

1 CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

2
3 TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 2005

4
5 THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION WAS
6 CONVENED BY CHAIRMAN DUISTERMARS ON TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 2005 AT 6:01
7 P.M. AT THE CITY OF HEMET COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 450 EAST LATHAM AVENUE,
8 HEMET, CALIFORNIA.

9
10 Present: Chairman Bob Duistermars and Commissioners Jim Calkins and
11 Mayzelle Rhoten

12
13 Absent: Vice Chairman Nick Jones (*Unanimously excused*)

14
15 Invocation and Flag Salute: Commissioner Rhoten

16
17
18 I. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

19
20 There were no members of the public who wished to speak regarding the meeting.

21
22
23 II. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA

24
25 There were no amendments or additions to the agenda.

26
27
28 III. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE

29
30 Due to the absence of Director of Facilities, Sandra Packham, there was no Hemet Unified
31 School District Update.

32
33
34 IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

35
36 A. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 04-15 (*Continued from February 1,*
37 *2005*)

38 _____ APPLICANT: JAKS, LLC
39 AGENT: John Maple - Maple Dell McClelland Architecture
40 PLANNER: Ron Running
41 LOCATION: Southeast corner of Sanderson and Acacia Avenues
42 DESCRIPTION: A request for a conditional use permit to construct two
43 (2) multi-tenant commercial retail buildings, totaling
44

1 12,000 square-feet on a 1.5 acre vacant parcel on
2 property zoned C-2 (General Commercial).
3

4 The staff report was presented by Case Planner, Ron Running who provided some
5 background and details regarding the project, and advised the Commission regarding the
6 resolutions to the issues that the Planning Commission had been concerned with at the
7 previous hearing that was held on February 1, 2005. He noted that Condition No. 48 had
8 been deleted, which required the applicant to install left turn signals, and explained that the
9 burden of that satisfying that condition would be placed on the Lowe's Home Improvement
10 Center prior to their final Certificate of Occupancy. He further noted that Condition No. 53,
11 which had also inspired concern by the applicant, would be left in place, as originally
12 written, with the applicant's concurrence.
13

14 A discussion of the berming on the outskirts of the project ensued.
15

16 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the screening of the rear doors, in the event that
17 they should end up being included in the building design.
18

19 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:06 p.m.
20

21 John Maple, 380 Stevens Avenue, Solano Beach, California approached the lectern as a
22 representative for the applicant and explained that the rear door element would be
23 dependent on the tenant, but that if any rear doors were included in the building design,
24 they would be painted to match the building and would be adequately screened to obscure
25 their view from the public.
26

27 Chairman Duistermars advised Mr. Maple that he should meet with the Planning
28 Department Staff regarding this issue if there ended up being a need to include doors on
29 the rear portion of the building that would be facing the street.
30

31 A discussion ensued regarding the location of the electrical panels for the building.
32

33 Case Planner Running noted that the main concerns were regarding the appearances of
34 the building along Acacia and Sanderson Avenues.
35

36 Chairman Duistermars suggested that a condition be added requiring the utility panels to
37 be housed in some sort of enclosure. He asked Mr. Maple if he would agree to such a
38 condition.
39

40 Mr. Maple concurred.
41

42 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:11 p.m.
43
44

1 City Attorney Vail noted that conditions should be added regarding the screening of the
2 rear doors and the exterior utility panels, so that the applicant would be required to consult
3 with staff regarding the arrangement of the screening for those items. He read the
4 additional condition into the record, as follows:

5
6 **Condition No. 88:** *“If rear doors are necessary, the applicant shall consult
7 with staff and arrange for appropriate screening of those
8 doors.”*

9
10 **Condition No. 89:** *“Utility panels that are placed on the exterior of the
11 building will be placed in cabinets, and the applicant shall
12 consult with staff with regard to the appropriate screening
13 as may be allowed by Southern California Edison or the
14 appropriate utility company.”*

15
16 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.

17
18 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
19 adopt Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 05-6, approving Conditional Use Permit
20 No. 04-15, as amended.

21
22 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

23
24 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins and Rhoten
25 NOES: None
26 ABSTAIN: None
27 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones

28
29 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-10.***

30
31
32 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS**

33
34 There were no public meetings scheduled for review on the agenda.

35
36
37 **VI. WORK STUDY**

38
39 There were no work study sessions scheduled for review on the agenda.
40
41
42
43
44

1 **VII. CONSENT CALENDAR**

2
3 There were no consent calendar items scheduled for review on the agenda.
4

5
6 **VIII. UPDATE OF CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS ON PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS -**
7 Update given by Planning Director Richard Masyczek
8

9 **A. APPEAL OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S APPROVAL OF**
10 **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 04-12**
11

12 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that the appeal hearing for this project
13 had been continued to the March 8, 2005 City Council meeting.
14

15 City Attorney Vail elaborated regarding the extent of what the appeal included.
16

17
18 **IX. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**
19

20 **A. LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES CONFERENCE - APRIL 13-15, 2005 IN**
21 **PASADENA**
22

23 Chairman Duistermars indicated that he would be attending this conference.
24

25 Commissioner Calkins stated that he would allow Minutes Secretary Shaw know whether
26 he would be able to attend, noting that it could be a problem since he was leaving for a
27 two-week vacation on April 19, 2005.
28

29 Commissioner Rhoten noted that she would not be able to attend the conference.
30

31 **B. TENTATIVE JOINT MEETING WITH CITY COUNCIL FOR EITHER MARCH**
32 **15TH OR 16TH, 2005**
33

34 All Commissioners indicated that they would check their calendars and let staff know which
35 date would work best for them.
36

37
38 **X. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**
39

40 Commissioner Calkins initiated a discussion regarding the Valley Beautiful project.
41
42
43
44

1 **XI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

2
3 There were no requests for any future agenda items.
4

5
6 **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

7
8 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten, SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins and
9 unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 6:18 p.m. to the regularly scheduled
10 meeting of the City of Hemet Planning Commission, scheduled for March 15, 2005 at 6:00
11 p.m. to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue,
12 Hemet, California 92543.
13
14
15
16
17

18 _____
19 **Bob Duistermars, Chairman**
20 **Hemet Planning Commission**

21 **ATTEST:**

22
23
24
25 _____
26 **Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary**
27 **Hemet Planning Commission**
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44