

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

5 **Thursday, April 28th, 2016, 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 Meeting of the Planning Commission to order. Today is Thursday, April
12 28th, 2016. The time is a little past 7:00 PM. It's 7:08 PM. May we have roll call
13 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 **Staff Present:**

30 Rick Sandzimier, Planning Official
31 Paul Early, Assistant City Attorney
32 Chris Ormsby, Senior Case Planner
33 Claudia Manrique, Associate Planner
34 Erica Tadeo, Administrative Assistant
35
36

37 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
38
39

40 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Wow. We have a full crew today. That's awesome. With
41 that, I would like to invite Vice Chair Sims to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.
42

43 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – Please stand and follow me in the Pledge of Allegiance.
44

1 **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

2
3 **Approval of Agenda**

4
5
6 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Now we are moving onto approval of
7 tonight’s Agenda. I don’t know if we have the voting option available. Would
8 anybody like to motion to approve tonight’s Agenda?

9
10 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I move to approve tonight’s Agenda.

11
12 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – I’ll second.

13
14 **CHAIR LOWELL** – We have a motion and a second. Should we just say “I” or
15 should we do the votes on here? I don’t have the option just yet. There we go.

16
17 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – There it goes.

18
19 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, Commissioner Baker could you hit second? Now let’s
20 cast your votes. Great. We have approved tonight’s Agenda 7-0.

21
22
23 Opposed – 0

24
25
26 **Motion carries 7 – 0**

27
28
29 **CONSENT CALENDAR**

30
31 *All matters listed under Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and all*
32 *will be enacted by one rollcall vote. There will be no discussion of these items*
33 *unless Members of the Planning Commission request specific items be removed*
34 *from the Consent Calendar for separate action.*

35
36
37 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Moving onto the Consent Calendar. Do we have any items
38 on the Consent Calendar tonight?

39
40 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Just the approval of the Minutes.

41
42 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yes, that is correct. So I have a list of all the Commissioners
43 that were seated on the various Minutes, so we will just take them one by one by
44 one.

1 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2
3 **Planning Commission - Regular Meeting - Oct 8, 2015 7:00 PM**

4
5 **Approve as submitted.**

6
7 **Planning Commission - Regular Meeting - Oct 22, 2015 7:00 PM**

8
9 **Approve as submitted.**

10
11 **Planning Commission - Regular Meeting - Nov 12, 2015 7:00 PM**

12
13 **Approve as submitted.**

14
15 **Planning Commission - Regular Meeting - Feb 25, 2016 7:00 PM**

16
17 **Approve as submitted.**

18
19 **Planning Commission - Regular Meeting - Mar 24, 2016 7:00 PM**

20
21 **Approve as submitted.**

22
23
24
25 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So, for the October 8th, 2015, Regular Meeting of the
26 Planning Commission we had Commissioner Gonzalez, Commissioner Korzec,
27 Commissioner Nickel, Commissioner Baker, Commissioner Barnes, Vice Chair
28 Sims and myself. Of those seven people, who would like to motion to approve
29 the.....can we just do a roll call vote on these since we don't have the alternates
30 seated? Yeah, I was going to ask for that. So, who would like to motion to
31 approve the October 8th, 2015, Minutes?

32
33 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – I'll move to approve the October 8th, 2015, Minutes.

34
35 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – I second.

36
37 **CHAIR LOWELL** – We have a motion and a second. Could we have a roll call
38 vote? What was it? We have Commissioner Gonzalez, Commissioner Korzec,
39 Commissioner Nickel, Commissioner Baker, Commissioner Barnes, Vice Chair
40 Sims and myself.

41
42 **COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ** – Yes

43
44 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – I

45
46 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Yes

1
2 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Yes

3
4 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Yes

5
6 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – Yes

7
8 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yes. That passes 7-0.

9
10
11 Opposed – 0

12
13
14 **Motion carries 7 – 0**

15
16
17 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Moving onto the October 22nd, 2015, Regular Meeting of the
18 Planning Commission. Who would like to motion to approve the Minutes from
19 that meeting?

20
21 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – I so move.

22
23 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I second.

24
25 **CHAIR LOWELL** – We have a move and a second, perfect. So we have
26 Commissioner Nickel, Commissioner Korzec, Commissioner Van Natta,
27 Commissioner Gonzalez, Commissioner Barnes, Vice Chair Sims and myself.

28
29 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – If I may just make a
30 suggestion. If you'd like to, because there are so many of these, instead of
31 taking a rollcall vote you could just call for "I" and "neigh" and only record if there
32 are any neighs since these are likely to go by unanimous consent.

33
34 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Should we just do them blanketing and have everybody
35 vote?

36
37 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – It might make it more efficient
38 for you.

39
40 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, well let's just do that. Let's just say then, since we
41 have a motion and a second for the October 22nd, 2015, Meeting Minutes, all in
42 favor of approval say "I."

43
44 **COMMISSIONER NICKEL** – I

45
46 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – I

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 VAN NATTA – I

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ – I

COMMISSIONER BARNES – I

VICE CHAIR SIMS – I

CHAIR LOWELL – I

CHAIR LOWELL – All opposed say “neigh.” No opposed.

Opposed – 0

Motion carries 7 – 0

CHAIR LOWELL – Moving onto the November 12th, 2015, Regular Meeting. We had Commissioner Ramirez, Commissioner Korzec, Commissioner Van Natta, Commissioner Baker, Commissioner Barnes, Vice Chair Sims and myself. All those in favor of approving these Minutes.....

COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA – You still have to have a motion.

CHAIR LOWELL – We still need a motion?

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY – You would still need a motion, but you could do a motion for all the Minutes if you wanted to.

CHAIR LOWELL – Okay.

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY – And then take the “I” and “neigh” then and simply record if there are any neighs on the Minutes.

CHAIR LOWELL – That’s a better way of doing it. Would anybody like to motion to approve all the Minutes for tonight?

COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA – I move to approve all the remaining Minutes that have not yet been approved.

1 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – I'll second.

2

3 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Perfect. We have a motion by Commissioner Van Natta and
4 a second by Commissioner Baker. All in favor of the November 12th, 2015,
5 Regular Meeting say "I."

6

7 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – I

8

9 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – I

10

11 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I

12

13 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – I

14

15 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – I

16

17 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – I

18

19 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I

20

21

22

23 **CHAIR LOWELL** – All opposed say "neigh." Nobody? That's 7-0.

24

25

26 Opposed – 0

27

28

29 **Motion carries 7 – 0**

30

31

32

33 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Moving onto the February 25th, 2016, Regular Meeting of the
34 Planning Commission. All in favor of approving the Minutes say "I."

35

36 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – I

37

38 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – I

39

40 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I

41

42 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – I

43

44 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – I

45

46 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – I

1
2 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I

3
4
5
6 **CHAIR LOWELL** – All opposed say no. That passes 7-0 again.

7
8
9 Opposed – 0

10
11
12 **Motion carries 7 – 0**

13
14
15
16 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Moving onto the March 24th, 2016.....

17
18 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Chair, I think the motion was to
19 approve them all, so that last vote since there were no neighs the Minutes can
20 just reflect that all of them are passed.

21
22 **CHAIR LOWELL** – One by one?

23
24 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Yeah. Your motion was to
25 approve them all, so they are all already approved.

26
27 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay. That was difficult. They are all approved.

28
29 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – We’re done. I like it.

30
31 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Now we should have one per meeting as we go on now that
32 we’re caught up to date, I believe. Okay and that moves us onto the Public
33 Comments procedure.

34
35
36 **PUBLIC COMMENTS PROCEDURE**

37
38 *Any person wishing to address the Commission on any matter, either under*
39 *Public Comments section of the Agenda or scheduled items or public hearings,*
40 *must fill out a “Request to Speak” form available at the door. The completed*
41 *form must be submitted to the Secretary prior to the Agenda item being called by*
42 *the Chairperson. In speaking to the Commission, member of the public may be*
43 *limited to three minutes per person, except for the applicant for entitlement. The*
44 *Commission may establish an overall time limit for comments on a particular*
45 *Agenda item. Members of the public must direct their questions to the*
46 *Chairperson of the Commission and not to other members of the Commission,*

1 *the applicant, the Staff, or the audience. Additionally, there is an ADA note.*
2 *Upon request, this Agenda will be made available in appropriate alternative*
3 *formats to persons with disabilities in compliance with the Americans with*
4 *Disabilities Act of 1990. Any person with a disability who requires a modification*
5 *or accommodation in order to participate in a meeting should direct their request*
6 *to Guy Pagan, our ADA Coordinator, at (951) 413-3120 at least 48 hours prior to*
7 *the meeting. The 48-hour notification will enable the City to make reasonable*
8 *arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.*

9
10
11 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So we have Non-Public Hearing Items. Does anybody wish
12 to speak on an item that’s not on the Agenda tonight? We do have one person.
13 Do we have a Speaker Slip for them?

14
15 **ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT ERICA TADEO** – Rafael Brugueras.

16
17 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Perfect.

18
19 **SPEAKER RAFAEL BRUGUERAS** – Good evening Commissioners, Staff,
20 guests, and residents. I wanted to sit there and just listen today but it’s hard
21 because I go to other meetings, and I go to the chambers meeting and I hear
22 people say there’s nothing to do with Moreno Valley. And that’s true because a
23 lot of other stuff got voted out (speedways, Disneyland, Magic Mountain). They
24 all went somewhere else. But I am proud of Moreno Valley because we have
25 jobs. We have big companies that are here supporting us. We have a base, the
26 World Logistics Center, Amazon, Harbor Freight, and all these big companies
27 that are here that people don’t see while their driving towards the freeway
28 because most of them are hidden behind barriers and that’s good because that’s
29 what they wanted. They didn’t want to see the big buildings that have jobs that
30 employ Moreno Valley residents and other people from the region. You know,
31 we all can’t have everything that we want. But I’d rather have a City that can
32 help the State of California, our County, Riverside, and the region with jobs. I’d
33 rather have a lot of jobs, a lot of homes, a lot of small businesses doing well in
34 Moreno Valley than nothing. Okay? Now if you want a speedway, baseball field,
35 then come out to the meetings and complain. Make your voice heard. That’s the
36 only way things will get done but don’t complain behind the Board or behind the
37 Chairs and talk about there is nothing to do in Moreno Valley. There’s a lot of
38 things in Moreno Valley you can do. I mean, we have sports, we’ve got parades.
39 You know, we’ve got a lot of things. So stop complaining, really, residents. Be
40 part of the committee. Come out to the meetings and voice your opinions so we
41 can sort it all out, but Moreno Valley is not going to give up creating jobs. That is
42 a fact, and I’m deeply grateful for the Planning Commissioners that are here
43 today. Their new, their bright, and they care about the City, and that’s what we
44 want. We want seven professional people that love their City and want to
45 continue to provide jobs so they can go to Disneyland and Magic Mountain in

1 Buena Park but come home to Moreno Valley. We have jobs. You want jobs in
2 the City. Thank you.

3
4 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. I don't see anybody, so I will.....do
5 we have anymore Speaker Slips?

