

1 would begin at 1:00 p.m. on the last day of school, and that asbestos abatement would
2 start on Saturday morning.

3
4 Regarding the installations of relocatable buildings, Ms. Packham reported that they were
5 in progress at Hamilton Elementary, Bautista Creek Elementary and the Alternative
6 Learning Center. She noted that installation at West Valley and Hemet High Schools
7 would begin on the last day of school.

8
9 Ms. Packham reported that the escrow documents for the Hemet High School stadium
10 were in the process of being signed, and that escrow was scheduled to close by the end
11 of July. She added that the CEQA process was underway and that the Initial Study had
12 been distributed for the review process.

13
14 Ms. Packham reported that clean-up of the new high school site was underway, with the
15 demolition of existing buildings scheduled to start in September, and grading of the site
16 to begin at the beginning of 2005. She noted that they would be mass grading both the
17 new high school and the new middle school sites, and that utilities would be brought to
18 both sites at the same time.

19
20 Ms. Packham concluded her report by advising the Commission that Cawston Elementary
21 was moving along on schedule and would be opening in July.

22
23
24 **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

25
26 **A. VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31280 / ENVIRONMENTAL**
27 **ASSESSMENT NO. 03-32 (Continued from May 4, 2004)**

28 _____ APPLICANT: Orangewood Investment Partners
29 LOCATION: West side of Pine Avenue between Commonwealth
30 and Esplanade Avenues
31 PLANNER: Maureen Losey
32 DESCRIPTION: A request to subdivide 16.18 acres into 13 lots for
33 single-family residential development with adoption of
34 a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project.
35

36 Vice Chairman Jones asked for a motion to continue this item, per staff's
37 recommendation.

38
39 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
40 continue Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 31280 / Environmental Assessment No. 03-32
41 to the Planning Commission meeting of June 15, 2004.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

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 **B. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31737**

9 APPLICANT: Victoria Homes, Inc.
10 AGENT: Mel Haugen
11 LOCATION: West side of Palm Avenue between Eaton Street and
12 Esplanade Avenue (approximately 967-feet south of
13 Esplanade Avenue)
14 PLANNER: Maureen Losey
15 DESCRIPTION: A request for a tentative tract map to subdivide 19.43
16 acres into 19-lots for future single-family residential
17 development.
18

19 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Losey who provided some details
20 regarding the proposed project. She advised the Commission that the City Council had
21 approved the corresponding zone change on May 25, 2004. She discussed some
22 possible modifications to the engineering conditions.
23

24 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that the applicant had asked staff to
25 have the Commission consider a more rural type of standard for their project as an
26 alternative to the regular Public Works conditions. He noted that the Commission had
27 two (2) options for approval, which were either to approve the project as recommended
28 or to approve it with the added condition for a rural standard, which, he noted, was not
29 currently supported by Public Works.
30

31 Vice Chairman Jones asked if there were any objections to the proposed conditions by
32 other members of staff.
33

34 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that there had been no input from other staff
35 members, since the concept had not been reviewed by the Staff Review Committee.
36

37 Commissioner Calkins expressed concern with there being another long, straight street,
38 although he noted that he liked the proposed lot sizes.
39

40 Assistant City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that if they were going to discuss the
41 project they should open the public hearing.
42

43 Vice Chairman Jones opened the public hearing at 6:12 p.m.
44
45
46
47
48

1 Mel Haugen, 1333 Clydesdale Court, Hemet, California approached the lectern as a
2 representative for the project applicant. He advised the Commission that the issue of
3 rural standards had come up in the development process on many occasions, and that
4 there were currently no rural standards in place for the City of Hemet. He suggested that
5 this particular area was a perfect example of why there should be rural standards, noting
6 that there were no sidewalks or streetlights in the neighborhood and that many residents
7 had expressed a desire for it to stay that way.

8
9 Mr. Haugen advised the Commission that it would be his preference to accept the
10 conditions as written with the one modification, which would include installation of a
11 sidewalk on the north side of the street. He noted that there was currently no sidewalk
12 in existence on Commonwealth Avenue from Lyon Avenue coming east, and further
13 noted that the sidewalk they were proposing would tie into that of the proposed Vesting
14 Tentative Tract Map No. 31280, which the Commission had just continued.

