their family
45 meals are their biggest seller. When the que line is even at six or seven cars,
46 people just park in a space and walk in. So it's not, if the que line.....Now at In-

1 N-Out, typically there aren't that many parking spaces so it's not as much of an
2 option. This has plenty of parking, so I think it'd be easy enough that if
3 somebody saw a que line backed up there, they'd just park in one of the spaces
4 and go in. That's my opinion and that's what I've seen in the past but.....

5
6 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I'd like to play that game and see if I can beat the drive-
7 through.

8
9 **APPLICANT STEVEN SHAW** – Yeah, I know. Me too. Try and look in the store
10 and see how long it is inside and yeah I know.

11
12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I would try to see which car would pull behind and then see if
13 I could beat them out.

14
15 **APPLICANT STEVEN SHAW** – Yeah, yeah.

16
17 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Does anybody else have any questions for the Applicant.

18
19 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – No.

20
21 **CHAIR LOWELL** – No? Okay, thank you very much.

22
23 **APPLICANT STEVEN SHAW** – Thank you.

24
25 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I like to open up the Public Comments portion. Do we have
26 any Speaker Slips today?

27
28 **SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST DARISA VARGAS** – We do not have
29 any Speaker Slips.

30
31 **CHAIR LOWELL** – With that said, I'd like to close the Public Comments portion
32 of the hearing. If you want to fill out a Speaker Card and talk against yourself, go
33 for it. If not, we've got you covered. Okay, with that said, do we have any
34 questions or comments above and beyond what we already talked about? I don't
35 see anybody's hands going up.

36
37 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I just wanted to say one thing.

38
39 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Van Natta, by all means.

40
41 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I was really disappointed when they closed
42 the El Pollo Loco that was on Sunnymead because it was so close to my house.

43
44 **CHAIR LOWELL** – That used to be a Fazoli's. Remember that?

45
46 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – No.

1
2 **CHAIR LOWELL** – The drive-through Italian joint.

3
4 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Hum-um.

5
6 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – I've got one question.

7
8 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Baker.

9
10 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – And I don't know who to address this to but you
11 know we got that 115,000 volt line coming down through there. Who handles
12 that? Is that Land Development? Is that going to get buried there? And
13 O'Reilly's, what's holding that program up? They got the slab in. Is there
14 something going on with permitting there or?

15
16 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER VINCE GIRON** – Vince Giron with Land Development.
17 To address the O'Reilly's first, I'm not quite sure what's holding them up. They
18 have been slow. Our Land Development Division Inspectors have reported that
19 there is just inactivity there. I think it's on the side of O'Reilly's. Well, I know it's
20 on the side of O'Reilly's. Now the overhead utilities, I don't believe they are 115.
21 They are probably 15K. I don't know for sure, but they are less than 115 volts.

22
23 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – So it'll get buried, right?

24
25 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER VINCE GIRON** – They will be undergrounded.

26
27 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Both O'Reilly's and El Pollo Loco gets
28 undergrounded?

29
30 **TRAFFIC ENGINEER VINCE GIRON** – That's correct.

31
32 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – The other thing I was kind of wondering here from
33 the City's standpoint with a restaurant background, where this is under 5000
34 square foot, is this building going to be sprinkled or? I know that's kind of a fire
35 department deal. That won't be? Non-sprinkled. Okay. Oh, okay, I guess we
36 do have fire.

37
38 **FIRE SAFETY SPECIALIST PAUL VILLALOBOS** – Yeah I can speak to that.

39
40 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – And we do have a fire suppression system going in
41 the cook line?

42
43 **FIRE SAFETY SPECIALIST PAUL VILLALOBOS** – Yes there is. That's
44 required. Sure.

45

1 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Okay. And the other thing I wanted to know, does
2 the City require a grease interceptor or grease trap for a restaurant this size?

3
4 **FIRE SAFETY SPECIALIST PAUL VILLALOBOS** – Yes.

5
6 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – They do, okay. And what do we do? Is it one that
7 goes outside or inside the building?

8
9 **FIRE SAFETY SPECIALIST PAUL VILLALOBOS** – Yes, it's outside.

10
11 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Okay.

12
13 **APPLICANT STEVEN SHAW** – A grease food receptor is required. I think
14 we're doing 1200 gallons but don't quote me on that. It's over 1000.

15
16 **CHAIR LOWELL** – The plans right here show 1500 gallons. Sorry.

17
18 **APPLICANT STEVEN SHAW** – It could be 1500, yeah. And it will be in the.....I
19 don't know if we show it in the Site Plan, it's hard for me to see. But it will be
20 outside. It's required to be outside of the restaurant, so somewhere in the
21 parking lot where they have access to clean it.

22
23 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I just noticed it after Mr. Baker said it, but it's right behind the
24 trash enclosure.

25
26 **APPLICANT STEVEN SHAW** – Okay.

