1	CITY OF MORENO VALLEY PLANNING COMMISSION
2	REGULAR MEETING
3	CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER – 14177 FREDERICK STREET
4	
5	Thursday, August 24, 2017 at 7:00 PM
3	maroday, Adgust 24, 2017 at 1.001 m
6	
7	
8	CALL TO ORDER
9	
10	
11	CHAIR BARNES – Good evening ladies and gentlemen. I would like to
12	welcome you to this evening's meeting of the Planning Commission. Today is
13	Thursday, August 24, 2017, and it is 7:04 PM. May we have roll call please?
14	
15	
16	ROLL CALL
17	
18	Commissioners Present:
19	Commissioner Baker
20	Commissioner Sims
21	Vice Chair Korzec
22	Chair Barnes
23	Commissioner Lowell – Excused absent
24	
25	Ctoff Draggati
26	Staff Present:
27	Rick Sandzimier, Planning Official
28	Erica Tadeo, Administrative Assistant
29 30	Sergio Gutierrez, Case Planner Mayra Salas, Case Planner
31	Jeff Bradshaw, Case Planner
32	Chris Ormsby, Senior Planner
33	Offis Offisby, Serilor Flatifier
34	
35	Speakers:
36	Rafael Brugueras
37	Naidel Bruguelas
38	
39	PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
40	· · / / / / / / / / / / / / /
41	
42	CHAIR BARNES - Thank you. Commissioner Korzec, could you lead us in the
43	pledge?
44	r9

1	
2	APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
3 4	Approval of Agenda
5 6 7 8	<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – At this time, we need to approve the Agenda. Can I get a motion?
9 10	COMMISSIONER BAKER – I'll move that we approve the Agenda.
11 12	COMMISSIONER SIMS – I'll second.
13 14 15	<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – A motion from Commissioner Baker and a second from Commissioner Sims. All in favor
16 17	VICE CHAIR KORZEC – Aye.
18 19	CHAIR BARNES – Aye.
20 21	COMMISSIONER BAKER – Aye.
22 23	COMMISSIONER SIMS – Aye.
242526	CHAIR BARNES - Opposed? The motion carries unanimously.
27 28 29	Opposed – 0
30 31 32	Motion carries 4 – 0
33 34	CONSENT CALENDAR
35 36 37 38 39 40	All matters listed under Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and all will be enacted by one rollcall vote. There will be no discussion of these items unless Members of the Planning Commission request specific items be removed from the Consent Calendar for separate action.
41 42	APPROVAL OF MINUTES
43 44	Planning Commission - Special Meeting - July 20, 2017 at 7:00 PM
45 46	Approve as submitted

1	
2	
3	CHAIR BARNES – Moving onto the Consent Calendar. We have the approval of
4	Minutes from the Special Meeting of July 20, 2017. Anyone have any comments,
5	corrections, adjustments?
6	COMMISSIONED SIMS Well like to make a motion
7 8	<u>COMMISSIONER SIMS</u> – Well, I'd like to make a motion.
9	CHAIR BARNES – Please.
10	TICASC.
11	COMMISSIONER SIMS – I would like to make a motion to approve the Minutes
12	from the Planning Commission Special Meeting of July 20, 2017.
13	
14	CHAIR BARNES - Thank you. Motion from Commissioner Sims and a second
15	from Commissioner Baker. All in favor
16	
17	VICE CHAIR KORZEC – Aye.
18	OLIAID DADNES. A
19	<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – Aye.
20	COMMISSIONED DAKED Avo
21 22	COMMISSIONER BAKER – Aye.
23	COMMISSIONER SIMS – Aye.
24	7.yo.
25	CHAIR BARNES - Opposed? No opposed. Moving along.
26	
27	
28	Opposed – 0
29	
30	

Motion carries 4 – 0

PUBLIC COMMENTS PROCEDURE

Any person wishing to address the Commission on any matter, either under Public Comments section of the Agenda or scheduled items or public hearings, must fill out a "Request to Speak" form available at the door. The completed form must be submitted to the Secretary prior to the Agenda item being called by the Chairperson. In speaking to the Commission, member of the public may be limited to three minutes per person, except for the applicant for entitlement. The Commission may establish an overall time limit for comments on a particular Agenda item. Members of the public must direct their questions to the Chairperson of the Commission and not to other members of the Commission, the applicant, the Staff, or the audience. Upon request, this Agenda will be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with disabilities in

1 compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Any person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in 2 a meeting should direct their request to Guy Pegan, our ADA Coordinator, at 3 4 (951) 413-3120 at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. The 72-hour notification will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to 6 this meeting. 7 8 9 CHAIR BARNES – Now to the Public Comments portion of the meeting. Do we 10 have any Speaker Slips? 11 12 **ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT ERICA TADEO** – No. 13 14 **CHAIR BARNES** - No Speaker Slips, alright. We will move past Public Comments. Moving onto Non-Public Hearing Items. 15 16 17 18 **NON-PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS** 19 20 None 21 22 23 **PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER** – We have none. 24 **CHAIR BARNES** – We have none, alright. Next, Public Hearing Items. The first 25 case is PEN17-0048. The Applicant is Martha Veloz, and do we have a Staff 26 27 Report? 28 29 30 **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS** 31 32 33 34 1. Case: PEN17-0048 (PA16-0026) 35 Martha L. Veloz 36 Applicant: 37 38 Owner: John Lin 39 40 Representative: Melvin Evitt 41 42 Location: 13373 Perris Boulevard 43

Case Planner:

Council District:

44

45 46

1

Sergio Gutierrez

Proposal:

PEN17-0048 Conditional Use Permit. An application to allow for the sale of beer and wine within an existing convenience store located at 13373 Perris Boulevard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2017-30, and thereby:

1. **CERTIFY** that this item is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as a Class I Categorical Exemption, CEQA Guidelines, Section 15301 for Existing Facilities; and

2. **APPROVE** PEN17-0048 Conditional Use Permit subject to the attached Conditions of Approval included at Exhibit A.

