

1 2004. She stated that New High School No. 1 had closed escrow and that the plans were
2 being finalized for submittal to DSA in April, with construction starting in June.

3
4 Ms. Packham reported that Diamond Valley Middle School was moving along ahead of
5 schedule, and that interviews had been held for the Office Manager position. She noted
6 that staff would be moving into the school in April. She went on to say that Cawston
7 Elementary School was also moving forward ahead of schedule and that the move-in
8 would begin in July.

9
10 Ms. Packham advised the Commission that there were nine school sites that would be
11 undergoing modernization projects over the summer. She concluded her report by noting
12 that a representative from the Department of Education would be coming to the city to visit
13 13 potential school sites the following week.

14
15 Planning Director Masyczek asked that the Commission review Item No. VII. A prior to Item
16 No. IV.

17
18 The Commission concurred.

19
20
21 **VII. PUBLIC MEETINGS**

22
23 **A. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT REQUEST**

24 _____ A request from the Hemet Unified School District requesting a letter of
25 verification that: 1) the Jacob Weins Elementary School site conforms to the
26 General Plan for the City of Hemet, and 2) the Planning Commission
27 considers the site suitable for an elementary school.

28
29 Ms. Packham advised the Commission that the request for a letter was merely a
30 requirement by the State that the school district go to the Planning Commission to make
31 sure that the school sites that they had selected are consistent with the City's General Plan
32 and consistent with any zoning that is in place for the property.

33
34 The Commission concurred with the school district's request, and Vice Chairman Jones
35 signed the proposed letter on behalf of Chairman Duisternars.

1 **IV. UPDATE OF CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS ON PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS**

2
3 **A. PARKING ORDINANCE UPDATE**

4
5 Planning Director Masyczek gave an update to the Commission regarding revisions to the
6 parking ordinance, explaining that the City Council had given direction to staff at their last
7 meeting to move forward with this update. He noted that their concern focused in on three
8 areas, the first being medical offices and the possibility that there may be a shortage of
9
10 medical parking spaces, the second being commercial parking, and the third being with
11 residential parking, particularly pertaining to Assisted Living Facilities. He advised the
12 Commission that the Council had directed staff to work with the Community Development
13 Committee (CDC) on this issue, and to begin to take a look at the ordinance. He noted
14 that when the revisions had been completed, staff would be coming back to the Planning
15 Commission to begin the approval process.
16

17
18 **V. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**

19
20 Planning Director Masyczek recommended that Item No. VIII. A. be held concurrently with
21 Item No. VI. F., as they were related projects.
22

23 The Commission concurred.
24

25
26 **VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

27
28 **A. ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-13 / ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 03-60**
29 ***(Continued from February 3, 2004)***

30 APPLICANT: K.B. Homes Coastal, Inc.
31 LOCATION: Northwest corner of Lyon and Commonwealth Avenues
32 PLANNER: Maureen Losey
33 DESCRIPTION: A request to change the zoning from A-1-C-1 (Heavy-
34 Agriculture) to R-1 (Single-Family Residential) and
35 adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration, including
36 the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the proposed
37 project.
38

39 Mark Irving, 12235 El Camino Real, Suite 100, San Diego, California advised the
40 Commission that they were withdrawing their request for a zone change as they were
41 allowing the Hemet Unified School District to move forward with their plans for the property.
42
43
44

1 Vice Chairman Jones asked Mr. Irving if he was asking for a continuance.

2
3 Mr. Irving responded that he was not asking for a continuance, but rather a cancellation.
4 He stated that he had a letter for the Commission advising their intent.

5
6 Planning Director Masyczek advised Mr. Irving that the letter would confirm the withdrawal
7 of the project.

8
9 Mr. Irving distributed a copy of the letter to each of the Commission members and Planning
10 Director Masyczek.

11
12 **B. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 03-8**

13 APPLICANT: Delta Groups Engineering, Inc.
14 AGENT: Ahmad Smith
15 LOCATION: Northwest corner of Lyon and Acacia Avenues
16 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni
17 DESCRIPTION: A request for a conditional use permit to construct a 67-
18 foot mono-pine telecommunications facility on property
19 zoned C-M (Commercial-Manufacturing).
20

21 Planning Technician Domenigoni advised the Commission that staff was requesting a
22 continuance to the March 16, 2004 Planning Commission meeting to allow the applicant
23 time to provide additional information regarding the project.
24

25 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Searl and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Rhoten to
26 continue Conditional Use Permit No. 03-8 to the Planning Commission meeting of March
27 16, 2004.
28

29 The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote:

30
31 **AYES:** Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins, Rhoten and Searl
32 **NOES:** None
33 **ABSTAIN:** None
34 **ABSENT:** Chairman Duistermars
35

