

1 There were no amendments or additions to the agenda.

2
3 **IV. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE**

4
5 There was no update provided due to the absence of a Hemet Unified School
6 representative.

7
8
9 **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

10
11 **A. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 33003 & CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO.**
12 **04-19**

13 APPLICANT: Gardon FLP
14 AGENT: Kevin Barnes - Cataldo Architects
15 LOCATION: South side of Devonshire Avenue approximately 280-
16 feet west of Sanderson Avenue
17 PLANNER: Maureen Losey
18 DESCRIPTION: A tentative tract map to create one (1) lot for
19 commercial condominium purposes and a conditional
20 use permit to construst and operate one (1) 21,748
21 square-foot multi-tenant building with suites ranging in
22 size from 2,551 square-feet to 2,788 square-feet.

23
24 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Losey, who provided various details
25 regarding the proposed project. She noted that there were some changes to the
26 conditions of approval, and distributed revised copies to the Commissioners.

27
28 Assistant Planner Losey noted that **Condition No. 32** had been modified to read as
29 follows:

30
31 ***“This conditional use permit is for the site and architectural design for the***
32 ***proposed center and does not preclude the requirement for any use to apply***
33 ***for and receive a separate conditional use permit per Section 90-82 of the***
34 ***Hemet Municipal Code. The uses within this shopping center shall be limited***
35 ***to the following uses and shall be subject to the same permit requirements***
36 ***as stated in Section 90-892 of the Hemet Municipal Code.***

37
38 Assistant Planner Losey advised the Commission that there was also an addition to Item
39 No. C15 on the amended permitted uses, which she read as follows:

40
41 ***“Communications services without assembly or manufacturing and does not***
42 ***include retail sales of communication equipment.”***

1 Assistant Planner Losey noted that with the modifications the project was consistent with
2 the intent of the Commercial Design Guidelines and the Commercial zone and was
3 compatible with the surrounding land uses. She noted that the applicant did not yet have
4 a copy of the revised conditions.

5
6 Vice Chairman Jones inquired as to why the project was being reviewed at this meeting,
7 indicating that he had not seen it before.

8
9 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that the modified condition was actually a part of the
10 original conditions of approval, but that some wording had simply been added for
11 clarification purposes. He noted that if other uses were desired for the shopping center,
12 other than those indicated, additional conditional use permits would be required.

13
14 A discussion ensued regarding the project, and Chairman Duistermars asked if the use
15 indicated as "C55" could be eliminated.

16
17 Principal Planner Sawyer noted that the conditions of approval could be amended to
18 eliminate that use.

19
20 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding hours of use being limited since the site was
21 adjacent to a mobile home park. He asked if this had been done.

22
23 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that there had not been a limit placed on the hours
24 of use. He suggested that the primary impact, with the way the site was oriented, could
25 be the traffic that would be generated in and out of the parking stalls in the front of the
26 building, which was adjacent to the mobile home park. He suggested that restrictive hours
27 of operation could be added to the conditions of approval.

28
29 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:11 p.m.

30
31 Kevin Barnes of Cataldo Architects approached the lectern as a representative for the
32 applicant. He indicated that he did not have a problem with the elimination of the use
33 indicated as "C55", and that adding a condition of approval limiting the hours to regular
34 business hours was acceptable to him as well.

35
36 A discussion ensued regarding what could be stored on the exterior of the building.

37
38 Mr. Barnes noted that he was not planning to have any outdoor storage.

39
40 Chairman Duistermars asked Mr. Barnes if he would object to the addition of a condition
41 that would restrict outdoor storage.

1 Mr. Barnes noted that he would not object to such a condition.

2
3 Commissioner Mendoza inquired as to what kind of tenants were planned to locate there.

4
5 Mr. Barnes responded that their main objective would be trades people, such as
6 subcontractors, carpet stores, etc.

7
8 A discussion ensued regarding use "C17" and the elimination of counseling offices as a
9 use for the project.

10
11 Mr. Barnes agreed that this use could be eliminated.

12
13 Further discussion ensued regarding animals being outside, in the event that a
14 veterinarian office was located there, but it was agreed that this would be prohibited by
15 the outdoor storage restriction.

16
17 The Commission then embarked on a discussion of the impact that the project would have
18 on traffic.

19
20 Principal Planner Sawyer indicated that there were no mitigation measures for this project,
21 relative to traffic. He noted that the project to the east had been the one that had caused
22 the requirement for the traffic signal, and that this project would not have a significant
23 additional impact on traffic that had not already been mitigated with previously approved
24 projects.