<u>PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER</u> – I would like to introduce Sergio Gutierrez, a consultant that works for our department who will be making this presentation.

CHAIR BARNES – Welcome.

CASE PLANNER SERGIO GUTIERREZ - Thank you, Rick. Chairman Barnes. Thank you, Planning Commission. The project consists of a Conditional Use Permit to allow alcoholic beverage sales within an existing 2,400 square foot Carniceria Las Glorias convenience store located at 13373 Perris Boulevard. The alcoholic beverage sales will be limited to beer and wine, offsite consumption only, through a Type 20 Alcohol License obtained by the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control. The current hours of operation for the convenience store are 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. The interior of the convenience store includes a variety of amenities, including groceries, a meat market, and household items, which make the convenience store unique. Based on the City's Municipal Code definitions in consideration of the size of the store, it was determined that this business most closely fit the convenience store, as opposed to the retail sales establishment. The project site is located within the Hometown Square Commercial Center in Suite D304 and D305. The site is surrounded by existing retail office and restaurant uses within the commercial center. The surroundings uses from the project site include residential to the west, commercial uses to the north, vacant land to the east zoned as office, and

existing commercial and residential uses to the south. The project site is located in the Community Commercial Zone. Convenience store use is consistent with the Community Commercial Zoning District. Based on the City's Municipal Code, alcohol sales within convenience stores require a Conditional Use Permit if within 300 feet of residential. The site is located approximately 200 feet from residential, which requires a Conditional Use Application. There are no proposed exterior modifications to the site. The only modifications include interior, which will accommodate a refrigerator for the beer and wine sales. To minimize potential concerns, a Conditional Approval has been placed to limit alcohol sales to current hours of operation, which are 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. The project was routed and reviewed by the police department. The police had addressed specific comments to Staff. The project was reviewed in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines and determined to be exempt in that this project qualifies as a Class I Categorical Exemption under Section 15301, Existing Facilities. Staff recommends approval of Resolution 2017-30 and thereby certify that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act as a Class I Categorical Exemption, Section 15301, Existing Facilities, and requests approval for Conditional Use Permit PEN17-0048, subject to the attached Conditions of Approval included as Exhibit A. The representative, Mr. Melvin Evitt, is present tonight to answer any questions that may arise from the Planning Commission. Thank you.

21 22 23

1

2

3 4

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

CHAIR BARNES – Thank you very much. Would the Applicant like to make a presentation?

242526

27

28 29

30

31

32

33

3435

36

3738

39

40

SPEAKER MELVIN EVITT - Good evening. My name is Melvin Evitt. Also, known as Nick Evitt. I reside at 5905 Glen Cliff Drive in Jurupa Valley. I have been a real estate business broker for quite a number of years, and I've been to Moreno Valley over the years, and they have been very cooperative with what I have been requesting. The client is a very small operation, and they are requesting that they be allowed to sell beer and wine in their store to accomplish and complement their sales in meat, produce, and groceries. They are not asking to...they'll even specify they don't even require singles. They would just like to have prepackaged from the manufacturer. There is going to be a limited space. They don't have a large space so they are respectfully requesting that you allow them to have the sale of beer and wine. And, while we're talking about this, ABC requires a PCN letter, a public convenience necessity letter, either by the...in this case, I believe the police department is the one that authorizes that or, if they would make comment, that they will make no decision that ABC can issue the license with your approval and, until then, we're on a hold, so are there any questions I can answer for you?

41 42

VICE CHAIR KORZEC – Can you explain what prepackaged is?

sales of any size.		6-pack or a 12 ounce, no 20 o		
prepackaged items	from the manufac	cturer.		
VICE CHAIR KOR you're talking abou		about wine? Like	e wine coolers?	' Is that what
SPEAKER MELV couldyou could e other words, you going to have any thana little less th	eliminate the size don't have a sma of that. The wi	of the containers all, easy single-sine will consist	s of the wine a shot package. of the 750 mL	t 750 mL. In We are not , a little less
COMMISSIONER	<u>SIMS</u> – I have a q	uestion.		
CHAIR BARNES -	- Commissioner S	ms, go ahead.		
COMMISSIONER ifyeah there it is.		etchit is on p	acket page 63	, I don't know
SPEAKER MELVI	N EVITT – I see it.	Go ahead.		
COMMISSIONER : right in front of the That looks like it is	e restroom for this	s property. So,	• .	•
SPEAKER MELVI for you?	N EVITT – (blank	air for several s	econds) Does	that clarify it
COMMISSIONER like the refrigerator	. ,	·	though, would	tend to look
SPEAKER MELVI	N EVITT – No.			
COMMISSIONER	SIMS – To the res	troom.		

