

# CITY OF PERRIS

*MINUTES:* Special City Council Meeting  
*Date of Meeting:* 03 April, 2002  
*Time of Meeting:* 6:00 p.m.  
*Place of Meeting:* City Council Chamber-City Hall

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

*6:05 p.m. Called to Order*

**2. ROLL CALL:**

Council Members Present: Yarbrough, Landers, Motte, Rogers, Busch

*All Present*

Staff Members Present: City Manager Vasquez, Assistant City Manager Apodaca, City Attorney Dunn, Community Director Gutierrez, Finance Director Rogers-Elmore, City Engineer Motlagh, Community Services Director Owens, Police Chief Kestell, Fire Chief Williams and City Clerk Rey.

**3. INVOCATION:**

*Mayor Pro Tem Rogers Led the Pledge*

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**5. NEW BUSINESS:**

City Council interviews of applicants for the Perris Planning Commission, followed by consideration and appointment of Commission Members as deemed appropriate by the City Council.

*Planning Commissioners:  
Mr. Hammond – 4 Year  
Mr. Novison – 4 Year  
Mr. Mitchell – 4 Year  
Mr. Streich – 2 Year  
Mr. Finney – 2 Year  
ALTERNATES:  
Ms. Roseen-Haughney  
Mr. Martin*

**CITY COUNCIL INTERVIEWS AND APPOINTMENTS:**

Mayor Busch requested each applicant present a three-minute presentation to Council.

*Mayor Busch Called for Applicant's Presentations*

Applicant, Joanne Stanzini presentation included: 1) twenty years in Cement Mason trade and member of the Building Trade Council; 2) Employee with the City of Los Angeles/Housing Authority; 3) an apprentice instructor (credential) from the State of California. Reason applied for the Planning Commissioner position was she had education/experience the City could utilize and would be an asset to the City of Perris.

*Applicant, Joanne Stanzini*

Mayor Pro Tem Rogers asked, for all candidates, how familiar they were with planning and zoning issues.

*Mayor Pro Tem Rogers' Familiarity Planning & Zoning Issues Query*

Councilmember Landers asked, for all applicants, if they were ‘pro growth’ and why.

*Councilmember  
Landers’ Pro Growth  
Query*

In response, Ms. Stanzini said she was familiar with some of the zoning codes of the City of Los Angeles and she was to take her Building Inspector test for the City of Los Angeles. In regards to ‘pro growth’, Ms. Stanzini said she had made her living, for twenty years, in the building field of Los Angeles.

*Ms. Stanzini’s  
Response*

Applicant, Mr. Finney’s presentation included: 1) a Perris resident since 1988; 2) truck driver for Emery Worldwide since 1975; 3) Married in 1973 and had two children; four grandchildren; 4) AA Degree in Business Administration; 5) served as a negotiator for Emery Worldwide; 6) installed ceramic tile for twenty-five years; 7) member of Temple Baptist Church. He would like to serve as a commissioner because he had faith in the City of Perris/community; Perris was growing and was going somewhere; and he understood the function of the elected officials and appointed officers.

*Applicant Mr.  
Finney’s Presentation*

Mr. Finney said he was familiar planning/zoning to the extent of involvement with a request for re-zoning to Council. He was ‘pro growth’ because it was the tax base for the City; produced jobs; and change was positive.

Applicant, Mr. Kaus presentation included: 1) degree in Criminal Justice; 2) Perris resident for fifteen years; 3) Perris property owner. In regards to being familiar with planning and zoning, Mr. Kaus said he had developed a small amount of redevelopment in the City (rehabilitation of old houses, apartments and commercial buildings). In regards to knowledge of zoning, Mr. Kaus said Perris was on the verge of industrial growth; and he was ‘pro growth’ because it was inevitable due to March Joint Powers Authority and their major cargo project. There would be the need for roads to be built to accommodate the project and it took a good Planning Commission to look into the future. He would prefer the two-year term in order to reconsider the position of commissioner.

*Applicant Mr. Kaus’  
Presentation*

Applicant, Mr. Hammond presentation included: 1) resident of Perris since 1990; 2) two children; 3) born in the City of Los Angeles; 4) City of Los Angeles employee for eighteen years; 5) a vast experience with city government experience (been employed with the Cities of Compton, Vernon, Cypress and the Santa Ana Courts). Mr. Hammond was ready to be involved with City government; understood Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) regulations; General Plan process; importance of community; and would be proud to be part of the City of Perris. In regards to planning/zoning issues, he was not familiar in detail, but was more familiar with Community Development Block Grants (CDBG); Request for Proposals and Quotes. He was ‘pro growth’ and that would be in conjunction with need for green spaces/belts and parks; providing low/moderate income homes; vibrant middle/working class; and a transportation system.

