

1 CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

2
3 TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2005

4
5 THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION WAS
6 CONVENED BY CHAIRMAN DUISTERMARS ON TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2005 AT 6:00
7 P.M. AT THE CITY OF HEMET COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 450 EAST LATHAM AVENUE,
8 HEMET, CALIFORNIA.

9
10 Present: Chairman Bob Duistermars, Vice Chairman Nick Jones and
11 Commissioners Jim Calkins, Wigs Mendoza and Mayzelle Rhoten

12
13 Absent: None

14
15 Staff Present: Principal Engineer Jorge Biagioni, City Planner Bernard Chase,
16 Associate Planner Loretta Domenigoni, City Planner Ron
17 Running, Principal Planner David Sawyer, Minutes Secretary
18 Melissa Diels, City Attorney Eric Vail and Battalion Chief Dave
19 VanVerst

20
21 Invocation and Flag Salute: Chairman Duistermars

22
23
24 I. PUBLIC COMMENTS

25
26 There were no members of the public who wished to address the Commission.

27
28
29 II. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA

30
31 There were no amendments or additions to the agenda.

32
33
34 III. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE

35
36 There was no Hemet Unified School District Update given.

37
38
39 IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

40
41 A. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 04-16

42 APPLICANT: Roman Catholic Bishop of San Bernardino
43 AGENT: James E. Calkins

1 LOCATION: 812 South State Street
2 PLANNER: Bernard Chase
3 DESCRIPTION: A request for approval of a conditional use permit to
4 convert a 1,271 square-foot house with garage on a 12,
5 246 square-foot lot, and utilize the interior space as
6 ancillary church meeting rooms for the adjacent church,
7 with primary access and parking on the existing church
8 parking lot.
9

10 Commissioner Calkins excused himself from the public hearing due to a conflict of interest.
11

12 The staff report was presented by City Planner Chase who provided various details
13 regarding the project and indicated its precise location on the overhead projector. He
14 explained that the zoning for the property was R-1 (Single-Family Residential), and was
15 also surrounded by single-family residences. He further explained what the applicant was
16 proposing and that staff found the project to be environmentally exempt from CEQA.
17

18 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:04 p.m. and asked if there were any
19 members of the public who would like to speak regarding the project. Since there were
20 none, he inquired as to whether there was adequate parking for the expansion of the
21 church.
22

23 City Planner Chase confirmed that there was.
24

25 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:05 p.m. and asked for a motion.
26

27 It was **MOVED** by Vice Chairman Jones and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Rhoten to
28 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 05-30* approving Conditional Use Permit
29 No. 04-16.
30

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

33 **AYES:** Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Mendoza
34 and Rhoten
35 **NOES:** None
36 **ABSTAIN:** None
37 **ABSENT:** Commissioner Calkins
38

39 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-24.***
40
41
42
43
44

1 **V. WORK STUDY**

2
3 **A. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 03-05 / ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-11 /**
4 **VARIANCE NO. 04-01 / VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31466**

5 A work study session with possible direction to staff regarding the: 1) General
6 Plan Amendment from the current land use designations of Commercial (C),
7 Rural Residential (RR-0.5) and Multi-Family Residential (R-II) to R-I (Single-
8 Family Residential); 2) Zone Change from the current classification of C-2
9 (General- Commercial), R-A (Residential-Agriculture), R-3 (Multi-Family
10 Residential) and R-1-14-C (Single-Family Residential - 14,000 square-foot
11 lots) to R-1-7.2 (Single-Family Residential - 7,200 square-foot lots); Variance
12 from the City of Hemet ordinance prescribing minimum lot widths (frontage)
13 on lots having an area in excess of 10,000 square-feet – specifically the
14 shape, dimensions and topographical features of the property are such that
15 lots 55, 56, 83, 84 and 85 are much deeper than they would ordinarily be;
16 and 4) Vesting Tentative Tract Map for 90 single-family residential lots with
17 a minimum of 7,200 square-feet of lot area on property located on the
18 northwest corner of Florida Avenue and Lake Street, and being processed
19 by John Petty / JDP Development.
20

