# MINUTES
# CITY OF NORCO
PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS – 2820 CLARK AVENUE
REGULAR MEETING
AUGUST 10, 2011

---

1. CALL TO ORDER: **7:07 PM**

2. ROLL CALL: **Chair Wright, Vice-Chair Henderson, Commission Members Jaffarian, Leonard and Hedges**

3. STAFF PRESENT: **Planning Director King, Public Works Director Thompson, Fire Chief Bryan, Senior Planner Robles, Deputy City Clerk Germain and Deputy City Attorney Burns.**

4. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: **Chair Wright**

5. APPEAL NOTICE: **Read by PD King**

6. HEARING FROM THE AUDIENCE ON ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA: **NONE**

7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of July 13, 2011. **Recommended Action: Approval** (Deputy City Clerk)

**M/S Hedges/Leonard** to approve the minutes of July 13, 2011 as written
**AYES: Unanimous** **Motion Passed**

Chair Wright announced that the public hearing agenda items No. 9.A., 9.B. and 9.C. will be heard first as they will go quickly, adding that items 8.B. and 10.A.-D. will be heard together.

8. CONTINUED ITEMS:
   A. **Resolution 2011-___;** Site Plan 2011-05 (Beckman): A Request for Approval to Allow a 439 Square-foot Tack Room/Shed at 249 Oldenburg Lane located within the Norco Ridge Ranch Specific Plan (NRRSP). **Recommended Action: Continue** Continued from regular meeting on July 13, 2011 (SP Robles)

SP Robles recommended that this item be continued to the next scheduled meeting.

**Jack Beckman, applicant**: Mr. Beckman stated that there seems to be a lot of subjectivity through the previous discussions concerning the three accessory buildings, adding that his project was denied because it was going to be stucco and yet it is half the size of the last accessory building discussed. He asked that the accessory building code details be reviewed.

**M/S Jaffarian/Henderson** to continue Site Plan 2011-05 to the next scheduled meeting
**AYES: Unanimous** **Motion Passed**

B. **Resolution 2011-___;** Tentative Parcel Map 36392 (Alere Property Group LLC): A proposal to merge several existing lots and subdivide the total approximate 86.93 acres into 7 parcels with one lettered parcel for a detention basin, located generally east of Pacific Avenue, west of Mountain Avenue, north of First Street, and south of Second Street, excepting out approximately 5 acres on the southeast corner of Pacific Avenue and Second Street and adding approximately 13.6 acres on the east side of Mountain Avenue (Several Assessor Parcel Numbers). Continued from cancelled meeting on July 27, 2011 **Recommended Action: Approval** (PD King)

PD King presented the staff report on file in the Planning Division. He gave a visual presentation of the proposed project within the Gateway Specific Plan Industrial District. He explained all the components within the master plan, street improvements, architecture, landscaping, and other areas involved.

PD King noted that new studies were done for traffic impact, air quality and greenhouse gas analysis due to changes and updated research done by the State and WRCOG. In conclusion, he stated that the design meets all requirements, trails meet city standards and all lot areas as well as lot depth, width and frontage requirements are met with the tentative parcel map.

In response to PC Hedges, PD King confirmed that all trails are to be 12 feet wide, and that new state regulations note that trucks cannot idle more than three minutes.

PC Leonard stated that the traffic analysis does not seem to address the potential for traffic jams between the freeway off-ramps and on-ramps onto Second Street.

VC Henderson shared that he had concerns with reviewing and discussing this large of a project, he feels is without proper public notification. He understands that the Tentative Parcel Map was set as a public hearing, but not the additional site plans. He added that he would like the notice area be larger and notice twice the number of residences. He shared that he had concerns with making any decisions on this item without additional notice on this project.

DCA Burns noted that this item was noticed properly, as set by code per the City Council's guidelines.

**Clark Neuhoff, Vice President, Alere Group**: Mr. Neuhoff introduced himself and his team on this project. He stated that this project is functional, code compliant, and added that he will be addressing the misinformation circulating, during his presentation.

The topics reviewed within the presentation included the following:

- What this project is and is not – Truck Depot versus Warehouse
- Project design features, including transportation patterns, horse trails and rural themes

- Traffic and Air Impact Analysis
- Safety and security measures
- Project fees and mitigation
- Project Zoning and Specific Plan Compliance

Mr. Neuhoff noted that there will be no truck entrances on First Street, Pacific Avenue and Second Street, west of Mountain Avenue. He stated that the landscape buffers are larger than required and the project will have large trees along with additional foliage. He shared some of the rural themed façade features and building accents which have also been added.

