



MINUTES
CITY OF NORCO

Parks and Recreation Commission
Special Meeting

May 26, 2015

City Hall Conference Rooms A & B
2870 Clark Avenue, Norco, CA 92860

-
1. **CALL TO ORDER:** 6:07 PM
 2. **ROLL CALL** Corinne Holder, Present
Geoff Kahan, Present
Richard Boyle, Present
Jennifer Gable, Present
Richard Hallam, Absent
 3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** Commissioner Boyle
 4. **COMMISSION ACTION ITEMS**

Discussion Regarding Tentative Tract Map No. 36717

Deputy City Manager/Director of Parks, Recreation and Community Services Petree explained that each commission evaluates a tract map for new developments. What affects the P/R is the Quimby dedication of the Sub-Division Map Act which is land to be dedicated for park use within a sub-division. The city of Norco has an ordinance, Chapter 17.14, that defines what that entails. There is a formula used to calculate how much land is to be dedicated. Once the lot placement is reviewed by the City to determine what land is to be dedicated, it will be turned over to the Planning Commission who will make the decisions a condition of the development for approval. This particular tract is 26.69 of total acreage.

DCM/DPRCS Petree went over the tract layout with the commission. The actual dedication of land from this development is about .36 acres. Petree pointed out the land that was offered by the developer and provided reasons why the City is not interested in that particular piece of land. If the city takes the land as proposed for a park, it is one more infrastructure expense as well as daily maintenance and upkeep expenses.

The city also has the option to take in lieu fees instead of the land dedication. They will pay the City the value of the land. The fair market value shall be determined by the City Council, or the City Council designee, based on unimproved land with a written appraisal report prepared and signed by a certified MAI appraiser (to be paid by the

sub-divider). The City shall review the qualifications of the MAI appraiser prior to the appraisal of the land. The ordinance is very clear as to what type of land is permitted to be dedicated.

The developer offered to give the property "Lot B" which is 2.15 acres as open space. DCM/DPRCS Petree did not think this lot would not benefit the City and there would still be the issue of upkeep and maintenance. It would not be accepted unless there was an assessment district formulated to the residents. He stated it may be better used as a benefit to the residents along the border to enlarge their properties.

DCM/DPRCS Petree stated the Commission must consider whether or not they concur with Staff recommendation of Lot B and in-lieu fees is preferred to building a new park. The Development Impact Fee from these homes would be approximately \$10,000 - \$11,000. The idea of the Quimby Act was to dedicate land and the impact fees were to be used to pay for the development of the park. It can only be used for new construction and some infrastructure.

Commissioner Boyle stated he felt that with the condition of the City budget, it doesn't really allow us to build a new park without it being a burden. He questioned if there was a situation where the appraisal comes in and the developer doesn't agree with it. DCM/DPRCS Petree stated that it is a condition of the ordinance. If the developer disagrees, he can get a second opinion from an approved appraiser.

Vice Chair Kahan started a discussion on the fencing/walls of the development along Lot B. He stated he is willing to let the developer retain Lot B and let the Planning Commission determine the fencing of the borders.

Commissioner Gable questioned that if the developer chose not to use Lot B to expand the property of the resident lots and not to develop it at all, can they just leave it as a dirt lot and if so, how does that stop people from accessing the area and being it becoming an eye sore. Petree stated that it would be a condition of the development to fence off the area and maintain it.

Chair Holder stated that residents are under the assumption that horse trails were to be added along Bluff Street toward River when the development was approved. The plans do not show this as a condition so the residents may be upset by this.

M/S Holder/Gable to condition the developer to pay in-lieu fees for its Quimby Park dedication.

Ayes: Boyle, Gable, Holder, Kahan
Noes: None
Absent: Hallam

Motion Passed

M/S Boyle/Kahan to condition developer to dedicate Lot "B" to the property owners that abut up to the rear of the property to include Southern California Edison (SCE) Easement overlay

Ayes: Boyle, Gable, Holder, Kahan

Motion Passed

Noes: None

Absent: Hallam

5. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Pumpkin Rock Sub-Committee Update

DCM/DPRCS Petree stated that Norco Hills was dedicated to the City of Norco as part of mitigation to set aside land for a conservation easement. Environmental documents state that the only thing allowed in the area of easement other than hiking is horses. When speaking with the Planning Director, it was stated that even painting a pumpkin is wrong to begin with; it should be natural. But because it has been painted for so long, we have accepted it. He strongly recommends we do not do anything to change that. There have recently been complaints from residents about motorized vehicles being in that area. The Parks Superintendent has been directed to block the accesses that have been known to be used by motorized vehicles. Emergency vehicles will have the ability to access these areas if needed.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Holder adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m.

Robin Shepard
Executive Secretary