



1 **III. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE**

2  
3 There was no Hemet Unified School District Update (HUSD) given due to the absence of  
4 a representative from the HUSD.  
5

6  
7 **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

8  
9 **A. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 04-14A (Amendment) (Continued from**  
10 **01-03-06)**

11 APPLICANT: John Guell - Southland Development  
12 AGENT: Thomas Riggle - Thomas Riggle Architects  
13 LOCATION: 240 N. Sanderson Ave (Southeast corner of Sanderson  
14 & Devonshire)  
15 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni  
16 DESCRIPTION: A request to construct a 6,806 square-foot building for  
17 use as a restaurant and sports bar.  
18

19 Associate Planner Domenigoni advised the Commission that this project had been  
20 withdrawn as submitted. She explained that the applicant was planning to submit plans  
21 for a different use for the building.  
22

23 **B. ZONE CHANGE NO. 04-14 AND TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 32878**  
24 **(Continued from 01-17-06)**

25 APPLICANT: Mark O'Brien - S.V. Investments  
26 AGENT: Oscar Montez - Cozad and Fox  
27 LOCATION: Northeast corner of Devonshire Avenue and Girard  
28 Street  
29 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni  
30 DESCRIPTION: A request for approval of: 1) a zone change to change  
31 the zoning from R-1-8 (Single-Family Residential -  
32 8,000 square-foot minimum lot size) and SLR (Small-  
33 Lot Residential) to R-1-7.2 (Single-Family Residential -  
34 7,200 square-foot minimum lot size); and 2) a tentative  
35 tract map to subdivide 10.0 acres into 23 lots and one  
36 (1) remainder lot for the future development of single-  
37 family homes.  
38

39 Associate Planner Domenigoni advised the Commission that the property had been sold  
40 and that, therefore, the applicant had withdrawn his application in its entirety.  
41  
42  
43  
44

1           **C.     VESTING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 30602 (Continued from 02-07-**  
2           **06)**

3           APPLICANT:       Lock Piatt - Frey and Associates  
4           AGENT:             Jim Unland - James Unland & Associates  
5           LOCATION:         North side of Wentworth Drive approximately 480-feet  
6                           east of Cawston Avenue with a portion of the property  
7                           located on the east side of Cawston Avenue  
8                           apprximately 375-feet north of Wentworth Drive  
9           PLANNER:        Loretta Domenigoni  
10          DESCRIPTION:   A request to subdivide 19,10 acres into eight (8) lots for  
11                           future industrial development.

12  
13   The staff report was presented by Associate Planner Domenigoni who provided various  
14   details regarding the project, and noted that it had been continued several times.

15  
16   A discussion ensued regarding the extension of Cawston Avenue and how it related to the  
17   project, and it was noted that the Mayor had implemented an Ad Hoc Committee that  
18   included Council Members Lori Van Arsdale and Brian Christie.

19  
20   Associate Planner Domenigoni advised the Commission that staff was recommending  
21   approval of a revised resolution, which she distributed to the Commission for review.

22  
23   Chairman Duistermars inquired as to whether the airport expansion had been considered,  
24   and asked if the heavier aircraft would cause a problem.

25  
26   Planning Director Masyczek responded that the airport expansion and heavier aircraft  
27   would only affect the areas on the west end.

28  
29   Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:04 p.m.

30  
31   Don Bender of Tierra West Commercial Real Estate, 4110 West Florida Avenue, Hemet,  
32   California approached the lectern as a representative for the applicant. Following some  
33   discussion, he advised the Commisison that he was in agreement with all of the proposed  
34   conditions of approval.

35  
36   Chairman Duistermars asked if there was a requirement for the landscaping and signage  
37   plans to be brought back to staff for additional review.

38  
39   Planning Director Masyczek indicated that both types of plans were required to come back  
40   for a typical staff review.

41  
42   Commissioner Mendoza asked Mr. Bender who the proposed tenants would be.  
43  
44

1 Mr. Bender responded that since the proposed buildings were from 5,000 to 50,000  
2 square-feet in size, there had been an excellent response from the marketing of the map.  
3 He noted that the project would include some mixed uses with light industrial.