**Aric Evatt, Principal, and Haseeb Qureshi, Senior Air Quality Specialist, Urban Crossroads**: They presented the Traffic and Air Impacts and Mitigations portion of the presentation.
Mr. Evatt gave some background on the company's qualifications. He reviewed the steps taken to prepare a traffic study, explaining what is considered the peak hour a survey is taken. He stated the peak hours are between 7:00 am to 9:00 am and 4:00 pm to 6:00 pm, counts are done in 15-minute increments and then the busiest hour is what is considered as "the peak hour". Mr. Evatt noted that both human count and a mechanized system were used to do the traffic count; adding that the mechanized system is done over a 24-hour period whereas the human count is done in a two-hour increment. He shared that the traffic study is conclusively consistent with the 1991 traffic study which was approved for the Gateway Specific Plan. He noted that the study does take into consideration bottle-neck areas and will look at options to avoid causing traffic.

In response to VC Henderson, Mr. Evatt explained that the traffic study looked at approximately 10% of the truck traffic from the Building 5 entrance on Second Street. VC Henderson suggested that the truck entrance be moved to Mountain Avenue and have only a vehicle entrance from Second Street.

Mr. Qureshi provided a response to a fact sheet that had been provided by a resident over a blog; he noted that upon review the fact sheet was over 10 years old. He further explained that trucks are now regulated more closely by the State and have additional measures to follow which provides for 85% reduction in fuel exhaust than what was previously allowed. All trucks entering the State must have the proper papers showing that they are following these standards. He presented further air quality measures that will be followed by this project.

Clark Neuhoff continued the presentation, touching on additional points such as public services and safety, the low need for police intervention as there will be a high level of tenant security, the low need for fire services as the buildings will have the ESFR sprinkler system, and the project fees that will provide for crucial funds for the City, including parks and other areas.

In conclusion, Mr. Neuhoff stated that this project is consistent with all Specific Plan requirements adopted in 1991. He added that having a single developer will have continuity on the project with the benefit of providing jobs for locals.

**Recess: 9:04PM**

**Reconvene: 9:14PM**

**Chair Wright OPENED the public hearing, indicated that proper notification had been made and asked for the appearance of those wishing to speak.**

**Su Bacon**: Ms. Bacon stated her concerns with trucks on Second Street and in our neighborhood, noting that as citizens "do we want this type of magnitude in our town."

**Linda Dixon**: Mrs. Dixon suggested that this this project be sent to the City Council without a recommendation, if the Planning Commission cannot come to an agreement. She noted her disagreement with the potential of job development and tax base, traffic mitigations and hours of operations. She asked that this project be taken slowly to allow further public input.

**Wayne Steffner**: Mr. Steffner stated his concern with high road maintenance which he stated is due to heavy trucks; adding that he is against this project.

**Patricia Overstreet**: Mrs. Overstreet stated she opposes giant warehouses in Norco; she further suggested that it be scaled back to the egg ranch height of business. She noted her concern with one-time development fees paid and that a negative cash flow will be generated for the City. She asked that the project be reduced in size, hours, and no Sunday traffic.

**Lana Futrell**: Ms. Futrell stated that she does not want to live by the truck traffic and noted her concern that trucks will try to avoid traffic and travel on the streets which are prohibited for trucks.

**Herb Higgins**: Mr. Higgins stated that the City's lifestyle will be changed forever if this "truck depot" goes into place. He added that the City needs jobs and taxes but no trucks. He suggested that this be sent to the City Council with no recommendation but ask for direction.

**Ed Dixon**: Mr. Dixon stated that truck distribution and organized crime go hand in hand, and that prostitutes are also attracted to this type of business. He asked "what is green about this project?" and that the rights of residents should be taken into consideration as opposed to the property owner.

**Greg McAulay**: Mr. McAulay stated that he doesn't see the benefits of this project for Norco, adding his concerns with traffic that will be on Mountain Avenue and Second Street from the freeway. He asked that the Commission reconsider approval of this project.

**Matt Potter**: Mr. Potter introduced himself as a Historic Preservation Commission Member; he shared that a survey of historic homes in Norco is being conducted and asked that this project be placed on hold until the survey can be completed. He suggested that an ad-hoc committee be developed between the Planning Commission and his commission in order to review cultural resource reports from the developer. He provided a copy of his statement for the record.

