



MINUTES
CITY OF NORCO
PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS – 2820 CLARK AVENUE
REGULAR MEETING
MARCH 26, 2008

-
1. CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 p.m.
 2. ROLL CALL: Chair Newton, Vice-Chair Wright, Commissioners Harris, Hedges, and Jaffarian
 3. STAFF PRESENT: Senior Planner King, Associate Planner Robles, and Executive Secretary Dvorak
 4. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Chair Newton
 5. APPEAL NOTICE: Read by SP King
 6. HEARING FROM THE AUDIENCE ON ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA: None
 7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of March 12, 2008
M/S Wright/Jaffarian to approve the minutes of March 12, 2008 as written.

AYES: Unanimous

MOTION CARRIED

8. CONTINUED ITEMS: Site Plan 2008-01 (Trevino/Martinez): **Resolution No. 2008-05**; A request for site plan approval to allow the conversion of an existing structure from a residential home to a commercial office building at 1060 Sixth Street located within the C-4 zone. Recommendation: Approval (Associate Planner Robles)

AP Robles presented the staff report on file in the Planning Department. This was continued from the March 12, 2008 meeting so that the applicant could revise the site plan to address the horse trail fencing going across the existing driveway and to add landscaping within the paved area in front of the building. Those changes have been done and are shown on Exhibit D-1. Curb is still required to be replaced in front of the old driveway. Staff is recommending approval as noted in conditions of approval and offered to answer any questions of the Commission.

PC Hedges asked about the new landscaping. AP Robles replied it is three cuts in the paved area in front of the building.

PC Jaffarian questioned the overhang; AP Robles replied there was no change.

There was a question from PC Wright about how the landscaping was going to be watered. AP Robles suggested the applicant could answer that.

Staff concurs with the recommendation of the Public Works Director regarding the curb.

Albert Nelson, designer for the project, said the concerns of the Commission have been addressed but the applicant still has an issue with the existing pavers and the present driveway curb cut. Other properties in the immediate area have driveway cuts that go nowhere and those property owners have not been required to replace those areas with curbing. Regarding the planters, they are small enough to be watered by hand. The owners live just a few houses away and keep all their properties nice. It was confirmed that the existing landscaping is on an irrigation system.

Olivia Lopez, 1060 Sixth Street, one of the property owners, asked the Commission to reconsider and let them leave the old driveway there because of other properties not being asked to do the same. It is a heavy financial burden. She questioned why a lot of businesses already got the pavers put in by the City; so why not for this business?

Glenn Hedges, 4061 Temescal Avenue, on the City's Streets and Trails Commission, said the City contractor who took the asphalt out in the first place and put the pavers in the wrong place is correcting that. The City has a problem with decomposed granite (d.g.) going into the storm drains so every bit of curb is helping that issue. The curb needs to be brought up to City standards at the expense of the owner. The pavers will be replaced in the correct area by the city contractor, and only for commercial properties. Mr. Hedges talked about the driveway width being at 12 feet being okay because at 25 feet, half the building would have to be removed.

PC Hedges was in agreement with staff's recommendation.

PC Jaffarian said the way the project is conditioned is good; but added that the trail fence should be extended and he did not feel the planters would be that difficult to irrigate. He suggested blocking the end of the concrete portion and turning the fence back by the corner of the planter area, leaving a five-foot access for the handicapped parking spot.

PC Wright agreed the conditions were fine; but he recommended against any additional palm trees. The ones on site have been there awhile.

Chair Newton reiterated to staff that the property owner is responsible to extend the fence but that the City is removing the pavers, and that the planters needed at least drip irrigation.

MOTION: Wright/Hedges to approve Site Plan 2008-01 in accordance with and subject to all conditions of approval contained within draft Resolution 2008-05 as amended to include the turn on the fence and the irrigation of the planters.

PC Harris asked if the City fails to remove the pavers, what happens.

Vice-Chair Wright said the pavers have to be removed, regardless of who pays. What the Commission is hearing tonight is that the City is paying.