15
16 Commissioner Calkins asked Mr. Haugen why he objected to street lights.

17
18 Mr. Haugen responded that he had no objection, except for the fact that there were
19 currently no street lights in place, and that to maintain the rural atmosphere it should stay
20 that way.

21
22 Commissioner Calkins suggested that street lights have been helpful in preventing
23 burglaries. He mentioned that they may want to consider decorative street lighting.

24
25 Mr. Haugen responded that a streetlight was a streetlight whether it was decorative or not.

26
27 Vice Chairman Jones inquired about trails for horses.

28
29 Mr. Haugen responded that horses are ridden on the streets throughout the
30 neighborhood, and that many residents take their horses out in trailers and go riding
31 elsewhere.

32
33 Vice Chairman Jones asked if there were any members of the audience who wished to
34 speak regarding the project.

35
36 There were none.

37
38 Commissioner Searl suggested that he would like to see this public hearing diverted to
39 the City Council to get the concept of rural standards back in front of them.

40
41 Assistant City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that there was no provision for
42 referring the project to the City Council, noting that in order for it to go before the Council
43 the applicant would have to appeal the Commission's decision to either deny or approve
44 the map. He further noted that rural standards could not be created where none exist.

1 Mr. Haugen noted that the Commission had the authority to change the one condition that
2 they would like to have changed.

3
4 Assistant City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that if they were going to deviate
5 from a standard, they would need to add to the record why they were going to do so, as
6 such an action was not of the norm. He stated that the same thing would need to be
7 done with the elimination of streetlights.

8
9 Commissioner Rhoten inquired regarding how the Police Department felt about the
10 streetlights.

11
12 Police Captain Cabrera approached the lectern and responded that lighting is always
13 better for the Police Department. He referred to an 11-foot section between the curb and
14 the right-of-way that was indicated on the plans and asked what was intended to go there.

15
16 Mr. Haugen responded that the section included an easement for utilities, and that if a
17 sidewalk was required, that was where it would be installed.

18
19 Assistant City Attorney Vail stated that he was hesitant not to impose a city standard
20 where there was clearly one in place.

21
22 Principal Planner Saywer noted that, when referring to the easement, the full width of the
23 right-of-way was actually being referred to.

24
25 Discussion ensued regarding the liability that the City would take on by waiving any
26 standards.

27
28 Principal Engineer Biagioni stated that he believed the only body that could waive the
29 standards was the City Council.

30
31 Assistant City Attorney Vail suggested that Planning Director Masyczek may be able to
32 shed a different point of view on the issue, and that perhaps the Commission should hear
33 from him before making a decision.

34
35 Vice Chairman Jones asked Mr. Haugen if he would have a problem with the item being
36 continued to the June 15th meeting to allow Planning Director Masyczek to be present.

37
38 Mr. Haugen stated that this would not be a problem.

39
40 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Searl and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Calkins to
41 continue Tentative Tract Map No. 31737 to the Planning Commission meeting of June
42 15, 2004.

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 **C. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 03-9**

9 APPLICANT: Jarinala "Sonny" Sanjay
10 AGENT: Ashok Parikn - Cypress Builders
11 LOCATION: 395 W. Stetson Avenue
12 PLANNER: Ron Running
13 DESCRIPTION: A request for a conditional use permit to expand an
14 existing gasoline station with the construction of an
15 additional fuel pump island located on the southeast
16 corner of Stetson Avenue and Sapphire Place in the
17 C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial) zone.
18

19 The staff report was presented by City Planner Running, who provided the Commission
20 with some details regarding the project.
21

22 Vice Chairman Jones inquired regarding signage for the project.
23

24 City Planner Running responded that a condition of approval had been added to the
25 project, requiring a new monument sign to be erected prior to issuance of a Certificate of
26 Occupancy.
27

28 Commissioner Rhoten asked if they were going to be able to see the landscaping plan.
29

30 City Planner Running responded that the project could be conditioned to require the
31 landscaping plan to be reviewed by the Commission.
32

33 A discussion ensued regarding the landscaping, followed by a discussion of the parking
34 situation.
35

36 Vice Chairman Jones opened the public hearing at 6:43 p.m.
37

38 Ashok Parikn of Cypress Builders approached the lectern as a representative for the
39 applicant, advising the Commission that the applicant was out of town and unable to be
40 present for the meeting.
41