**Mike Thompson**: As a homeowner in the Gateway Specific Plan area, Mr. Thompson noted that all the truck depots shown in the presentation had no homes around it and asked that there be a closer look into the air quality problems. He noted his concern with large blank walls which are invitations to graffiti.

**Judy Lambert**: Ms. Lambert stated she lives on Mountain Avenue, and noted her concerns on how much this will affect her life and her property value.

**Lorne Whittle**: Mr. Whittle stated that he has lived in Norco long enough to have seen many changes, he asked that the public work with the City and make this work for the City.

**Jacki McCray**: Ms. McCray stated that she feels this project will bring revenue to the City as well as jobs, so that Norconians don't have to travel to Orange County for work.

**Gregory Dellenbach**: Mr. Dellenbach noted his concerns about the City's debt and asked that all consider the chance that a blighted area be beautified.

**Richard Grossman**: Mr. Grossman stated that he is in favor of the development but has a few issues for review such as the number of vehicle trips per day, the upkeep of the landscape and roads once it is built, and monitoring of emissions and noise levels.

**Barbara Dellenbach**: Mrs. Dellenbach stated that as a longtime resident, she has seen growth in Norco; she noted that jobs are needed, services are being cut, adding that this project will give funds to help keep services in Norco.

**Tony Mauro**: Mr. Mauro, Commission Member of the Streets, Trails and Utilities Commission, noted that the Commission has asked for more information from staff and noted that the project is moving too fast. He suggested that we take our time and get all the facts before decisions are made.

**Bob Osborne**: Mr. Osborne opposed this idea; he stated that he moved to Norco to keep animals in his yard and raise his children. He noted his concerns of trucks parking on the streets and in their yards.

**Sharon Higman**: Ms. Higman stated that she is against this project, noting that it is not conducive to Norco's life style, and it will affect our homes negatively due to the heavy traffic it will generate.

**Michael Leiendecker**: Mr. Leindecker noted concerns with traffic on his street; he resides at the corner of Mountain Avenue and First Street. He asked what will be done to mitigate the noise and pollution this will cause.

**Ken Sprowlt**: Mr. Sprowlt stated that he opposed this project, noting most of his concerns have been brought forth. If approved, he suggests that Norco proposes a tax on warehouses to help provide some revenue for the City.

**Karen Leonard**: Mrs. Leonard stated that the Commissions have a responsibility to the general specific ordinances; and asked if the Planning Commission has adequate information to make a decision.

**Glen Hedges**: Mr. Hedges noted that Eastvale is in the same situation and are having joint meetings with City Council and Planning Commission which he recommends.

**Michael Baker**: Mr. Baker stated that he is opposed to this project, and sees nothing but negativity such as no employment benefits, concerns with traffic and no point for sales tax.

**Jorge Vilegas**: Mr. Vilegas noted that he brought his family from Orange County to a nice place to live and be comfortable. As a Second Street neighbor to the project, he stated his concerns with trucks idling and parking on the street.

**Constance Muckenthaler**: Ms. Muckenthaler stated her concerns with having only one way in and out of her neighborhood due to the proposed project, and the impact on the neighborhood and she questioned the timing of the traffic study.

**Danny Azevedo**: Mr. Azevedo indicated that NHA will be looking into this project to make sure that the trails are created properly. As a citizen, he stated that he opposes this project, noting his concern with home values around this project.

**Edward Clark**: Mr. Clark stated his concern with the amount of trucks traffic this project will produce.

**Denise Shoemaker**: Ms. Shoemaker stated she is opposed to this project, adding her concern with traffic along Second Street, which is already bad.

**Becky Thom**: Ms. Thom stated that her family lived on Pacific Avenue and that her home will be torn down, adding that having to make a move like this is going to be hard on her family.

**Dean Smith**: Mr. Smith stated that he opposed the project. He noted that the AQMD reports are immaterial and voiced his concerns with tax generation and enforcement. He added that the property can better serve the City as light-industrial.

**Taryn Hefler**: Ms. Hefler noted her concerns with heavy truck traffic on the streets as recently Second Street has been inundated with broken water lines.

**Elizabeth Pinedo**: Ms. Pinedo stated she opposed this project. She added that she lives across the street from the proposed project and has concerns with noise pollution and traffic.