6
7 **ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT ERICA TADEO**– We do not.
8
9

10
11 **NON-PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**
12

13 1. Weed Abatement and Weed Barriers on Private Property (Report of:
14 Community Development)

15
16 Case: Discussion item regarding weed abatement and weed
17 barriers

18
19 Applicant: City of Moreno Valley
20

21 Owner: Not applicable
22

23 Representative: Not applicable
24 Location: City-wide
25

26 Case Planner: Chris Ormsby
27

28 Council District: Not applicable
29
30
31

32 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, then the Public Comments portion is now closed.
33 Moving onto Non-Public Hearing Items. We do have one item tonight, which is a
34 discussion item regarding weed abatement and weed barriers. The Case
35 Planner is Mr. Chris Ormsby.
36

37 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Yes before Chris speaks I just
38 wanted to, for the record, so the public is also aware, clarify this item is a Non-
39 Public Hearing Item. It was brought before you at the request of the
40 Commission, particularly Chairman Lowell who had asked about some followup
41 research on weed barriers and so this report is in response to that. Thank you.
42

43 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – Chair Lowell and Members of the
44 Planning Commission: This item concerns the appearance of front yard
45 landscaping within new single-family residential tracts. There were some
46 pictures provided with the Staff Report. The homes identified are all owner-

1 occupied homes. The particular tract identified was the very first one affected by
2 the Eastern Municipal Water Districts drought tolerant requirements, which
3 requires a turfless front yard. At present, there are only three tracts that have
4 been designed with turfless front yards. The graph has provided you with a
5 considerable amount of background information. My intent is not to go over all of
6 that. It was to basically frame the issue for you. It is important, though, to
7 mention that turfless drought-tolerant landscapes and front yards present new
8 challenges for Staff to implement, as well as for homeowners as far as the
9 maintenance aspect of these. In preparing for the discussion tonight, Staff
10 completed research into weed barriers as a possible solution for reducing the
11 maintenance of turfless landscapes. Weed barriers are essentially a fabric or
12 plastic that is placed over the soil and then a layer of mulch or topsoil is placed
13 over that and the intent is to reduce weed growth, which in the short-term it does
14 reduce weed growth. But, in reviewing the requirements of other cities in doing
15 research, there are concerns with weed barriers. First of all, none of the cities
16 that we identified required or necessarily recommended weed barriers. Again,
17 this was only looking at maybe six or seven cities. The downside of weed
18 barriers....I can just summarize a few of the points. There are more details in the
19 Staff Report. Weed barriers do reduce percolation into the soil even if they are
20 made of a permeable-type fabric. They also restrict organic materials from being
21 able to get back into the soil, which is important for regeneration of the soil. The
22 barriers do breakdown in time, so it is definitely more of a short-term solution.
23 And then weed barriers can be a concern in planter beds because, for example
24 in a front yard if somebody wants to change out plants, they pretty much have to
25 replace major sections of the fabric material. As mentioned in the Staff Report,
26 the proposed Code Amendment will be discussed later this evening, and it
27 includes some clarifications to the Code that will help further the quality of
28 drought-tolerant landscapes. Some of those items may help a little bit with
29 maintenance. They are not geared towards the maintenance of it. The Staff
30 Report that I provided includes some suggestions for further improving the quality
31 of these turfless drought-tolerant landscapes for new single-family homes.
32 These include exploring further Code Amendments to establish specific minimum
33 standards for turfless drought tolerant requirements, research ways to ensure
34 that drought-tolerant landscapes are installed according to approved plan. I
35 mean, from a Staff standpoint, it's much easier to look at a front yard landscape
36 with grass and verify that that's installed correctly versus it being a drought-
37 tolerant landscape with mulch, which there's challenges in trying to figure out
38 how you measure that (how you in fact evaluate it). Thirdly, and this is
39 something that there has already been some work done on that, is to develop a
40 handout to address maintenance of drought-tolerant landscapes for residential
41 homeowners. And then finally, and this I think was something I discussed with
42 Code Staff, is to encourage or require developers to provide information to
43 homebuyers with regard to installing drought-tolerant landscape. And so
44 education would seem like an important way to try to facilitate better
45 maintenance of these landscapes. So Staff appreciates your bringing forward
46 this very timely topic, and with that, I will open it up for the discussion.

1
2 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Does anybody have any questions or comments for Staff?
3 Commissioner Barnes.

4
5 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – I take it the problem we're trying to solve here is
6 maintenance after installation basically, right? That's the issue that we're
7 addressing?

8
9 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – Yes.

10
11 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Okay, alright.

12
13 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – Well maintenance and then some of
14 that may be able to be addressed by the requirements that we apply from a Staff
15 standpoint to new residential landscapes.

16
17 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – What does the current Code, not as it relates to
18 drought tolerant, but just front yard maintenance in general? What are the
19 requirements currently to maintain their front yard? Do you have to.....are you
20 supposed to maintain it in some reasonable fashion? Is there already a
21 mechanism in place that, if somebody's lawn is poorly maintained, Code
22 Compliance can drive by and say you've got to clean this up?

23
24 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – Yeah, Title 6 addresses maintenance
25 of properties and to keep them neat and orderly in a junk, trash, and debris free
26 area.

27
28 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – So could this be just a maintenance issue that we
29 have to pass onto Code Compliance and not overly complicate people's front
30 yards?

31
32 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – The simple answer to that would
33 be, yes, we could do that. There is a cost involved and there are resources
34 involved. And there are an enormous amount of properties throughout the City
35 that are in a state of, what some people may describe as, disrepair. So it is an
36 enormous effort. I think one of the things, the objective of our Standards, is to try
37 and help minimize the amount of maintenance that is necessary and I think that
38 was the issue with the weed barriers. What we've come to find out in research
39 though is that, even through the installation of the weed barriers, there is still the
40 possibility that you're going to get the weeds, and maintenance becomes the
41 crux of everything. So we're looking for some direction from you to see if we
42 need to follow up on some different standards. Or, if it is just maintenance and it
43 is an issue of getting more Code Officers engaged, then that is a different
44 solution that does require some resources and budget and we do not have the
45 answer for that here.

1 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – I guess I'd make the argument that no matter how
2 it was initially landscaped, if the occupants choose not to maintain it whether it
3 was drought tolerant or not, it's going to be a labor issue for the City to find it and
4 monitor it. So, okay. Thank you.

5
6 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I think my comment is somewhere along the
7 same line. We've had a problem with people not maintaining their yards no
8 matter what type of landscaping was provided by the builder. So, whether they
9 let the green grass die and weeds grow up or whether they allow weeds to grow
10 up in the midst of the drought-tolerant landscaping, it's still the same issue. As
11 you said, it's the individual homeowners either maintaining or not maintaining
12 their front yard in an acceptable condition. We can't say "if it's not broke, don't fix
13 it." But we can certainly say there's no reason to layer on another level of
14 changes to the Code or other regulations. If the regulations are already there
15 that the front yard is to be maintained and free of debris and weeds and that's
16 already there, it's just a matter of enforcing it as it always has been. From my
17 experience in having seen a lot of houses and a lot of front yards, the weed
18 barriers are more trouble than they are worth. They start out looking fine when
19 you first put in the landscaping and, within a year, they are looking worse than if
20 you hadn't had the weed barrier there in the first place. And then you add weeds
21 to the exposed weed barrier and that just makes it look worse. So I'm thinking
22 we already have provisions in our Code to require the front yard landscaping to
23 be maintained no matter what it is, and we don't need to add more to it.

24
25 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other comments or questions?

26
27 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – I do.

28
29 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Vice Chair Sims.

30
31 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – This is the old story of competing public policy. You have
32 an arid region that struggles with water and, as I work for a Water District,
33 probably the biggest waste of water is putting water on grass. It's
34 absolutely.....so whether you have grass or whether you do not have grass, it
35 comes down to an issue of maintenance. So, from a water utilities standpoint,
36 the public policy is you want to minimize so you've got to give people alternative
37 ways to effectively landscape their property with natives, low-drip or xeriscaping
38 with dirt, rocks, and stuff like that. So I am a proponent of the weed barrier, and I
39 think they are very effective if they are installed correctly and you maintain and
40 use whatever maintenance to do to keep it right and keep the mulch or whatever
41 on top and you maintain it. They work very well. From the other policy side, the
42 City wants to keep a good-looking City with landscape, so I would tend to say
43 there's two ways to do this. Every new development that goes in, I don't know
44 every new development because I'm not as familiar as I probably should with the
45 Government Code or the Municipal Code, but I can tell you where I live my tract
46 does not have an HOA. The tract directly next to us, and I'm on a large lot (half

1 acre), the tract right next to us is one-third acre and they have an HOA and they
2 are very well maintained. All those lots are maintained, and they go through and
3 they have a little once a month you drive through the neighborhood and
4 somebody has a little sign that says I'm the yard of the month, you know, and
5 they do it up. But you don't drive around and you see weeds and stuff like that in
6 the neighborhood that has HOA's. I think if there was a policy decision made to
7 look at Municipal Code you require all new development, especially ones that is
8 just requiring to have HOA that has a requirement that they have to maintain and
9 you let the private HOA (the community) police itself and find themselves and
10 keep the owners in check. That's my two cents.

11
12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Korzec.

13
14 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – I was going to say there's two issues that I have
15 here. This is new development, but there's a lot of existing development that this
16 is happening to. I live in a really nice neighborhood. I won't say but on my street
17 someone's digging up their yard right now, and I have no idea what they are
18 doing. But it doesn't look good. So I don't know where the answer lies whether
19 we can say this looks good/this doesn't look good. Obviously, on this picture you
20 gave us, all the scruff along the sidewalk to me is weeds. But, looking at the rest
21 of it, are native plants and at what point do you say this native plant doesn't look
22 good or this one doesn't. I do know from my own experience that the weed
23 barriers do not work. I tried it in several other homes and it was a pain. It was an
24 awful pain to keep it maintained.

25
26 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – You go by the good stuff from the Home Depot store.

27
28 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – Well not everyone can afford the good stuff. We
29 have to keep in mind that there's a lot of different people that live in our
30 neighborhoods, but I find this a real conundrum because something that you
31 think looks bad I might not think looks bad because I'm a naturalist and I like it to
32 have very natural landscape. So I don't know. I'm just sort of venting here
33 saying, and I do also know Code Enforcement does work really well in some of
34 the existing neighborhoods because I do know someone who has had three
35 approaches by Code Enforcement in the last year. But the whole street looks
36 that way, and it's a more rural section. And, again, are they getting hit more than
37 the people in my neighborhood whose places don't quite look up to par? I still
38 have grass on my front lawn but the rest of my house is concrete and planters
39 and stuff like that. But I don't know it's a judgment call as to what looks good and
40 what doesn't, except for scruffy little things along the sidewalk. That definitely
41 doesn't look good.

42
43 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – A little Roundup fixes that.

44

1 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – A little Roundup, yeah. But not all our citizens
2 can afford the topnotch stuff like Roundup. You know, some of us have to hand
3 pull our weeds.

4
5 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Top notch like Roundup?

6
7 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – But maybe it's a matter of.....

8
9 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – Or a top-notch screwdriver and get them out of the cracks.

10
11 **COMMISSIONER KORZEC** – I don't know. I just...I do want to see our
12 neighborhoods continue to look good, and I know the issue with this drought
13 tolerant is not a lot of people really understand what it's all about and they just
14 think they can throw rocks on their front yard and let things pop up that don't look
15 good. Anyways, I'm done.

16
17 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Ramirez, I saw your hand go up for a
18 moment.