*Applicant Mr.  
Hammond’s  
Presentation*

Applicant, Mr. Martin said he desired to be a commissioner because, since he had moved to the City of Perris he was active in city government. His experience was service on the Perris Planning Commission; Board of Zoning Adjustment of Perris and Modesto, California; Stanislaus County Manpower Planning Council and Economic Development Council; and EMWD Division 4, Advisory Council. Mr. Martin was ‘pro growth’, but sensible growth; a city must have the infrastructure to support the growth and must be part of the overall aesthetic of the city. In regards to planning/zoning issues, Mr. Martin said he understood the issues due to service on the Perris Planning Commission.

*Applicant Mr.  
Martin’s Presentation*

Applicant, Mr. Mitchell’s presentation included: 1) Perris resident since 1990; 2) BS Degree in Chemical Engineer; 3) served in the military. Mr. Mitchell’s interest in serving as a commissioner was he had been involved in many of the new projects within the City of Perris; worked with the Planning Department for many years; concern for the need of a functioning commission would be beneficial to businesses and community; the City needed to be pro active. If selected it would be the second governmental group that he would be in the initial phase of creating. His experience was: working with Riverside County Hazardous Materials Management Division; worked with major projects; worked with Perris Building Department and Fire Marshal. In reply to planning/zoning issues, Mr. Mitchell said he knew some of the zoning codes and worked closely with Perris’ Planning Department. ‘Pro growth’, Mr. Mitchell said there was no choice in growth and the question was how do we grow.

*Applicant, Mr.  
Mitchell’s  
Presentation*

Applicant, Mr. Novison’s presentation included: 1) Perris citizen since 1984; 2) involved in political activity of various councils; and 3) able to aide in accomplishments. His experience included forty-five years in industry as an engineer; fifteen years in the real estate market; assisted with projects that interfaced with State and Government. In response to planning/zoning issues, Mr. Novison commented on planning of a city was important to circulation, uses; control and enforcement of a master plan of a city. In answer to ‘pro growth’, Mr. Novison said you can not stop growth and Perris needs growth for jobs, improvements, better parks and schools.

*Applicant Mr.  
Novison’s  
Presentation*

Applicant Ms. Roseen-Haughney’s presentation included: 1) resident since 1994; 2) involved in her community May Ranch and the entire City; 3) office manager for her husband’s locksmith business; 4) familiar with the American Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and some building issues. Some of her involvement included: installation of a stop sign at the intersection Evans/Springwood Lane; extension of Evans Road; and KB Home sub-committee for May Farms development. Ms. Roseen-Haugney said familiarity with planning/zoning was the activity with other homeowners and zoning issues; importance of zoning was to develop buffer zones between the different zones. In regards to ‘pro growth’, she was for growth, but in a responsible manner; envisioned an industrial corridor along 215 Freeway; entrance and exit of the City needed to be improved; learn from the past and how to utilize that information to improve the present and future of Perris.

*Applicant Ms.  
Roseen-Haughney’s  
Presentation*

Applicant Ms. Shook said she had been a Perris resident for eight years and during those years she noticed many improvements; wished to see the positive improvements continue; excited about the future of Perris and its many possibilities. As a perspective commissioner she believed she had the skills, interest and desire that would make a positive contribution. She possessed excellent organizational, planning, communication skills and a genuine interest in learning the intricacies of city government. Some of the important issues of the new reformed Planning Commission would be: 1) General Amendment Plan; 2) Downtown Promenade Project; 3) Perris Valley Storm Drain; 4) North end fire station; and 5) Multi-Species Habitat Project. She envisioned Perris as a beautiful harmonious place where people come to do business and become a homeowner. She believed in teamwork to accomplish great tasks and create a Perris that all would like to see in the future. In regards to planning/zoning issues, Ms. Shook was not too familiar, but she had an interest in learning and education was part of that job. Ms. Shook said she was 'pro growth' and as a homeowner she would only benefit from the increase sales of homes and the entry of new businesses. Too quick of birth and poor planning would do more harm than good.

*Applicant Ms.  
Shook's Presentation*

Applicant, Mr. Streich said he was from Wisconsin; broadcaster; experience with management; AA Degree in Public Affairs; Management Analysis for Military Installations; Perris resident since 1992; and employed with the City of Moreno Valley. His desire to serve as a commissioner was due to: take pride in my city; involvement; aid in progress; give back to the city and add a positive voice in the endeavor. In regards to planning/zoning issues, Mr. Streich said he was very limited, but was aware cities were required to have a general plan and the process for approval of development. Mr. Streich said he was 'pro growth'; well thought out growth was the key and support services would need to be in place.

*Applicant Mr.  
Streich's Presentation*

Mayor Busch pointed out a Planning Commission Schedule 2002 that was in the agenda packet. Mayor Busch cited the process of selection and the following agenda:

*Mayor Busch's  
Introduction to  
Selection & Training  
of the Planning  
Commission*

- 1) Selection of commissioner; which had taken place tonight;
- 2) Swearing in ceremony at the first meeting of the election of officers and adoption of the By-Laws; which would be done by City Clerk and a reception in the council chambers;
- 3) Planning Commission training on the Brown Act and Conflict of Interest by the City Attorney Dunn;
- 4) Training in the General Plan; Subdivision/Zoning Ordinances;
- 5) Training in California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA);
- 6) Orientation of all City Department;
- 7) Planning Commission would start hearing cases.