AYES: Unanimous

MOTION CARRIED

9. PUBLIC HEARINGS

SP King said he would present Items A and B concurrently.

A. **Resolution No. 2008-06;** Zone Code Amendment 2008-02, a City-Initiated Proposal to Amend the Norco Zoning Code by Amending Chapter 18.13 (A-1 Zone) Section 18.13.11 (Primary Animal-Keeping Area) regarding Access Clearance. Recommendation: Recommend approval. (Senior Planner King)

B. **Resolution No. 2008-07:** Zone Code Amendment 2008-03, Specific Plan 99-01, Amendment No. 4, a City-Initiated Proposal to Amend the Norco Ridge Ranch Specific Plan by Amending Section III 2B(4) (Equestrian/Pedestrian Access) regarding Access Clearance. Recommendation: Recommend approval. (Senior Planner King)

SP King presented the staff report on file in the Planning Department. He explained that when the Norco Ridge Ranch Specific Plan (NRRSP) was amended in 2006 to provide clear access to Primary Animal Keeping Areas (PAKAs), Council directed that the same verbiage pertain to any new lot created in the A-1-20 zone. Therefore, any future code changes done to PAKA access would involve both Chapter 18.13 and the NNRSP. This amendment is to provide clear and specific verbiage to prevent a permanent structure from being built on any access to a PAKA. The language is approved by the City Attorney. The amendment proposes to protect that access to be free and clear. This project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). He offered to answer questions of the Commission.

PC Jaffarian said the way amendments read is that temporary structures are prohibited; and he asked if this was an oversight.

SP King replied that was an oversight and that the amendments would only apply to permanent structures. He noted that the individual who came to the previous meeting has Commission approval, but he will be the only one in the NRRSP. He has not formally submitted at this time.

John Box, 159 Oldenburg Lane, said numerous structures have been allowed throughout Norco and felt it was a value to the community if more structures were built. He asked that the Commission not stop someone from having an RV garage but instead come up with mutual criteria.

Mike Box, 3620 Corona Avenue, said he does not have a PAKA but has a huge garage with a lot of concrete and still finds room for his horses. He asked the Commission to not jeopardize the town of tomorrow for what we want today.

Dave Henderson, 3010 Corona Avenue, asked what prompted this issue.

PC Jaffarian explained that there was so much ambiguity in the previous wording that the Commission agreed that his drive-through RV structure on the access to his PAKA was not inconsistent. However, because that home owner has not made an application to the Building Department yet, he essentially does not have approval. When this amendment is approved, he will not be able to build. He asked that the City Attorney review this before it goes to Council. He strongly supports the amendment and asked the Commission to.

Roy Hungerford, 3201 Cutting Horse Road, built an RV garage and has a barn and he has horses and toys, just like his neighbors do. He agrees about having the access available for emergency services and farrier services, but he wants to make sure that the Commission realizes not everyone will own horses. A lot of houses up in the hills don't even have emergency access to their back yard. He asked that the Commission review these requests on a case-be-case basis. Mr. Hungerford said a Council member has a garage on his access to his PAKA.

There were no further comments and the public hearing was declared closed.

Vice-Chair Wright said this is clarifying the Code, but he doesn't think temporary buildings should be included.

PC Jaffarian said PAKAs are only on certain properties, and would not affect what already exists. He said the amendments should prohibit all structures,

permanent and temporary; to include trash enclosures, block wall; and anything under a conditional use permit.

Vice-Chair Wight said "flat and clear" as written covers everything.

PC Hedges agreed with Commissioner Jaffarian and Vice-Chair Wright.

PC Harris said there are a lot of violations all over town; that unless a procedure is put into place, he could not see a difference with a motor home parked in the area as a structure. Concern is one of enforcement, which is not being done.

It was noted the 12-foot gate size was determined by the Fire Chief.

PC Harris said that pools are still being built with the equipment being put in the 15-foot access. What is direct access; straight line or curving around?

Wright said that was a code enforcement issue and not the Commissions'.