4  
5 Chairman Duistermars asked if the Council Ad Hoc Committee was comfortable with the  
6 project without there having been traffic studies completed.

7  
8 Planning Director Masyczek indicated that, yes, the Committee was comfortable with the  
9 way the project was being handled.

10  
11 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:09 p.m.

12  
13 Associate Planner Domenigoni indicated that there had been some revisions to the  
14 conditions of approval, and she distributed revised copies to the Commission. The  
15 changes were noted as follows:

- 16  
17 – Condition No. 71 changed to include Condition Nos. 71A and 71B:

18  
19 **Cawston Avenue**

20  
21 **Condition No. 71A:** *Prior to, and as a condition of approval of any*  
22 *final map for VTPM 30602, applicant or its successor-in-interest shall provide*  
23 *to the City an irrevocable offer to dedicate to the City a thirty-three foot (33')*  
24 *right-of-way for an extension of Cawston Avenue north along the terminus*  
25 *of Cawston Avenue ("Dedication") and a reservation of the City's right to*  
26 *purchase an additional eleven foot (11') right-of-way for further widening,*  
27 *sidewalks and landscaping areas for an extension of Cawston Avenue north*  
28 *along the terminus of Cawston Avenue ("Reservation"). The Reservation*  
29 *shall provide that the City may purchase the additional right-of-way for \$5.50*  
30 *per square-foot with final purchase price determined by a survey of the*  
31 *easement area by a licensed land surveyor. The Reservation shall also*  
32 *provide that, unless exercised by the City, the Reservation and all rights and*  
33 *obligations provided for therein shall expire at 11:59 p.m. on the third (3<sup>rd</sup>)*  
34 *anniversary of the recording date of the Reservation. The Reservation shall*  
35 *be exercisable by the City by tendering a written notice to the Applicant*  
36 *and/or its successor-in-interest, prior to the expiration date, that the City will*  
37 *purchase the right-of-way with a commitment to close the transaction within*  
38 *60 days from and after the date of the letter. The form of the Dedication and*  
39 *Reservation shall be acceptable to the City Attorney and City Engineer. The*  
40 *Dedication and Reservation shall be recorded concurrently with the recording*  
41 *of any final map for VTPM 30602.*

1           **Condition No. 71B:**       The City's installation and completion of a  
2 temporary emergency access way utilizing some or all of the Cawston right-  
3 of-way offered for Dedication and Reservation shall be a condition precedent  
4 of installing combustible materials into any lot or structure and to the  
5 issuance of the first certificate of occupancy for lots or any structure within  
6 VTPM 30602. Provided, however, that the foregoing condition shall be  
7 deemed waived and released by the City, if after approval and recording of  
8 the final map, and after written notice to the City by Applicant or its  
9 successor-in-interest, City does not complete installation of the access way  
10 within 120 days of such notice. Applicant shall install a knox-box to provide  
11 access to the property at such location as may be indicated by the City  
12 Engineer and the City Fire Marshall.

- 13  
14 –       Condition No. 72 changed to include Condition Nos. 72A and 72B:

15  
16           **North of Cawston Avenue (Northern Property Line):**

17  
18           **Condition No. 72A:**       Prior to, and as a condition of approval of any  
19 final map for VTPM 30602, applicant or its successor-in-interest shall provide  
20 to the City an irrevocable offer to dedicate to the City a thirty-three foot (33')  
21 right-of-way for an extension of Cawston Avenue along the north property  
22 line of VTPM 30602 ("Dedication") and a reservation of the City's right to  
23 purchase an additional eleven-foot (11') right-of-way for further widening,  
24 sidewalks and landscaping areas for an extension of Cawston Avenue along  
25 the northern property line of VTPM 30602 ("Reservation"). The Reservation  
26 shall provide that the City may purchase the additional right-of-way for \$5.50  
27 per square-foot with final purchase price determined by a survey of the  
28 easement area by a licensed land surveyor. The Reservation shall also  
29 provide that, unless exercised by the City, the Reservation and all rights and  
30 obligations provided for therein shall expire at 11:59 p.m. on the third (3<sup>rd</sup>)  
31 anniversary of the recording date of the Reservation. The Reservation shall  
32 be exercisable by the City by tendering a written notice to the Applicant  
33 and/or its successor-in-interest, prior to the expiration date, that the City will  
34 purchase the right-of-way with a commitment to close the transaction within  
35 60 days from and after the date of the letter. The form of Dedication and  
36 Reservation shall be acceptable to the City Attorney and City Engineer. The  
37 Dedication and Reservation shall be recorded concurrently with the recording  
38 of any final map for VTPM 30602.