36 **C. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT NO. 04-1 (Continued from February**
37 **3, 2004)**

38 _____ **APPLICANT:** City of Hemet
39 **LOCATION:** City-wide
40 **PLANNER:** David Sawyer
41
42
43
44

1 DESCRIPTION: An amendment to the Hemet Municipal Code adding
2 Sections 90-895(h) and 90-1045(i), establishing
3 regulations for outdoor storage areas located in all
4 commercial and industrial zones.
5

6 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that staff was requesting a continuance
7 of the project to the meeting of March 16, 2004.
8

9 It was MOVED by Commissioner Calkins and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
10 continue Zoning Ordinance Amendment No. 04-1 to the Planning Commission meeting of
11 March 16, 2004.
12

13 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
14

15 AYES: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins, Rhoten and Searl
16 NOES: None
17 ABSTAIN: None
18 ABSENT: Chairman Duistermars
19

20 **D. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31796 / ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**
21 **NO. 03-59**

22 APPLICANT: Hemet 132, LP
23 AGENT: Glenn Bosworth
24 LOCATION: North side of Fruitvale Avenue approximately 590-feet
25 east of Palm Avenue
26 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni
27 DESCRIPTION: A request for the subdivision of 29.3 acres into 122 lots
28 for the future development of single-family residential
29 homes.
30

31 The staff report was presented by Planning Technician Domenigoni who reminded the
32 Commission that the concerns that had been expressed at the February 17, 2004 Planning
33 Commission meeting included meandering sidewalks, an on-site 3/4-acre park, and
34 compatible lot sizes to the adjacent lots to the west. She advised the Commission of the
35 changes that had been made to address those concerns. She further advised the
36 Commission that a revised Environmental Resolution had been distributed to the
37 Commission prior to the meeting.
38

39 Planning Director Masyczek noted that the project had been reviewed by the Park
40 Commission who wanted to see a 1-acre park rather than a 3/4-acre park.
41
42
43
44

1 Commissioner Jones asked what needed to be done to adhere to the Park Commission's
2 recommendation.

3
4 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the issue had been discussed with the City
5 Attorney, and that the applicant was obligated to provide a 3/4-acre park. He explained
6 that an option that was available to the Commission was for the City to acquire a site for
7 the park, if the applicant would agree to reserve a lot for such. He added that if the
8 applicant agreed to reserve a corner lot next to the retention basin, the City could acquire
9 the property from the applicant to provide a larger park.

10
11 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.

12
13 Commissioner Searl inquired as to whether, upon completion of the park, a parking area
14 could be installed that could later be turned into a roadway in the event that other property
15 were linked to the park.

16
17 Commissioner Calkins asked if meandering sidewalks would continue to the nearby
18 subdivision that was also owned by this developer.

19
20 Planning Technician Domenigoni responded that meandering sidewalks had not been a
21 condition of approval for the previously approved subdivision, so this would not be likely.

22
23 Vice Chairman Jones inquired about Commissioner Searl's suggestion.

24
25 Planning Director Masyczek noted that there were a couple of options. He indicated that
26 in order for Britannia Street to go through the applicant would have to make design changes
27 and bring the project back to the Commission, or if the Commission would like to give staff
28 direction to take a look at this issue in the future, they could take that route.

29
30 Further discussion ensued regarding this issue.

31
32 Vice Chairman Jones opened the public hearing at 6:25 p.m. and asked for comments on
33 the project.

34
35 Glen Bosworth, 2155 Oak Hill Drive, Escondido, California approached the lectern and
36 noted that having Britannia Street go through had never been brought up before, so the
37 discussion was a surprise to him. He explained what he had done to resolve the
38 Commission's concerns. He noted that meandering sidewalks had been added to the new
39 tract, per the Commission's request, and suggested that he did not think it made sense for
40 Britannia Street to go through with Eaton Avenue so close, as it would create an unsafe
41 traffic situation. He further noted that he had increased the size of the lots along the west
42 property line to 9,000 square-feet to address the Commission's concern with compatibility.