MOTION: Wright/Hedges to adopt Resolution No. 2008-06 recommending that the City Council approves Zone Code Amendment 2008-02 and adopts Resolution No. 2008-07 recommending that the City Council approve Zone Code Amendment 2008-03.

10. BUSINESS ITEMS: Pencil File 2008-02 (Catalina Investments): A Request for Consideration to Allow the M-1 (Heavy Commercial/Light Manufacturing) Industrial Uses Within the Industrial District of the Gateway Specific Plan. Recommendation: Provide Direction (Associate Planner Robles)

AP Robles presented the staff report on file in the Planning Department. The applicant is requesting this change because he is having difficulty leasing out the units because of the limited allowed uses. He wants the uses to be consistent with the M-1 zone. If the Commission concurs, this will return as a public hearing. AP Robles offered to answer questions of the Planning Commission.

PC Hedges asked if there would be any drawbacks, assuming it was set this way for a reason when the Specific Plan was adopted. AP Robles said she was not aware of any drawbacks as far as she knew from discussions with Director Daniels.

PC Jaffarian recalled that the area from Parkridge out to Lincoln was the only area okay for big truck traffic.

SP King said one drawback maybe in the future is that some uses with different parking standards would be introduced to the area and that could be an issue. This area does not fall under any of the overlays. It is just a specific plan. Staff does support the proposal.

Chair Newton asked if this opened the door for apartments over existing businesses. AP Robles said most of the area is already fully developed with industrial uses.

Vice-Chair Wright noted there is still vacant land in the area and asked if the developer knew what the zoning was before he built. AP Robles said he did.

PC Harris asked if this was rezoning. AP Robles replied that this was just adding more uses in the Gateway Industrial District only.

Don Slater, 690 Parkridge Avenue, applicant, said he is asking for the change because possible tenants are being turned away because of their proposed uses not being allowed. This site is sitting out there with a lot of non-conforming businesses and a large adjacent vacant lot in Corona.

Mike Box, 3620 Corona Avenue, said that if the Commission is going to make a special change for Mr. Slater, how about the homeowners with PAKA access issues. He wanted the Commission to be fair.

SP King said the reintroduction of uses is up for discussion tonight. Did the Commission want to take all the uses in the M-1 zone and make them permitted in the Industrial District of the Gateway Specific Plan?

AP Robles confirmed this change would affect all the areas within the District, not just Mr. Slater's property.

PC Jaffarian said currently if a dance studio wanted to go in now, it could not, but with the change, it could.

PC Hedges wanted to see uses come in as conditional use permits.

PC Harris wanted more clarification as to what staff was expecting tonight. He wanted to see some expansion of the uses; but there needs to be a solution to parking concerns. He did not want to see properties limited.

PC Jaffarian suggested structuring a list showing following uses as they fit with parking, fire access, and other requirements, easy expansions that don't require

much, and another list with following uses that would need to have analysis of parking, for example, to be evaluated.

PC Harris noted uses need to be attractive and considerate of what is already in the surrounding area.

It was noted any specific plan amendments call for public hearings. PC Jaffarian noted that not many people would be on the mailing list because of the current uses but Staff verified that at least 25 properties need to be notified for public hearings.

Chair Newton, Vice-Chair Wright, and PC Jaffarian agreed with PC Hedges about the conditional use permit process.

Chair Newton confirmed that this entire specific plan would be involved, such as the Norco Egg Ranch area and not just this Parkridge site.

Direction was given to Staff to bring this back as a public hearing.

11. CITY COUNCIL: Received and filed.
 - A. City Council Action Agenda dated March 19, 2008:
 - B. City Council Minutes dated March 5, 2008 and Joint Minutes dated February 27, 2008
12. PLANNING COMMISSION: Oral Reports from Representatives on Various Committees/Commissions: None
13. STAFF: Current Work Program: Received and filed.
14. OTHER MATTERS: None
15. ADJOURNMENT: M/S Hedges/Wright to adjourn. Unanimous. Chair Newton declared the meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve King
Planning Commission Secretary

/sd-68613