39  
40           **Condition No. 72B:**       The City's installation and completion of a  
41 temporary emergency access way utilizing some or all of the Cawston right-  
42 of-way offered for Dedication and Reservation shall be a condition precedent  
43 of installing combustible materials into any lot or structure and to the  
44

1 issuance of the first certificate of occupancy for lots or any structure within  
2 VTPM 30602. Provided, however, that the foregoing condition shall be  
3 deemed waived and released by the City, if after approval and recording of  
4 the final map, and after written notice to the City by Applicant or its  
5 successor-in-interest, City does not complete installation of the access way  
6 within 120 days of such notice. Applicant shall install a Knox-box to provide  
7 access to the property at such location as may be indicated by the City  
8 Engineer and the City Fire Marshall.

9  
10 – Condition No. 73 revised to read as follows:

11  
12 **Condition No. 73:** The map may be revised to reflect the new detention  
13 basin design up to and including no basin requirement subject to the  
14 approval of the City Engineer. Plans shall be submitted to the City prior to  
15 recordation and shall be to the satisfaction of the Engineering Department.

16  
17 – Condition No. 74 to be stricken in its entirety.

18  
19 – Condition No. 78 (formerly Condition No. 79 prior to the elimination of  
20 Condition No. 74) shall be revised to include the words **“if required”** and  
21 shall read as follows:

22  
23 **Condition No. 78:** If required, the detention facility shall be a lettered lot on  
24 the Parcel/Final Map and may be required to mitigate off-site flows through  
25 the project site in accordance with City of Hemet Resolution No. 2108. Said  
26 detention basin shall be maintained by the Business Park Association and/or  
27 another mechanism as approved by the City Attorney.

28  
29 – Condition No. 79 (formerly Condition No. 80 prior to the elimination of  
30 Condition No. 74) shall be revised to include the words **“if required”** and  
31 shall read as follows:

32  
33 **Condition No. 79:** If required, construction of the detention basin shall  
34 include, but not be limited to, the following improvements: concrete driveway,  
35 perimeter fencing (decorative block and/or wrought iron fence, as determined  
36 by the Planning Department), access ramp, outlet structure and discharge  
37 pump. The use of an underground detention system is preferred. Such  
38 system shall include appropriate filters at the inlet(s) and a discharge pump.

39  
40 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.

1 It was MOVED by Commissioner McBride and SECONDED by Commissioner Mendoza  
2 to adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 05-12EA* approving Environmental  
3 Assessment No. 05-27 as a Negative Declaration for Vesting Tentative Parcel Map No.  
4 30602.

5  
6 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

7  
8 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners McBride, Mendoza and Rhoten  
9 NOES: None  
10 ABSTAIN: None  
11 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones  
12

13 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-04EA.***

14  
15 It was MOVED by Commissioner McBride and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to  
16 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 05-50* approving Vesting Tentative Parcel  
17 Map No. 30602 as amended.

18  
19 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

20  
21 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners McBride, Mendoza and Rhoten  
22 NOES: None  
23 ABSTAIN: None  
24 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones  
25

26 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-12.***

27  
28 **D. ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-13(2) AND TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31064(2)**

29 APPLICANT: Commonwealth Holdings, LLC  
30 AGENT: Dan Koby  
31 LOCATION: Northeast corner of Commonwealth Avenue and Kirby  
32 Street  
33 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni  
34 DESCRIPTION: A request to change the zoning designation from A-1-C-  
35 1 (Light-Agriculture - One-acre minimum) to R-1-7.2  
36 (Single-Family Residential - 7,200 square-foot  
37 minimum) and to subdivide 39.0 acres into 134 lots for  
38 future development of single-family homes.  
39