1 Planning Director Masyczek discussed the addition of Condition No. 89, to read:

2
3 ***“Prior to issuance of any Certificates of Occupancy for***
4 ***any house within the subdivision, the applicant shall***
5 ***install the 0.75-acre park as reviewed and approved by the***
6 ***Planning Commission. Quimby Act credit shall be given***
7 ***for costs of building the park as specified in the***
8 ***reimbursement provision of the Hemet Municipal Code.”***
9

10 A discussion ensued regarding the imposition of an additional condition regarding Lot No.
11 10 or 11, pertaining to the Park.
12

13 Assistant City Attorney Vail stated that Condition No. 90 should read:

14
15 ***“Pursuant to Government Code Section 66479 and Article***
16 ***X of Chapter 70 of the Hemet Municipal Code, the***
17 ***subdivider is hereby required to reserve Lot 10 as shown***
18 ***on Tentative Tract Map 31796 for park and/or recreational***
19 ***use by the City of Hemet (“City”) or such other public park***
20 ***or recreation district designated by the City. In***
21 ***accordance with Government Code Section 66480, at the***
22 ***time of approval of the Final Map, the City shall enter into***
23 ***a binding agreement to acquire the reserved lot at the time***
24 ***of the filing of the Tentative Tract Map, plus taxes against***
25 ***such lot from the date of reservation and reasonable costs***
26 ***incurred by the subdivider for maintenance of the***
27 ***reserved lot. If the City does not enter into such a binding***
28 ***agreement with the subdivider, then, in accordance with***
29 ***Government Code Section 66481, the reservation shall***
30 ***automatically terminate.”***
31

32 Mr. Bosworth noted that this was the first he had seen of this condition, and that he had
33 a bit of a problem with it. He stated that keeping the lot available for up to two years
34 without building on it would be troublesome.
35

36 Assistant City Attorney Vail stated that he did not necessarily disagree with the applicant,
37 and that the Commission may want to approve the project with the additional wording, but
38 then have himself and Planning Director Masyczek confer with the applicant to come up
39 with some agreeable wording.
40
41
42
43
44

1 Mr. Bosworth stated that he felt they had met the requirement for the 3/4-acre park, and
2 that he was now feeling that he was being conditioned beyond that requirement. He added
3 that if the City was willing to purchase the lot now he would be more than happy to sell it,
4 but that he did not think it was reasonable to hold it for 2 years.

5
6 A discussion of the park issue ensued.

7
8 Commissioner Rhoten asked if the applicant felt the 2-year period was excessive because
9 the project was expected to be completed prior to the end of 2 years.

10
11 Mr. Bosworth responded that this was correct.

12
13 Commissioner Rhoten inquired as to when the project was expected to be completed.

14
15 Mr. Bosworth responded that it was hard to say. He suggested that it could be 12 to 18
16 months, but that he did not want to be conditioned to meet that such a deadline.

17
18 A discussion regarding other alternatives ensued.

19
20 Assistant City Attorney Vail suggested that condition could be based on the issuance of
21 building permits. He added that while the lot could be purchased now, he was hesitant to
22 recommend this because there was no certainty that the tract would actually be developed.

23
24 Further discussion ensued regarding parking.

25
26 Vice Chairman Jones closed the public hearing at 6:43 p.m.

27
28 Commissioner Searl suggested that perhaps the reservation of a lot should be tied to Park
29 Commission review.

30
31 Planning Director Masyczek explained that the project would not be reviewed by the Park
32 Commission until the applicant submitted the design to the Planning Department.

33
34 Commissioner Jones commented that this was not a project that he liked, and that he did
35 not think it would be enhancing the community, but that they would rather end up being
36 stuck with it in 20 years. He asked for a motion.

37
38 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Searl and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Calkins to
39 adopt *Resolution Bill No. 04-4EA* approving Environmental Assessment No. 03-59 to adopt
40 a Mitigated Negative Declaration for Tentative Tract Map No. 31796.

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

2
3 AYES: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins, Rhoten and Searl
4 NOES: None
5 ABSTAIN: None
6 ABSENT: Chairman Duistermars

7
8 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-2EA.***

9
10 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
11 adopt *Resolution Bill No. 04-12* approving Tentative Tract Map No. 31796 as amended.

12
13 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

14
15 AYES: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins, Rhoten and Searl
16 NOES: None
17 ABSTAIN: None
18 ABSENT: Chairman Duistermars

19
20 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-12.***

21
22 **E. TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 31668/ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

23 **NO. 04-1**

24 APPLICANT: Sanderson Plaza, LLC

25 LOCATION: Southeast corner of Sanderson and Devonshire
26 Avenues

27 PLANNER: Ronald Running

28 DESCRIPTION: A request to subdivide 10.9± acres into six (6) lots for
29 future commercial development, and adoption of a
30 Mitigated Negative Declaration.

31
32 The staff report was presented by City Planner Running who displayed an aerial photo of
33 the site, described the surrounding areas and gave some details regarding the project.

34
35 A discussion ensued regarding the project, particularly pertaining to the driveway.

36
37 Vice Chairman Jones opened the public hearing at 6:54 p.m.

