

1 CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

2
3 TUESDAY, MAY 20, 2003

4
5 THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION WAS
6 CONVENED BY CHAIRMAN DUISTERMARS ON TUESDAY, MAY 20, 2003 AT 6:00 P.M.
7 AT THE CITY OF HEMET COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 450 EAST LATHAM AVENUE,
8 HEMET, CALIFORNIA.

9
10 Present: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Hicks and Commissioners
11 Calkins, Jones and Rhoten

12
13 Absent: None

14
15 Staff Present: Principal Planner Matthew Bassi, Assistant Planner Losey,
16 Planning Director Richard Masyczek, Principal Planner David
17 Sawyer, Minutes Secretary Myrna Kasick, Assistant City Attorney
18 Eric Vail

19
20 Invocation & Flag Salute: Commissioner Jones

21
22
23 I. PUBLIC COMMENTS: Anyone who wishes to address the Commission
24 regarding items not on the agenda may do so at this time. Please line up at the
25 lectern when the Chair asks if there are any communications from the public. ***When***
26 ***you are recognized, please give your name, spelling of last name, and***
27 ***address for accurate recording in the minutes.***

28
29 There were no members of the public who wished to address the Commission.

30
31
32 II. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE: Update given by HUSD Director
33 of Facilities, Sandy Packham

34
35 Sandy Packham, Director of Facilities for the Hemet Unified School District, reported that
36 the staff at HUSD had been very busy. She reported that the school district was moving
37 forward with the possibility of utilizing the site at the northeast corner of Esplanade and
38 Sanderson Avenues for the new high school. She went on to say that the bid for Cawston
39 Elementary School had come in at \$1.4 million over budget, and that the bids for Santa Fe
40 Middle School had also come in quite high. She stated that the bids for Little Lake
41 Elementary School and Acacia Middle School were opening the following day.

42
43
44

Planning Commission Minutes
May 20, 2003

1 Ms. Packham reported that there were two new relocatable buildings being installed at
2 Bautista Creek Elementary School, and that the old bungalow building at Hemet
3 Elementary School would be demolished due to fire marshal violations.

4
5 Ms. Packham advised the Commission that HUSD had been negotiating with the applicant
6 for the McSweeny Farms project, and that they were asking for a 5-year option on a piece
7 of property within the project for a school site. She added that at the end of five years the
8 property would be reverted back to homes if it had not been purchased by the school
9 district. She further added that if the middle school needed to be built prior to
10 development, the school district would not be able to pay for the connecting roads.

11
12 Chairman Duistermars suggested that the property with the 5-year option be tied to a
13 phase rather than a length of time.

14
15 Ms. Packham concluded her presentation and excused herself to attend a WRCOG
16 meeting.

17
18 The Commission thanked her for her report.

19
20
21 **III. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**

22
23 There were no amendments or additions to the agenda.

24
25
26 **IV. CONSENT CALENDAR:**

27
28 There were no items on the consent calendar for approval.

29
30
31 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS:**

32
33 **A. COMMERCIAL DESIGN GUIDELINES (Continued from May 6, 2003)**

34 APPLICANT: City of Hemet
35 LOCATION: City-wide
36 PLANNER: David Sawyer
37 DESCRIPTION: Adoption of commercial design guidelines that provide
38 guidance on architectural details, landscaping,
39 pedestrian amenities and overall compatibility for
40 commercial projects in the City of Hemet.

41
42 The staff report was presented by Principal Planner Sawyer who advised the Commission
43 that staff had been meeting with the Community Development Committee (CDC) for
44

1 several months in an effort to establish the Commercial Design Guidelines. He added that
2 the guidelines had been through several workshops, and that they had been prepared
3 following a review of the guidelines used by other communities. He clarified for the
4 Commission that the proposed guidelines were recommended by the CDC.

5
6 Principal Planner Sawyer emphasized to the Commission that the Commercial Design
7 Guidelines were **guidelines**, as opposed to regulations, to be used in the review and
8 approval of projects by staff and the Planning Commission. He explained that they should
9 be utilized for purposes of consistency, and that there was flexibility as to the manner in
10 which they could be used. He added that staff was looking for a recommendation from the
11 Planning Commission at this time.

12
13 Chairman Duistermars asked if there were any members of the public who would like to
14 speak regarding the issue.

15
16 There were none.