40 The staff report was presented by Associate Planner Domenigoni who provided various  
41 details regarding the project and advised the Commission that it had been processed a few  
42 years previously by KB Home, and withdrawn, but had subsequently been reactivated by  
43 the property owner. She advised the Commission that on Page No. 7 of the staff report,  
44

1 it was indicated that staff wanted the landscape islands to remain, but that the applicant  
2 was wanting to have them removed. She noted that the original plan showed the entrance  
3 streets from Commonwealth Avenue at 16-feet, but that this was not acceptable by the Fire  
4 Department, who was requiring that they be 20-feet. She explained that the applicant was  
5 opting to remove the landscaped medians rather than widen the streets. She further  
6 advised the Commission that, in an effort to eliminate the raceway effect of the streets,  
7 staff had asked the applicant to include traffic calming features for the straight away,  
8 including a bulb-out effect, and that the applicant was in agreement with this request. She  
9 noted that Condition No. 16 required construction of single-story homes, exclusively, along  
10 Commonwealth Avenue, but that the applicant was wanting to include a few two-story  
11 homes. She added that Condition No. 15 would require all landscaping to come back  
12 before the Planning Commission for review and approval through the Site Development  
13 Review application process.

14  
15 Associate Planner Domenigoni indicated that correspondence regarding the project  
16 included: 1) a telephone call from Maurice Cofer of 1945 West Esplanade Avenue, Hemet  
17 California, who felt that there shouldn't be any lots smaller than one-acre, and that some  
18 type of on-site gopher control should be implemented since gophers would likely become  
19 a problem when grading was started; and 2) an e-mail from Donna Reusch of 1440 North  
20 Kirby Street, Hemet, California, which she distributed copies of to the Commission for  
21 review.

22  
23 Principal Engineer Biagioni advised the Commission that the applicant had agreed to  
24 extend the street improvements so that the curb and gutter would match from the church  
25 property to Commonwealth Avenue, which was based on the property owner granting an  
26 easement to the City.

27  
28 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:22 p.m.

29  
30 Bruce Kramer of 2095 West Esplanade Avenue, Hemet, California approached the lectern  
31 and advised the Commission that his property adjoined the proposed development. He  
32 noted that approximately 10 days earlier a representative for the applicant had called him  
33 and that the project had been explained over the telephone much differently than it was  
34 being presented now. He added that this plan seemed very similar to the plan for the  
35 property that had been presented a year or two ago, noting that the community did not  
36 support it then and they would not support it now. He explained that a lot his size would  
37 have 11 houses on it. He advised the Commission that there was already an increased  
38 amount of traffic along Esplanade Avenue and that the plan was not taking into  
39 consideration the fact that the properties just southeast of the proposed project were all  
40 horse properties. He added that the development that was being proposed was not in  
41 conformance with what the residents had been told the City would allow as development  
42 for this property. He vehemently stated that he was opposed to the proposed project, that  
43  
44

1 one-acre lots were sufficient in the area, and that two-story homes were not consistent with  
2 the surrounding development.

3  
4 Mel Haugen, 1333 Clydesdale Court, Hemet, California approached the lectern and  
5 advised the Commission that the residents in the vicinity of the proposed project were all  
6 accustomed to a rural lifestyle on property that was zoned for horses. He stated that he  
7 was opposed to the project's density, adding that one-acre lots would be more consistent  
8 with the surrounding development.

9  
10 Ron Hill, 1250 North Kirby Street, Hemet, California approached the lectern and advised  
11 the Commission that he resided five houses east of the intersection of this project and that  
12 his area was a very nicely developed horse community. He expressed his concern with  
13 the fact that the entrance into the proposed project would be trying to flow 200 cars in and  
14 out of a single entrance, and that the number of residents exiting onto Commonwealth  
15 Avenue would be excessive with many people racing through the area at high speeds. He  
16 noted that, in his opinion, the proposed project appeared to be a tract of homes that was  
17 just being plopped into the middle of their nicely developed horse community.

18  
19 Diane Miller of 1431 North Lyon Avenue, Hemet, California approached the lectern and  
20 expressed her opposition to the proposed project, noting that she would like to see the  
21 property remain as an agricultural zone with lot sizes of no less than ½-acre.