42 Since there were no other members of the public who wished to speak regarding the
43 project, Vice Chairman Jones closed the public hearing at 6:43 p.m.
44

45 Further discussion of the landscaping and signage for the project ensued.
46
47
48

1 Assistant City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that if landscaping and signage
2 plans were not required as part of the original project, the item could not be continued
3 due to the fact that these items were not available for the Commission to review.
4

5 The Commission concurred that they would like the applicant to be present to answer
6 questions prior to further consideration of the project.
7

8 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
9 continue Conditional Use Permit No. 03-9 to the Planning Commission meeting of July
10 6, 2004.
11

12 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
13

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

19 **D. TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 30204 - EXTENSION OF TIME -**
20 **(Continued from 5-18-04)**

21 APPLICANT: Philip Frey Jr., Trustee of the Frey Living Trust
22 AGENT: Jim Unland - Unland & Associates
23 LOCATION: South side of Esplanade Avenue between Palm
24 Avenue and State Street
25 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni
26 DESCRIPTION: A request for a one (1) year time extension to
27 subdivide 11.3 acres into 14 commercial lots on
28 property zoned C-M (Commercial Manufacturing)
29

30 The staff report was presented by Principal Planner Sawyer on behalf of Planning
31 Technician Domenigoni who was not present for the meeting.
32

33 Principal Planner Sawyer provided some details regarding the project. He explained that
34 the Commission was being given two options, and described what those options were.
35

36 Principal Engineer Biagioni approached the lectern and discussed the sight visibility issue
37 and how it could be rectified by the installation of a stop sign.
38

39 A brief discussion followed.
40

41 Vice Chairman Jones opened the public hearing at 6:49 p.m.
42

43 Jim Unland of Unland & Associates, 3550 E. Florida Avenue, Hemet, California
44 approached the lectern as a representative for the applicant. He advised the Commission
45 that they were in agreement with the requirement to install a stop sign in order to rectify
46 the sight visibility issue.
47
48

1 Vice Chairman Jones closed the public hearing at 6:54 p.m. and asked for a motion.

2
3 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
4 adopt *Resolution Bill No. 04-39* approving a one-year extension of time for Tentative
5 Parcel Map No. 30204, as modified.

6
7 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

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

13
14 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-28.***

15
16
17 **V. WORK STUDY**

18
19 **A. DIAMOND VALLEY GATEWAY - SPECIFIC PLAN 96-001 & VESTING**
20 **TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 31075** - Maureen Losey

21 A work study session to review and discuss possible options for the
22 Diamond Valley Gateway Specific Plan (SP 96-001) and proposed Vesting
23 Tentative Parcel Map 31075 located at the northwest corner of State Street
24 and Gibbel Road.

25
26 The work study session was initiated by Principal Planner Sawyer.

27
28 John Karubian, 2140 Trendy Lane, Los Angeles, California approached the lectern as the
29 project applicant. He advised the Commission that he had been working to respond to
30 concerns that were raised by the Planning Commission and Planning Department staff
31 at previous meetings. He informed them that he had transmitted various items requested
32 by Planning Director Masyczek. He noted that one of the issues that had come up early
33 on was regarding the undesirable uses that were permitted in the commercial portion of
34 the specific plan. He stated that he was hoping to have an idea after the work study
35 session as to what uses the Commission would like to have omitted. He noted that he
36 did not have the zoning matrix with him, but that he would like to hear the thoughts of the
37 Commission as to what uses they would deem appropriate for this location.

38
39 Assistant City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that, at the request of Mr. Karubian
40 and Planning Director Masyczek, and following a discussion with Mr. Karubian's attorney,
41 a condition had been drafted, for inclusion within the conditions of approval for the
42 proposed parcel map, which discussed the project's exemption from TUMF and the
43 permitted uses for the project. He noted that the condition would allow either the City or
44 the applicant to amend the standards and/or guidelines pertaining to the Specific Plan.
45 He explained that the City would have to reasonably allow some commercial use of the
46 site, and offered to answer any questions regarding the special condition.