City Attorney Dunn indicated that three of the commissioners' terms were four year terms and two were the two year terms. He suggested the first three that received the majority vote would assume the three full term seats and the other two would assume the two-year seats.

*City Attorney Dunn's  
Recommendation of  
Assuming Seats*

PLANNING COMMISSIONER NOMINATIONS:

Mayor Pro Tem Rogers nominated Mr. Duane Hammond.

*Mayor Pro Tem Rogers  
Nominated Mr.  
Hammond*

Nomination of Mr. Duane Hammond as Planning Commissioner carried by five votes.

*Mr. Hammond  
Nominated for Four Year  
Term-Planning  
Commission  
Vote: 5-0*

AYES: Yarbrough, Landers, Motte, Rogers, Busch  
NOES:

Councilmember Motte nominated Mr. Kelly Kaus.

*Councilmember Motte  
Nominated Mr. Kaus*

Nomination of Mr. Kaus as Planning Commissioner not carried.

*Mr. Kaus Nomination  
Not Carried by Majority  
Votes: 2 Ayes; 3 Noes  
Noes: Rogers, Yarbrough,  
Landers*

AYES: Busch, Motte  
NOES: Rogers, Yarbrough, Landers

Councilmember Landers nominated Mr. Dick Novison.

*Councilmember Landers  
Nominated Mr. Novison*

Nomination of Mr. Novison as Planning Commissioner carried by five votes.

*Mr. Novison Nominated  
for Four Year Term-  
Planning Commission  
Vote: 5-0*

AYES: Yarbrough, Landers, Motte, Rogers, Busch  
NOES:

Councilmember Yarbrough nominated Mr. Paul Mitchell.

*Councilmember  
Yarbrough Nominated  
Mr. Mitchell*

Nomination of Mr. Mitchell as Planning Commissioner carried four votes with one opposition.

*Mr. Mitchell Nominated  
for Four Year Term-  
Planning Commission  
Vote: 4-1  
Noe: Busch*

AYES: Rogers, Yarbrough, Landers, Motte,  
NOES: Busch

Mayor Busch nominated Mr. Terry Streich for the two year term.

*Mayor Busch Nominated  
Mr. Streich*

Nomination of Mr. Streich as Planning Commissioner carried by five votes.

*Mr. Streich Nominated  
for Two Year Term-  
Planning Commission  
Vote: 5-0*

AYES: Yarbrough, Landers, Motte, Rogers, Busch

Councilmember Motte nominated Mr. Finney for the two-year term.

*Councilmember Motte  
Nominated Mr. Finney*

Nomination of Mr. Finney as Planning Commissioner carried by three votes.

*Mr. Finney Nominated  
for Two Year Term-  
Planning Commission  
Vote: 3-2  
Noes: Yarbrough,  
Landers*

AYES: Busch, Rogers, Motte  
NOES: Yarbrough, Landers

City Attorney Dunn said there were no other steps to take; the Planning Director would need to schedule a meeting date in order to swear in the commissioners and begin the training process. The attorney said the ordinance only reflected five members, but there had been alternates in the past. The ordinance would need to be modified and then selection of alternates could take place. The alternates would be allowed to be included in the training. After discussion of alternates, City Attorney Dunn suggested to select two more applicants if one of the applicants selected could not serve for some reason or another.

*City Attorney Dunn's  
Recommendations:  
Meeting Date-Swear In  
Ceremony & Ordinance  
Revision-Alternate*

**SELECTION OF TWO ADDITIONAL APPLICANTS:**

Mayor Pro Tem Rogers nominated Ms. Roseen-Haughney.

*Mayor Pro Tem Rogers  
Nominated Ms. Roseen-  
Haughney*

Nomination of Ms. Roseen-Haughney carried by five votes.

*Ms. Roseen-Haughney  
Nominated  
Vote: 5-0*

AYES: Yarbrough, Landers, Motte, Rogers, Busch

Councilmember Motte nominated Mr. Henry Martin.

*Councilmember Motte  
Nominated Mr. Martin*

Nomination of Mr. Martin carried by a three-two vote.

*Mr. Martin Nominated  
Vote: 3-2  
Noes: Yarbrough,  
Landers*

AYES: Busch, Rogers, Motte

NOES: Yarbrough, Landers

Mayor Busch thanked and gave appreciation to the participants. The commissioners would be notified of future training dates.

6. **ADJOURNMENT:** By unanimous consent the Special City Council Meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

*7:50 p.m. Special City  
Council Meeting  
Adjourned*

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Margaret Rey, City Clerk