22  
23 Catherine Waddell of 1382 Hackney Street, Hemet, California approached the lectern and  
24 advised the Commission that the project had been visited a few years earlier and that the  
25 neighborhood residents had opposed the project then, just at they were now. She  
26 expressed her strong objection to the project, noting that the proposal would affect not only  
27 the traffic, but the area as a whole. She inquired regarding the plans for schools, which  
28 should be an important consideration. She added that it was her opinion that lot sizes  
29 should not be smaller than one-acre.

30  
31 Cindy Lachappa of 1010 North Lyon Avenue, Hemet, California approached the lectern  
32 and advised the Commission that she had been a resident in the neighborhood for 35  
33 years with a 2 ½-acre lot. She expressed her opposition to the project, noting that she  
34 could not understand why the area should have lot sizes smaller than one-acre, which was  
35 the way it had been for years.

36  
37 David Lebs of 2045 West Esplanade Avenue, Hemet, California approached the lectern  
38 and expressed his opposition to the project.

39  
40 Jerry Kramer of 2025 West Esplanade Avenue, Hemet, California approached the lectern  
41 and noted that they had been before the Commission to oppose the previous project and  
42 that he did not know why they had to be there again. He stated that he had received no  
43  
44

1 notice regarding the meeting, and that when he looked at the proposed map what he saw  
2 was his worst nightmare.

3  
4 Dan Koby approached the lectern as the project applicant and advised the Commission  
5 that his project had been in process for four years. He noted that on February 16, 2006  
6 he had visited with the Kramers, personally, and asked for their support on his project. He  
7 went on to say that he had been the owner of the property since the late 1980's at which  
8 time, he claimed, it had been zoned R-2, which would have allowed for up to 7 units per  
9 acre. He noted that what he was proposing now was half of that, and that there would be  
10 10,000 square-foot lots at the top. He advised the Commission that the nearby church was  
11 in support of his project, and that he had a letter from them that he would be willing to  
12 submit. He noted that he was trying to be cooperative with the Planning Commission and  
13 Planning Department staff, and that he had even met staff's request for the exit on Kirby  
14 to have a right-turn lane available.

15  
16 It was noted that the General Plan designation – not the zoning – allowed for up to 7 units  
17 per acre.

18  
19 Mr. Koby suggested that it did not make sense to have vacant land a mile from the mall,  
20 noting that the neighbors wanted the land to stay vacant forever. He noted that he had  
21 taxes and fees that he needed to pay every year for the property and that he really needed  
22 to get it developed. He stated that it was not fair that the neighbors were opposing his  
23 project and asked why the Commission was discriminating against his property.

24  
25 Commissioner Rhoten inquired regarding the figures pertaining to the traffic in the traffic  
26 analysis.

27  
28 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the traffic study indicated 1,455 one-way trips  
29 through the project per day.

30  
31 Mr. Koby noted that the figure in the traffic study was based on a higher density of 152  
32 homes. He referred to the density of the nearby trailer park.

33  
34 Catherine Waddell re-approached the lectern and noted that the trailer park was a different  
35 thing entirely, suggesting that while it may be high-density there were no parks need, nor  
36 areas for children to play. She noted that Valleywide Recreation was ½-mile away from  
37 the project, as were the schools, and that there was no play area within the proposed  
38 project for children.

39  
40 Mary Hurst of 1431 North Lyon Avenue, Hemet, California approached the lectern and  
41 stated that Mr. Koby “talked a good line”, but that he was trying to take away the residents’  
42 way of life just so that he could make more money. She added that she would much rather  
43 have a school on the property than the proposed project. She noted that Mr. Koby had  
44

1 even offered to purchase 5 acres of her land. She pleaded with the Commission not to  
2 change the zoning.

3  
4 Ron Hill reapproached the lectern and stated that while the visual of two-story homes over  
5 the wall of the proposed project would be shocking, it was the traffic analysis that was truly  
6 shocking. He asked why an entrance was not proposed off of Lyon Avenue or Kirby Street,  
7 and suggested that the concept of a single entrance accommodating 1,455 trips per day  
8 right next to a senior community was insane.

9  
10 Bruce Kramer reapproached the lectern and advised the Commission that his family had  
11 purchased their property around 1980, and that his 2 ½-acre parcel – which was as small  
12 as the County would allow – was only a limited part of the 40 acres that he had originally  
13 owned.