1 Vice Chairman Jones stated that one of the biggest concerns was that this particular
2 piece of property was literally a gateway to the community.
3

4 Assistant City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that Mr. Karubian was willing to work
5 with the City regarding amendments to the Specific Plan, which could be initiated by
6 either the applicant or the City.
7

8 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that the point of the work study
9 session was for the Commission to give the applicant some ideas of what uses would be
10 acceptable to the Commission for the proposed map.
11

12 Assistant City Attorney Vail added that uses could be discussed, but that a separate
13 action, other than approval of the map, would be required to amend the uses that were
14 listed within the Specific Plan.
15

16 Commissioner Calkins suggested that one undesirable use that was currently allowed
17 within the Specific Plan was a dog kennel.
18

19 A discussion of desirable and not so desirable uses for the site ensued.
20

21 Mr. Karubian pointed out that full development of the acreage at that corner was likely to
22 take a number of years, which made it very difficult to know, at this point in time, what
23 uses would end up being preferred. He added that he would be willing to give up “fortune
24 telling” and a “recycling center”, and that he recalled the “dance hall with alcoholic
25 beverage service” as a use that had been of concern to the Commission. He suggested
26 that he could make up his own list of uses that he would find to be obnoxious, but that he
27 was participating in the work study session to find out what uses the Commission would
28 like to omit.
29

30 Vice Chairman Jones asked Tom Olsen, who was an adjacent property owner and
31 present in the audience, what his opinion might be regarding the project site.
32

33 Tom Olsen, 2829 S. State Street, Hemet, California approached the lectern and
34 responded that he had not reviewed the permitted uses and did not have an opinion
35 regarding the project.
36

37 Mr. Karubian stated that he was extremely receptive to the elimination of uses and would
38 like to be responsive as well, but that he needed input from the Commission in order to
39 respond.
40

41 Commission Rhoten suggested that she would be opposed to an automotive use at the
42 site.
43
44
45
46
47
48

1 Mr. Karubian responded that he partly agreed with this suggestion, although he felt that
2 the corner almost had to include some sort of automotive use, such as a gas station,
3 since it was the closest commercial facility for the users of the lake. He noted that while
4 he felt it should be somewhat desirable for an automotive service facility, he was in
5 agreement that he would not find automotive repair shops to be appropriate.
6

7 Vice Chairman Jones expressed frustration, stating that the work study session could not
8 work when the first item that a Commissioner mentioned as being non-desirable was
9 something that the applicant was insistent on developing.
10

11 Principal Planner Sawyer suggested that staff could go through the list of uses with the
12 applicant and come up with some suggestions for the Commission regarding which uses
13 might be appropriate, and which should be eliminated.
14

15 Commissioner Calkins asked if it would be helpful for the Commission to submit individual
16 lists to staff indicating what items they would find acceptable.
17

18 Assistant City Attorney Vail suggested that staff should come up with a start-up list to
19 review with the applicant.
20

21 Principal Planner Sawyer suggested that the work study session be continued to the July
22 6, 2004 Planning Commission meeting to allow staff to review the uses and meet with the
23 applicant to discuss them.
24

25 Mr. Karubian noted that he was hoping to have the parcel map reviewed for approval
26 purposes in the very near future.
27

28 Principal Planner Sawyer suggested that the special condition that had been drafted by
29 Assistant City Attorney Vail would allow the approval process for the parcel map to move
30 forward prior to the amendment of the uses within the Specific Plan.
31

32 Mr. Karubian displayed a bubble diagram of the adopted Specific Plan. He pointed out
33 the 13-acre triangular area with an R-2 zoning, and noted that one of the changes that
34 was being considered was relocating that acreage to elsewhere within the Specific Plan
35 area. He added that there were a string of alternatives within the R-2 area that were
36 consistent with the contemplated densities.
37

38 A discussion ensued regarding the R-2 portion of the Specific Plan.
39

40 The Commission thanked Mr. Karubian for his presentation.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

1 **B. HOTEL AT 127 S. HAMILTON AVENUE** - Maureen Losey

2 A work study session to review and discuss an 80-unit hotel proposed by
3 Anthony Hassan, and located at 127 S. Hamilton Avenue on the west side
4 of Hamilton Avenue approximately 173-feet south of Florida Avenue.
5