**Chair Wright CLOSED the public hearing, bringing the discussion back to the Commission.**

VC Henderson shared that he is very anxious to hear input from the Streets, Trails & Utilities Commission before making any decisions. He stated that he would also like input from WRCOG's new air quality requirements; he suggested that a greenhouse study be done in Norco, and asked to review the Gateway Specific Plan. VC Henderson stated that he would like all the street improvements to be done in Phase I, asked that the trail on Pacific Avenue be moved to the west side, that an additional 24-hour traffic study be done at Hamner Avenue and Second Street and at Hamner Avenue and Third Street, measuring the college traffic.

PC Jaffarian had a few questions concerning the traffic study from 1991 compared to the current study done. Mr. Evatt was able to address all questions, adding that the street improvements scheduled will address the current traffic problems in the area.

Public Works Director Thompson confirmed that the improvements scheduled will bring the flow of traffic to the standard that it should be at.

Discussions ensued.

PC Leonard noted his concerns about the traffic impact on the on-ramp/off-ramp off Interstate 15 on Second Street; in response, Mr. Evatt noted that CalTrans has jurisdiction over the freeway area and they do their own studies. PC Leonard also stated that he worries about the project's neighbors living on Pacific Avenue, noting how it may impact them and their life style.

PC Hedges stated that most of her questions have been posed. She asked if an environmental study was done when the chicken farm was there, in response, Mr. Evatt did not know but noted that an air quality study was done only for the new development. PC Hedges commented that she would like more people involved, get more public comments; and that at this time she is unable to make a decision without more information.

Chair Wright stated that his biggest concern is the traffic, at both Second Street and Hidden Valley Parkway crossing Hamner Avenue.

PWD Thompson shared that new controllers have been installed at Hidden Valley Parkway and Hamner Avenue, adding that the City of Corona handles the synchronization of this corner. He stated that he agrees with VC Henderson that the Streets, Trails and Utilities Commission needed to finish their findings so that this Commission can make its decision.

Further discussions continued.

VC Henderson asked if this item can be continued as a public hearing, in response, DCA Burns stated that this item can be continued but not as a public hearing as the public hearing was already closed. DCA Burns suggested that a date be given to the applicant, even though it will be re-advertised. PD King suggested that a special meeting be set separate from a regular meeting. In response to PC Hedges, PD King stated that he will verify availability for a larger meeting room.

**M/S Hedges/Henderson** to re-advertise TPM 36392 to a yet undetermined date as a public hearing. PD King will check the availability of a meeting room.
**AYES: Unanimous Motion Passed**

The following public hearing items were heard by the Planning Commission at the beginning of the meeting, at 7:10 AM.

9. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. **Resolution 2011-___:** Conditional Use Permit 2011-10 (Foltz): A Request for Approval to Allow an Accessory Building Consisting of a 1,200 Square-Foot Metal Garage at 2030 Western Avenue Located within the A-1-20 Zone. **Recommended Action: Approval** (SP Robles)

SP Robles presented the staff report on file in the Planning Division. She noted that the applicant is proposing to use a current slab if it is deemed usable by the engineer; if not, it will be demolished and rebuilt. She stated that the project has been reviewed for setbacks and all requirements have been met. The Architectural Review Sub-

Committee had concerns with the location of the building, noting that it is near animal-keeping areas. The Sub-Committee suggested that the building be moved closer to the house. Staff recommends approval.

In response to PC Leonard, SP Robles noted that the applicant is planning on using 1,200 square feet of the 1,800 square feet of existing slab.

**Chair Wright OPENED the public hearing, indicated that proper notification had been made and asked for the appearance of those wishing to speak. With no one wishing to speak, Chair Wright CLOSED the public hearing.**

PC Jaffarian stated that he has concerns about the location of the building. He suggested that the applicant move the location to be closer to the house and away from any animal-keeping area. He added that the existing slab will need to be examined by the engineer of record and the City inspector, and will most likely have to be cut for placing of footing.

**M/S Henderson/Hedges** to adopt Resolution 2011-38, approving Conditional Use Permit 2011-10, allowing a 1,200 square-foot accessory metal garage building at 2030 Western Avenue, with the condition that if the slab is not proven usable, that the proposed structure be moved closer to the house, and approved at staff level.
**AYES: Unanimous**
**NAYS: Jaffarian** **Motion Passed**
PC Jaffarian voted against due to the building's location.

