

**LAKESIDE COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP
SPECIAL MEETING
MINUTES
April 18, 2012**

Members present: W. Allen, M. Baker, G. Barnard, J. Brust, J. Bugbee, L. Carlson, R. Clegg, L. Cyphert, M. Cyphert, G. Inverso, T. Medvitz, P. Sprecco

Members excused: B. Turner, C. Enniss, L. Strom.

Members absent: None

Community Present: 40

1. Call to Order 7:15 pm

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approval of minutes: April 2, 2012. Motion to approve made by G. Barnard; Seconded by J. Bugbee. Motion passed 10-0-2-3; L. Carlson, J. Brust abstained.

4. Administrative Items/Announcements:

A. Announcement that trails committee will be meeting on May 2, 2012 at 6:15 pm immediately preceding the regularly scheduled planning group meeting.

5. Open Forum:

A. None.

6. Public Hearing:

A. Presentation/Discussion Items

1. None

B. Proposed Privately Initiated Action.

1. General Plan Property Specific Request LS7A –Reconsideration of the General Plan Update Property Specific Request LS7A regarding rezoning in Moreno Valley, which was voted on and unanimously supported at the March 2012 planning group meeting. Based on additional clarifying information received from the County, the planning group considered if the issue should be reheard. Prior to any discussion, G. Barnard recused himself noting that although he no longer works for Enniss, he has very close friends who work at Enniss, and he owns a feed store with customers who are impacted by this decision, and therefore he recused himself due to a potential conflict of interest. Subsequent to the announcement, G. Barnard immediately vacated the meeting to ensure compliance with the Brown Act. Prior to any hearing on the matter, the Chair requested that G. Shackelford, present the “clarifying information” from the county as he had made the original request for rehearing. G. Shackelford presented a brief summary of the nature of the new information, noting that a central premise to the previous decision was based on the misunderstanding that the agricultural zones had been eliminated by the county, which he stated was not accurate. M. Cyphert made a motion to rehear the item based on the new information as explained by G. Shackelford. P. Sprecco seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously; 11-0-0-4. The Chair requested that the proponent present their request. D. Peitrizal, Heartland Ranch, gave background information on the request, noting that the request was originally made in 2005 as a group of 15 property owners, noting that the LCPG had voted to approve the rezoning request in 2005. He then stated that the county designated an area, known as “Area 41” as a study area for the county to further determine how the new industrial zoning would work. Peitrizal stated that they had been told that after the study was completed, the property owners would be included in the General Plan proposal for the new industrial zoning. However, when the General Plan was presented, they discovered that 5 of the properties had been excluded, in error, from the industrial re-zoning. Per D. Pietrizal, they were then informed that the remedy was for property owners to go back to the LCPG and get approval, and then return to the County for a general plan update. W. Enniss, proponent, stated that there would be a zoning “clean up” to follow even if the zoning is not changed, and unless they are changed to industrial, this could likely impact the animal designator and existing uses. L. Cyphert requested clarification on the existing uses. Uses were described as horse ranch, agriculture, equipment