6 The work study session was initiated by Principal Planner Sawyer and Assistant
7 Planner Losey.
8

9 Anthony Hassan, 350 E. Carson Street, Carson, California approached the lectern as the
10 potential project applicant. He suggested that it was his hope to bring something
11 desirable, decent and stylish to the city, such as a hotel that was like a “home away from
12 home”. He added that the quality of the facility that he was proposing would be
13 comparable to that of a high-class hotel.
14

15 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that staff had met with Mr. Hassan
16 previously and had advised him of the concerns with having a hotel at that location. He
17 noted that while this was the first time he had actually seen the proposal, he was
18 concerned with the 2-story context of the building on the perimeter of the site. He added
19 that he had not analyzed the project for compliance with the Commercial Design
20 Guidelines.
21

22 Vice Chairman Jones stated that the Commission had reviewed the proposal previously,
23 and had advised Mr. Hassan that they did not find this use appropriate for the location.
24

25 Mr. Hassan stated that the zoning of the property was permissive of a hotel, and that he
26 had been advised by staff that a proposal for a hotel would be more desirable than a
27 proposal for apartments. He pointed out that the property currently attracts homeless
28 people and drug dealing, and that a hotel would drive away the nuisances that currently
29 exist on the site. He stated that he could not see what other type of use the Commission
30 could recommend for the site. He referred to the adjacent mobile home park, stating that
31 it did not compare to what he was proposing to develop. He expressed his willingness
32 to do whatever it would take to obtain approval, regarding the design of the project,
33 including the landscaping and architecture.
34

35 Commissioner Calkins inquired regarding the zoning for the vacant property across the
36 street.
37

38 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that one of the issues with this particular site was
39 that it had a C-2 zoning designation, in which a hotel/motel was a permitted use that did
40 not require a conditional use permit. He added that the property across the street had
41 a C-M zoning designation.
42

43 Commissioner Searl inquired of Mr. Hassan regarding what types of marketing surveys
44 had been completed, noting that this type of use had not been very successful within the
45 valley thus far.
46
47
48

1 Mr. Hassan responded that it was his belief that, with the completion of the lake and the
2 casinos in the area, the need for the use was there. He suggested that the hotel would
3 work with the casinos and the recreation group for the lake to provide transportation and
4 such.

5
6 The Commission thanked Mr. Hassan for his presentation.

7
8 **C. SANDERSON LAKES AT PAGE RANCH** - Ron Running

9 A work study session to review and discuss the architecture and floor plans
10 proposed by D.R. Horton for Tract No. 30041 in the Page Ranch Planned
11 Community Development located on the east side of Sanderson Avenue,
12 approximately 400-feet south of Stetson Avenue.

13
14 The work study session was initiated by City Planner Running who provided some details
15 regarding the proposal.

16
17 Joannie Madrid of D.R. Horton approached the lectern as the project manager, and
18 introduced John Thatcher as the architect.

19
20 John Thatcher discussed the guidelines for the project. He reviewed Villages 1 & 2,
21 noted as "The Magnolias", which he pointed out as a nice mixture along with the
22 character of the elevations. He displayed several visual devices indicating how the
23 finished product would appear.

24
25 The Commission embarked on a discussion of the 40% vs. 60% rule relative to garages,
26 followed by a discussion of how the proposal complied with the guidelines.

27
28 Mr. Thatcher displayed the floor plan design for Plans 1 & 2.

29
30 City Planner Running advised the Commission regarding the Specific Plan's allowance
31 for the designs indicated in the proposed Plans 1, 2 & 3.

32
33 Further discussion ensued regarding the 40% vs. 60% rule relative to garages.

34
35 Mr. Thatcher asked if the Commission would allow for averaging.

36
37 Vice Chairman Jones adamantly responded that they would not.

38
39 Villages 3 & 4, called the "Cedars" were described, and Plans 1, 2, 3 & 4 were indicated.
40 Some detail regarding the proposal was provided and the architectural design of the
41 proposed Plans was reviewed.

42
43 Discussion regarding the architectural design ensued, followed by a discussion of what
44 type of landscaping would be possible within the backyards of each plan.