17
18 A discussion regarding the guidelines ensued, followed by a recommendation from the
19 Commission that the guidelines be scheduled for review by the City Council at their May
20 27, 2003 meeting.

21
22 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Hicks and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
23 recommend by Minute Order approval to the City Council of the Commercial Design
24 Guidelines as presented.

25
26 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

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

33
34 **B. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NO. 03-10**

35 APPLICANT: Carlos Gonzales
36 LOCATION: 3710 Park Avenue
37 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni
38 DESCRIPTION: A request for site development review to construct a
39 2,400 square-foot metal accessory structure on 1.6
40 acres of land zoned R-1-C.

41
42 Due to the absence of Planning Technician Domenigoni, the staff report was presented by
43 Principal Planner Bassi who explained that the applicant was requesting approval of an
44

1 accessory structure that was in excess of 50% of the principle structure on the property,
2 which was located in the R-1-10 zone. He explained that the lot was larger than a typical
3 lot and that staff was recommending that the Planning Commission approve the project.
4

5 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding what lay behind the area where the accessory
6 structure would be located.
7

8 Vice Chairman Hicks responded that he had taken a look at the site, and that there were
9 light buildings in the area, with a hill behind the proposed location of the structure.
10

11 Commissioner Jones clarified that the Commission did not have any jurisdiction over fire
12 sprinklers, etc., adding that the permission given at this time by the Commission was for
13 the construction of the structure only.
14

15 Don Gonzales approached the lectern and addressed the Commission as a representative
16 for the applicant and a member of the California State Bar. He advised the Commission
17 that he understood what this particular approval was for and that the Commission did not
18 have any jurisdiction as far as the fire requirements were concerned. He expressed
19 concern with the project being approved as conditioned, stating that the applicant had a
20 problem with the conditions. He added that there was plenty of property on the lot where
21 the building could go without a need for the proposed conditions, and stated that they
22 would like the Commission to consider approving the plan without the fire department
23 conditions. He added further that there would be nothing behind the structure but the
24 existing hill, and that directly to the right of the property was a 5-acre parcel of land. To the
25 west of the property is a house, which is the closest structure. He stated that with the fire
26 department conditions imposed, they would be required to have a fire hydrant within 150-
27 feet of the structure, which would mean they would have to bear the burden of cost to have
28 one installed. He added that there was an existing fire hydrant at the southwest corner of
29 the property. He went on to say that the requirement of a 20-foot driveway for ingress and
30 egress for the fire department, as well as the requirement for a turnaround were
31 unreasonable requirements that would be impossible to achieve on this property.
32

33 A discussion ensued regarding the conditions that had been imposed by the fire
34 department and the fact that there was no representative from the fire department present
35 at the meeting to answer questions.
36

37 The Commission suggested, and the applicant concurred, that the project be continued to
38 allow the applicant time to negotiate with the fire department.
39

40 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Hicks and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
41 continue Site Development Review No. 03-10 to the Planning Commission meeting of June
42 3, 2003.
43
44

Planning Commission Minutes
May 20, 2003

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

2
3 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Hicks and Commissioners Calkins,
4 Jones and Rhoten
5 NOES: None
6 ABSTAIN: None
7 ABSENT: None
8
9

10 **VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

11
12 **A. ZONE CHANGE NO. 02-5 & ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 03-6**
13 **(Continued from May 6, 2003)**

14 APPLICANT: Sumer Vardhan / Kalpesh Homes, Inc.
15 LOCATION: Northeast corner of Hemet Street and Berkeley Avenue
16 PLANNER: Matthew Bassi
17 DESCRIPTION: A proposal to change the zoning on a 10-acre parcel
18 from the existing classification of A-1-C (Light-
19 Agricultural) to R-1 (Single-Family Residential) and R-1-
20 20,000 (Single-Family Residential - 20,000 square-foot
21 minimum lot size).
22

23 Commissioner Calkins excused himself from participating in the public hearing due to a
24 conflict of interest.
25

26 The staff report was presented by Principal Planner Bassi who reminded the Commission
27 that they had given staff direction to come up with split zoning. He explained that they had
28 come up with the R-1-20 zone, and indicated that the plat map for the project shows the
29 area along Smith Road where four lots would be zoned with the R-1-20 designation. He
30 indicated a cul-de-sac that had been approved by the fire department, which was a change
31 from the previous meeting. He added that staff was requesting that the Commission
32 recommend approval of the project to the City Council.
33