<u>PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER</u> – It would have to be by our Building Code and existing requirements, and the width of the aisles would have to be checked. We did not...actually let me ask Sergio. Sergio did you visit the site to see if the entire interior of this place already has the shelving as described?

COMMISSIONER SIMS - And I would assume that would...it would be placed

 per Code, whatever building...

CASE PLANNER SERGIO GUTIERREZ – I did make a site visit. Unfortunately, I did not go inside the convenience store. I mainly checked the exterior and did a walk around the project site as far as the outside. I did not go inside to check on the shelving as mentioned.

4 5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

1

2

3

PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER - Okay, so in terms of changing out the equipment to put in a new refrigerator, they would have to obtain the appropriate business...I mean building permit, there would be an inspection done, and the inspection would be to verify that it was installed correctly and that it also maintains all the exiting requirements and would provide access to the restroom. So we have some assurances that that could be accommodated, and we can pass that information onto our building department if that is a concern of the Commission that you would like us to emphasize. Thank you.

13 14 15

CHAIR BARNES – Commissioner Baker.

16 17

18 19

20

21

COMMISSIONER BAKER – I did visit the site and visited, I think, the manager or the owner, and I think where they're going to put this...it seemed like to me...I mean, it didn't measure anything out, but it seemed like it would work. And, I will say this, this is one of the cleanest markets I've seen in a long time. I mean, it really...he is spic and span, and they, they really do a nice job the way it looks to me, but I'm no expert on markets but, when I went in there, it really looked nice.

22 23 24

25

26

27

28 29

<u>VICE CHAIR KORZEC</u> – You know, you're saying it's prepackaged right now but, when you get this permit, I don't believe the ABC license says it has to be prepackaged. So now you're talking prepackaged but, in a year, you could eliminate that and do the regular bottles of wine and all those things, so I, I understand your approach on this but I don't think that...first, we're just going for the Conditional Use Permit, but I don't think the ABC license requires it to be prepackaged. I think it's your plan for now but will it be your plan in a year?

30 31 32

33 34

35

36

37 38 **SPEAKER MELVIN EVITT** – When the City approves...if and when the City approves this and you put a Condition in there that the beer and wine will be sold as prepackaged items only, that goes directly to ABC, and they'll type up their Conditions accordingly. If they decided after a year they want to change it and try to sell singles, then they have to come back to the City and have to go back to the ABC Board before it is considered. So that's, that's a year down the road before they could even consider it, and they have no desire to sell singles because they don't have room for it.

39 40 41

<u>VICE CHAIR KORZEC</u> – But things do change and you know....

42 43

SPEAKER MELVIN EVITT – Well, that's correct, but you're protected by the Conditional Use Permit that you issue to the City....to ABC, and they will modify and make the Conditions according to however you tell them.

8

45 46

CHAIR BARNES – Can Staff confirm that? Is that true?

1 2 3

4

SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY – Well just to clarify that...right now, as the Conditional Use Permit Conditions are written, there is not a condition that specifies a restriction of a sale of singles.

6 7

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – Okay. Do we know...do we know that what he has presented is accurate that...

8 9 10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29

30 31

32

33 34

35

PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER - If I may, if I may add...the Applicant has had or the applicant's representative had a meeting with our Staff just a little bit earlier before the meeting, and we talked about this particular issue. It has been the position of the Planning Department not to put such a condition on the CUP at this point because that would be a very difficult condition to enforce. If it is the prerogative of the Commission, we can enter that into the Conditions of Approval. I just want to make sure that you understand it is an enforcement issue, and so Chris is correct. With regard to ABC issuing a license, that is a completely separate process from the approval of the Conditional Use Permit, so tonight what we have before you is a recommendation from the Staff to approve the Conditional Use Permit. That Conditional Use Permit basically is a prerequisite for them to sell the alcohol at the site. It does not remove the necessity for them to get an appropriate license through the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board. If the Alcohol Beverage Control Board is not yet prepared to issue a license, I just want to point out for the Commission, for the CUP that you approve tonight, if you did go that route, it is good for 36 months. So they would have up to 36 months to work out any of their issues with ABC to get the license, and there are also opportunities, if for whatever reason they weren't able to work out those issues within 36 months. then the Applicant can always request an extension of time on their applications, and we do have provisions in the Code to extend the time. I know that doesn't necessarily give the Applicant some assurance that they are ready to go, but we can't force the determination of Alcoholic Beverage Control Board. He is absolutely correct that, right now, our process here at the City is, if ABC needs a letter stating that there is a public necessity or convenience that can override ABC's concerns with an oversaturated market, that determination is made by our police department. And so he has stated the process correctly.

36 37 38

CHAIR BARNES – Okay. Does that answer your question?

39 40

41

42

43

<u>VICE CHAIR KORZEC</u> – Yeah. I have another question. I looked at the chart, and I've actually gone...I go down that street all the time. I go to Dollar General. There's a lot of people out there selling alcohol in that neighborhood. What makes this market think that they are going to have a competitive edge over the liquor store, over the other places along that strip that are selling alcohol?