19
20 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – Yeah I'm in agreement with Commissioner Sims.
21 I think HOA can definitely help or encourage the issue, but the other issue is
22 you've got rental properties. We're not keeping these tenants liable or
23 responsible for the issue, so that's another thing that we would have to take a
24 look at as well.

25
26 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other questions or comments before I have a crack at
27 it? Commissioner Van Natta.

28
29 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I want to respond to a couple of things that
30 were said. First of all, I don't believe an HOA is the proper solution. It adds
31 another level of expense, and there's a lot of people who do not want to be in an
32 HOA for various different reasons and keeping up the landscaping is certainly not
33 enough of a reason to establish an HOA just so that everybody will keep up their
34 yards. There's got to be another way to deal with that. The other thing is, it's not
35 really a matter of whether you like a green yard or a natural plant yard or
36 whatever, everybody has their own likes and their own taste. I think the Code
37 and the existing Guidelines are very clear. It doesn't say you've got to have
38 green grass. It just says landscaping must be maintained in a healthy condition
39 free of weeds and trimmed clear of sidewalk and parking spaces. That can be
40 any type of landscaping there. So I don't think....I mean there's still HOA's out
41 there who, in their books and they haven't changed it yet, says that you have to
42 have grass on 80% of your front yard. So, until that's changed, you still have
43 HOA's that are enforcing an outdated type of landscaping based on what we
44 have to look at now.

45
46 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – I have.....

1
2 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Vice Chair Sims, go for it.

3
4 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – Just as a.....I don't know if I'm a huge proponent of HOA's
5 either. But, at the end of the day, I tend to believe that there's folks who want to
6 do what they want and live in the County unincorporated areas where there's
7 less rules and regulations. They can have chain-link fence, and they can have
8 aluminum butler buildings or whatever they want. And, if you move into the City
9 that is incorporated, by definition you're agreeing to live within the Municipal
10 Code that has certain rules and regulations. And, you know, if you go.....I'm not
11 saying if Moreno Valley is ever going to be Newport Coast or anything or Irvine.
12 But, if you go into areas where they have more of a consistent streetscape that's
13 maintained well and you go from house to house from neighborhood to
14 neighborhood and there's a feel about it and there's a high value of equity held
15 within the neighborhoods, it is because there's HOA's. And there is a stringency
16 about it where neighbors start policing themselves. If we were to divest
17 ourselves of the responsibility by having Code and not, or if you're going to stick
18 with having Codes and you don't enforce it, then we shouldn't have the Code. It
19 would be better....it seems to be, if you have smaller HOA where people that live
20 in it, they are committed to their neighborhood. They live there. They pay money
21 towards that. They'll take care of it. So that's....it's just kind of an inherence.

22
23 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Well the idea of....the reason why I brought this up in the
24 first place in the last meeting was not to figure out what is good, what is bad,
25 what's a weed, what's not a weed. It was moreover trying to modify the Drought-
26 Tolerant Landscaping Standard that we are asking our new developments to
27 adhere to. And the picture that I provided tonight and in the Agenda that was
28 mailed out (I have an excellent picture), this is a neighborhood fairly close to me
29 and the weeds are just ramped. And granted it's the homeowners responsibility,
30 but this a brand new home that's been occupied for maybe two months; maybe
31 three months at most. So if you have pride in your new home ownership.....if
32 you lose your pride in new home ownership and let the front yard look like that
33 within the first two months, what's it going to look like in the next 10 years or 20
34 years? So the idea was that when the drought-tolerant landscaping is installed,
35 when it's just a bare dirt front yard, to put down a fairly high quality weed barrier
36 which allows air and moisture to go through. I have that at my house. Then
37 place the rocks on top of it to keep the weed barrier down. I believe one of the
38 modifications in here was adding a two inch to three inch thick layer of rock,
39 which would definitely cover up the weed barrier, and then you plant through the
40 weed barrier whatever plants you wanted. So if you wanted a yucca plant or an
41 aloe plant or a cactus, you would move the rocks away, cut a hole in the fabric,
42 plant the plant, and it would be there. And, in my experience at my home I did
43 this about six/seven years ago, and I have yet to have to weed my front yard.
44 And it looks great. My planters right along the perimeter have a couple of weeds
45 that sprout up every once in a while, and I go out and spend two seconds and pull
46 it. But the majority of my planter area has no weeds, and it looks fantastic. I

1 don't agree with the comments in here saying that the long-term maintenance is
2 an issue. And, like I said, I've had mine for seven years. And I'm living by it, and
3 it works great. I would really like to look into it again instead of just modifying the
4 Code to say we have two to three inches of gravel, which again in tonight's
5 Agenda it said (although we're requesting the two to three inches of gravel, there
6 is no checking. There is no implementation. There is no inspector saying, yes, it
7 is built correctly). So we say we do it and then we go out and put a quarter inch
8 thick layer of pea gravel and we're done with it. But I think long-term keeping the
9 City in a nice state, out of blight, I think this would be a good idea to ask for some
10 weed barrier; maybe do some testing to see which brand names, which quality,
11 what thickness, what materials are better than others.

12
13 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – Well in the proposed Code Amendment
14 that we're bringing forward, the next item we actually are adding language about
15 weed barriers. It's not a requirement, but you'll see that language then as part of
16 what we're looking at.

17
18 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other questions or comments? Commissioner Barnes.

19
20 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Yeah I'd like to weigh in first on the HOA issue. It
21 seems like, if the goal is to clean up the City, first of all there's a lot of
22 development that's already in place that what we're talking about won't affect.

23
24 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yeah. I wasn't looking to do retrofitting.

25
26 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – So if the economy of scale works and the goal
27 was to clean up the City (that's existing residences too) then maybe we need to,
28 if it's a priority for the City, maybe we need to somehow upgrade or improve the
29 Code Enforcement process so that we do something essentially city-wide. To do
30 it HOA on a new development is piece mail, and it leaves a lot of things behind.
31 So, if it's really important, let's go big picture and do something that's city-wide
32 and applies to everybody (community outreach/community education)....

33
34 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Well we don't have the authority to tell people that you have
35 to put this in once you have a home built, but we have the authority to ask the
36 developers when they are installing landscaping for the first time to adhere to the
37 new Codes. Once you have it in, if they want to rip it out, there's nothing you can
38 do about it.

39
40 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Right.

41
42 **CHAIR LOWELL** – But....

43
44 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Which is why I'm more concerned with.....

45

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Developers to put in a higher-end front landscaping I think
2 would do the City good.

3
4 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – It probably would, but I'm more concerned with
5 the thousands of homes that are already out there that might have, you know,
6 lousy landscape and it's poorly maintained.....

7
8 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And that's a Code Enforcement issue. I would be offended if
9 the City came to my house and I've lived there for almost 10 years now and they
10 said we don't like your yard and you have to fix it even though I think I have a
11 pretty decent yard. But, if I moved into a house that was brand new and the
12 developer did all this work and put in the weed abatement stuff ahead of time, it's
13 already done and that's when the City still has authority and still has control over
14 it. Before you get issued a Certificate of Occupancy you make sure the
15 landscaping is done the way the City wants it. That's the time where we can flex
16 a little bit and say this is what we need.

17
18 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – That only allows for five years and then it's an
19 existing house and then we're back to Code Enforcement so.

20
21 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And that's again kicking the can down the road a little bit but
22 anyway.

23
24 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – I'm done.

25
26 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I was kind of, in my brain, analyzing this or an analogy to this
27 would be we've had this ongoing debate for the last 20 years about putting
28 seatbelts in school buses. Well the idea is that it is too expensive to do it globally
29 across every school bus in the entire district, so we're just not going to put in
30 seatbelts. And we're not going to buy new school buses with seatbelts in it
31 because what if a kid that was in a bus without a seatbelt got in an accident and
32 got hurt? Then there's a lawsuit, so the better idea is just don't put seatbelts in
33 school buses. So something's got to give, and I think this would be a good step
34 towards getting the City where we want it to be reducing blight in the City. And
35 this is a pretty easy thing to do. And it costs maybe \$100.00 for the landscape
36 weed barrier, and it's under landscape, and it's already approved and required so
37 that's my opinion and my feedback.

38
39 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – That's a great analogy. You know, when we
40 decide that all the school buses need seatbelts so put them in all of them, so that
41 has been city-wide.

42
43 **CHAIR LOWELL** – That's why it's been 20 years and we don't have any yet.

44
45 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Yeah.

46

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Anyway, with that said, do we have any other questions or
2 comments?
3

4 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Yeah just one more. I kind of agree with the
5 idea that just doing it on the brand new houses is only going to affect a handful
6 and there again you can put the best landscape and weed barrier in that you can
7 force the developers to do and within just a few years it can look just as bad as if
8 it never had it unless it's properly maintained and taken care of and so forth. I
9 think the bigger issue is that we have a city-wide issue and that goes back down
10 to Code Enforcement. The Codes are already there. The requirements are
11 already there. Right now, it seems as though Code Enforcement gets involved
12 only when somebody complains and then they have a specific thing to go out and
13 take a look at and that would just be an issue of having the money, having the
14 time, and having the personnel to go out and do Code Enforcement as it's
15 needed. And, right now, they don't have the personnel to do more than just to
16 respond to complaints.
17

18 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – You know, one other thing we've got here in the
19 City, we've got a lot of rental properties and a lot of the renters don't feel like that
20 landscape is totally their deal. And I think some of these developers aren't too
21 apropos to putting in additional landscape, whether it be landscape barrier or
22 whatever. Now the only thing I can say on that landscape barrier, on my house
23 in the back yard, I put that in 30 years ago. And I'm not saying it's as good now
24 as it was then, but you've got to maintain it. And it's still there and I put down
25 with the four inches of rock, and it has worked for me. But you've got to work at
26 it, whether you've got landscape with grass or with gravel, you've got to keep the
27 weeds out of it one way or the other. It's not going to happen by itself, and it's
28 going to be a tough issue. But on my block, and I'm not in an HOA and we're not
29 in a high-end neighborhood, but we kind of govern our own. So you know
30 discretely, since I've been there 32 years, I'm kind of the block captain. So you
31 just kind of say, hey can I help you clean this up? I mean that, and I have helped
32 some people do that. Or maybe we can put a work party together and help you
33 out because we have some older people. We've got a lady up on the corner
34 that's probably older than I am, but she needs some help so we all pitched in and
35 fixed her yard up for her. And she appreciated that, and she is keeping it in
36 check. So I don't know if that's an answer or not, and I find that a lot of people in
37 Moreno Valley they don't even know who their neighbors are. And the first thing I
38 do, like I had two neighbors move in, and I go down and introduce myself and
39 find out what their name is and tell them what's going on. And I don't know
40 whether that's a bad thing or a good thing. But you've got to keep people talking
41 about these things, whether it's weed abatement or protecting the mailboxes.
42 The mailbox issue is a big deal in this town right now. It's unbelievable. It's
43 probably worse than the weed abatement to be honest with you. That's off the
44 subject, but I don't know. I think if we can kind of police our own, and I'm not a
45 real big proponent of HOA's. They do have their place, but it's just that other
46 \$200.00 or \$300.00 per month that you're going to have to pay for that little

1 privilege so. How many Code Enforcement people do we have out here hired in
2 the City? Three or four?

3
4 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – No. I have a few more than that
5 thankfully.

6
7 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – I didn't know how many it was.

8
9 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – I have a City of 200,000. I've got five
10 career Staff.

