



**MINUTES**  
**CITY OF NORCO**  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS – 2820 CLARK AVENUE  
REGULAR MEETING  
JUNE 25, 2008

---

1. CALL TO ORDER: 7:03pm
2. ROLL CALL: Chair Newton, Vice-Chair Wright, Commissioners Harris, Hedges and Jaffarian
3. STAFF PRESENT: Senior Planner King and Deputy City Clerk Germain.
4. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Commissioner Jaffarian
5. APPEAL NOTICE: Read by Staff
6. HEARING FROM THE AUDIENCE ON ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA:  
None
7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of June 11, 2008

**MOTION: M/S Wright / Hedges** to approve the minutes of June 11, 2008 as written:

AYES: Newton, Wright, Hedges, Harris

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: Jaffarian

8. CONTINUED ITEMS: None
9. PUBLIC HEARINGS: None
10. BUSINESS ITEMS:
  - A. Large Family Daycare 2008-01: A Large Family Daycare for Property Located at 3120 Curly Horse Way in the Norco Ridge Ranch Specific Plan.  
Recommendation: Approval (Senior Planner King)

SP King presented the staff report in detail (the report being on file in the Planning Department). SP King handed out emails received after the agenda preparation, emails from seven (7) individuals in support of the day care facility and one (1) opposing the facility; included in the hand out was a letter from the Riverside County Children & Families Commission with information in support of Child Care Services in our community.

Questions answered by staff:

PC Jaffarian, Wright and Hedges had no questions at this time.

PC Harris questioned one of the letters of protest included in exhibit F of the staff report, SP King stated the unnamed letter's origin is unknown as it was delivered at the information counter in an unaddressed envelope.

In response to Chair Newton, SP King stated a public hearing is only required if the applicant is requesting a day care for more than 12 children, which then would also require a conditional use permit. Above 6 and Under 12, only requires approval by the Director of Community Development.

Chair offered for anyone wishing to comment from the audience; Linda Gaskill, the applicant, asked to speak last in order to address any issues brought up by other speakers.

Kevin Abbott, 250 Gulf Stream: He is in support of the day care; his child attends Linda's day care. It seems all the conditions have been met, there is a need for this service in our community.

Robert Scott, 3020 Curly Horse Way: He wanted to point out three items of concern from the Conditions of Approval list: number 12: signs not allowed, he states there is a sign out advertising the day care; number 19: landscaping plan including irrigation system, he questions if a plan has been submitted, is there a deadline on submitting this plan and what options are available to enforce this item; and he questioned item number 6 on use shall be incidental, states this determination is subjective.

Leticia Peacock, 3200 Crestview Dr: Her views have not changed since last years decision to not approve; she lives in a family oriented residential area and wants to keep it rural. There are more pre-schools and day care facilities down on Pedley. This large day care will increase traffic on her street. She stated already there are lots of children playing in the backyard area, which contains play ground equipment. She stated that she pays a lot of taxes up there and doesn't want to share the neighborhood with any "strip mall" type businesses.

Brian Peacock, 3200 Crestview Dr: He wishes to keep a residential area and their little piece of the "country in the city" situation. A business operating there would be contrary to that. He is concerned with traffic of the parents dropping and picking up children, and someone not familiar with Norco and its horse traffic. Having a day care in the neighborhood may be detrimental to their home values, which have already dropped significantly and this business would be further damage to their home values.

Leticia Peacock, 3200 Crestview Dr: Last time this item was brought to Council, regulations stated that she allowed only so many kids now she is requesting for 12, but it was stated then that the City does not have enough staff to make sure she doesn't go over the limit.

Jacklyn Le, 3181 Crestview Dr: Her concerns are the same as the previous speaker. A business does not belong in the residential area; there are enough kids in the neighborhood already; she is concerned with traffic this may create. She is also concerned about the potential of her home value decreasing because of too many children around.

Todd Le, 3181 Crestview Dr: He has the similar opposition to this day care facility in his area; he stated he received the notice 1-2 hrs ago of this meeting. He has noticed cars going 45-50 mph on Crestview Dr; people from outside the area will tend to drive a lot faster to pick up their child from day care because they may be running late. He agrees with the points other speakers have stated.

