

1 **II. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**

2
3 It was MOVED by Chairman Duistermars and SECONDED by Commissioner Searl that an
4 update be provided as Agenda Item No. VIII. B. regarding the MWD response to the letter
5 requesting revisions to the park site for KB Homes Tract No. 30560.

6
7 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

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

13
14
15 **III. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE**

16
17 Sandra Packham, Director of Facilities for the Hemet Unified School District, reported to
18 the Commission that the school district was moving ahead on Phase 2 of the Jacob Wiens
19 Elementary School site, which included grading and off-site improvements. She noted that
20 the stadium was gone and that they were moving earth, with the Notices to Proceed having
21 been issued for Phase 3 of the project, which would include the buildings. She further
22 noted that material submittals were being prepared so that supplies could be ordered.

23
24 Regarding the Alternative Learning Center, Ms. Packham reported that work on two new
25 relocatable buildings was being wound up, that the fitness equipment had been installed
26 and they were waiting for the rubberized surface to be completed. She further advised that
27 grading and excavation for the new office building had begun.

28
29 Ms. Packham reported that the demolition work had been completed for the nine sites that
30 were included in the modernization projects for the summer. She described how they had
31 run into some surprises, such as dry rot, but assured the Commission that all was
32 progressing, including the Santa Fe Middle School site work.

33
34 Ms. Packham advised the Commission that the relocatable buildings had been craned into
35 Bautista Creek Elementary School earlier in the day, but that some of the buildings had
36 been delayed due to a shortage of materials. Regarding the Hemet High School Stadium
37 she reported that escrows had been opened, the CEQA process was progressing, the
38 plans were being prepared for submission to DSA, and they were continuing to work with
39 Riverside County Transportation on signals and road improvements.

1 Ms. Packham reported, regarding the new high school, that the demolition package was
2 being prepared for the buildings, wells, septic tanks, pool, irrigation reservoir and
3 underground irrigation system.

4
5 Ms. Packham concluded her report by advising the Commission that Dr. Pendley and
6 Steve Temple would be discussing the after hours use of playgrounds at the schools, as
7 well as the master plan of streets around the new high school site and the help that the
8 school district would need from the City.

9
10
11 **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

12
13 **A. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 03-9 (Continued from June 1, 2004)**

14 APPLICANT: Jarinala "Sonny" Sanjay
15 AGENT: Ashok Parikn - Cypress Builders
16 LOCATION: 395 W. Stetson Avenue
17 PLANNER: Ron Running
18 DESCRIPTION: A request for a conditional use permit to expand an
19 existing gasoline station with the construction of an
20 additional fuel pump island located on the southeast
21 corner of Stetson Avenue and Sapphire Place in the C-
22 1 (Neighborhood-Commercial) zone.
23

24 Due to the absence of City Planner Running, the staff report was presented by Principal
25 Planner Sawyer, who provided some details regarding the proposal. He noted that the
26 project was categorically exempt from CEQA as an infill development project. He noted,
27 specifically, several conditions for the Planning Commission's consideration.

- 28
29 ! *Condition No. 17 requires that the landscaping be completed in the project*
30 *and approved by the Planning Department prior to a Certificate of*
31 *Occupancy.*
32 ! *Condition No. 24 requires the elimination of one parking space in order to*
33 *maintain the existing landscaping that is currently at the northwest corner of*
34 *the parking lot.*
35 ! *Condition No. 25 states that parking space no. 7 shall be eliminated, but staff*
36 *would like to amend that condition to read:*

37
38 ***Condition No. 25: "Applicant shall revise the site plan to eliminate two***
39 ***parking spaces so as to provide the necessary***
40 ***backup space (25-foot minimum). The final parking***
41 ***and circulation plan shall be approved by the***
42 ***Planning Department."***
43
44

1 ! *Condition No. 23 requires replacement of the existing sign with a monument*
2 *sign per the City codes.*

3
4 Commissioner Rhoten noted that at the June 1, 2004 Planning Commission meeting she
5 had asked to see the landscaping plan. She inquired as to whether they would be able to
6 see that plan this evening.

7
8 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that no additional materials had been provided by the
9 applicant, so unless the applicant had brought it with them to the meeting, the Commission
10 would not be able to review at this meeting.

11
12 A brief discussion of the parking provisions ensued.

13
14 Chairman Duistermars noted that it was his understanding that the gas pump had already
15 been installed, and asked if a Building Permit had been obtained for the installation.

16
17 Principal Planner Sawyer confirmed that the pump had, indeed, been installed without a
18 building permit and that the Code Enforcement Division had issued a "Stop Work" order.
19 He noted that the pump had not been used for several months as a result of that order.

20
21 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:14 p.m.

22
23 Carlos Gonzales of Cypress Builders, 395 W. Stetson Avenue, Hemet, California
24 approached the lectern as a representative for the applicant. He inquired regarding what
25 type of landscaping the Commission would like to see, and asked, regarding the monument
26 sign, if they could leave the existing sign.

27
28 Chairman Duistermars responded, regarding the landscaping, that they could work with
29 staff on the landscaping, but that he believed it was xeriscape, which required little water.
30 Regarding the monument sign, he explained that any businesses that were doing upgrades
31 were also being required to change their signs. He noted that the existing sign was a pole
32 sign and that a monument sign needed to replace it.