11
12 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – Okay.

13
14 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – And then I've got some grant-funded
15 Staff and some part-time Staff.

16
17 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – It's a tough issue. I know that.

18
19 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – It's a lot of square miles, but we do our
20 best. We do have...I'd like to share with you real quick since this came up. We
21 do mostly complaint-driven work. However, we do have a program out that's
22 called Keep Moreno Valley Beautiful, so we do what we can. The Code Officers
23 go by those properties that we think need a little help and volunteering is a great
24 way to take care of it. But we leave the door tag, and it gives them some good
25 information on how to take care of their property, how to get to the resources to
26 help them but the majority of it is complaint driven.

27
28 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – You know, one other thing I'm thinking. I know a
29 lot of times the Scout Troops are looking for conservation projects and that type
30 of thing and even some of the other service projects. That might be a good way
31 to approach it. I don't know exactly how to do it in a town of 200,000. But, when
32 I lived in a town of 3000, it was a little easier because you knew everybody and
33 you could get it going. But we've got a lot of Scout Troops, both on the Girl
34 Scout side and the Boy Scout side in this town. I was in the Scouting Program
35 for a while. I don't know if that would work. If any of the troops, you know, if they
36 want to get out and do that type of work. And we do have a Spring Cleanup
37 Program in this town of some sort, right?

38
39 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – We do. Well we have neighborhood
40 cleanups that go through each Council District currently right now.

41
42 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – Okay.

43
44 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – And then something I should add too,
45 we do have a Volunteer Program that we're looking for high school student age
46 folk to come out and help those property owners like you were mentioning

1 Commissioner Baker about how maybe their elderly and don't have the
2 resources to take care of their property maybe like they should. They have a
3 program in place to garner volunteers to help out in those situations too.

4
5 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – Could I see a copy of that doorknocker when
6 we're done?

7
8 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – Sure. You bet.

9
10 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – I think that's a great idea.

11
12 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – Yeah.

13
14 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – Okay.

15
16 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Van Natta.

17
18 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Just in case anybody is under some
19 misconception about these tenant-occupied properties, it's still the homeowner
20 whose responsible. And their the ones who get the citation and their the ones
21 who get the lien, and it's up to them to ensure that their tenants do the
22 maintenance or in some cases the landowners will pay for maintenance and just
23 consider that part of the cost of renting property.

24
25 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any other questions or comments? No? Okay, I think we
26 have beaten this one up pretty good.

27
28 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – Pulverized it. It's pulverized.

29
30 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And, since this is a Non-Public Hearing Item, there is no
31 action to be taken. So, if anybody has any questions or comments, now is the
32 time. If not, we're going to move onto the Public Hearing Item, which is Item No.
33 2 tonight. Case No. P16-007 and P16-008. The Applicant is Riverside Housing
34 Development Corporation. The location is 22889 Allies Place.

35
36 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Allies Place.

37
38 **CHAIR LOWELL** – What is it?

39
40 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Allies.

41
42 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yes that's true, Allies. I should probably put my glasses on.
43 The Case Planner is Claudia Manrique. Do we have a Staff Report on this item?
44
45
46

1
2 **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**
3

- 4 2. Case: P16-007 and P16-008
5
6 Applicant: Riverside Housing Development Corp (RHDC)
7
8 Owner: Riverside Housing Development Corp (RHDC)
9
10 Representative: Riverside Housing Development Corp (RHDC)
11
12 Location: 22889 Allies Pl and 22899 Allies Pl
13
14 Case Planner: Claudia Manrique
15
16 Council District: 5
17
18 Proposal: P16-008 & P16-008 - Variance requests to reduce the
19 rear setback of two existing four-unit apartment
20 complexes.
21
22
23

24 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**
25

26 Staff recommends that the Planning Commission **APPROVE** Resolutions No.
27 2016-07 and 2016-08, and thereby:
28

- 29 1. **CERTIFY** that the proposed Variances are exempt from the provisions of
30 the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as a Class 5 Categorical
31 Exemption, CEQA Guidelines, Section 15305 for the Minor Alterations in
32 Land Use Limitation; and
33
34 2. **APPROVE** Variance P16-007 based on the findings contained in Planning
35 Commission Resolution 2016-07; and
36
37 3. **APPROVE** Variance P16-008 based on the findings contained in Planning
38 Commission Resolution 2016-08.
39
40

41 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER CLAUDIA MANRIQUE** – Good evening. I’m Claudia
42 Manrique, Case Planner. The Variance requests are to reduce the required rear
43 setback from 25 feet to 5 feet for two existing apartment complexes to allow for
44 the construction of four one-car garages for each complex along with some
45 laundry facilities and storage rooms. The project sites are on Allies Place.
46 Here’s the Land Use Map. The Zoning is R20. R20 requires a rear setback of

1 25 feet, and again we're asking for a Variance to reduce the rear setback to 5
2 feet. With the caveat that....there's an alleyway behind the apartments where
3 the garages will be built. So, though there is a reduction in the setback, there is
4 still going to be 10 feet between the alley and the face of the garage in order to
5 provide adequate site distance for the future residents to get in and out of the
6 garages. We're going to look at the Aerial Map. There's currently 9 of the 13
7 properties along Allied Place that have garages, a condition that's very similar to
8 the Variance request we have tonight. In fact, one was approved back in June
9 2014 with a neighboring property of 22877 Allies Place. In the photo with the
10 truck on the top, there's some red paint on the ground. That is how far the
11 garage will come out. The bottom picture is showing the current condition of the
12 alleyway. The picture on the left shows the current condition of the structures
13 along with the third one that was the one approved back in 2014 that was under
14 construction when that picture was done. With allowing the Variance and
15 therefore the reduction of the rear setback, it's going to allow the apartments to
16 not only have the garages and laundry facilities but it's going to have the ability to
17 go into all the units and correct any current Building Code issues, as well as
18 improvements to the exterior. The pictures with the blue background, this is the
19 neighboring one that has been completed. This is from the alleyway. You can
20 see the new garages. Then we have two pictures from the sides showing the
21 new landscaping and fencing and then from Allies Place out on the front
22 elevation and you can see that with the new roof line and the enhancements for
23 like a midcentury line, and it looks a lot better than the current condition. The
24 project is exempt under CEQA as a Class 5 Categorical Exemption in Section
25 15305. Public notice was sent to all property owners within 300 feet of the
26 property on 04/15/2016, as well as posted on site and published in the Press
27 Enterprise Newspaper on 04/16/2016. As of tonight, I have received one phone
28 call of a resident who is nearby, and she was hoping that her apartment complex
29 was next in line for an enhancement and we're not sure but possibly. And I just
30 wanted to note that, the Riverside Housing Development Corporation, they work
31 a lot with the City to help rehabbing different multiple-family properties in fact in
32 this area. They have approximately nine, so it really helps the City and helps us
33 provide some low-income housing that looks really nice. So we recommend that
34 the Planning Commission **APPROVE** Resolution Nos. 2016-07 and 2016-08 and
35 **CERTIFY** that the Variances are exempt under CEQA and **APPROVE** both
36 Variances. Thank you.

37
38 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you. Any questions for Staff before I move onto the
39 Applicant? Nope. No hands going up, perfect. I would like to invite the
40 Applicant up to speak.

41
42 **APPLICANT RIVERSIDE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION** – Good
43 evening. We would appreciate approval on this. Something I wanted to point out
44 too since you guys are talking about landscape and barriers. Our landscape is
45 water tolerant and our barrier is a geo fabric, so you were talking about nutrients
46 from the water going back into the soil so this fabric allows the water to penetrate

1 but not muddy up or add silts to our barrier. We use the bark barrier, and it's fire
2 resistant also. So, as far as a maintenance issue, we've been on this property
3 completed for a little over a year and virtually no weeds; occasional weed at the
4 edge but no weeds. On the next two units, we're looking at a weed barrier with a
5 rock landscape out front even reducing the grass even more and possibly an
6 artificial turf. There are some drawbacks on that. This is all accessible, 11B
7 adaptable accessible units, so all four units are adaptable and accessible. And it
8 enhances the back alley and secures the back alley, so the tenants actually can
9 secure their possessions with the garages. They are all locked up. The laundry
10 is within the gated area of the units, so it's a safety issue also when they are
11 doing their laundry and just social activities in the complex. The units are to the
12 east or the next two units to the east and so, as we develop those two, this would
13 be opened up and the three would have a complex look to it where they could
14 have access and walk among the three apartments. And that's all I've got to
15 comment on. We love partnering with Moreno Valley, and we have about maybe
16 11 units in the neighborhood. We've been in the neighborhood for 12 years, and
17 our management staff do a great job with the community in providing community
18 services. So that's who we are, and we'd love your approval on this.

19
20 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Do we have any questions for the
21 Applicant? No? Okay. Thank you very much. I'd like to open up the Public
22 Comments portion for tonight for this hearing item. I see that we have one
23 speaker. We have Mr. Rafael Brugueras.

24
25 **SPEAKER RAFAEL BRUGUERAS** – Good evening again Commissioners,
26 Staff, residents, and our guests. He surprised me. I mean, he just filled in the
27 topic that we just talked about in the last five minutes ago. Look at the picture,
28 Commissioners. If we got away from what Moreno Valley was in the old days
29 because of the economy, the base closing, the water drought. Today you saw
30 another miracle. Here it is right here. He's been here for 12 years working on
31 these kinds of buildings making them beautiful. That's one of the things we
32 talked about a few minutes ago making our City beautiful. Here's a great
33 example. I wish he had a way to communicate with a lot of other property
34 owners that want to remodel their properties, and he was one of the
35 organizations that went out and did the evaluations for them and came up with a
36 plan like this. How many people would love to stay in that place for a period of
37 long time instead of moving around? How many low-income families would be
38 proud adults to live in a complex like that? I mean, he mentioned it didn't take
39 probably.....I don't know if it took a lot of money but you know he enjoyed doing
40 something for us, for the City of Moreno Valley. I mean, that's great. It helps all
41 of us. If even the big companies/big developers would use that example of fire
42 resistant, whatever it is, that put that red clay/that red thing.....

43
44 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Bark.

45
46 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Bark.

1
2 **SPEAKER RAFAEL BRUGUERAS** – Okay, that red bark. Thank you. Now
3 what’s wrong with the weeds that we don’t see here? I don’t know what’s
4 underneath. But I know if we use fabric, you know, branches break through
5 fabric. But, if we use plastic, it takes a little longer for it to crack through. And I
6 don’t know if you use something heavy to hold down the plastic and then you put
7 the bark on top because I know bark just doesn’t hold down plastic. It’s got to be
8 something else. Sometimes a little bit of rock then the bark on top. But that was
9 a great example that Moreno Valley needs to follow in the future because that
10 can clean up our old neighborhoods without having to tear them down. If we just
11 painted it grey, put new windows, gave them garages and their own washers and
12 dryers that would be a better place to live you know for a lot of us. That was a
13 wonderful, wonderful example. And I’m deeply grateful that he came and he
14 spoke and he showed us, and I thank the Staff for giving us that illustration that
15 we can do a greater job in our City.

16
17 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Any other Speaker Slips for tonight?

18
19 **ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT ERICA TADEO** – No.

20
21 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Perfect. I’d like to close the Public Hearing Items. Moving
22 onto the Applicant. Would you like to respond to anything you heard?