Guevara Blanca, 3120 Crestview Dr: She has lived in this neighborhood only two years and she likes this area very well and feels the area is safe. A large family child care is a business which does not belong in this neighborhood. She asks that the Commission maintain the same decision as made last year. She does not want businesses in her neighborhood and feels her home value will decrease tremendously which affects the neighborhood. There is already a lot of traffic on the street due to lots of empty homes.

Keri Abbott, 250 Gulfstream: She is here in strong support for Linda, stating that what she offers is wonderful. Mrs. Abbott lives in the neighborhood, appreciates Linda's service. She doesn't drive like a maniac when she drops off her child as stated by a previous speaker. Without Linda's service she would not be able to work; with cost of gas she appreciates that Linda is close by. She can not afford a large place like a Kinder Care. Her two year old son is the oldest child Linda takes care of and he will be leaving Linda's day care soon to attend a pre-school. Linda has run a large family day care in Tustin for many years without a problem; there should be no reason to deny her.

Sherrill Adams, 3120 Curly Horse Way, Applicant's roommate: She explained that a family day care is where little children are taken care of in a family environment; there is no large play ground equipment. There is no extensive traffic at any one time as the current few children in her care are on staggered schedules and do not drive past any of the previous speakers' homes to get to Linda's Day Care. The current clients live in Norco and are aware on how to drive and behave around horses.

Linda Gaskill, Applicant, 3120 Curly Horse Way: In reference to the sign mentioned by the first speaker, Mr. Scott, she did have a sign up but has since taken it down once

she got her approval from the City; as for the landscape irrigation mentioned by Mr. Scott, Ms. Gaskill stated that she has worked on her landscape for a year now, she waters the grass areas by hand herself and the slopes are automatically watered every day. She has a gardener to clear the trails, mow the lawn, and pull weeds. She also stated that she is financially able to make all her payments for her home; she qualified to purchase her home based on her state issued day care license for twelve. She is also a real estate broker; she is not creating any traffic problems at all; she lives on her own, her roommate is away four days out of the week; property value is not down, three neighboring homes have gone into default; keeps working hard on making her home look nice; has offered for the opposing neighbors to come in to see her home and was refused; there are other home businesses located on the street that are causing a lot of the traffic; she has received a lot of support this week from many neighbors. Her business is a family day care home, not a "strip mall" business as noted by a previous speaker; she plans on having a horse and chickens in the future. She has no complaints of her neighbors, she wished they were friendlier; she has spoken to neighbors within the 100 feet radius, and has two pending clients who will be having babies; she caters only to infants and toddlers, infant care is in great need. While she is licensed for six, she can only have four infants and no other children; if she is licensed for twelve and Sherril is home, she can have the four infants and two toddlers and would be considered full. She has rules for the toddlers playing in the yard which includes no screaming or yelling, she has also sound proofed her home as an added precaution.

In response to Chair Newton, Ms. Gaskill explained the ratio of children allowed based on the license. A child under two years of age is considered an infant; until he becomes two then he is considered a toddler. Having a license for twelve gives her some flexibility with scheduling since not all the children come to her at once. As an example she states that her first customer arrives at 4:30 am; and out of consideration to the neighbors she turns off her car headlights and coasts into her driveway.

Ms. Gaskill explained that the parents monitor her; they are aware of the rules and will contact social services should she be over the allowed ratio.

In response to PC Hedges, Ms Gaskill explained that her state license is currently on hold, they will not transfer it from her old home in Tustin until she gets a fire safety inspection from the City. She has had the license for twenty years in Tustin and has had no problems.

In response to PC Jaffarian in reference to condition 15, the state does not require an alarm system only a bull horn. Ms Gaskill has an upgraded alarm system as well as a bull horn, and security cameras. She is also trained in self defense karate.

With no other questions for the applicant from the panel, Chair Newton brought the discussion back to the Commission.

PC Wright had no comments.