34 Commissioner Jones asked if the traffic flow met the approval of the Planning Department.
35

36 Principal Planner Bassi responded that it did, adding that the road would be designed to
37 city standards.
38

39 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:40 p.m.
40

41 Gaye Duffin, 748 Smith Road, Hemet, California approached the lectern and addressed
42 the Commission as an adjacent resident of the project. She stated that following the
43 previous public hearing her husband had submitted a letter. She read portions of the letter
44

1 aloud for the Commission to hear. She then proceeded to read a letter that had been
2 written by Robert Wainer who was also an adjacent resident. She advised the Commission
3 that as residents they would like to see the zoning designation for the property kept as A-1
4 in an effort to maintain an area in Hemet that has space. She explained that this part of
5 Hemet was one with many large lots and that she would like to see it stay that way. She
6 went on to say that the neighborhood schools were already crowded and that with the
7 Corwin project that was being proposed on the other side of this proposed project, the
8 congestion would be significant.

9
10 Jim Unland, 3550 E. Florida Ave., Hemet, California approached the lectern as the project
11 engineer and a representative for the applicant. He stated that they had been working on
12 the modifications of the project for six weeks, and that they had complied with all of the
13 recommendations that had been made. He further stated that they were looking at this as
14 a transition area, but that they had preserved some open space areas and fixed Smith
15 Road so that it would be a lane and a half of paved road. He expressed frustration at the
16 fact that one obstacle after another seemed to keep coming up.

17
18 Mike Duffin, 748 Smith Road, Hemet, California approached the lectern as an adjacent
19 resident of the project. He asked the Commission to address the issue of neighborhood
20 planning, inquiring as to how a single row of homes with a density of 4 homes per acre
21 qualified as a "transition" area. He stated that 20 years ago the Planning Commission had
22 a master plan, and that the only houses that were built were large houses on one-acre lots.
23 He expressed anger and frustration with the idea that the Planning Commission now allows
24 developers to do whatever they want to do, and that making money is their primary goal,
25 with neighborhood planning falling into second place. He added that it was inappropriate
26 for one of the Commissioners to have a conflict of interest with the project.

27
28 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:51 p.m.

29
30 Assistant City Attorney Vail explained that, regarding the issue of a Commissioner having
31 a conflict of interest, the fair and political thing for that Commissioner to do was remove
32 himself from the public hearing. He advised that Commissioner Calkins had complied with
33 State law in doing so.

34
35 Chairman Duistermars stated that he hated to see names and reputations trashed at a
36 public meeting, adding that this Commission had worked very hard to improve overall
37 development within the City, although they could not always make everyone happy. He
38 continued, stating that a transition piece was needed there, and that the transition and all
39 of the other considerations reflected the fact that this Commission was indeed interested
40 in making a better community.

1 It was MOVED by Commissioner Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
2 adopt **Resolution No. 03-5EA** recommending approval to the City Council of
3 Environmental Assessment No. 03-6 for Zone Change No. 02-5.

4
5 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

6
7 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Hicks and Commissioners Jones and
8 Rhoten
9 NOES: None
10 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Calkins
11 ABSENT: None
12

13 It was MOVED by Commissioner Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
14 adopt **Resolution No. 03-14** recommending approval to the City Council of Zone Change
15 No. 02-5.

16
17 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

18
19 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Hicks and Commissioners Jones and
20 Rhoten
21 NOES: None
22 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Calkins
23 ABSENT: None
24

25 **B. VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 30869 & ENVIRONMENTAL**
26 **ASSESSMENT NO. 03-9 (Continued from May 6, 2003)**

27 APPLICANT: Sumer Vardhan / Kalpesh Homes, Inc.
28 LOCATION: South side of Berkeley Avenue between Soboba and
29 Lake Streets
30 PLANNER: Matthew Bassi
31 DESCRIPTION: A proposal to subdivide 10-acres into 17 lots for future
32 ½-acre single-family residential development on
33 property zoned A-1-C (Light-Agricultural).
34

35 The staff report was presented by Principal Planner Bassi, who advised the Commission
36 that due to the Planning Commission's denial of the related zone change, the applicant had
37 revised the map to meet the standards of the current zone, and that based on those
38 revisions staff was recommending approval of the map. He added that the Commission
39 would see the project again when the request for Site Development Review was submitted
40 for approval. He explained that the "Vesting" status of the map would exempt the applicant
41 from the TUMF fee requirement.
42

43 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:59 p.m.
44

1 Jennifer Jeocha, 575 Clarissa Lane, Hemet, California approached the lectern as an
2 adjacent resident to the project site. She advised the Commission that there continued to
3 be an active hawk's nest present on the property. She further advised that the weeds were
4 quite high on the property and that someone had been dumping dirt there. She expressed
5 concern with the fact that when the road was extended around with the development, the
6 lights from the cars traveling the road would be pointing directly at her house.