25
26 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:35 p.m. and asked for a motion
27 regarding the tentative tract map.

28
29 Vice Chairman Jones asked if the landscaping, setbacks and other design issues were
30 being approved with this conditional use permit.

31
32 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that everything was being approved at this meeting
33 and that the applicant was in compliance with the City's standards.

34
35 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the distance from the curb to the first building,
36 which he did not see on the map.

37
38 Mr. Barnes indicated that it was approximately 30-feet.

39
40 Principal Planner Sawyer noted that if the Commission wanted to increase the landscaping
41 a couple of trees could be added as well as the size of the shrubs. He noted that the
42 project was being processed as an in-fill project.

1 Chairman Duistermars asked if a sign program was included with the proposal.

2
3 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that a sign program had been included with the staff
4 report and exhibits.

5
6 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that the landscaping be increased for the project along
7 Devonshire Avenue.

8
9 Chairman Duistermars added that he would like to see a couple more trees included with
10 the landscaping.

11
12 Mr. Barnes concurred with the Commission's suggestion.

13
14 It was noted that since the landscaping plan had to come back to staff for approval, it was
15 not necessary to modify the conditions to include the additional landscaping.

16
17 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Mendoza to
18 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 05-59* approving Tentative Tract Map No.
19 33003 as presented.

20
21 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

22
23 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride
24 and Rhoten

25 NOES: None

26 ABSTAIN: None

27 ABSENT: Commissioner Rhoten

28
29 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-09.***

30
31 Chairman Duistermars asked for a MOTION regarding the conditional use permit.

32
33 Principal Planner Sawyer clarified the revisions to the conditions of approval as follows:

- 34
35 1. Revised Condition No. 32
36 2. Omission of permitted use "C17"
37 3. Omission of permitted use "C55"
38 4. Add Condition No. 85 to read: ***"All businesses located within the center***
39 ***shall be limited to operation between 8am and 9pm.***
40 5. Add Condition No. 86 to read: ***"All storage of equipment and materials***
41 ***shall be located within the proposed building."***
42
43
44

1 It was MOVED by Commissioner McBride and SECONDED by Commissioner Mendoza
2 to adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 05-60* approving Conditional Use Permit
3 No. 04-19 as amended.
4
5
6

7 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
8

9 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride
10 and Mendoza

11 NOES: None

12 ABSTAIN: None

13 ABSENT: Commissioner Rhoten
14

15 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-10.***
16
17

18 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS**
19

20 **A. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NO. 05-09**

21 APPLICANT: The Fredda and Jack Schaffer Family Trust

22 AGENT: KB Home

23 LOCATION: North side of Fruitvale Avenue between Sanderson and
24 Cawston Avenues

25 PLANNER: Maureen Losey

26 DESCRIPTION: A request by KB Coastal for approval of the design of
27 38 single-family residences on individual lots and
28 associated improvements.
29

30 The staff report was presented by City Planner Chase who provided various details
31 regarding the project.
32

33 Vice Chairman Jones referred to some of the minor modifications that had been made to
34 the original project. He asked if those modifications had required the applicant to pay
35 additional fees to the City.
36

37 Mark Irving of KB Home Coastal, Inc., 26201 Ynez Rd. - Suite 104, Temecula, California
38 approached the lectern as a representative for the applicant. He advised the Commission
39 that the changes that had been made to their original project were not in terms of fees, but
40 rather in the terms of additional architecture and design features which resulted in direct
41 costs on the homes. He explained that the architecture that was being proposed with this
42 project would be exactly the same as the original project, noting that this project was
43

1 merely a continuance of what was already built. He noted that he believed that what Vice
2 Chairman Jones was talking about, relative to fees, was the fact that the Building Division
3 was going to require all new sets of plans and drawings for this project, which was simply
4 an in-fill project that would be a duplication of what was existing around it on 3 sides. He
5 noted that the new plans that the Building Division was asking for would cost the company
6 around \$50,000.

7
8 A discussion ensued regarding this issue, and the Commission asked that staff talk to the
9 Building Division to see if this requirement could be waived.

10
11 Principal Planner Sawyer noted that he would discuss this issue with the Building Division.

12
13 Mr. Irving advised the Commission that KB Homes would, of course, pay whatever fees
14 were necessary, but that they found the requirement for new plans and drawings to be
15 somewhat unreasonable since the project was an extension of the existing tract, and the
16 homes would be duplicating those that were already built and approved.