23
24 **APPLICANT RIVERSIDE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION** – No.

25
26 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay. Moving onto Commissioner.....

27
28 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Mr. Chairman, may I ask a
29 question?

30
31 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yes, Sir.

32
33 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Just for clarification, since we’re
34 talking about the landscaping, it might be interesting to find out how the
35 maintenance of those properties takes place. Like he said, that property was
36 actually in place now for a year to a year-and-a-half. I was just wondering if it
37 would be helpful to you to understand if the homeowners are maintaining that
38 property or if there is a management company that maintains that property.
39 What are the other aspects that make sure that it stays the way that those
40 images show?

41
42 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I think he’s here, so let’s just ask him.

43
44 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Okay. I’m just.....

45

1 **APPLICANT RIVERSIDE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION** – Well
2 to address that, Riverside Housing Development, we have a Development Team
3 and we have a Construction Team, which I'm over, and then we have a
4 Management Team. And so, our Staff, we have Staff onsite and we oversee
5 these units along with the other 12 buildings. And it's on-staff management, and
6 so we have subcontractors that come in and do our maintenance on a weekly
7 basis and maintain all of our properties. So, with that, we have somebody on
8 staff in that neighborhood 24/7. And then subcontractors, local-hired
9 subcontractors, that actually work on the maintenance. We have subcontractors
10 that do our service work on plumbing and electrical, those issues as we need.
11 So that's how we maintain the properties. We staffed for it. Frankly, our
12 projects, we have projects that are going on 20 years. And I've come in and
13 done construction right next to the project that's been maintained for 20 years.
14 And, when I walk away, it's new. And I can't tell the difference between the
15 maintained properties and the new construction, and that's not lowering the level
16 of new construction. That's how well our Staff does the job in maintaining the
17 properties. And you would see that on Adrienne and Allies as you drive and
18 we're the grey buildings. That's just us with the wrought iron, the security, the
19 landscaping that's actually maintained in that neighborhood.
20

21 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Any other questions or comments,
22 discussions? Nope? Okay, would anybody like to make a motion?
23

24 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – I'll motion.
25

26 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Push the button. There we go.
27

28 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – I'll move to **APPROVE** Variance P16-007 based
29 on the findings contained in the Planning Commission Resolution 2016-07 and
30 **APPROVE** Variance P16-008 based on the findings contained in the Planning
31 Commission Resolution 2016-08.
32

33 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Would you also want to certify
34 the CEQA Exemption?
35

36 **COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ** – And **CERTIFY** that the proposed Variances are
37 exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as a Class 5
38 Category Exemption, CEQA Guidelines Section 15305 for Minor Alternations and
39 Land Use Limitation.
40

41 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Perfect. We have a motion. Would somebody like to
42 second?
43

44 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – I already did.
45

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Perfect. We have a motion by Commissioner Ramirez and a
2 second by Commissioner Barnes. Let’s please cast your vote. Perfect. All votes
3 are cast. The item passes 7-0.

4
5
6 **Motion carries 7 – 0**

7
8
9 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Do we have a Staff wrap-up on this item?

10
11 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Yes. These are two separate
12 Resolutions for two separate approvals. Each of the approvals is appealable. If
13 any interested party is interested in appealing this action, they can file an appeal
14 to the City Council through the Community Development Director. If an appeal is
15 filed, it will be scheduled for a hearing before the City Council within 30 days.

16
17 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Moving on to item No. 3. Item No. 3
18 is a Municipal Code Amendment. The Case Planner is Ms. Claudia Manrique
19 again.

20
21
22
23 3. Case: PA14-0011
24
25 Applicant: City of Moreno Valley
26
27 Owner: City of Moreno Valley
28
29 Representative: Community Development Department
30
31 Location: City-wide
32
33 Case Planner: Claudia Manrique
34
35 Council District: City-wide
36
37 Proposal: Municipal Code Amendment
38

39
40
41 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

42
43 Staff recommends that the Planning Commission **APPROVE** Resolution No.
44 2016-05, and thereby:
45

- 1 1. **RECOGNIZE** that PA14-0011 (Municipal Code Amendment) qualify as
2 exemptions in accordance with CEQA Guidelines, Section 15061.
3
- 4 2. **APPROVE** Planning Commission Resolution No. 2016-05,
5 recommending that the City Council approve the proposed
6 amendments to Title 8, Title 9, and Title 12 of the City Municipal Code,
7 PA14-0011.
8
9

10 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER CLAUDIA MANRIQUE** – Good evening again. We
11 have various amendments to the Municipal Code that have occurred over time in
12 order to keep regulations current with State Law, the General Plan of the City,
13 and by City Council direction. I’m looking for my Power Point. Since there’s so
14 many different pieces, I put together a Power Point. The proposed amendments
15 include changes to further increase the amount of consistency in the Municipal
16 Code, as well as we added some new definitions. There are some changes to
17 the Permitted Uses Table. Most of the changes are to Title 9. There’s a few to
18 Title 12 and then also Title 8. The first two items are modifications to monument
19 signs. The first one is just a simple cleanup. Currently, it reads modified
20 monument sign and we’re changing it just to monument sign. The second one is
21 revising the definition of monument sign to be a little more clear to developers
22 who want to put in monument signs. Item No. 3 is also dealing with monument
23 signs but they are for multi-family complexes. Currently, they are allowed to
24 have one monument sign at the entry. Now there’s going to be an option that
25 they can have two, but the size limit will not increase. So it’s either one
26 traditional monument sign or two wall signs, but they will equal the same square
27 footage. Item No. 4 is a simple cleanup to Title 8. There’s two sections of Title 8
28 that have construction and grading hours. This is just to make them consistent.
29 The hours will now be 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM Monday through Friday excluding
30 holidays and 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM on Saturdays. Item No. 5 clarifies the types of
31 vehicles that can be parked at single-family homes with Home Occupation
32 Permits. This is just to clarify what type of vehicles can be parked at the homes.
33 Right now, you cannot have any pickups really bigger than like an F150. This is
34 just so there is not like the really big super cab/long cab trucks like the Ford F250
35 or F350. And there is also the minor cleanup because we do not have
36 Commercial Vehicle Parking Permits, so that part will be deleted. Item No. 6,
37 very simple text cleanup. We’re just making sure that the numbers in this section
38 regarding pools matches the part under single-family residences that also deals
39 with swimming pools. Item No. 7 is a clean up as well to have a consistency
40 between two sections, one in Title 9 and one in Title 12 regarding vehicle idling
41 times. It currently reads 15 minutes. The State requirement is 5 minutes, so
42 both these will be changed to meet the State requirement. Item No. 8 is a text
43 cleanup. The previously-approved Municipal Code Amendment advertently put
44 in the word building in regards to the separation distance between residential
45 districts and buildings and warehouse projects, so this is just to simply remove
46 the word building. Item No. 9, this is for Special Single-Family Residential

1 Development Standards. Currently, only R5 tracts are required to have front
2 yard landscaping. This is to expand to include Residential 2,
3 Residential/Agriculture 2, and Residential 3 Districts. This will just help with
4 enhancing individual neighborhoods and the overall image of the City and this
5 again is just for new tracts coming in, which the tract would have five or more
6 homes. So this doesn't impact custom homes or if a Parcel Map comes in with
7 only two homes. Item No. 10 is a text cleanup. We're deleting a section of
8 Pacific Plan District as the General Plan no longer has this in it and also deleting
9 the reference to the General Plan under the Map Designation Section. Item No.
10 11 is Single-Family Residential General Guidelines. Currently, you're allowed to
11 store your RV and boat on your side yard or rear yard if you have the capability
12 of getting to them. Right now, it must be concrete. We're expanding it to add
13 gravel or crushed rock if it meets the standards. Below we have some pictures.
14 The one on the left is showing gravel in DG, which is leading to the side gate
15 where you can park your vehicle. Then the two center ones have concrete pads.
16 And then the last one is showing the pad with the gravel. That's all possibilities
17 to store your vehicles. Item No. 12 is related to TUP's, which are Temporary Use
18 Permits. They are very popular with our commercial centers, and this is to allow
19 merchandise sales in the parking lot. Currently, there is a limit of 18 days per
20 shopping center, and this proposed amendment is to increase the days from 18
21 to 36 in the larger shopping centers and by larger we mean 20 acres or greater.
22 In the larger centers, if you have one or two stores that do this a couple times a
23 year, that takes all the days. So this is to be fair to have multiple stores to have
24 days available for opportunity for parking lot sales. Item No. 13, this is to
25 introduce some new definitions clarifying the differences between various
26 restaurants and bar-type uses. The new definitions include bar, bar with limited
27 live entertainment, nightclub, and restaurant with limited live entertainment.
28 These changes also impact the Permitted Uses Table and now with their
29 breakdown of the different definitions, bars and bars with limited live
30 entertainment will be allowed in various Commercial Zones with a Conditional
31 Use Permit and nightclubs also need a Conditional Use Permit but are only
32 allowed in the Community Commercial and the two Mixed Use Overlay Zones of
33 Mixed Use Commercial and Mixed Use Institution. And then the limited live
34 entertainment tied to restaurant use will be allowed in the same zones as regular
35 restaurants with a Plot Plan Application. Item Nos. 14, 15 and 16 are additional
36 new definitions to the Code, including a pool hall, mulch, permeable paving
37 surfaces and hardscape. This is really to help us help the citizens at the counter
38 and developers when trying to figure out where their use is allowed and also the
39 type of landscaping and what materials are allowed where. Item No. 17, this is in
40 regards to the single-family residential standards for landscaping and water
41 efficiency. The goal is just to help the homeowners and developer provide some
42 better guidance for drought-tolerant landscaping. And the key examples include
43 removing the current requirement for any turf or grass and expanding how mulch
44 can be used for groundcover. We have three pictures that are showing drought-
45 tolerant landscaping. The center one is actually a brand new home in the Pacific
46 Communities Development; Pacific that is just south of the 60. They were one of

1 the three tracts that Chris mentioned earlier that are the first ones in with the
2 required front yard drought tolerance. And the last one looks more like a really
3 nice custom home with mostly gravel and with the change in expanding how
4 much mulch/gravel can be used. We are now allowing for more creativity in front
5 yard designs. Item Nos. 18 and 19 are dealing with the second dwelling unit
6 modifications. The first one is just a cleanup of previous amendment; removed
7 the section requiring noticing for second units. Somehow the change wasn't
8 made, so we're redoing it with the change submitted. And the second one is
9 updating the Parking Standards Table in the Off-Parking Section. Currently, the
10 Second Dwelling Unit Section has the right parking standards, but the table will
11 now be changed to match. Item No. 20 is another cleanup. We're adding stuff
12 back to the Parking Table that was accidentally removed, and there is quite a list
13 of different items. There are no changes to the text. It's just replacing the items
14 that were mistakenly deleted. The last one, Item No. 21, is the City Council had
15 approved two Ordinances revising Title 11 regarding massage parlors and had
16 requested that the Planning Commission adopt an Ordinance to amend Title 9.
17 And the four changes include changing the terminology from massage
18 establishment to spa facilities, changing the term as well to spa facilities in the
19 Home Occupation Section, delete the definition of massage parlor, and we're
20 adding a definition for spa facilities since it's a newer use that's becoming more
21 popular and this way we can capture it. And the environmental, it's exempt
22 under CEQA Section 15061. And, for public notice, there was a one-eighth page
23 public notice that was published in the Press Enterprise back on 03/14/2016 for
24 the 03/24/2016 public hearing, which the Planning Commission continued until
25 tonight. And, given that the prior action of the Planning Commission was to
26 formally continue the hearing, we did not have to re-notice the project. We're
27 recommending **APPROVE** Resolution 2016-05 and recognize that P14-0011
28 qualifies as an exemption under CEQA 15061 and **APPROVE** Resolution 2016-
29 05 recommending that the City Council approve the amendments to Title 8, Title
30 9, and Title 12 of the Municipal Code. Thank you.