7
8 Discussion of the roadway ensued.

9
10 Jim Unland of Unland & Associates, 3550 E. Florida Ave., Hemet, California approached
11 the lectern as the project engineer and a representative for the applicant. He advised the
12 Commission that they had complied with all of the concerns and requests that the residents
13 of the neighborhood had asked for. He added that the applicant had hired a biologist who
14 had advised them that red-tailed hawks were development friendly birds, and that they
15 should monitor the situation and proceed with the project when the hawks had vacated the
16 nest.

17
18 Commissioner Hicks expressed his appreciation for the extra mile that the developer had
19 gone to meet the requests of the neighboring residents.

20
21 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 7:09 p.m.

22
23 At the request of Chairman Duistermars, Planning Director Masyczek indicated that
24 Condition No. 14 required the project to come back for approval of the Site Development
25 plan.

26
27 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.

28
29 It was **MOVED** by Vice Chairman Hicks and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Rhoten to
30 adopt **Resolution No. 03-1EA** approving Environmental Assessment No. 03-9 for Vesting
31 Tentative Tract Map No. 30869.

32
33 The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote:

34
35 **AYES:** Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Hicks and Commissioners Jones and
36 Rhoten

37 **NOES:** None

38 **ABSTAIN:** Commissioner Calkins

39 **ABSENT:** None

40
41 It was **MOVED** by Vice Chairman Hicks and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Rhoten to
42 adopt **Resolution No. 03-4** approving Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 30869.

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

2
3 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Hicks and Commissioners Jones and
4 Rhoten

5 NOES: None

6 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Calkins

7 ABSENT: None

8
9 **C. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 02-1** - David Sawyer

10 An amendment to the Public Safety Element of the Hemet General Plan
11 addressing airport compatibility standards and criteria.

12
13 Commissioner Calkins rejoined the meeting at 7:16 p.m.

14
15 Principal Planner Sawyer presented the staff report, advising the Commission that this item
16 had initially been brought before them as a work study item in August of 2002. He
17 explained that the Planning Commission had recommended approval of the first version
18 of the amendment, which then went to the City Council, who directed staff to make some
19 revisions. He advised the Commission that the revisions had been made as noted in the
20 staff report, and that staff was encouraging the Planning Commission to recommend
21 approval to the City Council of General Plan Amendment No. 02-1.

22
23 Commissioner Jones noted that the original Public Safety Element had been prepared
24 years ago and that he did not have enough information to feel comfortable approving the
25 amendment.

26
27 Planning Director Masyczek explained that the amendment provided clarification within
28 certain areas of the Public Safety Element, adding that the amendment would allow the
29 City to find certain projects within the airport influence area to be consistent with the
30 General Plan.

31
32 Principal Planner Sawyer suggested that it was appropriate to move forward at this time.

33
34 Assistant City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that the Planning Department staff
35 and the City Attorney's office had spent a great deal of time on the project, including the
36 process of addressing issues within the Environmental Impact Report. He explained that
37 this portion of the General Plan was inconsistent and confusing, and that this amendment
38 was necessary to incorporate the airport land use plan with the general plan. He further
39 explained that this amendment would not constitute a significant impact, and that studies
40 had been completed, including one by the aeronautics board. He added that if the City did
41 not approve the General Plan Amendment they would be unable to utilize the updated
42 information. He assured the Commission that the amendment was a good and solid one.

1 Commissioner Jones asked if additional language could be added to the recommendation,
2 to address the Commission's concerns.

3
4 Assistant City Attorney Vail responded that the Commission could make whatever
5 recommendation that they found appropriate.

6
7 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 7:21 p.m.

8
9 Since there were no members of the public who wished to speak regarding the issue,
10 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 7:21 p.m. and asked for a motion.

11
12 It was MOVED by Commissioner Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
13 adopt **Resolution No. 03-8EA** recommending approval of Environmental Assessment No.
14 02-6 for General Plan Amendment No. 02-1.