38
39 Gerry Simmons, 1071 Shatner Street, San Diego, California approached the lectern and
40 addressed the Commission as a representative for the applicant. He provided the
41 Commission with some additional details regarding the project.

1 Ben Etemadi of Hunsaker & Associates approached the lectern as the project engineer.
2 He discussed the entrance and exit to the project off of Devonshire Avenue. He suggested
3 that by realigning the access point, it would be detrimental to the Social Security building
4 which was the largest building for the project at 20,000 square-feet. He discussed possible
5 mitigation for the driveway issue, and displayed some plans indicating the proposed
6 mitigation.

7
8 Mr. Etemadi expressed concern with conflicting Condition Nos. 49 and 71. He mentioned
9 the possibility of Brandon Way continuing south to another subdivision in the future.

10
11 Planning Director Masyczek stated that they did not really want to mix residential traffic with
12 commercial traffic. He suggested that the emergency access should be maintained off of
13 Kirby Street. He noted that an option that was available to the Commission was to
14 continue the item to allow time to address the concerns.

15
16 Commissioner Searl asked if the concerns could be addressed with a future conditional
17 use permit.

18
19 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the problem at this point was that the applicant
20 was proposing changes to address some of the concerns, but that those changes had not
21 yet been reviewed by staff.

22
23 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Calkins and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Rhoten to
24 continue Tentative Tract Map No. 31668 to the meeting of March 16, 2004.

25
26 The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote:

27
28 **AYES:** Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins, Rhoten and Searl
29 **NOES:** None
30 **ABSTAIN:** None
31 **ABSENT:** Chairman Duistermars

32
33 **F. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 03-5 / ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-11 /**
34 **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 03-43**

35 **APPLICANT:** John D. Petty / JDP Development
36 **LOCATION:** Northwest corner of Lake Street and Florida Avenue
37 **PLANNER:** David Sawyer
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

1 DESCRIPTION: A proposal for a General Plan Amendment from the
2 current land use designation of Commercial (C) and R-II
3 (Multi-Family Residential) to R-I (Single-Family
4 Residential) and a zone change from the current
5 classification of C-2 (General Commercial), R-3 (Multi-
6 Family Residential) and R-1-14-C (Single-Family
7 Residential - 14,000 square-foot lots) to R-1-7.2 (Single-
8 Family Residential - 7,200 square-foot lots), including
9 adoption of a Negative Declaration for the projects.
10

11 The staff report was presented by Principal Planner Sawyer who provided the Commission
12 with some details regarding the project. He indicated the General Plan and zoning
13 designations for the different portions of the property, explaining that they would all be
14 changed to R-1 (Single-Family Residential). He noted that the primary issue in the staff
15 report was with compatibility. He described the surrounding land uses and discussed the
16 RR and R-1 designations of properties adjacent to the site. He explained that some of the
17 lots currently faced onto Lincoln Avenue, which created a compatibility problem, but that
18 this could possibly be resolved by having the lots face inward. He noted that additional
19 design revisions may be needed to make this option compatible. He suggested that a
20 requirement could be imposed for the lots adjacent to the RR properties to be made larger
21 in order to create a buffer. He displayed a map indicating the proposed subdivision, which
22 consisted of 7,200 square-foot lots and slightly larger.
23

24 Commissioner Rhoten asked if the smallest lot would be 7,200 square-feet.
25

26 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that he would allow the applicant to provide more
27 details, adding that a variance was also being requested by the applicant to reduce some
28 of the lot widths.
29

30 A discussion of density ensued.
31

32 Planning Director Masyczek explained that the map portion of this project was a Vesting
33 Tentative Tract Map with proposed lot widths of 72-feet, however the Vesting status
34 allowed the applicant to provide the minimum widths that were required at the time of
35 submittal, which were 6,000 square-feet.
36

37 Assistant City Attorney Vail noted for the Commission that only the General Plan
38 Amendment and Zone Change were on the agenda for approval at this meeting, and that
39 any concerns that the Commission might have with the map should not affect a decision
40 being made on the General Plan Amendment or zone change.
41
42
43
44

1 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that the General Plan Amendment and
2 Zone Change were tentatively scheduled for review by the City Council on March 23, 2004,
3 and that the map would tentatively be scheduled for the Commission's review on April 20,
4 2004.

5
6 John Petty, 2662 Marmalade Lane, Hemet, California approached the lectern as the
7 project applicant. He discussed some details of the project, including zoning and density,
8 indicating that the minimum lot size would be 7,200 square-feet, and that a number of the
9 lots would be larger than 10,000 square-feet. He added that all of the homes would be
10 constructed as single-story.

11
12 Chairman Duistermars joined the meeting at 7:28 p.m. and Vice Chairman Jones turned
13 the meeting over to him.