SPEAKER MELVIN EVITT – They are not in there for competition. They are in there to service their customers conveniently when they come in to buy the meat for the barbecues, their produce, and their groceries and they would like to buy a 6-pack or a 12-pack and take it home. We're not in there to compete against them. We're providing a community service for the customers. That's what the purpose is behind this and there are...there are others licensed in the area. Yes, they do have those, but they don't have groceries. The 7-11 doesn't have meat. The 99 Cent Store doesn't have the same thing. This is a public convenience for the customers, and that's what we're trying to do.

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – Thank you. Any other questions of the Applicant? I have one the...thank you very much. I have a question on Condition P10, the outdoor trash receptacle. Is that just a trash can or a trash enclosure?

<u>PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER</u> – Mr. Chairman can I ask...this does require a Public Hearing, so I was wondering if your questions would be better if there are any Public Comments on...if you would like to open the Public Hearing first before we go into conditions...the questions on the conditions.

CHAIR BARNES – Okay.

<u>PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER</u> – I was just thinking that might be a...just to close out the Public Hearing process.

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – Happy to do that. Alright, at this time I would like to open the Public Hearing. Do we have any speakers?

<u>ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT ERICA TADEO</u> – We do, just one. Rafael Brugueras.

CHAIR BARNES – Mr. Brugueras.

SPEAKER RAFAEL BRUGUERAS — Good evening Chair, Vice-Chair, Commissioners, Staff, and our guests. I want to thank Vice Chair Korzec for the questions of how we all together collectively want to protect our city and make sure that all the rules are in place, and this is a unique store because not every store wants to serve you packages only. They want you to buy single bottles and everything around this particular store is going to sell you single bottles but, this store, they are either going to sell you a 4-pack, 12-pack or something larger. Now, he made a good point because many of us that shop in the supermarket, especially when we buy meats on sale and we get this urge to drink a wine with it, we buy this wine at the supermarket level or at Costco, so we do get service from these types of stores. Now, this is what this little store is going to do also; have a service for customers that decide at that moment that they want to buy a wine, a cooler, or a 6-pack, and that's it. No single bottles, nothing like that. So we're not going to have a lot of traffic with a lot of people going in and buying

single bottles like they do at 7-11 or at the gas stations. We know that for a fact. So this makes the store a little unique. The other thing what I like about it is that they are trying to stay in the City of Moreno Valley and do business without closing up, and I know if you went like she does, she shops at Dollar Tree, and I know the neighborhood very well. This little store is among a jungle of big stores, so they are not in competition with the big stores like you mentioned. They are just trying to stay alive, stay in business, and serve the public. That's about it. So I'm hoping that it does get approved, but I do appreciate her for coming up with these questions to make sure that whatever happens that they stick to the rules that they don't open up those packages in the future and, if they do, there are conditions for them to come back to us or the ABC to let them know what they want to do. I like what the Staff just said, and I love her question, and I hope it gets approved so we can have them stay and serve our city as they have been doing for however long, but we want them to stay in our city. Thank you so much.

CHAIR BARNES – Thank you Mr. Brugueras. Any other speakers?

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT ERICA TADEO – No.

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – Alright. I will now ask if the Applicant would like to respond to anything he just heard?

SPEAKER MELVIN EVITT – Sure. Again, thank you for letting me speak. I do...would like to clarify about the PCN, the public convenience necessity letter, which will be coming from the police department, and the police department, to my understanding, have sent a letter to the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control stating it is up to ABC to make the determination and, according to Rich at the ABC Office, the supervisor there, he says we have to have something from the police department either saying...either denying it altogether or they have no objection or their decision is not to or make no decision on the license. That's all they ask. That is asked of the police department to make a statement to say they have no decision on the issue of the license. Thank you.

CHAIR BARNES – Thank you very much. Yes....

<u>PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER</u> – Mr. Chairman, if I could just add...I did look through the process that ABC has and, if a city's police department, in this case is supposed to make a...or was asked to make a determination, if that determination is not made within the 90-day period of time, in the absence of that determination, then the ABC Board takes over the making the decision on their own. So it seems like it would be a timely process if the...if the police department was to put something on the record, but that is not the only requirement. So, if the police department does not make a decision or there is a 90-day period that passes, then ABC has some rights that they have.

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – Thank you. Alright, having no other public speakers, we will close the Public Hearing and do we have any comments or questions of Staff?

<u>VICE CHAIR KORZEC</u> – I'm confused because, in the paperwork that we have, it says the Moreno Valley Police Department does not support the additional license in it. When did this change and is there anybody here from the police department because, reading this, they are worried about the oversaturation that I am. I go to that neighborhood several times a month. I come from Steer N' Stein. I stop there, and I shop. At night, there is a change in that neighborhood, and there are a lot of people hanging out that obviously are drunk or....I don't even want to shed my opinion of what it is but, in that neighborhood at night, there are a lot of people hanging out that look a little unseemly. This says that the police department doesn't support this and now I'm hearing that the police might write a letter, so can someone clarify that for me?

<u>SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY</u> – Well, at this point, the police department has not written a letter. They were...had indicated they might be here to answer questions tonight. Unfortunately, they are not able to be here apparently. I think the Staff Report pretty well described the whole scenario with regard to oversaturation, what that means, and the police department's position on that...that's pretty much the status.