1 A discussion of Villages 5 & 6, called "The Junipers" followed and the proposed Plans 1,
2 2, 3 & 4 were indicated. It was noted that there would be 16-feet between the buildings
3 of the two-story element. A visual display was provided for the plans followed by a
4 display of each of the four floor plans
5

6 Vice Chairman Jones asked Principal Planner Sawyer what some of the things were that
7 needed to be discussed within this work study session.
8

9 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that the work study session was being held to allow
10 the Commission to review the proposed plans and provide feedback to the applicant. He
11 noted that they should be paying attention to the architectural design aspects of the
12 project, and advising the applicant regarding what would or would not be acceptable.
13

14 Further discussion ensued regarding the proposed project.
15

16 Commissioner Jones expressed his frustration with the developer's failure to follow the
17 rules and adhere to the standards for the project.
18

19 Mr. Thatcher displayed the proposal for Villages 7 & 8 known as "The Pines". He
20 described the provisions that each plan included, and displayed a visual elevation of the
21 proposed plans, indicating the front, side and rear portions of the plans.
22

23 Commissioner Rhoten asked if the buyers whose homes were not located on the lake
24 would have access to the lake, and if there would be a clubhouse.
25

26 Mr. Thatcher responded that all residents would have access to the lake, and that they
27 were in the process of elaborating on the design for a clubhouse.
28

29 Commissioner Searl suggested that the applicant had done some pretty interesting things
30 with their design, but that he felt it would be a shame to wall off a portion of the garage
31 as an additional bedroom.
32

33 Vice Chairman Jones invited members of the audience to comment regarding the
34 proposal.
35

36 Sue Fox, 3800 W. Thornton Avenue, Hemet, California, approached the lectern and
37 commented that Sanderson Avenue was already extremely congested, and that it would
38 be getting more congested with the development of the Page Plaza shopping center. She
39 expressed concern with the number of people that would begin using her street as an
40 alternative route.
41

42 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that there should be concern with the number of
43 bedrooms that were included within the proposed homes.
44

45 Ms. Fox noted that any family that had teenagers usually has additional vehicles, and that
46 she was very concerned with the increased possibility of car accidents.
47
48

1 Don Berry, 1177 Basswood Way, Hemet, California approached the lectern as a resident
2 of the Seven Hills community, which was adjacent to the proposed project. He asked for
3 clarification that the homes that would be backing up to Seven Hills would be single-story.
4

5 Vice Chairman Jones responded that they would.
6

7 Mike Tyler, 3449 Morro Hill Road, Hemet, California approached the lectern as a resident
8 of the adjacent Mayberry community. He suggested that there were many issues to be
9 concerned with regarding development in the city, and that the current problems should
10 be mitigated before additional problems were allowed to seep in.
11

12 Vice Chairman Jones asked Mr. Tyler if he had any issues regarding this particular
13 project.
14

15 Mr. Tyler responded that there should be "flow". He noted that he was not necessarily
16 referring to "traffic flow", but rather to how the houses look from one area to the next. He
17 suggested that the new development should have some continuity with the adjacent
18 developments. He noted that there was currently a situation within the west valley area,
19 consisting of massive numbers of homes with no continuity, pointing out that the Arcon
20 homes, which were adjacent to the Mayberry community were vastly different from the
21 homes within the Mayberry tract.
22

23 Commissioner Calkins inquired regarding the provision of a requirement that offsets the
24 side-yards.
25

26 City Planner Running confirmed that there was such a provision.
27

28 Commissioner Calkins asked what had happened to the product that was promised with
29 the Stowe-Passco presentation, noting that the square-footage of the homes that were
30 currently being proposed was far too great for the size of the lots, and not at all what the
31 Commission had agreed to when they had approved the map.
32

33 City Planner Running responded that the Specific Plan did not include a cap on the size
34 of the homes, which therefore allowed for this type of development, with the discretionary
35 input of the Commission.
36

37 Vice Chairman Jones asked what the Commission should be doing at this work study
38 session.
39

40 Assistant City Attorney Vail responded that the Commission had done exactly what the
41 work study session had been designed for them to do.
42

43 Vice Chairman Jones thanked the representatives of D.R. Horton for their presentation.
44
45
46
47
48

1 **D. GAS STATION AT PAGE PLAZA - Ron Running**

2 A work study session to review and discuss the gasoline station, carwash
3 and convenience store proposed by "Just 4 Fun" in the Page Plaza Specific
4 Plan area located on the southwest corner of Sanderson and Stetson
5 Avenues.
6

7 The work study session was initiated by City Planner Running who provided some details
8 regarding the project, and pointed out some of staff's concerns.
9