14  
15 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 7:02 p.m.

16  
17 Commissioner Rhoten asked Mr. Koby how he would respond to Ms. Waddell's concerns  
18 regarding the parks, and asked if the detention basin could be utilized as a park.

19  
20 Mr. Koby responded that there was no need for a park with the larger lots. Regarding the  
21 exits and entrances to the subdivision, he noted that Assistant Public Works Director Gow  
22 had changed them from Kirby Street and Lyon Avenue to Commonwealth exclusively.

23  
24 Chairman Duistermars suggested that the landscaped islands would be necessary to kick  
25 up the landscaping and provide consistent curb appeal. He noted that it was of concern  
26 to him that they were not included and that he would like them to be re-added to the  
27 project.

28  
29 Mr. Koby indicated that a great deal of time had been spent on the engineering of the  
30 project and that the islands had been removed because of the increased street width.

31  
32 Planning Director Masyczek noted that the street width was 20-feet, curb-to-curb. He  
33 added that an option would be to put the islands back in the plan, but that Mr. Koby would  
34 probably lose a lot or two.

35  
36 Mark Anderson, 1223 University Avenue, Riverside, California approached the lectern as  
37 the civil engineer for the project. He suggested that they could enhance the existing  
38 landscaping and include additional landscaping for the bulb-outs at the two middle entries.

39  
40 Commissioner Mendoza referred to the concerns of the surrounding community, which  
41 included compatibility, drainage, lot sizes and flooding. He noted that the residents were  
42 obviously united by their way of life, and that in this case they were also united in their  
43 opposition to this project. He suggested that there must be a compromise, perhaps  
44

1 requiring a minimum lot size of one-acre and the addition of a horse trail, etc. He  
2 questioned as to why, if these were the sentiments of the community, the issues were not  
3 addressed before the project had come to the point of a public hearing where a decision  
4 needed to be made.

5  
6 Mr. Koby reiterated that he had been trying to get approval on this project for the past four  
7 years, noting again that the church and the mobile home park were in support of the  
8 project, as proposed.

9  
10 Commissioner McBride stated that, while he appreciated Mr. Koby's efforts within the  
11 community, a project of the proposed density did not seem to fit that particular community.

12  
13 Commissioner Rhoten noted that there had been no statements made by anyone who was  
14 in support of the project.

15  
16 Mr. Koby submitted his letter of support from the church to the City Attorney for public  
17 record.

18  
19 Planning Director Masyczek noted that the project was somewhat compatible with the  
20 neighborhoods to the south and the west, and suggested that Mr. Koby may want to  
21 consider proposing a split zone, adding that the project was a contentious issue from the  
22 beginning. He advised the Commission that if they opted to deny the project, it should be  
23 noted that their decision was based on compatibility.

24  
25 Mr. Koby advised the Commission that he intended to leave the project as it was, and that  
26 if it was not approved he was not interested in pursuing a split zoning.

27  
28 Chairman Duistermars asked Mr. Koby if he wished to withdraw his application.

29  
30 Mr. Koby responded that he did not.

31  
32 City Attorney Vail explained that the Planning Commission would make a recommendation  
33 to the City Council regarding their final decision.

34  
35 Chairman Duistermars advised Mr. Koby that if he would like to work on re-designing the  
36 project to change the lot sizes and densities, and make it more compatible with the  
37 surrounding neighborhood the Commission could continue the project, but that as  
38 designed it was looking like the Commission would be recommending denial.

39  
40 A discussion ensued regarding what changes the Commission would expect in order to  
41 reconsider the project for approval.

42  
43 Mr. Koby chose to proceed with the project as designed.  
44

1 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.

2  
3 It was MOVED by Commissioner Mendoza and SECONDED by Commissioner McBride  
4 to recommend denial to the City Council of *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 06-*  
5 *02EA, 06-03 and 06-04*, due to issues with density, traffic, lot sizes and compatibility.

6  
7 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

8  
9 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners McBride, Mendoza and Rhoten  
10 NOES: None  
11 ABSTAIN: None  
12 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones

13  
14 It was noted that the project would tentatively be reviewed by the City Council at their  
15 meeting of April 25, 2006.