27
28 **CHAIR LOWELL** – In the parking stall.

29
30 **APPLICANT STEVEN SHAW** – Okay.

31
32 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Yeah, I see it. Yeah. Okay, very good. Thank
33 you.

34
35 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yeah, it shows it.

36
37 **APPLICANT STEVEN SHAW** – Thanks.

38
39 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I was actually going to ask that same question, but you beat
40 me to it.

41
42 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Okay.

43
44 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Well I just worked on a similar project. Any other questions
45 or comments before we move to go to a motion? I don't see anybody's hands.
46 No lights. Okay, would anybody like to motion, make a motion? If you make a

1 motion, I request that you read your motion or state your motion also. Don't
2 everybody rush. We have a motion by Commissioner Van Natta.

3
4 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I move that we **APPROVE** Resolution No.
5 2015-31 as the recommendation from the Staff is.

6
7 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – And as amended.

8
9 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And as amended.

10
11 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – And as amended.

12
13 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So we have a motion by Commissioner Van Natta. Do we
14 have a second?

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

17
18 **CHAIR LOWELL** – We have a second by Commissioner Baker. Please place
19 your vote. Oh, you need to push the button. All votes have been cast. Last
20 chance, we're going to end the vote. There we go. The motion passes 7-0. Do
21 we have a Staff warp-up on this item?

22
23
24 Opposed – 0

25
26
27 **Motion carries 7 – 0**

28
29
30 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Yes, before I give the normal Staff
31 wrap-up, I wanted to extend my appreciation to the Applicant's representative for
32 coming up this evening and actually paying some compliments to my Staff. We
33 appreciate that very much when the applicant's do that. But, in all candor, this
34 has been a challenging site and we also want to say that we appreciate the
35 patience that El Pollo Loco has actually extended to us in working with them
36 through the issues. And we are committed to working with El Pollo Loco in a
37 more timely and expeditious fashion as they move forward towards the actually
38 construction of this, so that's our commitment to El Pollo Loco. We are pleased
39 that they were able to get through this tonight. As far as the wrap-up goes, this is
40 a Conditional Use Permit. The Conditional Use Permit, it is an application or
41 entitlement that is subject to appeal. Any interested party that would like to
42 appeal this has 15 days to appeal your action. The appeal should be filed
43 directly to the Community Development Director, and if an appeal is filed, it will
44 be scheduled for a hearing before the City Council within 30 days.

45
46 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much.

1
2
3 **OTHER BUSINESS**
4
5

6 **CHAIR LOWELL** – With that said, let’s move onto Other Business, which I don’t
7 think we have any. One of the things that I’d like to ask is if our alternates will be
8 available on the next meeting on December 10th, 2015, to hear the Verizon item?
9 They are both nodding yes, so I’m assuming that’s a yes. Perfect.
10

11
12 **STAFF COMMENTS**
13

14 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, Staff Comments. Do we have any Staff Comments
15 tonight?
16

17 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Just a couple. One, I’ve already
18 introduced the promotion that we’ve given to Grace. So we look forward to
19 Grace moving on to a different role, and we look forward to having Erica Tadeo.
20 We will introduce her when she comes on board. She was formally approved on
21 the personal access for City Council earlier this week, so we’re just working on a
22 start date. And then, once we have the start date, we will be bringing her before
23 you. We are also hearing some noise on the streets with regard to the World
24 Logistics Center project. As you know, the World Logistics Center project was in
25 the newspaper in terms of initiatives that are being circulated. We’ll keep you
26 posted on anything else we hear, but what we’re hearing is that there could be
27 some activity in the near future. If any of the Commissioner’s are hearing
28 anything or have any questions, please direct your questions to me. I’ll be happy
29 to try and shed any light on that that you might hear. We are not going to be
30 having a second meeting in November because we have the Thanksgiving
31 holiday coming up, so I’d like to just close on wishing all of you a very happy
32 Thanksgiving and we’ll see you in the early part of December.
33

34 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. I would like to thank Ms. Vargas for
35 her work tonight. Thank you very much. Congratulations to Mrs. Espino-Salcedo
36 for her promotion. Any other questions or any other comments by
37 Commissioner’s?
38

39
40 **PLANNING COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**
41

42 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other questions or any other comments by
43 Commissioner’s?
44

45 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I did want to say we’re not happy about losing
46 you, but we’re glad you got the promotion.

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

PERMIT TECHNICIAN GRACE ESPINO-SALCEDO – Thank you.

CHAIR LOWELL – I’ll second that. I don’t want to see you go, but I’m happy you’re moving on.

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIR LOWELL – With that said, I’d like to adjourn to our next Regular-Scheduled Meeting, which is December 10th, 2015, at 7:00 PM right here in the Council Chambers. Thank you very much and have a good night.

NEXT MEETING

Next Meeting: Planning Commission Regular Meeting, December 10th, 2015 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