10 Roy Johnson approached the lectern as the project architect, and stated that it was his
11 understanding that they had addressed all of staff's concerns in the staff meeting that had
12 been held.
13

14 Vice Chairman Jones asked if the orientation of the tunnel could be turned so that the
15 building was more visible than the carwash.
16

17 Mr. Johnson asked if he was referring to a north/south direction.
18

19 Vice Chairman Jones responded that this was correct.
20

21 Mr. Johnson responded that they hadn't really looked at that option, but suggested that
22 there may be an issue with stacking if it were oriented that way.
23

24 Vice Chairman Jones pointed out that with the current design, if you are traveling south
25 on Sanderson Avenue you look right down the tunnel of the carwash.
26

27 Mr. Johnson stated that it was set back quite a ways from Sanderson Avenue, which
28 would make it pretty difficult to get such a view when traveling down the street, particularly
29 with the landscaping wall that would be in place.
30

31 Commissioner Calkins stated that he did not think there was adequate distance from the
32 incoming driveway, and suggested that a service station did not provide for an attractive
33 entry way. He further added that the location of the vacuum would not work.
34

35 Mr. Johnson asked if there was consensus among the Commission that the car wash
36 should be oriented in a north/south direction.
37

38 Mr. Jones responded that this was correct, and that the landscaping should be enhanced.
39 He added that they would like to see something that would be aesthetically pleasing.
40

41 Mike Tyler re-approached the lectern and inquired, regarding the gas station, what the
42 continuity was for the other buildings that were to be constructed on the site.
43

44 Vice Chairman Jones responded that the architectural design within the entire Page Plaza
45 Specific Plan was required to be compatible.
46
47
48

1 **VI. CONSENT CALENDAR**

2
3 **A. MINUTES**

- 4 1. September 30, 2003
5 2. May 18, 2004
6

7 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
8 approve the consent calendar as presented.
9

10 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

11
12 AYES: Commissioners Calkins, Rhoten and Searl
13 NOES: None
14 ABSTAIN: Vice Chairman Jones
15 ABSENT: Chairman Duistermars
16
17

18 **VII. UPDATE OF CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS ON PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS**

19
20 **A. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 03-2; ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-4 &**
21 **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 03-21 - BILL CORWIN**

22
23 **B. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 03-5; ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-11 &**
24 **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 03-43 - JOHN PETTY**

25
26 **C. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 03-7 & ENVIRONMENTAL**
27 **ASSESSMENT NO. 04-2 - JOHN PETTY**
28

29 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that Item Nos. A, B & C had been
30 tabled by the City Council at the May 25, 2004 meeting, due to issues with the emergency
31 response time.
32

33 **D. ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-14 & ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 03-**
34 **64 - VICTORIA HOMES**
35

36 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that this item had been approved by
37 the City Council at their meeting of May 25, 2004.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

1 **VIII. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**

2
3 **A. REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY**

4
5 **B. HIGHWAY 79 UPDATE**

6
7 The Commission concurred that these items should be carried forward to the June 15,
8 2004 agenda due to the absence of the Planning Director.
9

10
11 **IX. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

12
13 Commissioner Calkins inquired regarding the Starbucks and Panda Express that was
14 going in at Stetson Avenue and State Street. He noted that the Commission had never
15 reviewed the project. He expressed concern with the back portion of the building,
16 particularly the service doors, facing the street, noting that the Commission had
17 expressed the same concern when the Starbucks and Panda Express on Florida Avenue.
18 He suggested that somehow the Planning Commission's concerns were not being
19 considered.
20

21
22 **X. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

23
24 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that perhaps the comments mentioned by
25 Commissioner Calkins should be discussed at a future meeting.
26

27 Principal Planner Sawyer stated that he would discuss the issue with Planning Director
28 Masyczek to see about placing it on a future agenda.
29

30
31 **XI. ADJOURNMENT**

32
33 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten, SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins and
34 unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 9:02 p.m. to the regular meeting of the
35 City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for ***Tuesday, June 15, 2004 at 6:00 p.m.***
36 at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet,
37 California 92543.
38

39
40
41
42 _____
43 Vice Chairman, Nick Jones

44 ATTEST:

45
46 _____
47 Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary
48