21 The work study session was initiated by Associate Planner Domenigoni who provided the
22 Commission with some history regarding the proposed project. She explained that in
23 March of 2004 the Planning Commission had recommended approval of the General Plan
24 Amendment and Zone Change to the City Council, but that there had been issues
25 regarding the emergency response times for the area. She noted that the Council had not
26 acted on the General Plan Amendment or Zone Change, and that the map and variance
27 had not been reviewed by them at all. She further noted that there were some issues that
28 had been raised regarding the compatibility of the project with adjacent lots. She advised
29 the Commission that, at this time, the discussion at this meeting should be regarding the
30 issues of the map and the variance only.
31

32 John Petty, 262 Marmalade Lane, Hemet, California approached the lectern as the
33 applicant for the project. He displayed some exhibits of the project and discussed what he
34 was proposing.
35

36 Discussion ensued regarding the emergency response time, drainage, the lots along
37 Lincoln Avenue across from the project site, an easement for fire apparatus, schools and
38 traffic.
39

40 Principal Engineer Biagioni advised the Commission that the Riverside County Flood
41 Control District had the right-of-way on the project, which had already been reviewed by
42 Public Works. He noted that a detention basin would be required as the excess runoff
43 would need to be detained on site per City policy.
44

1 Vice Chairman Jones asked when this had come up.

2
3 Principal Engineer Biagioni responded that it it had not been seen before due to an
4 oversight and needed to be corrected now.

5
6 City Attorney Vail clarified that only the regulations that were in place at the time the
7 vesting map was deemed complete could be applied to the project.

8
9 Chairman Duistermars noted that the Public Works Division should have this issue worked
10 out before the project came back to the Commission for approval.

11
12 Chairman Duistermars asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak
13 regarding the project.

14
15 Erin Best of 345 Juel Lane, Hemet, California approached the lectern and addressed the
16 Commission as an adjacent resident to the project. She expressed her concern with the
17 lot sizes, since all of the homes down Lincoln Avenue had 1-acre lots. She noted that
18 during the previous review, she and other residents had requested that larger lots be
19 included all along Lincoln Avenue, from Soboba Street to Lake Street. She stated that they
20 felt that it would be a better buffer and necessary for the traffic increase. She further noted
21 that the project had only been increased by 3 lots, but that it didn't appear that much else
22 had been changed.

23
24 Bobbi Christie of 320 Juel Lane, Hemet, California approached the lectern and expressed
25 her appreciation to the City Council for stepping forward and adding the new Fire Station
26 on Hemet Street. She noted that when Mr. Petty had presented his map a year ago it had
27 been a subdivision of 80 homes, but now it had increased to 90 homes, as indicated in the
28 project description on the agenda.

29
30 It was clarified that an error had been made on the agenda, since the subdivision was to
31 be for 86 homes.

32
33 Ms. Christie noted that either way, the subdivision's density had increased, since it was 82
34 lots a year ago. She expressed her concurrence with Ms. Best, that they would like to see
35 larger lots along Lincoln Avenue. She went on to voice her concern with the alignment of
36 Juel Lane, noting that, for the alignment to come directly across Lincoln into the existing
37 Juel Lane, which was a private street, would be very detrimental to the families who live
38 on the current Juel Lane, as there are children who play there, including her grandchildren.
39 She further expressed her concern with bringing in 80 to 90 additional families when the
40 school that the children of those families should be attending was already full to capacity.

41
42 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that the Police Department could take a look at the issue
43 with the alignment of Juel Lane.

1 Commissioner Rhoten inquired of Ms. Christie as to whether there had been any
2 neighborhood meetings with the applicant.

3
4 Ms. Christie responded that there had been a meeting last year, at which time the fire
5 department issue had been addressed, and was now resolved. She noted that there had
6 been no recent meetings.