14
15 Mr. Petty continued his discussion, suggesting that some of the residents along Lincoln
16 Avenue may not have been aware of what the current configuration was, and the fact that
17 it would allow up to 225 units to be constructed. He stated that they were only proposing
18 88 units, which was 65% less than what was currently allowed.

19
20 A discussion of the proposed Variance ensued.

21
22 Mr. Petty discussed secondary access to the project off of Lincoln Avenue. He stated that
23 he anticipated some concerns from the public regarding his proposal, and explained that
24 anywhere there is a "T" intersection is where a secondary access should be located, and
25 that Juel Lane is the "T" intersection where they are proposing secondary access into the
26 subdivision.

27
28 Chairman Duistermars asked if there was anyone in the audience who would like to speak
29 regarding the work study for the proposed map.

30
31 Randy Clemens, 316 Juel Lane, Hemet, California expressed his concern regarding the
32 map. He added that he was worried about the traffic from Florida Avenue coming into the
33 area, and noted that some of the properties have 36-foot frontages. He advised the
34 Commission that in the past he and his neighbors had been promised that any
35 development would be consistent with the homes on Juel Lane, and that he did not see
36 that there was any consistency with the community that this proposal was butting up
37 against. He noted that most of the lots in the area were at least ½ acre in size.

38
39 Vice Chairman Jones asked when the property had been zoned for 6,000 square-foot lots.

40
41 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the zoning designation was made sometime
42 in 1994, and that the area had been annexed in 1991.

43
44

Planning Commission Minutes
March 2, 2004

1 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that staff had been looking for
2 information regarding exactly how the property had come to be zoned for its current
3 designation.

4
5 Bob Fechner, 300 Juel Lane, Hemet, California expressed his concern regarding the
6 density along Lincoln Avenue, stating that the lots were not compatible with the rest of the
7 area.

8
9 Bobbie Christie, 320 Juel Lane, Hemet, California expressed her concern with traffic on
10 Lake Street and Lincoln Avenue, which would be extremely heavy. She advised the
11 Commission that Lincoln Avenue was currently accessed by children, and that this would
12 be a dangerous traffic area for children walking home from school. She stated that she
13 was very much against the number of homes that were being proposed in the area.

14
15 Ben Van Dorien approached the lectern as an adjacent resident on the west side of
16 Bautista Creek. He stated that he had conferred with the Riverside County Flood Control
17 and the Fire Department, and that there were problems with residences backing up to
18 Bautista Creek Channel on the west side because they were already backed up on the
19 east side, and the channel would then be completely encased with no access to the creek
20 bed. He suggested that an easement was needed.

21
22 Harve Anderson, 5004 Merlyn Street, Hemet, California approached the lectern as an
23 adjacent resident to the project. He advised the Commission that when the area had first
24 been annexed, the City had agreed that there would not be any changes. He went on to
25 say that he had a lot of problems with this proposal. He stated that he had purchased his
26 ½-acre lot as semi-rural property, and that this proposal was of a much higher density and
27 was inconsistent with the surrounding communities. He suggested that there was the issue
28 of the Bautista Creek Channel posing as a fire hazard, and that erosion and runoff would
29 also be an issue. He inquired as to who would be in charge of weed abatement and fire
30 suppression in the wash if it became totally encased. He noted that prior to the
31 annexation everything in the area was designed for a more rural lifestyle, and that this
32 proposal was not consistent with being good neighbors.

33
34 Anna Marie Dalbey, 255 North Soboba Street, Hemet, California approached the lectern
35 as an adjacent resident and expressed her concern with the potential traffic increase that
36 the proposal would include. She further expressed her concern with the high density
37 proposal, suggesting that the area should be developed with 15,000 - 20,000 square-foot
38 lot sizes. She noted that property values would go down if this proposal were to be
39 approved.

1 Gabe Basi, 5068 Merlyn Street, Hemet, California expressed concern with drainage and
2 the potential erosion and fire hazard problems. He stated that he did not agree with any
3 of the houses going in.
4

5 Kimberly Hurderick, 4090 Merlyn Street, Hemet, California advised the Commission that
6 the erosion on the west side of the wash was horrible, and that next door to her the erosion
7 was clear up to the edge of her neighbor's home. She stated that she would be in favor
8 of larger lots, and that she thought there should be an easement for fire trucks to access
9 the channel.
10

11 Erin Best, 345 Juel Lane, Hemet, California pointed out that the proposed map didn't really
12 go along with the adjacent developments, and that ½ to 1-acre lots would be much more
13 palatable.
14

