



**MINUTES**  
**CITY OF NORCO**  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS – 2820 CLARK AVENUE  
REGULAR MEETING  
JANUARY 13, 2010

---

1. CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 p.m.
2. ROLL CALL: Chair Jaffarian, Vice-Chair Hedges, Commission Members Harris, Newton and Wright
3. STAFF PRESENT: Planning Manager King, Senior Planner Robles, Executive Secretary Dvorak
4. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Commission Member Newton
5. APPEAL NOTICE: Read by PM King
6. HEARING FROM THE AUDIENCE ON ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA: None.
7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of December 9, 2009

**MOTION:** M/S Wright/Newton to approve the minutes of December 9, 2009 as written.

AYES: Unanimous:

**MOTION CARRIED**

8. CONTINUED ITEMS: None
9. PUBLIC HEARINGS: None
10. BUSINESS ITEMS:
  - A. Lighting/Photometric Review 2009-03 and Landscape Review 2009-04 (Norco First Assembly of God): Review of Lighting and Landscape Plans Required in the Approval of Conditional Use Permit 2006-20. Recommended Action: Approval (SP Robles)

SP Robles presented the staff report on file in the Planning Division.

There was some dialogue on the photometric drawing as to what the numbers were showing. SP Robles said she would contact the engineer and find out exactly why the numbers did not appear to be logical.

Discussion followed about landscaping water run-off onto the trail. Although it is a standard engineering requirement, it was noted the plans did not reflect the use of a

4"x3" concrete mow strip instead of redwood runners. The sprinklers should also face away from the trail.

**MOTION:** M/S Wright/Hedges to approve Lighting/Photometric Review 2009-03 and Landscape Review 2009-04, as amended to add the mow strip.

AYES: Unanimous:

**MOTION CARRIED**

- B. Discussion of a Proposed Amendment in Residential and Animal-Keeping Zones Regarding Lot Coverage and the Size of Permitted Accessory Buildings. Recommended Action: Direction and set for public hearing. (PM King)

PM King presented the staff report on file in the Planning Division. Using the new exhibits he just handed to the Commission, PM King explained in detail a new way to look at this issue. A solution would be to define the building envelope instead over covering only 40% of the lot, as this calculation does not allow for setbacks. As was suggested by Vern Showalter (Streets and Trails and Utilities Commissioner), set aside 576 square feet for each allowable animal unit on a lot, and then work on lot coverage from that. Past Planning Commissioner Dave Henderson had suggested to staff that the building envelope equal the flat pad. Then off the building envelope, there would be an allowed 40% coverage of the lot.

Member Wright asked why pens and corrals are being counted as coverage as these structures are movable. He liked the idea of the animal-keeping area being set aside first.

As to barns being used for vehicular storage instead of animal uses, there is no law against doing flat work, as in cement floors, after a building permit is finalized. A solution to that would be to require a permit for flatwork.

This was not a public hearing but the Chair accepted comments.

Dave Henderson said he asked the City Manager for permission to speak to the Planning Manager about this issue. He proceeded to give a few ideas to the Commission regarding the proposed amendment.

Member Harris voiced deep concern about the process of review for this amendment, that he felt that changes were being pushed through by one or two people without community involvement and agreed to discuss this further under "Other Matters." His concern also included how the Commission continually sees changes without the integrity of maintaining previous discussions. We continually look at the micro level without reflection on how it reflects the macro level.

After an active discussion by the Commission, Chair Jaffarian reviewed the list of items generally agreed upon that:

- The City's definition of a "barn" should be "barn for animal keeping."
- The definition of a structure shall be determined by its use; Animal-keeping determines barn use; while a car in a building does not.
- "Natural" be used instead of "dirt" when referring to barn floors;
- Architectural review on accessory structures would be required only on those structures over 2,500 square feet.
- Section 18.13.02 be changed to read: ...on each and every residential lot, consistent with the allowed number of animal units allowed on said lot.
- 18.13.08(19) should be changed by inserting Private Garage, in front of "pergola."
- Accessory structures 600 square feet or less should be permitted uses; those larger would require Planning Commission review (by straw vote of the Commission);
- 18.13.08 should be changed by adding "private garages not larger than 600 square feet used by the owner of the premises.";
- The building envelope should include the structure (by straw vote of the Commission); and
- If someone must build a larger-than-ordinary-sized house, then look at using two lots.

Member Wright wanted to see Mr. Henderson's suggestions down on paper. He agreed with Member Newton's suggestion that anything over 600 square feet need to come before the Planning Commission for review.

Member Newton asked why 25 feet was chosen as the permitted height limit for accessory structures since RVs fit very nicely under 12-foot bridges on our freeways. He referenced a 40-year old book about California barns "harmonizing with the countryside"; and that did not mean oversized shiny metal buildings.

The Commission talked about any buildings requiring footings and thereby requiring a building permit being counted as a structure. PC Harris asked if a driveway is part of the formula discussed tonight. He said homes with 3-4 car garages have much larger driveways. Chair Jaffarian thought counting driveways, along with in-ground pools, was debatable.

Member Harris asked at what sized lot does the City say "no" to large animal keeping on small lots. PM King said even the smallest lot, as long as it is in the A-1-20 zone, is allowed at least one large animal; but he did not know off-hand what that smallest lot would be.

The unanimous direction to staff was to incorporate suggested changes into the draft ordinance and bring it back for one more discussion with new drawings to include side and rear yard setbacks, before setting for public hearing. It was discussed at a previous meeting that future discussion may include eliminating specific plans and placing all current properties under specific plans as R-1- or A-1-zoned properties.

11. CITY COUNCIL: Received and filed.
  - A. City Council Action Minutes dated December 16, 2009
  - B. City Council Minutes dated November 30, 2009 and December 2, 2009
12. STAFF: Current Work Program – Received and filed.
13. OTHER MATTERS:
  - Member Harris voiced concern about where the new approach on accessory buildings had come from. He wanted more public input in the process. It was determined that the public hearing is the public input process.
  - Vice-Chair Hedges asked about the Wall Design business at 1338 Sixth Street which is still operating outside of the limits of its conditional use permit. Staff indicated the owners were notified that the tire storage needed to be removed by a certain time period. Code Compliance will be following up to make sure that all other requirements are being met.
  - Vice-Chair Hedges said that no signs were posted at the Community Center so displaying of vehicles for sale was still occurring.
  - Member Wright suggested that the City consider allowing for this type of personal auto sales through a permit process at controlled locations in the City because enforcement at one location just causes them to find another area.
  - Because sumac, poisonous to horses, was on a recent landscape plan, Member Newton gave staff a current list of plants poisonous to horses in particular and suggested the City provide said list to landscape architects.
  - Member Newton asked if animal statues installed at the animal hospital under construction on Hamner Avenue had approval. Staff confirmed these were not shown on the landscaping plans and were installed without review, but that there is no requirement for public art to be reviewed by the City prior to installation.
  - Staff was directed to research whether a rather large LED sign on the front of Maverick's was permitted.
  - Staff confirmed that signage for the Silverlakes facility will require Department of Transportation approval.
14. ADJOURNMENT: 9 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve King  
Planning Secretary

/sd-74547