<u>VICE CHAIR KORZEC</u> – But don't really know if they are going to write the letter or not.

SENIOR PLANNER CHRIS ORMSBY – At this point, that is correct.

<u>VICE CHAIR KORZEC</u> – That's all...yeah. I'm going by what's here. That was official, and I know people say things, but I don't know if that would happen. I do have that same concern, oversaturation. I have nothing against this market. It's a lovely business but, when you have so many people selling alcohol in a neighborhood and if the police are concerned about, perhaps increase in a crime rate, then I think to protect the citizens I don't know if we should consider this and that's all that I'm saying by what is put in front of us from the police department.

PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER — If I may try and provide a little clarification on why the Staff Report says something, and it sounds like we're saying something different. It may just be a matter of semantics in terms of referencing something as a letter that is going to be written. It is my understanding in talking with the Staff, and I know directly in talking with the police department a couple of weeks back that the police department had made a determination that they did not want to issue a determination for a public necessity and convenience. That's what it reflected in your Staff Report. If there is ongoing discussions with the police department, that can be the case, and the applicant may be working with the police department to try and get that letter that

they are trying to seek, and that is a process that can continue. What I was trying to describe earlier is, if the Commission was to move forward and take an action on the Conditional Use Permit this evening, they cannot begin to sell alcohol at that store until they secure the license through ABC Board. They would have up to 3 years with the granting of this approval. They would still have an active CUP. In the absence of a CUP, they could not go to ABC to get a license to sell alcohol because then they would be in violation of our Municipal Code, which requires them to have the Conditional Use Permit to allow that to happen, so the CUP is a prerequisite for them to sell alcohol in any way. It is a governing law here in the city because of the proximity of the store to residential.

10 11 12

1

2

3

6 7

8 9

CHAIR BARNES – Thank you. Commissioner Sims.

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

COMMISSIONER SIMS – Yeah, when I read through this report, I struggled a little bit about that because, you know, the police, I would have deference to their opinion on this and that but at the end of...what gives me some...what it sounds like is, is they have not issued...if the police department has to provide something to ABC if this goes through and gets a CUP and ABC permit is applied for, then the police will have another bite at the apple to decide if they either want to...it sounds like they can be...deny it, affirmatively deny it, or they could affirm it and say, okay, we're good with it or they just say, uh, there is just no difference, and they stand down. So I'm okay with that. I guess, for me, it comes down to do we think this as a Planning Commission, do we think that this is a proper Conditional Use for this business? I tend to think in my thought process, I think it's okay. Mainly the fact that, and I did not go past the store, but I go to one of the restaurants there guite often, and there is some, even early Sunday morning, you can see some people hanging out at the liquor store on the north side of that that you go, hmm, what are they doing there? But they are going to get their singles to recover from Saturday or to keep the party going or whatever, so but a business like this is a business that is catering to groceries and, you know, meat market and so forth. I get the convenience part of it, to buy a 6-pack or 12-pack or something and take it home to your little barbecue. That is different than going to sell distilled and pints and singles, you know, tall cans and stuff like that. Not saying that it won't happen later. That sounds like there is a way for them to adjust their....well Commissioner Baker said that this guy is running a clean shop. He is not going to want the single traffic, the guys that are buying single traffic, to come and dirty up his store. He doesn't want that in his business.

373839

CHAIR BARNES – Thank you, Commissioner Sims.

40 41

42

43 44

45

46

<u>COMMISSIONER BAKER</u> – And he really did express that to me. Looking at the list here of the...there's only three stores right in that general area on this Census Tract 425.21. It's the Dollar General and then you've got the Circle K and, what's the other one on Perris Boulevard, there's the, I guess, that Valley Liquor. So that's the three in the general vicinity. The rest of these, I don't know how big this block is, but it goes all the way over to Alessandro. The rest of them are on

Alessandro, which have nothing to do with this location, but I think I could support this the way it stands. I think in the given situation where they are going to sell it with groceries and not sell the singles, and he really spelled that out. They don't want to mess with the single business, and I was there at the night part too. I stopped in and, not to discredit what you said, but I didn't see anything going on around that store. Maybe it was the night I was there but, in the day part, it was very good.

VICE CHAIR KORZEC – Yeah, the day part is fine.

COMMISSIONER BAKER – Very good. Okay.

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – Rick, I think you've probably answered this, but clarify to me if this is approved and the police department then writes a letter of opposition, if they take a position in opposition to this, what are ABC's options?

<u>PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER</u> – It's my understanding that ABC would take the determination from the local jurisdiction into consideration when they are going to make their determination on their license. Are they going to issue a license if they have that determination? It's probably less likely that they would, but I am not sure that they are precluded from doing that.

CHAIR BARNES – It's not an absolute.

PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER – I'd have to defer to ABC on that but our assurance in the CUP, if you turn to page 60 of the document, the reason we're comfortable as a Staff recommending this, is that Condition BD-12, which is the second to last condition on page 60, is indicating that Alcohol Beverage Control of the State of California approval will be required for alcohol licenses in the area. No alcohol beverage sales can commence until a Type 20 Alcohol License is secured, and the license must remain valid at all times. That's the assurance we have in here, so long as they want to continue to work with ABC and even in the event that the police department doesn't give them what they want, it is my understanding they can continue to work with ABC until ABC is comfortable issuing the license. If they can bring more compelling arguments to our police department over the course of that negotiation to the point where our police department is comfortable making a different determination, if they had issued some sort of determination to them already, I think that is still an option out there. I'm saying the doors not shut I guess.