In response to PC Jafarian, SP King explained that this type of day care is approved over the counter by staff; the decision would stand unless a neighbor notified of the approval objects, then it is brought to the Planning Commission. He also explained the conditions listed under "Conditions of Approval" are standard of all Large Day Care.

PC Hedges had no comments.

PC Harris felt there is a conflict of rights between the resident who just wants to live in a residential area without any commercial around and the one who uses their home for a business to help keep the home. He supports the day care for six children but twelve seems to be more of a commercial venture and belongs in a commercial area. He agrees the need for child care is tremendous; he feels he must respect both sides of this issue. He supports for only six children.

Chair Newton inquired about condition 19 – landscaping plan.

SP King stated the applicant only needs to provide a plan showing what has been done and where the automatic irrigation is installed.

Ms. Gaskill questioned if all the other day cares in Norco are required to have landscaping done as a condition. She felt this condition was added because of complaints from neighbors, her CC&R states the landscaping is up to the home owner. Although there is no law requiring it, she has done landscaping and all the irrigation is working.

SP King agreed with the applicant, landscaping is not required for day care facilities; the condition was added due to concerns by staff.

Chair Newton asked the Commission for thoughts on the irrigation system.

PC Harris stated he drove by the residence today, the lawn did not look as green as in the photos provided by the applicant. He would like assurance that the irrigation system would be used.

PC Jaffarian is fine with staff reviewing any plans the applicant would bring in. He stated that you can't tell a resident to water their lawn, it's a private residence. He continued by saying this is a permitted use per the codes. The only concern the Commission should have is in reference to life safety issues. The permit is fine the way it is written as long as staff keeps an eye on those issues.

PC Wright questioned the addition of condition 19, if it's not a normal condition, it should be removed. This day care should not be singled out. PC Wright reminded the rest of the commissioners that this issue is not a condition use permit, so should not be handled as such.

In response to Chair Newton in reference to condition 19 – all commissioners were in agreement to remove it from the Conditions of Approval.

Chair Newton questioned the need for condition 21 - self audit of compliance.

PC Jaffarian stated the State audit is more stringent than an internal audit by the city; he felt any life safety or compliance issues would be handled by the State before the Planning Commission would ever see it. He feels it should be taken out.

PC Wright agrees.

PC Harris feels it is appropriate; conditions are set for a reason and he would like to see that all individuals who are given conditions are checked once a year.

In response to Chair Newton and PC Wright, SP King confirms this condition is generally standard for a one year review on conditional use permits only, not on this type of permit. This condition was added and changed to six months from date of approval for this permit.

Chair Newton, Commissioners Wright, Jaffarian and Hedges chose to strike condition 21 – self audit of compliance; Commissioner Harris disagreed.

No further comments.

**MOTION: M/S Jaffarian/ Wright** to uphold staff's approval and approve Large Family Daycare 2008-01, striking conditions 19 and 21.

AYES: Newton, Wright, Jaffarian

NOES: Harris, Hedges

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

**MOTION CARRIED**

Commission Member Harris voted no because he stated that up to six children is acceptable but over six is too much of an impact on the neighborhood; Commission Member Hedges voted no because her opinion was that the Planning Commission should reflect the desire of residents in the neighborhood that were opposed. This action is final unless appealed to City Council.

11. CITY COUNCIL:
  - A. City Council Action Agenda dated June 18, 2008:  
  
SP King reported that the City Council had voted to re-appoint Commission Member Hedges to another term on the Planning Commission.
  - B. City Council Minutes dated June 4, 2008 (Two Meetings): No Discussion
12. PLANNING COMMISSION: Oral Reports from Representatives on Various Committees/Commissions: None
13. STAFF: Current Work Program: Received and Filed.
14. OTHER MATTERS:
  - Commission Member Wright inquired about the Trail Master Plan Sub-Committee and what the status was. SP King reported that he did not know and would have to report back; he also stated that the issue has been transferred to the Streets and Trails Commission under Public Works Director Bill Thompson. The Planning Commission asked if Public Works Director Bill Thompson could attend one meeting and give a report; staff stated the request would be passed on.
15. ADJOURNMENT: There being no further items of discussion, Chair Newton declared the meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Steve King  
Senior Planner

/di-69542