15 Vice Chairman Jones inquired about the owner of Bautista Creek.
16

17 Mr. Petty discussed the issue of the Bautista Wash, noting that there would be no drainage
18 into the wash for this project. He stated that everything needed to be graded and that
19 drainage needed to be provided away from the wash. Regarding access into the wash, he
20 stated that he doubted very seriously that the Hemet Fire Department would be interested
21 in taking their fire apparatus into the wash. He suggested that somebody should be
22 maintaining the wash, but that weed abatement was up to the individual property owners.
23

24 Commissioner Rhoten noted that most members of the audience had mentioned traffic as
25 an issue of concern. She asked if a traffic study had been completed for the project.
26

27 Mr. Petty stated that a traffic study had not been necessary since they were decreasing
28 density by 65% of what was allowed. He suggested that there was nothing to mitigate.
29

30 A discussion ensued regarding the zoning designations of the properties from Juel Lane
31 to the east. Mr. Petty stated that to the west of Juel Lane the zoning was R-A, and that
32 from Juel Lane to the east the zoning was R-1.
33

34 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that staff was currently trying to
35 research this issue, but that as far as they could tell, the zoning from Juel Lane to the east
36 was R-1-14-C, per county zoning, with 14,000 square-foot minimum lot sizes.
37

38 Marvin Anderson, 4004 Merlyn St., Hemet, California advised the Commission that the
39 issue of drainage had been inaccurately portrayed. He explained that the Bautista Wash,
40 during the rainy season, becomes a settling point for rainwater, and that when pavement
41 is installed and the water runs, it will inevitably end up running into the wash.
42
43
44

1 Since there were no other comments regarding the map, Chairman Duistermars moved the
2 meeting on to the public hearing for the General Plan Amendment and zone change.

3
4 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 8:06 p.m.

5
6 Randy Clemens, 360 Juel Lane, Hemet, California expressed his opposition to the zone
7 change. He stated that, regarding the runoff, Juel Lane tended to take a large hit from the
8 Lincoln Avenue runoff, and that with this development drainage would be increased. He
9 further stated that the impact on an overcrowded school district would be even more
10 negative than it already was, and suggested that if there was an opportunity to keep the
11 zoning at a low density it should be done. He stated that the issue of the 65% density
12 reduction and the scare tactics that the developer was trying to impose were unbelievable.
13 He added that he had seen a number of fatal accidents at Lake Street and Lincoln Avenue,
14 and that he was very opposed to the project and felt that it would have a negative impact
15 to the entire area.

16
17 Planning Director Masyczek advised the residents that under state law, the developer
18 impact fee paid by the developer satisfied the school requirement. He further advised that
19 the school district must send the City a letter providing a statement of overcrowding
20 conditions before the City could require more mitigation from a developer.

21
22 Bob Fechner, 300 Juel Lane, Hemet, California advised the Commission that he owned
23 property on the northeast corner of Juel Lane and Lincoln Avenue. He stated that it was
24 his understanding that the R-A zoning designation was supposed to extend beyond his
25 property and then go to R-1-14-C, which was supposed to be a buffer from the higher
26 densities. He added that he and others had moved to this area for a certain lifestyle, and
27 suggested that the R-1-14-C buffer should not be changed.

28
29 Ralph Morrow, 4272 East Lincoln Avenue, Hemet, California expressed his opposition to
30 7,200 square-foot lots, suggesting that they would not blend into the area, and that the
31 aesthetics of small lots was not appealing, as they appeared to be a wall of garage doors.
32 He further noted that the runoff would increase and would eventually end up in the Bautista
33 Wash, pointing out that the intersection of Soboba Street and Lincoln Avenue was not
34 large enough to carry the water runoff currently. He added that his main concern was with
35 the emergency response in the area, stating that emergency vehicles could not respond
36 to the area in less than 10 minutes, unless it was 2:00 a.m. and there was nobody else on
37 the road.

38
39 Erin Best, 345 Juel Lane, Hemet, California stated that she realized that the development
40 had to occur, but that she would like to reach some sort of compromise. She added that
41 she understood the current zoning allowed for multiple-family development, but that she
42 would really like to see ½-acre lots.

1 Vincent Cohee, 230 North Lake Street, Hemet, California stated that he was in favor of this
2 project because otherwise Mr. Petty could come in and build multiple-family housing. He
3 noted that there were definitely problems with traffic, stating that the existing traffic had
4 affected the school. He suggested that the issue of access to the wash should be
5 addressed to mitigate potential problems with fire hazards.

6
7 Brian Christie, 320 Juel Lane, Hemet, California reiterated the testimony of others. He
8 appealed to the Commission to retain the lots along Lincoln Avenue as larger lot sizes to
9 allow a buffer between the existing larger lot homes. He stated that he also thought the
10 project should be put on hold until the issue of the emergency response time was resolved.