7
8 Chairman Duistermars asked if everything else was okay with the map, as far as Ms.
9 Christie was concerned.

10
11 Ms. Christie responded that everything else was fine. She did note, however, that as a
12 member of the VEDC Committee, she would like to point out that any existing commercial
13 land that could be utilized as such, should perhaps be kept as commercial land, although
14 she did not know that it was a huge issue for only 3 acres.

15
16 Bob Fechner of 300 Juel Lane approached the lectern as an adjacent resident to the
17 project. He advised the Commission that he had lived in his home for 18 years. He further
18 advised that Mr. Petty had proposed to develop the subject property several times over the
19 years, and that he had, in the past, assured the residents that the buffer along Lincoln
20 Avenue would be maintained under any conditions. He noted that currently along Lincoln
21 Avenue there were R.V.'s parked all over in the street, which was one of the reasons that
22 they wanted to see larger lots along Lincoln Avenue. He added that he had no other
23 problems with the proposed subdivision.

24
25 Howard Rosenthal of 1600 E. Florida Avenue, Suite 110, Hemet, California approached
26 the lectern and addressed the Commission as a local businessman. He noted that he had
27 evaluated the property in the past, and that he had advised Mr. Petty that if he really
28 wanted to make money, he should propose 233 apartments, which was what the current
29 zoning would allow for. He suggested that, with this in mind, the City should be happy with
30 what was being proposed, rather than what could be developed.

31
32 Mr. Petty re-approached the lectern to respond to some of the comments that had been
33 made. Regarding the extension of larger lots all the way down Lincoln Avenue, he noted
34 that the location that they had stopped at with the 10,000 square-foot lots was because it
35 was where the boundary of the Tract on the north side of Lincoln Avenue ended. He
36 indicated that it was his understanding that the church parking lot, which was located to the
37 east of that Tract, would be expanding. He advised the Commission that he was
38 volunteering to build single-story homes exclusively for the proposed tract.

39
40 Chairman Duistermars suggested that a couple of additional lots be designed on the
41 interior portion of the project in order to provide larger lot sizes along Lincoln Avenue.

1 Mr. Petty responded that the project engineers had looked at this possibility and that what
2 made designing the project so difficult was the odd configuration of the site. He noted that
3 they had tried to address the compatibility issue by providing larger lots, though they did
4 not go all the way to Lake Street, and suggested that they were giving up a lot in an effort
5 to accomplish this. He advised that there would be a scenic highway setback on the south
6 side of the project perimeter along Florida Avenue.

7
8 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that if Mr. Petty were to lose two lots, he could provide
9 six 9,600 square-foot lots along Lincoln Avenue to Lake Street. He asked if this would be
10 feasible.

11
12 Mr. Petty indicated that he was there to listen as this was a work study session.

13
14 Further discussion ensued regarding this concept as well as the requirement of an on-site
15 retention basin.

16
17 Mr. Petty offered to meet with the various residents who were present to discuss the
18 project.

19
20 Commissioner Calkins indicated that there were a couple of items that disturbed him, one
21 of which was the interruption of the pattern along Lincoln Avenue at the Juel Lane
22 intersection, where all of a sudden lots were turned in the opposite direction.

23
24 Mr. Petty noted that, from a compatibility standpoint, they felt that the people across the
25 street would rather have a side-yard facing them than a driveway, which would provide
26 more of a buffer.

27
28 Mr. Calkins indicated that a side-yard could be ten feet off the street, whereas the adjacent
29 houses would have to be at least 20-feet.

30
31 Mr. Petty noted that there would be a landscaped block wall.

32
33 Mr. Calkins indicated that it would still be much closer to the curb line than the house
34 would.

35
36 Mr. Petty stated that he would not have a problem if the Commission wanted to condition
37 that lot as a 20-foot setback.

38
39 Mr. Calkins advised Mr. Petty that he also would like to see larger lots along Lincoln
40 Avenue, all the way to Lake Street.