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – I was just curious how much weight the police department recommendation carried with ABC. It's not an absolute.

<u>PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER</u> – I don't know that it's an absolute. I don't want to say that it's not important. I think that it is an important consideration of ABC. I think that is a fair statement to make.

1	
2	

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – It seems that it should be, but I was just curious. Okay. Anything else? Alright. Well, with no further comments, would anyone like to make a motion?

COMMISSIONER SIMS – I'll make a motion.

CHAIR BARNES – Commissioner Sims.

<u>COMMISSIONER SIMS</u> – I would like to make a motion that the Planning Commission approve Resolution No. 2017-30 and certify that this item is exempt from the provisions of CEQA as a Class I Categorical Exemption and (2) approve PEN17-0048, the Conditional Use Permit, subject to the attached Conditions of Approval included as Exhibit A to the Staff Report.

COMMISSIONER BAKER – I'll second that.

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – A motion from Commissioner Sims and a second from Commissioner Baker. Let me see if I can get the electronic wizardry to....Commissioner Sims, would you hit the mover button and Commissioner Baker can you hit the second? Again. One more time. There we go.

COMMISSIONER BAKER – Got it.

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – Alright, please vote; the rest of us. Alright, the...is somebody missing? Alright, what am I doing wrong? Oh, all votes have been cast. Sorry, operator error. I'm the Chair. Alright, three votes in favor, one opposed. The motion carries. Thank you. Closing remarks from...

Opposed – 1

Motion carries 3 - 1

 PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER – The item that you have just taken an action on is an appealable action. If any interested party would like to file an appeal on this item, they can direct their appeal through the Director of Community Development to the City Council, and we would work with the City Clerk to put it on an Agenda for the City Council within 30 days. They have 15 days to file that appeal.

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – Alright, thank you very much. Alright, moving onto Case No. 2, PEN17-0091. The Applicant is RSI Communities, and the request is for a Variance. Staff Report?

1		
2		
3		
4		
5	2. Casa:	DENIA 7 0004
6 7	2. Case:	PEN17-0091
8	Applicant:	RSI Communities, LLC.
9	Applicant.	Nor Communico, ELC.
10	Owner:	RSI Communities, LLC.
11		
12	Representative:	Rola Nicasio
13		
14	Location:	15436 El Braso Drive
15 16	Case Planner:	Mayra Salas and Joff Pradahaw
17	Case Planner.	Mayra Salas and Jeff Bradshaw
18	Council District:	4
19		·
20	Proposal:	PEN17-0091
21	·	
22		
23		

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission **APPROVE** Resolution No. 2017-31, and thereby:

 CERTIFY that the project is exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act in that it can be determined with certainty that there is no possibility that the variance application could have a significant effect on the environment and is therefore exempt under the general rule exemption Section 15061 (b)(3) of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines; and

2. **APPROVE** Variance application PEN17-0091 based on the findings contained in this resolution.

ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW – Thank you. Good evening, Chair Barnes and Members of the Planning Commission. My name is Jeff Bradshaw. I'm an Associate Planner with the Planning Division, and the application before you this evening is a request for a Variance. The applicant, RSI Communities, is requesting the Planning's consideration in the reduction of the street-side

setback for lot 48 of tract 22180-2 and, if you look at the Location Map on the screen, this is a Recorded Map that is located on the northwest corner of Jensen and Perris Boulevard. The lot is located interior to the tract and it is a....the lot itself is a site that is vacant. It is flat and has been graded in the past. Areas surrounding this particular location have comparable zoning. The zoning is R5 in surrounding neighborhoods with some smaller-sized lots to the west that are zoned RS10. There is an approved Planned Unit Development across the street to the southwest that the Planning Commission approved recently called Legacy Park and then, directly south, is the approved Walmart site that was also presented to the Planning Commission within the last couple years. The specific request is for a reduction in the street-side setback for lot 48. The size of the lot is 0.14 of an acre. It is zoned R5 currently, and the request would allow for reduction from the city's street-side setback standard of 15 feet to 11.9 feet. The tract 22180-2 is a recorded phase of a Tentative Map that was approved prior to City Incorporation, so this is a map...the original tentative was approved in April of 1990 and, shortly after that, the map was recorded, so the design of this map and the adjoining 22180-3 to the west were approved under a County Standard, and it makes some of the lot sizes a little bit smaller than the current standard. So, in this case, lot 48 is 61 feet in width. The current standard for the R5 zone is 70 feet. The City Staff worked with the developer to see if we could come up with any number of solutions to this challenge of siting a home on a narrow lot, a corner lot. There is approved housing product for tract 22180-3 to the west, which is also being developed by the Applicant. That same housing product was also approved for this tract 22180-2, and we worked with them. We considered every footprint that they had. We looked at combinations of setbacks and just were not successful in coming up with a solution that would work and that brings us here this evening with the request for the Variance. In the Staff Report, there are some specific references to the City's requirements for a Variance, and I wanted to read those into the record as part of the presentation. It reads, as provided for in Section 9.02.100 of the Municipal Code, the purpose of a Variance is to provide for equity in the use of property and to prevent unnecessary hardships that might result from a strict or literal interpretation in enforcement of certain regulations. The authority to grant Variances is vested with the Planning Commission and requires a Public Hearing. Variances can be granted with respect to Development Standards, which would include street-sidevard setbacks, which is what is being requested by the Applicant. In this case, the strict interpretation of the Code would result in an unnecessary hardship because of the unique circumstances that apply to lot 48 and this tract. Again, this map was recorded in October of 1990, prior to the adoption of our current Code. It is designed with a lot width that is substandard to the current Code. All other setbacks for lot 48 have been satisfied, so they have selected the smallest housing, the smallest product, the smallest floor plan that they have in the approved homes that the City approved for them and all of their setbacks can be met, except for the street side yard setback. Lot 48 would be the only lot within either this tract or the adjacent tract 22180-3, which is also being developed by RSI that would require the Variance. In terms of the environmental for the