11
12 Glen Dalbey, 255 North Soboba Street, Hemet, California stated that he had moved to the
13 area for the rural atmosphere. He noted that it currently remained rural on this portion of
14 Lincoln Avenue and that he would like to see it stay as such.

15
16 Jason David, 4169 Lincoln Avenue, Hemet, California spoke in opposition to the zone
17 change, reiterating the testimony of others.

18
19 Bobbie Christie, 320 Juel Lane, Hemet, California stated that she would like to see the
20 zoning designation accommodate larger lots as a buffer. She asked that caution be used
21 in decision making so as to maintain the rural area.

22
23 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 8:36 p.m.

24
25 Mr. Petty noted that Mr. Fechner had stated that in 1994 they thought that the R-1-14-C
26 zoning was a reasonable buffer to the R-A properties, but pointed out that now Lincoln
27 Street served as a 66-foot wide buffer itself. He further noted that the agreement that had
28 been referenced was made when the proposal was for multiple-family development. He
29 suggested that the Juel Lane residents would be better off with this project being built as
30 far as drainage was concerned.

31
32 Chairman Duistermars stated that one of the primary concerns was the emergency
33 response time. He noted that the Fire Department was not present at the meeting, and
34 stated that he felt that some comment was needed regarding this issue.

35
36 Marge Tandy, 1885 Flametree Way, Hemet, California advised the Commission that
37 someone had been recently hired by the City to find a location for a new fire station on the
38 east end of town.

39
40 Mr. Petty stated that he knew mutual aid had been attempted in the past, and that while
41 he was not sure how well it worked, he thought that it seemed insane not to be sharing
42 resources.

1 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding whether or not the project was within the
2 required response time so that they could move forward, or if the Fire Department should
3 evaluate the issue.

4
5 Planning Director Masyczek responded that he thought the Fire Department should provide
6 an evaluation, stating that the issue of the emergency response time was one that should
7 be answered. He suggested that the issue of the actual zoning should also be addressed,
8 as should the park issue.

9
10 Assistant City Attorney Vail pointed out in the Initial Study where it indicated that there
11 would not be any significant impacts, and that the emergency response time could be met,
12 etc. He stated that either this document was correct, or incorrect information had been
13 incorporated into the document. He suggested that if it was correct, the project had
14 already been reviewed by the police and fire departments, who had indicated that there
15 would not be a significant impact.

16
17 A discussion ensued regarding the issue of the emergency response time.

18
19 Chairman Duistermars expressed his disappointment that there was not a representative
20 available from the fire department to answer questions.

21
22 Mr. Petty stated that he believed he had complied with his CEQA obligations.

23
24 Assistant City Attorney Vail again stated that the Initial Study indicated that the project was
25 within a five-minute response area.

26
27 A discussion again ensued regarding the response time.

28
29 Chairman Duistermars expressed his concern with the idea that the Negative Declaration
30 did not offer any mitigation whatsoever.

31
32 Assistant City Attorney Vail responded that all he could do was point out the statements
33 within the document, but that he could not verify their accuracy.

34
35 Vice Chairman Jones asked of Mr. Petty if there were any way that he could provide
36 14,000 square-foot lots as a buffer by tightening things up in the center.

37
38 Mr. Petty responded that in order to do this he would have to go to 6,000 square-foot lots
39 in the center, which he didn't want to do. He added that he thought the impacts on those
40 who reside on the north side of Lincoln Avenue would be significantly less than what they
41 were anticipating.

42
43 A discussion of compatibility and other issues ensued.

44

Planning Commission Minutes
March 2, 2004

1 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that a 1/4-acre designation of R-1-10 lots as a
2 buffer might address some of the concerns that the surrounding residents had voiced.

3
4 Further discussion ensued regarding possible options that might make the project more
5 compatible with adjacent properties.

6
7 Vice Chairman Jones stated that he would like to see a split-zoning with the northern
8 portion of the property zoned as R-1-10, and the balance of the project zoned as R-1-7.2.

9
10 Assistant City Attorney Vail suggested that motions be made for Item Nos. 1 and 2.

11
12 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Searl to adopt
13 *Resolution Bill No. 04-8EA* recommending approval to the City Council of Environmental
14 Assessment No. 03-43 for General Plan Amendment No. 03-5, Zone Change No. 03-11,
15 Variance No. 04-1 and Tentative Tract Map No. 31466.

16
17 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

18
19 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,
20 Rhoten and Searl

21 NOES: None

22 ABSTAIN: None

23 ABSENT: None

24
25 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-3EA.***

26
27 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Searl to adopt
28 *Resolution Bill No. 04-22* recommending approval to the City Council of General Plan
29 Amendment No. 03-5.