41
42 The Commission thanked Mr. Petty for his presentation.

1 **B. SENIOR/ASSISTED LIVING DEVELOPMENT AT THE SOUTHWEST**
2 **CORNER OF CENTRAL AVENUE AND SANTA FE STREET (Formerly**
3 **CUP's 96-007 & 00-02 - Bernie Chase**

4 A work study session with possible direction to staff regarding the
5 resurrection of expired Conditional Use Permit No. 00-02 for an assisted
6 living facility for seniors. Architect, Keith Suchow, will be presenting a new
7 concept for the proposed project for Planning Commission comment and
8 input.

9
10 The work study session was initiated by City Planner Chase, who provided some
11 background information regarding the project and turned the presentation over to the
12 project architect, Keith Suchow.

13
14 Mr. Keith Suchow, P.O. Box 5367, Hemet, California approached the lectern as a
15 representative for the applicant. He displayed some renderings of the previously approved
16 conditional use permit for reference and advised the Commission that the project had
17 expired two years previously due to the death of one of the property owners and the injury
18 of another. He noted that the project had been approved as a 114-unit residential care
19 facility and that he had some loose schematics that he wanted to share with the
20 Commission regarding the current proposal. He indicated that one of the concerns with
21 the previous project had been the single-family residents on the left side of the project, and
22 the fact that the patios for the second-story of the proposed building would look into the
23 backyards of those homeowners. He suggested that a way to resolve this issue was to
24 build low-profile single-story garage units along that portion of the project, with minimum
25 50-foot setbacks, which would alleviate the privacy impacts. He added that there would
26 be a 20-foot setback around the entire project and noted that each of the groups of
27 buildings were only 60-feet wide. He suggested that there would be the feel of a 2-story
28 home with a very single-family home look. He advised the Commission that they would be
29 dropping the unit count by approximately 10% to 15%.

30
31 Vice Chairman Jones inquired as to whether there would be elevators.

32
33 Mr. Suchow responded that yes, there would be elevator access with this project, just as
34 there had been with the previous one. He noted that the central building would include a
35 care facility and that it would be 3-stories in height. He explained that the purpose of the
36 work study session was to present the project to the Commission before submitting an
37 application. He suggested that improvements could be made based on the Planning
38 Commission's input.

39
40 Vice Chairman Jones asked if the property owners were local.

41
42 Mr. Suchow responded that they resided out of town, but had given him the resources to
43 design the project as he saw fit.

1 Commissioner Rhoten asked if the facility would be licensed.
2

3 Mr. Suchow responded that the outside units would be independent, 2-bedroom units with
4 full kitchens, and that the central building would be more of a residential care facility that
5 would be licensed and complete with food and laundry service.
6

7 Vice Chairman Jones asked how many units would be in each pod.
8

9 Mr. Suchow responded that the internal buildings would have up to 3 units, and that all
10 street frontage was limited to 2-story.
11

12 Commissioner Mendoza asked if there were any ADA issues.
13

14 Mr. Suchow responded that every unit would be fully handicapped accessible.
15

16 Commissioner Rhoten inquired regarding what indication there was that bed availability
17 was needed in the valley.
18

19 Mr. Suchow responded that a fair amount of market study had been done. He noted that
20 for quite some time the low-end unit was what was in demand, but he indicated that this
21 was changing and that the demographics were showing that a step-up to nicer units had
22 occurred and were now what was desirable.
23

24 Commissioner Rhoten asked if there would be any units available for SSI residents.
25

26 Mr. Suchow noted that he could not really respond to that at the moment, and suggested
27 that perhaps the owners should be the ones to address that question. He noted that they
28 did not wish to go with the smaller, 500 square-foot units, but bump them up to 700 to 800
29 square-feet in size.
30

31 Commissioner Rhoten noted that SSI units were typically 500 square-feet.
32

33 Commissioner Mendoza asked how close the project was to residences.
34

35 Mr. Suchow responded that it was on an older portion of Santa Fe Street, and was
36 surrounded primarily with older single-family homes and churches. He added that a nice,
37 older home with some character was right across the street. He further noted that the
38 owners were anxious to submit a formal application.
39

40 Chairman Duistermars asked the rest of the Commission if they were comfortable with the
41 project.
42
43
44

1 Vice Chairman Jones stated that it was a little hard to tell, and that it didn't look like there
2 was much open space included with the project.