31
32 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Mr. Chairman, if I may.

33
34 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Go ahead.

35
36 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Just one bit of clarification on
37 Items 18 and 19 in the recommendation. You'll find on your dais this evening two
38 emails that we did receive under the Public Comments that is from two interested
39 parties that believe that Items 18 and 19 should be dealt with separately. So, for
40 clarification, we also provided for you an August 2003 letter that was issued by
41 the Department of Housing and Community Development. As Ms. Manrique had
42 indicated, the City had gone through an effort to actually change the
43 requirements regarding secondary units. If a secondary unit is applied for, the
44 State Law changed back in 2003 to make those ministerial actions and the City
45 had processed the corresponding Code Amendment back in 2010. And,
46 inadvertently, the information that was provided to the codifier (because the

1 codifier is a separate outside body) was given to them incomplete. There was
2 information that was shared with the City Council that did not get in the
3 information that was shared with the codifier. And so what we're trying to do
4 today is eliminate that section that was supposed to have been eliminated back
5 in 2010, and what it does is it deals with the public noticing requirements. The
6 public noticing requirements are not necessary because as a ministerial action
7 they are not supposed to be discretionary. So they are not open for public
8 discussion or public debate, and so that's why it was being eliminated. We did
9 want to make sure that you're aware that the comments that we received today
10 were given to you for your consideration. We also understand that those parties
11 did share their concerns up to the City Council. So, if you do hear from the City
12 Council, this item ultimately goes to the City Council for their consideration and
13 we'll let them know as well.

14
15 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So to clarify your clarification, are we dealing Item Nos. 18
16 and 19 separately tonight or are we.....

17
18 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – No. Our recommendation is to
19 deal with them as we've recommended as part of this entire, what we call,
20 Omnibus Code Amendment. It's a simple action. We believe that it should be
21 handled by the Planning Commission this evening and then carried forward to
22 the City Council, and we'll be asking the City Council to make the corrections
23 there too.

24
25 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay. I have a question for you guys on Item No. 5, the
26 review commercial vehicle restrictions for Home Occupation Permits. Could you
27 give us a little more clarification? Claudia said that there was already a
28 restriction saying that you can't park anything larger than an F150 in your
29 driveway. What if you have an F250 because you like big trucks and you're not
30 operating a business?

31
32 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER CLAUDIA MANRIQUE** – Yes. Most of this is some of
33 the trucks that would be for the business would be your F250, but you would
34 have some signage on the side advertising your business. So it would be our
35 hope that type of vehicle would fit in your garage or maybe on your side yard or
36 you have signage that you could remove. In the past, one of the biggest issues
37 was operators of tow trucks would come in and want a home occupation for their
38 office and then we would find that the tow truck was parked in front of their house
39 or on the street. Or you would have vehicles that would be a smaller pickup but
40 then they would have a trailer and so then they would park the truck and the
41 trailer in their driveway and then the trailer might actually over-cross and hang on
42 the sidewalk. So it's just sort of to respect that these are single-family homes
43 and so they don't start looking too commercial.

44

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So is this something that the City drives around with Code
2 Enforcement looking for these kinds of violations? Or is this something, if your
3 neighbors start complaining, that’s when you become aware of it?
4

5 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – It would end up being a
6 complaint-driven situation as well for Code Enforcement, and there are two
7 requirements; not just the size but also the commercial nature of the vehicle. So
8 Code Enforcement would have to not only establish that it was a certain size but
9 also that it was commercial. So your average person with a large F250 that he
10 uses to tow his boat to the river on the weekends is not going to fall under this.
11

12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Well to be technical, the license plates on all trucks make it
13 commercial. It is a commercial registration, so technically my pickup truck is a
14 commercial truck.
15

16 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – But the burden is going to fall
17 on the Code Enforcement Officer to establish that it is being used for commercial
18 purposes.
19

20 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Gotcha, okay.
21

22 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – And signage would be the
23 most obvious way to identify that.
24

25 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Van Natta.
26

27 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay my question was on the same item
28 because, to me, it is not clear. And that doesn’t mean it’s not clear to everybody
29 else. But I’m looking at this and I’m saying okay it says no commercial vehicles
30 may be used for delivery of materials with the exception of occasional reasonable
31 courier services to and from the premises. So I’m thinking does that mean that, if
32 I have a Home Occupation Permit and I’m running a business, I could have just
33 occasional and reasonable courier services somebody delivering something to
34 my home for my home occupation whatever it is. Is that correct?
35

36 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER CLAUDIA MANRIQUE** – That is correct.
37

38 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay, then going onto the next one: No more
39 than one vehicle larger than a three-quarter ton truck may be used in connection
40 with a home occupation. That single vehicle shall have a weight less than blah,
41 blah, blah, blah, blah. Okay, so I’ve got a buddy who has a home occupation
42 and he drives a truck that he uses. He’s a handyman, okay? And so he uses
43 this truck to go out and do work on people’s houses and brings it home and he
44 parks it in his driveway and it is not larger than a three-quarter ton truck. So he
45 would be allowed to have that?
46

1 **ASSOCIATE PLANNER CLAUDIA MANRIQUE** – He would be....ideally, again,
2 it would be.....

3
4 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I'm not talking about ideally. I'm talking about
5 what this says. So he has a truck and it's got toolboxes on the side and stuff like
6 that. That's what he uses for his handyman business. I'm just saying that as an
7 example. Okay single vehicle less than, let's say it meets all those things. It's
8 more than 21 feet and so forth. So he is allowed not more than one vehicle that
9 meets that? It says no more than one vehicle larger than a three-quarter ton.
10 That single vehicle shall have a weight less than, so it could be larger than a
11 three-quarter ton as long as it is less than, I mean what's....it's not making sense
12 to me. I'm sorry.

13
14 **CHAIR LOWELL** – What I'm also looking at on the same side that she's talking
15 about is what if my wife and I have this thing where I want to have an F350 or a
16 one ton pickup and she wants to have one that's raised bigger than mine and we
17 start having a battle and we have these huge monolithic trucks and their not
18 commercial purposes. We're not allowed to have these trucks in our house?
19 We're not doing commercial purposes, but according to this, it says no more than
20 one of these trucks.

21
22 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – In connection with a home
23 occupation.

24
25 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Correct, so my wife and I would live in the same house.....

26
27 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – If it's a business.....

28
29 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – A home occupation that means a business.

30
31 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – It's in connection with a
32 business.

33
34 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Home occupation?

35
36 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Let's say she sells Tupperware.

37
38 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – You don't occupy the house.....

39
40 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – A lot of Tupperware.

41
42 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – If she sells Tupperware and she
43 has an F350.

44
45 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Uh-huh.

46

1 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – And she wants to put a magnet on
2 the side of the truck that says she sells Tupperware then that now is a
3 commercial vehicle also being used for the business that is being conducted in
4 the home, and she'd be limited to having one of those trucks.

5
6 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So you could.....

7
8 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Wait a minute.

9
10 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – If there was a second truck that
11 also had the same sort of signage on it for a Tupperware business then that
12 would mean you've exceeded the number of vehicles allowed for that particular
13 business. The other part of this is that the intention is for when the truck is not
14 being used for the business purposes that any things that are attached to it would
15 be removed so that it looks more consistent with what goes on in the residential
16 area. So, if it's a removable magnet, what we would be encouraging is that the
17 magnet be removed so it doesn't look like it's a commercial vehicle. So some of
18 the stuff that we're trying to get across in here so it improves the.....

19
20 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay none of this says that though. That's, I
21 mean, ideally and the intent is and everything like that. That's not what this
22 paragraph says. What this paragraph says is that you can't have more than one
23 vehicle larger than a three-quarter ton, and it has to meet these certain
24 specifications. So let's go back to the example of my friend who is a handyman,
25 and he has a work truck. Okay? And that work truck, he comes home and he
26 parks it in his driveway. Is he allowed to do that?

27
28 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – Does he have a sign?

29
30 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I'm not talking....no we're not....signs are
31 something different. He has a work truck and he brings it home. Can he park it
32 in his driveway?

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

35
36 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay. What difference does it make if there is
37 a sign on the side or not?

38
39 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – He's allowed to have one of those
40 vehicles. He can't have multiple vehicles.

41
42 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay.

43
44 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – And to the extent that it's a
45 removable sign, it would be removed from the car, if possible, so that it.....

46

1 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – It’s painted on.
2
3 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Then it won’t be able to be
4 removed.
5
6 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Yeah, there’s some place.....
7
8 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – But he can still park it in the driveway?
9
10 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – He’ll be able to park it. It’s tied to
11 the home occupation.....
12
13 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Because we’re talking about attachments or
14 equipment aren’t allowed to be left on the vehicle while it’s parked in the
15 driveway.
16
17 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – So, as a handyman, he may have
18 a rack on his truck that has the ladders and the rakes and the power equipment
19 and all the other things. The intent would be to not have those on the vehicle at
20 all times.
21
22 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay all I can say is this is very.....it’s written
23 very unclear. It doesn’t really say what it is that you’re telling me it’s supposed to
24 be saying.
25
26 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – We’ll be happy to take a look at
27 that, and we can make the corrections.
28
29 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Now does this Ordinance also prevent you from parking the
30 same number of vehicles in the street? So I can park two or three of these trucks
31 with commercial signage all over it? I can park in the public right-of-way without
32 too much of an issue? I just can’t park it in my driveway?
33
34 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – I have a....oh, good ahead Chris.
35
36 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – Well the intent is not to allow those to
37 be parked on the street as well because it’s, I believe, just one vehicle per home
38 occupation. So you couldn’t have multiple vehicles.
39
40 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Correct, but if my neighbors each have a home occupation
41 permit and they each have one truck and they all park it in the driveway, or in the
42 street, or.....
43
44 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – There’s two things at play here.
45 One is the parking issue of where it’s parked and we would not be able to, as a
46 Code Enforcement situation, enforce the ones parked on the street. Those will

1 be handled differently pursuant to the California Vehicle Code. However, this
2 section that we're talking about is part of the Home Occupation Permit Section.
3 So somebody who is abusing that Home Occupation Permit could be subject to
4 the review and potential revocation of their Home Occupation Permit. Could you
5 add that in here where it says in connection with home occupation? Could you
6 put the word permit after that? That would clarify some of the things I think.

7
8 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Could you fix that?

9
10 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – We could add that.

11
12 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay now we've just said that the intent is you
13 can leave it parked in your driveway if you've removed the commercial wrappings
14 but then here it says commercial vehicles used in the home occupation that are
15 parked or stored on the premises shall not be visible from the public street or
16 right-of-way. So then that says I can't park it in the driveway, correct?

17
18 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Doesn't that only apply the one that doesn't meet
19 the size requirement for the driveway? Is that what that's saying?