1

2

3

4

6 7

8

9 10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

2425

26 27

28 29

30

31

32

3334

35

36

3738

39

40

41

42

43 44

45

project, there was an environmental assessment that was prepared previously for this original project, a Negative Declaration for the Tract Map rather. A Negative Declaration was adopted for Tract Map 22180 on April 10, 1990. Over time, the site has been disturbed through grading and other construction activities and, considering the site conditions and the request for the Variance, the minor change that would be requested by that Variance, Staff has reviewed this project in light of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines and determined that this project does not have the potential to cause a significant impact on the environment and therefore qualifies for a General Rule Exemption as provided for in Section 15061 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines. Standard notification was completed for this project. The site was posted. The notification of the Public Hearing was also published in the local paper and notices sent to all property owners within 300 feet of the site. As of this evening, I did not receive any inquiries about tonight's Public Hearing or questions about the Variance. With that, Staff would recommend the Planning Commission approve Resolution 2017-31 certifying that the project is exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act and approving Variance Application PEN17-0091 based on the findings contained in the Resolution. That concludes my report.

19 20 21

1

2

3

6 7

8

9 10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – Thank you, Jeff. Is the Applicant present and wishing to make a statement?

222324

<u>ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW</u> – I don't believe the Applicant was able to make it this evening.

252627

CHAIR BARNES – Okay, any questions from the Commissioners?

28 29

<u>COMMISSIONER SIMS</u> – I do have one. On the interior lots on the R5 Zone, it looks like you have five on one side. Is there...what...if it's an interior lot, is the other side five and would... is the other side larger?

31 32 33

3435

30

<u>ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW</u> – The standard is a combined 15 feet for interior lots, so you could go as small as five feet on one side as long as you had 10 feet of setback on the other, and then it can be any other combination as long as you have a minimum of at least five feet on the one side.

36 37 38

COMMISSIONER SIMS – So this one will have 60.9, or something like that, is what we're looking at there?

39 40 41

42

ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW – So, for corner lots, they would need to meet the minimum of five feet and typically would have to meet the full 15 feet, and they are not able to do that here in this case but, yes, you're correct in terms of the combined setbacks.

<u>COMMISSIONER SIMS</u> – So I guess my p similar	point	on	this	is	it's	going	to	look
ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW -	- Yeal	h						

COMMISSIONER SIMS – Along, along the streetscape to the other lots?

<u>ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW</u> – That is something we also looked at, in terms of placement of the wall and the street view and the parkway dimension between the wall and the corner...and the sidewalk, will all look the same as any of the other homes along the frontage.

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – Was the wall pulled back to five feet because there's a slope between the pad and right-of-way or was that an effort to mitigate the Variance?

<u>ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW</u> – No. I think the placement of the wall is where the wall always would have been. If this was a 70-foot-wide lot, I think the wall ends up placed....I don't know if I'm answering your question Chair Barnes. I apologize.

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – Well normally, without a slope, they would put the wall along the right-of-way to maximize the courtyard space.

ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW – For corner lots, typically they wouldn't have it right on the property line. There would be some width between the right-of-way and the wall to allow for street trees and so this, this dimension of five or six feet is pretty standard for corner lots and the placement of the wall.

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – Oh, okay. Alright, and then I think there's like nine other corner lots. Those are all wider than 48, huh?

<u>ASSOCIATE PLANNER JEFF BRADSHAW</u> – This is the only lot between tract 22180-2, in which lot 48 is located and the adjoining tract that was also recorded at the same time that requires the Variance.

CHAIR BARNES – Right, okay, alright. Any other questions?

<u>PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER</u> – Just one other comment about the placement of the fence. At a corner lot, the other thing that is being taken into consideration is the site distance, so the wall also has to be pulled back and over to allow for the site distance from El Braso Drive in this particular location looking in the direction where the wall would be so.....

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – Alright, thank you. Well, having no public speakers. Oh, I'm sorry....

- **ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT ERICA TADEO** Actually, we do have one.
- **CHAIR BARNES** We do have a public speaker, yeah.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT ERICA TADEO – Yes.

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – We don't have the Applicant. Alright, so, at this time, I will open the Public Hearing.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT ERICA TADEO – Rafael Brugueras.