storage. M. Cyphert asked W. Enniss what use he planned for the property. He stated he would like to be able to do whatever he wanted without code enforcement coming after him. He noted he has a code enforcement matter on his property now. Chairman W. Allen stated that the proponent's properties were only 95 feet away from heavy industrial. W. Enniss stated that he was concerned that A70 would be eliminated when they do the clean up, and now their properties are directly across from heavy industrial. R. Clegg stated that the concept of GP2020 was to clean up things that did not make sense and make things consistent. She stated that in 2005 when the Board previously voted on this issue this item was carefully studied and it was determined that the requested zoning was appropriate because of the radio towers, the mountains and Sparkletts were a buffer. She stated that it does not make good sense to not change these properties to industrial. R. Clegg stated that she believes that it will not greatly impact the residents further down Moreno but would impact the proponents more to not provide consistency with their zoning. M. Baker requested information regarding the zoning prior to 2005. W. Enniss noted that all the properties in the study area had the same zoning in 2000. The Chair then opened the floor to the community attendees to comment. Speakers were asked to complete speaker slips and were allotted two minutes each to provide comment. G. Shackelford addressed points he noted as "technical points" and expressed that he thought that the argument that a horse ranch would be safer from a clean up under Industrial zoning then it would be under the RS4 zoning is not a likely scenario. He also noted that there are plans to build a channel on the west side of Moreno Valley which would increase the buffer zone for those properties. K. Weatherson, who is one of the property owners in this study area stated that he owns 1/3 of the land in that area, and that they have always been agricultural, and they do not want creep of industrialization down Vigilante Rd. He stated that his property should be the buffer zone, and that there is residential zoning right next to M-54, and stated that they are not an island, but a peninsula. Meyers testified that he does not want Moreno to become another Vigilante Rd and is concerned with truck traffic. Meyers stated that he is a resident of San Diego and owns a property on Mid Ranch Rd. A. Weatherson testified and agreed with comments made by Meyers. S. Johnson, who is a resident of Moreno valley, stated that she moved to the community where she could ride horses down the street, and where children could ride bikes, and that this would take this away. S. Gwyer stated that she was burned out in 2003, and that she grew up in this neighborhood. Recalls growing up and playing and riding bikes on Vigilante, and wants to keep it the same for her kids. A. Frizzel stated that she owns property right across from radio the towers. She noted that Vigilante has street lights on every corner and that Moreno has zero street lights. She stated that you can see the stars, hear owls and coyotes and it will not stay that way if it becomes industrial. L. Nickerson, who is a horse property owner, stated that real estate values will be negatively impacted. She stated that she bought in 2004, and that her heart goes out to Heartland Ranch as the property across the street looks like a DMZ zone. She stated that if it turned more industrial it will have an even greater impact on property values. K. Ensall from Moreno Valley stated that she lives 5 houses down from proposed rezoning. She stated that she would not have bought if industrialized, and she wants to be able to someday ride her horse to the proposed horse staging area by San Vicente Rd. M. Evans stated that he believes that property regulations are important and that there are zoning restrictions because property owners would otherwise do whatever they wanted, even with disregard for their neighbors, so he believes that regulations are important. He stated that more industry coming into the valley is wrong, and cannot support rezoning even if may have been left out wrongly. G. Shackelford noted that in discussions there has been comment as to how far away speakers are from the property, and that there has been testimony from property owners that are in this zone with zero distance from it. He stated that Design Review has not done a good job at ensuring a high quality to make sure that the area is what it should be. R. Clegg suggested to G. Shackelford that he be careful because his wife served on design review and that he was wrong. L. Carlson responded to the earlier comment regarding traffic on Moreno, stating that the San Vicente dam is bringing the trucks down Vigilante and that if the trucks go to Enniss they get kicked out. J. Bugbee stated that she talked to the county and they stated they have no issue with making this industrial from a land use perspective. T. Medvitz stated that at times the planning group's hands are tied, noting that this area has already been zoned industrial. A call for a motion was made. L. Cyphert made a motion to oppose the industrial zoning. M. Cyphert seconded the motion. M. Cyphert stated that he believes that proper mitigation of the existing industrial properties needs to occur first before approval for new industrial can be made. He stated he is not against industry or growth, but believes that in this area it needs to be more well planned with proper mitigation and consideration of

impacts on the community. R. Clegg stated that any types of mitigation from any type of change of use would come forward as a project, ex: minor use permit, major use permit but and mitigation etc. would happen at that time. If the proponents continued their use today there is no need for mitigation.

A vote on the motion was held. Motion failed. 2-9-0-4; L. Cyphert and M. Cyphert voted to support the motion. M. Baker made a motion to decline the reconsideration of the board's previous vote. L. Carlson seconded the motion. G. Shackelford requested clarification on the motion. R. Clegg clarified that this motion would reconfirm the motion of support for the rezoning that was voted on at the previous meeting. Motion passed 8-2-1-4. M. Cyphert and L Cyphert oppose. P. Sprecco abstained.

8. Adjournment 8:55 pm

Laura Cyphert

Vice Chair and Secretary, LCPG

Email: LakesideCPG@gmail.com

Phone: (o) 858-627-1426