15
16 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

17
18 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Hicks and Commissioners Calkins,
19 Jones and Rhoten

20 NOES: None

21 ABSTAIN: None

22 ABSENT: None

23
24 It was MOVED by Commissioner Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
25 adopt **Resolution No. 03-23** recommending approval to the City Council of General Plan
26 Amendment No. 02-1, including a recommendation that the City Council use this
27 amendment to launch into an update of the General Plan.

28
29 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

30
31 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Hicks and Commissioner Calkins,
32 Jones and Rhoten

33 NOES: None

34 ABSTAIN: None

35 ABSENT: None

1 **VII. WORK STUDY**

2
3 **A. VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 30969 - Matt Bassi**

4 A work study session to review the revised 33-lot residential subdivision
5 related to Zone Change No. 02-5.

6
7 Commissioner Calkins excused himself from the work study session due to a conflict of
8 interest.

9
10 The work study session was initiated by Principal Planner Bassi, who displayed a map of
11 the proposed project and indicated the four transition lots that had been discussed during
12 the public hearing for the zone change.

13
14 Chairman Duistermars asked if there would be meandering sidewalks around the interior,
15 and if there was a retention basin indicated on the map.

16
17 Jim Unland of Unland & Associates, 3550 E. Florida Ave., Hemet, California responded,
18 as a representative for the applicant, that there was a retention basin indicated and that
19 the lettered lot would be given to the City, who would be responsible for the maintenance
20 of the lot.

21
22 Vice Chairman Hicks expressed concern with the issue of maintenance. He asked what
23 could be done to insure that the maintenance of the property did not fall through.

24
25 A discussion ensued regarding maintenance of the retention basin.

26
27 Mr. Unland suggested that the intention was that it would be incorporated into an Lighting
28 & Landscaping Maintenance District (LLMD).

29
30 Further discussion ensued regarding the landscaping & maintenance.

31
32 Chairman Duistermars asked if any landscaping would be done along Smith Road.

33
34 Mr. Unland responded that the amount of landscaping would be comparable to what was
35 on the opposite side of the street, and that there would be a sidewalk along Smith Road,
36 although it would not be a meandering one.

37
38 Gaye Duffin, 748 Smith Road, Hemet, California approached the lectern as an adjacent
39 resident to the proposed project site. She asked for an explanation regarding what an
40 LLMD was as well as what a retention basin was.

41
42 Chairman Duistermars offered the explanation.
43
44

1 Ms. Duffin inquired regarding meandering sidewalks.
2

3 Chairman Duistermars responded that a meandering sidewalk is monolithic and curves
4 through the development, as opposed to a park sidewalk which is offset from the curb.
5

6 Ms. Duffin inquired regarding the street improvements that would be made to Smith Road,
7 stating that she wanted curb and gutter added to her side of the street.
8

9 Mike Duffin, 748 Smith Road, Hemet, California approached the lectern as an adjacent
10 resident to the proposed project site. He asked where the center of the street would be,
11 adding that the west side of Smith Road is where his property boundary was.
12

13 The work study session concluded with a discussion regarding the street widths, the rights-
14 of-way and the centerline.
15

16 **B. ACCESSORY STRUCTURES - David Sawyer**

17 A work study session to review the recent amendment to the City's
18 regulations regarding residential accessory structures and direction regarding
19 potential additional amendments.
20

21 Commissioner Calkins re-joined the meeting.
22

23 Principal Planner Sawyer began the work study session by explaining that the City Council
24 had approved the amendment initially, but that at the second reading some questions had
25 come up and it had thus been referred back to the Planning Commission for those
26 concerns to be addressed. He indicated on the overhead projector the workshop that he
27 had presented to the City Council.
28

29 Commissioner Jones asked what the concerns of the City Council were.
30

31 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that the first concern was regarding the idea that an
32 accessory structure could be up to 50% the size of the principal structure on the property.
33 The City Council thought 50% might be too much. He suggested that, to address this
34 issue, either the allowable size of the accessory structure or the allowable lot coverage
35 could be reduced. He explained that the second issue dealt with the accessory structure's
36 compatibility with the color of the primary residence, stating the City Council was
37 concerned that having a compatible color might not be sufficient to satisfy the issue of
38 compatibility. He added that a building permit would be required, and that the whole
39 situation became complicated when carports were added as accessory structures. He
40 advised the Commission that staff felt that if there was a concern with compatibility, the
41 City may want to prohibit car and RV covers. He stated that the City Council did not give
42 much direction other than to get input from the Planning Commission. He asked the
43
44

1 Commission to provide staff with some idea of where they would like to go with the project.
2 He explained that the original issue had been with the covers for RV's.