20
21 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – It doesn't say that.

22
23 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – But that means.....

24
25 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – It says commercial vehicles. So is that the no
26 more than one larger than? So these would be the ones that are smaller than
27 the three-quarter but their still a commercial vehicle so they can't be in view?

28
29 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – The intent would be that they would not
30 be in view in that particular scenario where they are the larger vehicles.

31
32 **CHAIR LOWELL** – What it's saying is the first half says you can have one
33 vehicle and the second half says you can't have any vehicle visible.

34
35 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – And the first one says you can't have more
36 than one that's larger than three-quarter ton but you could have commercial
37 vehicles that are less than three-quarter ton and they'd still be commercial
38 vehicles and then they can't be visible. I guess the reason I'm harping on this is
39 because in the real estate business people come in and they say well this is what
40 I do and I work from home and I just want to make sure I'm buying a property that
41 I will be allowed to run my business from. We have to be able to tell them what
42 they can and can't do, what the ideal is and not what the intent is, but what does
43 it actually say so that they can say okay these are the rules and I know this is
44 what I have to do.

1 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – Well we can make some further
2 refinements like Rick had indicated with regard to the language to make it
3 clearer.

4
5 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I appreciate that. I'd be glad to consult with
6 you on that when you're redoing them before we get to this point.

7
8 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Is the intention.....

9
10 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Well here's.....

11
12 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Go ahead.

13
14 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – If I may, just for clarification, the
15 interest that the Staff has in making this recommendation is to provide a cleaner
16 image in our residential neighborhoods. We don't want there to be a
17 preponderance of commercial activity or businesses. We get complaints from
18 time-to-time. A lot of the complaints are the larger vehicles that look out of place
19 in a residential neighborhood. If those commercial vehicles can be parked
20 behind the gate or in a garage somewhere where it's not visible, the intent is it
21 provides for a cleaner image. If that's not what the interest or the consensus of
22 the Commission is, let us know and we can clarify that. I agree with you that the
23 language in here is confusing in terms of in one place we're saying you're limited
24 a certain amount and it can't be visible from the public viewpoint. That may be
25 impossible to achieve because in certain circumstances the vehicle may not fit in
26 the garage and so we don't want to keep somebody from not being able to run
27 the business, but our intent is to try and keep it clean. So I guess what I'm
28 looking for from the Commission this evening is do you agree with that concept?
29 Is there a consensus up there? And, if there is not, then we would know better
30 how to refine this.

31
32 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I would think if someone has a commercial
33 vehicle like a large work pickup truck or something like that and it can fit in the
34 driveway and it's not jetting out onto the sidewalk or anything like that then that
35 should be acceptable as long as it meets all the other requirements. I mean not
36 all properties have the ability to drive down the side and park it in the back or
37 something like that. But I think my concern is not exactly that so much but that
38 this be clear enough to where, when it's done, people will understand what they
39 can and can't do. Okay, you can have one truck but you can't have two. You
40 can have one truck and park it in the driveway, but it can't be larger than a
41 certain size. But you have conflicting instructions in this.

42
43 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Can I take a run at this?

44
45 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Mr. Barnes, go for it.

1 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – I agree with Meli. Is it saying then that you can
2 have multiple vehicles under the three-quarter ton? So, if you had a home
3 computer business, you can park four Geek Squad vehicles in the driveway and
4 be perfectly legal?

5
6 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Sure if you've got a big enough driveway.

7
8 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Yeah. Is that what it's saying? It seems like
9 maybe our intent here is to limit it to one commercial vehicle under a maximum
10 size of 21 feet period. If it exceeds that, then it should be parked behind the side
11 yard fence similar to an RV. That seems to cover it in a couple of very short
12 sentences in my mind.

13
14 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – But, then again, if somebody has a fleet of
15 Tupperware cars or Geek Squad cars and they have a four-car driveway.....

16
17 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – The way it's currently worded you
18 would be able to do that. That would not be our intent. We would want to clarify
19 that. Our intent is not to have a fleet of cars out there that have a commercial
20 identity to them. So you're absolutely correct that it's confusing because it
21 appears that it's limited only to the larger vehicles. I would ask for clarification
22 from the Commission though this evening if it's okay with you to have multiple
23 cars up there. If it would be okay if there were four Geek Squad cars or four
24 construction trucks or two or more; provide that clarification and we'll be happy to
25 rewrite that. But our intent from the Staff is to limit it to one.

26
27 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay.

28
29 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – No matter how large the vehicle is
30 so that it's not identifying a fleet so to speak.

31
32 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I don't think limiting it to one is really
33 something that I would want to do because someone might have more than one
34 vehicle and they are doing a home occupation. There's a lot of people who are
35 working from home now, independent contractors of all kinds, but I think there's
36 other ways to control it too like saying okay it's got to be in the driveway the
37 same as any personal car. You can't have, I mean I've seen houses where they
38 have four personal cars because they've got two teenagers and their parking
39 them in the driveway and it goes out over the sidewalk and everything like that.
40 That would be, to me, just as much of an irritant as having four little Geek Squad
41 cars or whatever. As long as there's room for it, and it's within their own
42 driveway and it's on their own property, you are going to run into times and
43 places where the HOA isn't going to allow and that's why they buy houses that
44 are not in an HOA so that they have flexibility to do something like this. I don't
45 see a problem with limiting it to not having a commercial vehicle over a certain
46 size, so you're not allowing a huge truck out there. But, other than that as long

1 as the vehicles are contained within the premises and on the driveway or in the
2 garage or other appropriate parking areas, I don't see why we should have to say
3 that they could only have one vehicle. You know, mother and daughter might
4 both be selling Tupperware or something like that.

5
6 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – And we're open to whatever the
7 interpretation of the Commission is this evening. Whatever consensus you guys
8 would like is how we'd like to take this forward.

9
10 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – I think I agree, as a compromise, that I could live
11 with two vehicles. But then I would be concerned about the contractor who just
12 makes his driveway really, really wide and suddenly he can park four commercial
13 vehicles. So I think we'd have to draw the line somewhere, and two works for
14 me. The size, it's somewhat arbitrary. But you've got to draw a line somewhere,
15 and I'm okay with the size. So, in my mind, I would simplify this to say two
16 commercial vehicles that don't exceed X size. End of story. Now, the only other
17 question I'd have is, would you want to allow additional vehicles in the side yard
18 behind the fence?

19
20 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Well this only applies to the Home Occupation Permit.

21
22 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Correct.

23
24 **CHAIR LOWELL** – So people like me who don't have a home business, we
25 could park whatever we wanted as long as we were within Code. So I think, if
26 you're going to the effort of having a home occupation and you're pulling a permit
27 for it, I think having one vehicle with the possibility of like a Conditional Use of
28 like a second or third vehicle like have an option for it but make it that if two
29 vehicles park in the driveway or some sort of a clarification where they have the
30 option of having a second vehicle wouldn't be a bad idea.

31
32 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Just allow the second vehicle. If the company is
33 big enough to support two vehicles, let them have two vehicles. I don't think they
34 have to apply for the second vehicle.

35
36 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Sure and, if there's more than two vehicles,
37 they have to be out of public site.

38
39 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Yeah, then they've got to deal with it. Then their
40 big enough that they can afford a solution.

41
42 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I think two vehicles is a better solution to it. That was a lot of
43 debate for two vehicles. I agree with everybody that I think the wording needs to
44 be clarified a little bit, and I second the idea of having a second vehicle. It could
45 get way shorter. That's for sure. Two vehicles not exceeding X size and we're
46 done.

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 – So because this is a Municipal Code Amendment, it's not a normal hearing item. We don't have an applicant. We have a member of the public wanting to speak. Can I invite them up now?

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY – You would just open the Public Hearing portion of it.

VICE CHAIR SIMS – I have a comment before we get started on that. I applaud the City Staff for going through the effort to clean this up, and personally I think you have parts of Moreno Valley that look like townships. There was Edgemont, there was Sunnymead, there was Box Springs, there were areas that were unincorporated areas and they looked how they look. You go into areas like Sunnymead Ranch, you go to Moreno Valley Ranch, you go to other areas where there's been master planning since the incorporation of the City. There's been standardization of how...man my voice is trashed out. But, anyhow, I think there's a clear nexus between the economic value of the City and the beautification of the City and to holding to some stringent and rigid standards. People have the opportunity to do what they want if they want to move into unincorporated areas. So to have more definition, and I agree that there's some cleaner language in this, but I think in concept it's a very important thing for the City to move forward and beautify itself and bring standardization and greater economic prosperity to the residential parts is to have standards that are consistent and then we need to have the funding mechanism to have more Code Enforcement to apply the standard codes. So that's my two cents. I'm a firm believer in that we should have the rules and they need to be enforced.

CHAIR LOWELL – Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BARNES – I agree on that. Are you opposed to two or?

VICE CHAIR SIMS – No. I think we're beating up....if a person goes in....how many people are actually coming in? I think the root of this thing is how many people are having a home business that don't come in for a permit. This is a nonsensical rule because probably 99% of the people don't come in for a Home Occupation Permit.

COMMISSIONER BARNES – That's probably true.

VICE CHAIR SIMS – I think we're spending a lot to do about nothing but.....

CHAIR LOWELL – So it's a solution looking for a problem.

VICE CHAIR SIMS – Yeah, I just, I think.....

1 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I think just cleaning up the verbiage and
2 allowing for two and, if there's any other vehicles, they have to be out of site of
3 the right-of-way and.....

4
5 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – I would agree with that.

6
7 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay well let me open up the Public Comments portion real
8 quick. I'd like to open up the Public Comments portion. We have Mr. Tom
9 Jerele, Sr.

10
11 **SPEAKER TOM JERELE, SR.** – Tom Jerele, Sr. speaking on behalf of myself
12 and a little bit on behalf of the Sundance Center where I spent a little bit of time.
13 Chairman Lowell, Vice Chair Sims, Commissioners, Staff, and the public: First I
14 want to thank Commissioner's Van Natta, Barnes, and Lowell for peeling the
15 grape on this. I was looking for the Staff Report. It's not in the little books here.
16 They just have the minutes from the past meetings and then the Agenda, so
17 there was nothing for me to peruse there. I'll take the blame, though, Mayor Pro
18 Tem Giba has been chatting me to get in the City Hall or go online and look at
19 the stuff ahead of time because it's pretty broad. You know, a lot of house
20 cleaning is going on here. But, as far as the vehicle issue, number (1) two
21 vehicles is fine with me. And I'm taking the position, you know, I live in the
22 Sunnymead Ranch area and in our area there is a fellow that lives up above us a
23 little bit that I inadvertently worked for. I see the Klure & Harris truck there and
24 that's a big truck. I don't think he's the owner. He's probably maybe one of the
25 store managers or something like that, and that was a question I had. How about
26 somebody who is an employee of a company? I know a framer who works for
27 CW Framing. He's got a pretty good sized truck, and it's all set up, and that's his
28 work truck. He goes to work in the morning. So how about somebody who is an
29 employee of a company? He's not running his business there, but he needs that
30 truck because he goes back and forth to work every day. So those are issues.
31 Signs, I'm a pro sign guy, but what I was thinking maybe this could use a little
32 tweaking on the condition of the vehicles. Case and point, well going back to
33 signs for a second, wraps are very popular right now and a good example is the
34 Margarita's Grill. They do like catering out of a van that's really nice and, when
35 they put those wraps on, I like them. You know, I think they are really cool. It
36 tells you, hey, somebody's business is there. You can contact them. You've got
37 a phone number. You might do some business with them. But, if they begin to
38 deteriorate and begin to look like an industrial park there instead of a
39 neighborhood, there's an issue. So maybe condition of the vehicles, you know, if
40 they are leaking oil, if the paint is peeling. You know, they get run down; a lot of
41 rust so on and so forth. It's a little bit tough because it gets subjective, but I'm
42 sure you can do a little tweaking on that. So condition of the vehicle is very, very
43 important. And so that's pretty much my comments, and again I thank you for
44 taking the time. I'll have to delve into this a little bit more before it gets to
45 Council, but I do appreciate the good insight that the Commission has provided.
46 Thank you.