B. **Resolution 2011-___:** Conditional Use Permit 2011-11 (Correa): A Request for Approval to Allow an Accessory Building Consisting of a 2,640 Square-Foot Metal Barn at 2330 Corona Avenue Located within the A-1-20 Zone. **Recommended Action: Continue** (SP Robles)

SP Robles presented the staff report on file in the Planning Division. She asked that the item be continued to the next scheduled meeting to allow staff to continue to work with the applicant.

**M/S Jaffarian/Henderson** to continue Conditional Use Permit 2011-11 to the next scheduled meeting
**AYES: Unanimous** **Motion Passed**

C. **Resolution 2011-___:** Conditional Use Permit 2011-12 (Arroyo): A Request for Approval to Allow an Accessory Building Consisting of a 938 Square-Foot Carport and Storage Building at 3764 Sierra Avenue Located within the A-1-20 Zone. **Recommended Action: Approval** (SP Robles)

SP Robles presented the staff report on file in the Planning Division. She stated that all requirements have been met. She added that the Architectural Review Sub-Committee has reviewed with no concerns expressed. Staff recommends approval.

PC Leonard noted concerns with a bathroom designed large enough that it could be converted to include a shower. In response, SP Robles stated that there is not a set size for a bathroom in an accessory building, adding that the allowance is to accommodate a sink and a toilet only.

PC Hedges stated her concern that a porch is added along with a car port behind a storage building; it could easily be converted to a house. In response, SP Robles asked if the applicant could come up to answer questions of the Commission; the applicant was not available to answer questions.

**Chair Wright OPENED the public hearing, indicated that proper notification had been made and asked for the appearance of those wishing to speak. With no one wishing to speak, Chair Wright CLOSED the public hearing.**

PC Jaffarian stated that he also had similar concerns, as well as the excess of lights and outlets; noting that Condition No. 10 is a key component to the conditions but will be difficult to enforce due to its location.

**M/S Jaffarian/Hedges** to deny Conditional Use Permit 2011-12, without prejudice to allow applicant to return with changes to address concerns discussed by the Commission.
**AYES: Unanimous** **Motion Passed**

10. BUSINESS ITEMS:

A. **Resolution 2011-___:** Site Plan 2011-07 (Alere Property Group): A Request for Approval of a Master Development Plan for Six Buildings Totaling 1,586,980 Square Feet Built with Three Phases on Property Located at 1811 Mountain Avenue. **Recommended Action: Approval** (PD King)

B. **Resolution 2011-___:** Master Site Plan 2011-07 Phase 1 (Alere Property Group): A Request for Approval for Development of Buildings 1 and 3 (605,280 Square Feet and 96,730 Square Feet Respectively) (Site Plans 2011-09, -11) between Pacific Avenue and Mountain Avenue North of First Street. **Recommended Action: Approval** (PD King)

C. **Resolution 2011-___:** Master Site Plan 2011-07 Phase 2 (Alere Property Group): A Request for Approval for Development of Buildings 2 and 4 (561,600 Square Feet and 89,670 Square Feet Respectively) (Site Plans 2011-08, -10) between Pacific Avenue and Mountain Avenue South of Second Street. **Recommended Action: Approval** (PD King)

D. **Resolution 2011-___:** Master Site Plan 2011-07 Phase 3 (Alere Property Group): A Request for Approval for Development of Buildings 5 and 6 (121,130 Square Feet and 120,370 Square Feet Respectively) (Site Plans 2011-12, -13) on the east side of Mountain Avenue south of Second Street. **Recommended Action: Approval** (PD King)

**M/S Hedges/Henderson** to advertise above listed site plans to a yet undetermined date as a public hearing. PD King will check the availability of a meeting room.

**AYES: Unanimous** **Motion Passed**

11. CITY COUNCIL: **Received and Filed**
    A. Recap of Actions Taken at the August 3, 2011 City Council/Community Redevelopment Agency Meeting.

    B. City Council Minutes dated July 20, 2011

12. PLANNING COMMISSION: Oral Reports from Various Committees: **NONE**

13. STAFF: Current Work Program dated August 4, 2011: **Received and Filed**

14. OTHER MATTERS:
    A. Follow-up on Items from Previous Meetings (PD King): **NONE**

15. ADJOURNMENT: Chair Wright adjourned the meeting at **12:16 PM**

Respectfully submitted,

_____
Steve King
Planning Secretary

/di-79133