SPEAKER RAFAEL BRUGUERAS — Good evening, Chair, Vice Chair, Commissioners, Staff, and Guests. I'm glad that it took a little while to call me up because I got to hear a lot more of the project, so that was good. So there is a solution to the problem and it is unnoticeable, as Mr. Sims mentioned, as it all gets done and all the trees get put in and the grass goes down and the bush. It's just going to be a smaller lot. For some people, it will be a little small. I went by there because I wanted to see how the City's growing on that side in District 4. To know that the Walmart will go up one day, that more houses will be around the school. I heard the year here, 1990. Wow, 27 years. Please don't let another 27 years be empty on that little corner. We want to fill it up with a house at least. Somebody will be happy not to have a lot to clean or something, but I was happy to go by because I got to see of all the approvals and other things that we're doing in the City of Moreno Valley. Please, let's move on. Accept it. It's a small change, and it will finish out the project. Thank you.

CHAIR BARNES – Thank you, Mr. Brugueras. No other public speakers?

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT ERICA TADEO - No.

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – Alright, I'll close the Public Hearing. Now, any deliberation or comments or possibly a motion? Oh, I'm sorry. I'm lost tonight. I can't get there. Alright, do you want to make a motion?

<u>COMMISSIONER BAKER</u> – Whatever you want.

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – Proceed. I haven't done anything else right tonight, so I better not make a motion.

 <u>COMMISSIONER BAKER</u> – Okay, the Planning Commission hereby approves Resolution, let me make sure, Resolution No. 2017-31 and thereby certifies that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act in that it can be determined with certainty that there is no possibility the Variance Application could have a significant effect on the environment and therefore exempt under Section 15061(b)(3).

	ARNES – We have a motion from Commissioner Baker, a second from ioner Korzec. The rest of us, please vote. The motion carries 4-0. Do
	a Staff wrap-up?
Opposed	- 0
Motion c	arries 4 – 0
PI ANNIN	IG OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER – Yes. The decision of the Planning
Commiss like to file be directe Council.	cion this evening is an appealable action. If any interested party would an appeal, they have 15 days to make an appeal. The appeal should an writing through the Director of Community Development to the City If we do receive an appeal, we will be working with the City Clerk to put Agenda for the City Council within 30 days.
CHAIR B	ARNES – Thank you, Mr. Sandzimier.
OTHER (COMMISSION BUSINESS
PLANNIN	NG COMMISSIONER COMMENTS
	BARNES – Well, that being the closing case, do we have any closing s from the Commissioners?
VICE CH	AIR KORZEC – I do.
CHAIR B	ARNES – Commissioner Korzec.
	AIR KORZEC – I want to wish Mr. Sims a happy birthday. We were to wear crazy hats tonight, and we all left them at home.
CHAIR B	ARNES – That's right. That was actually in the Minutes.
VICE CH celebrate	AIR KORZEC – So, happy birthday. You still have time to go out and
	SIONER SIMS – I'm happy to have lived another year. I'm looking many more.

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – We're happy that you could spend it with us, so thank you Commissioner Sims. Alright, anything else?

STAFF COMMENTS

<u>CHAIR BARNES</u> – Well, thank you everyone. Thank you, Staff, for your support and your assistance.

PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER – I have a Staff comment, if I may.

CHAIR BARNES – Please.

PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER – I just want to let the Commission know we do have budget for the Planning Commission to provide for some training opportunities from time to time. I don't have a robust budget. We can't send you guys to everything but it just came to mind that we just recently had a small event, the State of the City, which is also something that we can use some of our budget to send some of you to, if you'd like to go. So, if you ever see anything that comes up and you have a question to see if it is something that would be eligible, don't hesitate to give me a call. We'll try and work with you to get you the training that you need. We obviously budget some of the money to try and send some of the Planning Commissioners to the Planning Commission Academy that is put on by the League of California Cities, so that is part of what that budget is for, but there is a little bit in there for some little things here and there, so just wanted to let you know that.

CHAIR BARNES – Thank you, I appreciate that. Anything else?

<u>COMMISSIONER BAKER</u> – You know, I had one question here. Rick got...you know, when we post these locations....there is one over on Elsworth there next to Cactus, that sign has never been removed. Is that part of our contract with those guys or do you need to know about that? I can shoot you an email if you want to know about them?

<u>PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER</u> – If you see a sign that's out there after the case has already been heard…

COMMISSIONER BAKER – Yeah.

<u>PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK SANDZIMIER</u> – Bring it to my attention. I would like our sign contractor to be removing those. We have talked to them about that on projects in the past. Some of the push back they have given us is that they like to take those signs and then relocate them to the next...they repurpose

	, well, with that, thank you very much. We are
PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK	larly-scheduled meeting of SANDZIMIER – September 28 th I believe. Der 28, 2017? Is that correct?
PLANNING OFFICIAL RICK	<u> SANDZIMIER</u> – Yeah.
	<u>SANDZIMIER</u> – Yeah. September 28, 2017. We will see you then. Thank
CHAIR BARNES – Alright, syou very much. NEXT MEETING Next Meeting: Planning Co	September 28, 2017. We will see you then. Thank mmission Regular Meeting, September 28, 2017, at Valley, City Hall Council Chamber, 14177 Frederick

1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7		_		
8	Jeffrey Barnes Chair		Date	
9	Chair			
10				