1
2 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. Any other people wishing to speak?
3

4 **SPEAKER RAFAEL BRUGUERAS** – Every team should give a great illustration
5 on where the Code Enforcer's, when they go out and when they put up those
6 bulletins on the doorknob thing, they can direct them to a website and they can
7 show them different kinds of landscaping. I mean, we saw some rocks. I mean
8 some nice designs that developers could actually put down when their building
9 their homes in the beginning instead of doing grass. You could do rocks. They
10 have this in Nevada. They got away from the grass. They put down rocks as
11 landscaping and cactuses and things like that, desert plants. So maybe we could
12 have developers do that instead. People don't want to cut grass. They don't
13 want to hire a gardener and waste water because very time we try to save water
14 somehow they find a way to raise the bills. I mean, it's getting crazy. But kudos
15 to the Commissioners. Stick to the law. Stick to the law, and if somebody wants
16 a house and they want to bring in their two big trucks, find the properties that are
17 going to allow you to do that. Do not change the law. I'll tell you why. We just
18 approved 274 houses on Eucalyptus and they are going to build them little
19 boxes, and let's say 50 homeowners have the more than 21 feet of truck. That's
20 going to go out way out past the driveway and into the walkway. Now, I'll tell you
21 what's wrong by a truck blocking my path. I've got to go around into the street.
22 That means your violating my piece of property that we all pay for. So, if you
23 stay with the law and you let them know in the beginning what the law is, they
24 have to abide by it. If not, they pick another City. There's plenty of them in
25 California in the county, plenty of cities. People want to buy homes and not see
26 two 50 footers sitting in front of their property all the time blocking their view.
27 People don't want that, but I do like the 21 foot or not touch the curb or the
28 sidewalk. We have those laws here. We should follow them. And, if we stay
29 consistent with the law, then the homeowner can only make one choice whether
30 I'm going to buy or not buy. That's it really. You guys answered your own
31 questions. You stick to the law. When I was born, my mother taught me the law.
32 I broke some of them. I got scolded and paid the price but I learned. You know,
33 I have desert landscaping at my place. I've got rocks. It looks nice. I live on
34 Bay, and I could put 12 cars on my lot. I've got a long driveway, you know, that
35 could put a 50 foot RV. That's the property I live on. That's the choice I made.
36 Again, we're going to build 274 houses. So let's think about what we want to do
37 before we set the law or change things because a lot of people are not going to
38 buy houses and have all these trucks blocking their view in their little
39 communities.
40

41 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Thank you very much. I believe that was the last speaker for
42 tonight. With that, I will close the Public Comments. And any other questions or
43 comments for Commissioner Debate or Discussion?
44

45 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Yeah.
46

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Commissioner Barnes.

2
3 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – With questions on a particular item, how do we
4 move forward on this?

5
6 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – We have some alternate
7 language here that we've been bouncing around right here. We're seeing if we
8 can find a way to get it thrown up on the screen for you to consider so that you
9 might still be able to approve something tonight. If not, then you can approve
10 everything else and they'll have to come back and bring back that one item.

11
12 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – If we can come to an agreement with this.

13
14 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – If you want to take a five
15 minute recess, we can see about getting that done for you. Or, if you want to
16 move forward with everything else but that, that's your option as well.

17
18 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I guess we can take a five minute break.

19
20 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I'm not sure that five minutes is going....well it
21 might. We can see what they have.

22
23 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Let's see what Rick says when he gets back to his seat.

24
25 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – If not, then we can always move forward and
26 leave this one out of it.

27
28 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Okay we're trying some
29 technology things and our guys are really good, but we just emailed it to him.
30 He's going to try and put it up on the screen to show you our handwritten
31 corrections and then maybe we can just edit it right there on the screen. We can
32 write any additional changes. Whenever your ready, Bob, if you want to try and
33 put it up.

34
35 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, we will take a five minute recess. We'll take a five
36 minute recess. We'll be back at 8:55. Thank you.

37
38
39 **PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING RECESS**

40
41
42 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Well, yeah, we just came back on live. Sorry.

43
44 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – No more than two commercial vehicles and
45 those vehicles have to have dimensions no larger than.....

1 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Let me welcome everybody back. So we're back from break
2 and we're just discussing the....

3
4 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay, sorry.

5
6 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Revisions to the Municipal Code, and I don't know if it's
7 going out live just yet. There you go. So this is what we're trying to change Item
8 No. 5 to, and I guess there's still one more correction we're trying to do it.

9
10 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Yes. No more than two commercial vehicles.

11
12 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Yeah. The way this is drafted,
13 you could have four commercial vehicles as long as they were small ones. It just
14 says you can't have more than two large ones the way it's written, but this is just
15 the next step for you.....

16
17 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – No. On a Home Occupation Permit, we do
18 not want any vehicles longer than 21 feet for a home occupation.

19
20 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Yeah, so all you would have to
21 do there is add after the no more than two commercial vehicles.....

22
23 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Maximum dimensions or something like that.

24
25 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – With dimensions no larger
26 than.

27
28 **CHAIR LOWELL** – There you go.

29
30 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Just add the word no.

31
32 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Okay, here was my suggestion.

33
34 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay, wait a second. It's going to be easier.
35 No more than two commercial vehicles may be used in connection with a home
36 occupation. Each vehicle shall not be larger than. Did you get that?

37
38 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Did you get that, Chris? Okay, so
39 we're saying no more than two commercial vehicles may be used in connection
40 with a Home Occupation Permit. And then the second is.....

41
42 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Each vehicle....

43
44 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Each vehicle shall not be larger
45 than and then the remainder of the sentence.

1 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Yeah, each vehicle shall not have dimensions
2 larger than.
3
4 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Did you get that, Chris? Okay,
5 we've got that.
6
7 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – That's exactly right. We don't want a huge
8 vehicle parked in front of a house in a residential area.
9
10 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – This would prohibit large
11 vehicles all together.
12
13 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Correct.
14
15 **COMMISSIONER BARNES** – Yes.
16
17 **CHAIR LOWELL** – That's.....
18
19 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Yeah, they can have them up to 21 feet in
20 length and no more than two of them and that would also mean no more than two
21 Geek Squad Bugs.
22
23 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Staff has your revised
24 language. You can still vote to approve it. Whoever makes a motion, you would
25 just be moving to approve it as amended.
26
27 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Are you going to fix this first?
28
29 **CHAIR LOWELL** – It's going to be as amended.
30
31 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – As amended.
32
33 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And the amendment.....
34
35 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – I think Bob was just helping us to
36 get it up onto the screen.
37
38 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay.
39
40 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Right now, he's trying to film and
41 do the other stuff. We've got it written down here I think is what our attorney is
42 saying.
43
44 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay.
45
46 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – And so we have it.

1
2 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – So it can say with Item No. 5 as amended?
3

4 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Correct.
5

6 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Right. And when we get to that
7 point, we'd be happy to re-read what we have here just so it's clear on the
8 record.
9

10 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Okay, thank you.
11

12 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Okay, with that said, anymore questions, comments, or
13 concerns? Would anybody like to make a motion? Don't everybody jump up at
14 once.
15

16 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Yeah, I can make a motion. Let me just get to
17 it here. Where are we here.
18

19 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – This one here.
20

21 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I just have to get back to where I was. No I'm
22 just going to do this part here.
23

24 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Go for it.
25

26 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – I move that we **APPROVE** Resolution No.
27 2016-05 and thereby recognize that PA14-0011 Municipal Code Amendment
28 qualifies as exemptions in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15061 and
29 **APPROVE** Planning Commission Resolution No. 2016-05 recommending that
30 the City Council approve the proposed amendments to Title 8, Title 9, and Title
31 12 with the revision of Item No. 5. And could the Staff please read that revised
32 wording to us please?
33

34 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – Right. The wording will be as it
35 appears on the screen with the modification of no more than two commercial
36 vehicles may be used in connection with a Home Occupation Permit. Each
37 permit shall not have dimensions larger than 8 feet in total outside width, etc.
38

39 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Each permit or each vehicle?
40

41 **SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY** – I'm sorry, each vehicle.
42

43 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – Right, and just for clarification on
44 the record, the adjustments that Chris Ormsby just read were to sentence No. 2
45 on the screen. Everything else remains the same.
46

1 **COMMISSIONER VAN NATTA** – Correct. So that would be the amendments to
2 Title 8, Title 9, and Title 12 with the modification as read of the City Municipal
3 Code PA14-0011.

4
5 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Is that acceptable?
6

7 **ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY PAUL EARLY** – Absolutely.
8

9 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Perfect. We have a motion by Commissioner Van Natta.
10

11 **COMMISSIONER BAKER** – I'll second.
12

13 **CHAIR LOWELL** – And we have a second by Commissioner Baker. He beat
14 everybody to the punch. Now let's cast our vote. Commissioner Baker,
15 Commissioner Sims. All votes have been cast, perfect. With that said, the
16 motion passes 7-0. Do we have a Staff wrap-up on this item?
17

18
19 **Motion carries 7 – 0**
20

21
22 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – There is no wrap-up, other than to
23 say that the item will now be moved forward to the City Council. Our expectation
24 is that we would be putting it on the June Agenda. It could be June 7th or June
25 21st. We still haven't figured out that final date.
26

27 28 **OTHER PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS**

29
30 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Perfect and, with that said, moving onto Other Planning
31 Commission Business. I don't think we have any tonight.
32

33 34 **STAFF COMMENTS**

35
36 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Do we have any additional Staff comments?
37

38 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – None.
39

40 41 **PLANNING COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

42
43 **CHAIR LOWELL** – Any additional Planning Commissioner comments?
44

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

1 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – When’s the next meeting?

2

3 **CHAIR LOWELL** – I’m going to do that right now.

4

5 **VICE CHAIR SIMS** – Oh, okay.

6

7

8 **ADJOURNMENT**

9

10 **CHAIR LOWELL** – With that said, I’d like to adjourn tonight’s meeting to the
11 next meeting of the Planning Commission, which is a regular meeting on May
12 12th, 2016 at 7:00 PM right here in City Council Chambers. Thank you very
13 much everybody. Have a good night.

14

15

16 **NEXT MEETING**

17 *Next Meeting: Planning Commission Regular Meeting, May 12th, 2016 at 7:00*
18 *PM, City of Moreno Valley, City Hall Council Chambers, 14177 Frederick Street,*
19 *Moreno Valley, CA 92553.*

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31 _____
Richard J. Sandzimier
32 Planning Official
33 Approved
34
35

_____ Date

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

Brian R. Lowell
Chair

_____ Date