3
4 Mr. Suchow noted that there would be a garden area and that each unit would have a front
5 porch and a back patio.

6
7 The Commission thanked Mr. Suchow for his presentation.
8

9 **C. STREET STANDARDS IN RURAL / ESTATE AREAS - Bernie Chase**

10 A work study session with discussion and possible direction to staff regarding
11 the proposed revisions to the Standard Specifications for Public Works
12 Construction, revising Street Standards that may be applied in rural and
13 estate areas in the City of Hemet.
14

15 The work study session was initiated by City Planner Chase, who provided some
16 background information regarding the item, and noted some changes that had been made.
17 He indicated that some of the County of Riverside's standards had been "borrowed", but
18 that the Public Works Division preferred that the City's standards be tinkered with. He
19 described what was being proposed.
20

21 Vice Chairman Jones noted that with rural guidelines things tended to be done a bit
22 differently. He suggested that the trails be tied together, noting that he would like to see
23 some of the trails between Lake Skinner and Lake Perris go through the community.
24

25 Chairman Duistermars suggested that this item go to a special committee for the Single-
26 Family Residential Design Guidelines.
27

28 Principal Planner Sawyer indicated that this was intended.
29

30 Chairman Duistermars suggested that the areas where there were rolled asphalt curbs
31 should be lumped in with the Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines as well.
32

33 A discussion regarding sidewalks ensued.
34

35 City Planner Chase advised the Commission that, in their packet, they had a copy of the
36 existing City standards along with a revised set of standards.
37

38 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that staff get a copy of the City of Norco's rural guidelines
39 to review and consider.
40

41 The Commission thanked City Planner Chase for his presentation.
42
43
44

1 **VII. CONSENT CALENDAR**

2
3 **A. MINUTES**

4 1. September 20, 2005

5
6 It was MOVED by Commissioner Mendoza and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
7 approve the consent calendar as presented.

8
9 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

10
11 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Mendoza & Rhoten

12 NOES: None

13 ABSTAIN: None

14 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones

15
16
17 **VIII. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

18
19 Chairman Duistermars referred to a discussion regarding the difference between
20 condominiums and apartments that had been brought up at the previously held joint
21 meeting with the City Council. He asked Council Member Brian Christie, who was in the
22 audience, if the prospect of allowing condominiums to be built on smaller lots had been
23 discussed yet.

24
25 Council Member Christie responded that he did not believe it had been discussed, and that
26 he would talk to Planning Director Masyczek about it.

27
28
29 **IX. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

30
31 Commissioner Mendoza stated that he would like to discuss, at a future meeting, the
32 prospect of Metrolink coming into the City.

33
34 Chairman Duistermars suggested that someone from the Riverside County Transportation
35 Commission could probably come and speak to the Commission regarding this concept.
36 He asked that Staff look into this.

37
38
39 **XI. ADJOURNMENT**

40
41 It was MOVED by Commissioner Mendoza, SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten and
42 unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 7:22 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City
43
44

1 of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for *Tuesday, July 19, 2005 at 6:00 p.m.* to be
2 held in the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet,
3 California 92543.

4
5 (Minutes prepared by Nancie Shaw.)
6
7
8
9

10
11 _____
12 **Bob Duistermars, Chairman**
13 **Hemet Planning Commission**

14 **ATTEST:**

15
16 _____
17 **Melissa Diels, Minutes Secretary**
18 **Hemet Planning Commission**
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44