3
4 Commissioner Rhoten asked if the portable RV covers were fastened down.

5
6 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that some were and others were not.

7
8 Chairman Duistermars mentioned that portable covers were more problematic than
9 permanent ones.

10
11 Principal Planner Sawyer suggested that staff could prepare the Commission's
12 recommendations to the City Council, in light of the direction that had been given so far,
13 and that more research could be done on how other cities deal with the issues.

14
15 Vice Chairman Hicks suggested that staff talk to the Council members who had voiced the
16 concerns and get some ideas for possible solutions.

17
18 **C. VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31280 - Maureen Losey**

19 A work study session to review a proposed 97-lot R-1 subdivision on 26-
20 acres located at the northeast corner of Lyon and Commonwealth Avenues.

21
22 Assistant Planner Losey advised the Commission that the proposed project was scheduled
23 to be reviewed by the Staff Review Committee on May 27, 2003, which was why it was
24 being reviewed as a work study session this evening. She explained that the project would
25 involve a zone change, and that staff was expecting some concern from the project
26 engineer. She expressed staff's concern regarding compatibility with the context of the
27 surrounding neighborhood. She advised the Commission that there was an existing
28 subdivision with one-acre lots to the south of the project. She added that staff felt that a
29 standard R-1 project was inconsistent with the neighborhood, and stated that they would
30 be bringing the project back for the Commission's review following the SRC meeting.

31
32 Principal Planner Bassi mentioned that he was working on a similar project with the same
33 kind of land use pattern, stating that there had not been a neighborhood meeting
34 conducted as of yet. He explained that his project applicant was proposing 1/2-acre lots,
35 adding that there were a lot of agriculturally zoned lots within the area.

36
37 A discussion ensued regarding lot sizes and transition or buffer areas being provided.

38
39 The work study session concluded with a discussion of landscaping and meandering
40 sidewalks.

1 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the Minutes from the meeting
2 had not yet been approved, but he re-capped the meeting by stating that it had started off
3 with a discussion on raising the standards for development projects and reviewing the
4 zoning classifications.. He added that there had been discussion regarding rural vs. urban
5 areas, and stated that staff would be looking at other cities in terms of housing and
6 commercial development. He noted that direction had been given for staff to come up with
7 a development strategy. He briefly reiterated the concerns of the Commission regarding
8 the airport, circulation and updating the General Plan.

9
10 The re-cap concluded with a discussion regarding the generation of a Master Plan of
11 Parks.

12
13 **B. JOINT MEETING WITH TRAFFIC COMMISSION**

14 Discussion of holding a joint meeting with the Traffic Commission regarding
15 the Circulation Element of the General Plan.

16
17 A possible date for a joint meeting with the Traffic Commission regarding the Circulation
18 Element was discussed. It was agreed that street standards should be a topic on the
19 agenda along with traffic calming, and tying things together with the County and the City
20 of San Jacinto.

21
22 The Commission concurred that June 17, 2003 would be the best date to have the joint
23 meeting.

24
25 **C. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE 3RD SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT**
26 **DESIGN GUIDELINES**

27
28 Planning Director distributed copies of the 3rd Supervisorial District Design Guidelines,
29 suggesting that they could be placed on the next agenda as a discussion item.

30
31
32 **IX. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

33
34 No items.

35
36
37 **X. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

38
39 Commissioner Jones requested that the issue of weekend car sales be placed on one of
40 the upcoming agendas.

1 **XI. ADJOURNMENT:** It was MOVED by Commissioner Jones, SECONDED by Vice
2 Chairman Hicks, and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 8:51 p.m. to
3 the regular meeting of the City of Hemet Planning Commission, scheduled for
4 Tuesday, June 3, 2003 at 6:00 p.m. to be held at the City of Hemet Council
5 Chambers, 450 East Latham Avenue, Hemet, California, 92543.
6
7
8
9

10 _____
11 Chairman, Bob Duisternars
12

13 ATTEST:
14
15
16
17

18 _____
19 Myrna Kasick, Minutes Secretary
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