17
18 A discussion ensued regarding what portions of the project would be covered under the
19 Lighting & Landscaping Maintenance District (L&LMD).

20
21 Chairman Duistermars asked for a MOTION regarding the project.

22
23 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner McBride to
24 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 05-56* approving Site Development Review
25 No. 05-09 as presented.

26
27 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

28
29 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride
30 and Mendoza

31 NOES: None

32 ABSTAIN: None

33 ABSENT: Commissioner Rhoten

34
35 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-11.***

36
37
38 **VI. CONSENT CALENDAR**

39
40 **A. MINUTES**

41 1. February 7, 2006

1 It was MOVED by Commissioner Mendoza and SECONDED by Commissioner McBride
2 to approve the consent calendar as presented.

3
4 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

5
6 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride
7 and Mendoza

8 NOES: None

9 ABSTAIN: None

10 ABSENT: Commissioner Rhoten
11
12

13 **VII. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**

14 15 **A. CONFIRMATION OF ATTENDANCE AT 2006 LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA** 16 **CITIES PLANNERS INSTITUTE & EXPO**

17 Scheduled for March 22-24, 2006 in Monterey, California.
18

19 Chairman Duistermars asked for confirmation regarding which Commissioners were
20 planning to attend the League of California Cities Planners Institute & Expo.

21
22 All Commissioners present indicated that they would be attending.
23
24

25 **VIII. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

26
27 Vice Chairman Jones asked why the development on Palm and Florida Avenues had been
28 allowed to construct their sidewalk according to plans that had not been approved by the
29 Commission, and that were not accessible to people with wheelchairs or baby strollers.
30 He asked how they had been able to get away with this.
31

32 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that he was not aware that this had occurred and
33 asked Principal Engineer Biagioni if he was aware of there having been any modifications.
34

35 Principal Engineer Biagioni advised the Commission that the project had not yet been
36 finalized so there was still time to fix it. He noted that one of the inspectors had mentioned
37 that there was a problem at the site, but that no decision had been made yet regarding the
38 inspector's concerns.
39

40 Vice Chairman Jones brought up the issue of a lime green building near the Goodwill Store
41 on the north side of Florida Avenue. He noted that the color was definitely not on the color
42 chart.
43

1 Principal Planner Sawyer indicated that he would take a look at it and get the Code
2 Enforcement Division to follow up.

3
4 Chairman Duistermars referred to the Planning Commission meeting of February 7, 2006,
5 and the urgency item that the Commission had asked staff to have the Council review. He
6 noted that it was his understanding that the urgency item had been set aside due to a staff
7 determination that the City Council had already established a procedure and that the
8 urgency item request was outside of that procedure. He asked the Commission if they
9 would be interested in trying to rescue a piece of the urgency item regarding pole signs,
10 and ask Council if they would continue with an urgency ordinance that would just postpone
11 the construction of any new pole signs until the sign ordinance update was approved. He
12 noted that there were a lot of new developments in the works and that the City could be
13 inundated with pole signs.

14
15 Deputy City Attorney Jex suggested that the Commission make a motion to have staff bring
16 up the issue as a request to have the City Council consider an interim urgency ordinance
17 to postpone the erection of any pole and/or pylon signs until the sign ordinance update
18 was approved.

19
20 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion to this effect.

21
22 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Mendoza to
23 have staff convey their request to the City Council regarding the possible consideration
24 of an interim urgency ordinance postponing the erection of pole and/or pylon signs until
25 the approval of the Comprehensive Sign Ordinance Update.

26
27 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

28
29 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride
30 and Mendoza.

31 NOES: None

32 ABSTAIN: None

33 ABSENT: Commissioner Rhoten

34
35 Vice Chairman Jones asked for an excused absence from the March 7, 2006 Planning
36 Commission meeting.

37
38 Chairman Duistermars noted that he would ask for a motion to excuse the absence at the
39 time of the meeting.

40
41
42 **IX. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

1 There were no future agenda items requested.

2
3
4
5
6
7
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
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

1 **X. ADJOURNMENT**

2
3 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones, SECONDED by Commissioner Mendoza and
4 unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 6:57 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City
5 of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **Tuesday, March 7, 2006 at 6:00 p.m.** to
6 be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet,
7 California 92543.

8
9
10 **(Minutes prepared by Nancie Shaw)**

11
12
13
14
15
16 _____
17 **Bob Duistermars, Chairman**
18 **Hemet Planning Commission**

19 **ATTEST:**

20
21 _____
22 **Melissa Diels, Minutes Secretary**
23 **Hemet Planning Commission**