16  
17 It was agreed to take a five-minute break at 7:32 p.m., to allow for the audience to  
18 disperse.

19  
20 The meeting was reconvened by Chairman Duistermars at 7:40 p.m.

21  
22  
23 **V. WORK STUDY**

24  
25 **A. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS - Richard Masyczek**  
26 Review of the Planning Director's determination of use for internet cafes and  
27 hookah lounges as conditionally permitted uses.

28  
29 Planning Director Masyczek initiated the work study session with a discussion regarding  
30 Administrative Use Permits (AUP's) versus Conditional Use Permits (CUP's). He noted  
31 that there had recently been a request to open a hookah lounge in the City, and that he  
32 was recommending that a conditional use permit be required for this type of use.

33  
34 Commissioner Rhoten asked if there was actually a demand for this type of business.

35  
36 Chairman Duistermars indicated that it was his understanding that there was.

37  
38 Planning Director Masyczek added that, regarding arcades, he was recommending that a  
39 conditional use permit be required for any business that included more than 5 arcade  
40 games. He explained that the difference between an arcade and an internet café was not  
41 specifically called out in the Municipal Code, and that therefore, he perceived them to be  
42 one and the same.

1 The Commission concurred with Planning Director Masyczek's recommendations.

2  
3 City Attorney Vail noted that a zoning ordinance would need to be initiated and processed  
4 with a recommendation to the City Council.

5  
6 Chairman Duistermars agreed that it should be presented to the City Council with the  
7 Planning Commission's blessings.

8  
9 Jacob Reed approached the lectern as the business owner of "Insomniacs". He explained  
10 that his business was outside of the "cyber café" status, which, he noted, were quite rare  
11 as well as few and far between in the valley. He added that the computers that he  
12 maintained were monitored on a continuous basis.

13  
14 Chairman Duistermars advised Mr. Reed that the Planning Director was opening a legal  
15 channel for him to continue his business.

16  
17  
18 **VI. UPDATE OF CITY COUNCIL ACTION ON PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS**

19  
20 **A. CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF FEBRUARY 28, 2006**

- 21  
22 1. **ZONE CHANGE NO. 05-02, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 33424**  
23 **AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 05-13** - Scrimsher  
24 Construction - North side of Fruitvale Avenue between Palm and Lyon  
25 Avenues

26  
27 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that Zone Change No. 05-02, along  
28 with Tentative Tract Map No. 33424 and Environmental Assessment No. 05-13 had been  
29 approved as recommended by the Commission.

30  
31  
32 **VII. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**

33  
34 There were no Planning Director Items on the agenda.

35  
36  
37 **VIII. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

38  
39 There was a brief discussion regarding the possibilities of industrial development along  
40 Cawston Avenue and Wentworth Drive.

1 Chairman Duistermars noted that he would really like to suggest that the City Council put  
2 together some commercial or industrial guidelines, and that now was the ideal time to do  
3 so.

4  
5 Planning Director Masyczek noted that he would be presenting his list of recommendations  
6 to the City Council at their next meeting.

7  
8  
9 **IX. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

10  
11 Chairman Duistermars noted that drainage was becoming an issue in the City and that he  
12 would like to see the Commission educated on the status of drainage. He noted that it was  
13 his understanding that there was an approved drainage plan for the City of Hemet, and  
14 asked if copies could be obtained from the Public Works Department for each of the  
15 Commissioners.

16  
17 Planning Director Masyczek responded that he would work on this.

18  
19  
20 **X. ADJOURNMENT**

21  
22 It was MOVED by Commissioner Mendoza, SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten and  
23 unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 7:59 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City  
24 of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **Tuesday, March 21, 2006 at 6:00 p.m.** to  
25 be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet,  
26 California 92543.

27  
28  
29 **(Minutes prepared by Nancie Shaw)**

30  
31  
32  
33 \_\_\_\_\_  
34 **Bob Duistermars, Chairman**  
35 **Hemet Planning Commission**

36 **ATTEST:**

37  
38  
39 \_\_\_\_\_  
40 **Melissa Diels, Minutes Secretary**  
41 **Hemet Planning Commission**