30
31 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

32
33 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,
34 Rhoten and Searl

35 NOES: None

36 ABSTAIN: None

37 ABSENT: None

38
39 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-13.***

1 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Searl to adopt
2 *Resolution Bill No. 04-23* recommending approval to the City Council of Zone Change No.
3 03-11 **as amended**.

4
5 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

6
7 AYES: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Rhoten and Searl
8 NOES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioner Calkins
9 ABSTAIN: None
10 ABSENT: None

11
12 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-14.***

13
14 **G. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 03-7 / ENVIRONMENTAL**
15 **ASSESSMENT NO. 04-2**

16 APPLICANT: City of Hemet
17 OWNER: John Petty
18 LOCATION: North side of Florida Avenue between Lake Street and
19 Thomas Street
20 PLANNER: David Sawyer
21 DESCRIPTION: A General Plan Amendment from the current land use
22 designation of Commercial (C) to R-I (Single-Family
23 Residential), including a Negative Declaration for the
24 project.

25
26 The staff report was presented by Principal Planner Sawyer who provided the Commission
27 with a background regarding the necessity of the project.

28
29 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 9:26 p.m.

30
31 Since there were no members of the public who wished to speak regarding the project,
32 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 9:26 p.m. and asked for a motion.

33
34 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Vice Chairman Jones to adopt
35 *Resolution Bill No. 04-9EA* recommending approval to the City Council of a Negative
36 Declaration for Environmental Assessment No. 04-2 for General Plan Amendment No. 03-
37 7.

38
39 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

40
41 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,
42 Rhoten and Searl

1 NOES: None
2 ABSTAIN: None
3 ABSENT: None
4

5 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-4EA.***
6

7 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Vice Chairman Jones to adopt
8 *Resolution Bill No. 04-24* recommending approval to the City Council of General Plan
9 Amendment No. 03-7.

10
11 The MOTION was carried by the following:
12

13 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,
14 Rhoten and Searl
15 NOES: None
16 ABSTAIN: None
17 ABSENT: None
18

19 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-15.***
20
21

22 **VIII. WORK STUDY**
23

24 **A. VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31466 / VARIANCE NO. 04-1**

25 _____ A work study session regarding the subdivision of 21.0 acres into 81 lots for
26 single-family residential development, and a variance to deviate from the
27 minimum lot width requirement for six (6) lots in VTTM 31466.
28

29 Processed concurrently with General Plan Amendment No. 03-5 and Zone Change No. 03-
30 11.
31

32 **B. ACACIA AVENUE & YALE STREET PROPOSED MULTI-FAMILY IN-FILL**
33 **PROJECT**

34 _____ A revised proposal by Danelian Associates for a multiple-family in-fill project
35 at Acacia Avenue and Yale Street.
36

37 The work study session was initiated by Planning Technician Domenigoni who provided
38 some details regarding the proposed project. She advised the Commission that three
39 options were being proposed, and explained what each of those options entailed.
40

41 A discussion of what had been previously proposed ensued.
42

43 Concern was expressed regarding the policing of the project.
44

1 Police Lieutenant Cabrera approached the lectern and stated that visibility would be limited
2 within the project, which was of concern.

3
4 Mike Boyd of Danelian Associates, 360 Corporate Park, Irvine, California advised the
5 Commission that the interior of Alternative No. 2 would be passable by emergency
6 vehicles.

7
8 Chairman Duistermars asked if they would be open to the idea of a gated community.

9
10 Mr. Boyd responded that they would.

11
12 The Commission concurred that they would be inclined to go with Alternative No. 2 and
13 thanked the applicant for their presentation.

14
15
16 **IX. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**

17
18 **A. APPOINTMENT OF TWO PARK COMMISSIONERS TO MASTER PLAN**
19 **OF PARKS COMMITTEE**

20
21 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that two Park Commissioners had
22 been appointed to the Master Plan of Parks Committee, and that a meeting would be
23 scheduled soon.

24
25
26 **X. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

27
28 There were no comments made by any of the Commissioners.

29
30
31 **XI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

32
33 There were no future agenda items requested.

1 **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

2
3 It was MOVED by Commissioner Calkins, SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten and
4 unaniously approved to adjourn the meeting at 9:39 p.m. to the regular meeting of the
5 City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for Tuesday, March 16, 2004 at 6:00 p.m.
6 to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue,
7 Hemet, California 92543.
8
9

10
11
12

Bob Duistermars, Chairman
13

14
15 ATTEST:

16
17
18

Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary
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