33
34 Mr. Patel, 31367 Terrington Court, Yucaipa, California approached the lectern as a
35 representative for the applicant and asked if they could have permission to open use of the
36 new pump prior to the installation of the sign and landscaping.

37
38 Planning Director Masyczek responded that this would not be acceptable, but that they
39 could work with staff on phasing of the project.

40
41 A discussion ensued regarding the location of the trash enclosure.
42
43
44

1 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the trash enclosure was
2 acceptable as long as the canopy was in place.

3
4 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:20 p.m. and asked for a motion.

5
6 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkin to
7 adopt Resolution Bill No. 04-36 approving Conditional Use Permit No. 03-9 as amended.

8
9 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

10
11 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Rhoten and Searl

12 NOES: None

13 ABSTAIN: None

14 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones

15
16 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-32.***

17
18 **B. VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31075**

19 APPLICANT: Karubian Family Joint Venture

20 LOCATION: Northeast corner of State street and Gibbel Road

21 PLANNER: Maureen Losey

22 DESCRIPTION: A proposal for a parcel map to subdivide 21.5 acres into
23 eight (8) lots for future commercial development on
24 property located within the Diamond Valley Gateway
25 Specific Plan (SP 96-001).

26
27 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Losey who provided some details
28 regarding the project. She explained that Condition of Approval No. 52 had been drafted
29 by the City Attorney to allow the applicant to move forward with development of the map,
30 pending any amendment to the Specific Plan.

31
32 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:23 p.m.

33
34 John Karubian, 2104 Trendy Lane, Los Angeles, California approached the lectern as the
35 project applicant and offered to answer any questions that the Commission might have.

36
37 A discussion ensued regarding possible future changes to the Specific Plan.

38
39 Chairman Duistermars noted that it was his understanding that Condition No. 52 satisfied
40 any concerns regarding the Specific Plan.

1 Assistant City Attorney Vail explained that Condition No. 52 was a special condition, and
2 that the Commission should expressly ask the applicant to accept that condition on the
3 public record.

4
5 Chairman Duistermars asked Mr. Karubian if he was willing to accept Condition No. 52.

6
7 Mr. Karubian responded that he was.

8
9 A discussion of the typographical error in Condition No. 1, in which the condition referred
10 to "*Tentative Tract Map No. 30869*", where it should read "*Vesting Tentative Tract Map No.*
11 *31075*", ensued, and staff assured the Commission that the error would be fixed.

12
13 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:28 p.m. and asked for a motion.

14
15 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
16 adopt Resolution Bill No. 04-46 approving Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 31075.

17
18 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

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

21 NOES: None

22 ABSTAIN: None

23 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones

24
25 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-33.***

26
27 **C. TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 31992 / CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO.**
28 **03-18**

29 APPLICANT: Winston Capital Group

30 AGENT: Larry Reeves

31 LOCATION: Southwest corner of Devonshire and Sanderson
32 Avenues

33 PLANNER: Maureen Losey

34 DESCRIPTION: A proposal for a parcel map to subdivide 2.86 acres into
35 three (3) commercial lots and a conditional use permit
36 to construct and operate a 24,342 square-foot shopping
37 center consisting of a 13,800 square-foot retail building,
38 a 5,600 square-foot retail building and a 3,700 square-
39 foot fast-food restaurant building on property located in
40 the C-2 (General-Commercial) zone.

41
42 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Losey who provided some details
43 regarding the project. She discussed the parking issue, noting that the project had been
44

1 conditioned to reduce the square-footage so that the parking requirements would be met.
2 She explained that Building "B" was now proposed to be a retail use, and that the applicant
3 had been encouraged to obtain a reciprocal access agreement from Home Depot. She
4 noted that the vacant parcel was conditioned to be hydro-seeded, pending development,
5 and that the project was categorically exempt from CEQA.

6
7 Commissioner Searl asked if there should perhaps also be a condition requiring a
8 reciprocal access agreement between the future development to the west of the project.

9
10 Assistant Planner Losey explained that this had been considered, but that there was a
11 large trash enclosure there that the Refuse Department wanted left in place.

12
13 Commissioner Calkins expressed his confusion with the plans regarding whether Building
14 "B" was to be a future development, and Building "C" was to be a restaurant use. He noted
15 that the new plans did not indicate Building "C" as a restaurant, and asked if a future
16 conditional use permit would be required with the future development.

17
18 Principal Planner Sawyer explained that any approval that the Commission might grant this
19 evening was for all uses within the development, but that if a restaurant were to come in
20 at a later time with a drive-thru, an additional conditional use permit would be required.

21
22 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:34 p.m.

23
24 Larry Reeves, 625 Fair Oaks Avenue, South Pasadena, California approached the lectern
25 as a representative for the applicant. He explained that their original proposal had included
26 a fast-food restaurant use, but that the use had been changed to a retail use, per the
27 Planning Commission's request at the work study session. He noted that they had also
28 added some enhanced architectural features to the buildings per the Planning
29 Commission's request, and distributed a modified plan to the members of the Commission.
30 He noted the approach that had been made to resolve the parking issue, explaining that
31 Building "B" on the corner was proposed to be a restaurant, and that Buildings "A" and "C"
32 would be mixed uses. He suggested that if the modified plan was acceptable to the
33 Commission he would like to have it made part of the conditional use permit. He noted
34 that, as modified, there was a requirement for 129 parking spaces, and that 129 parking
35 spaces were being provided, so there would be no need for a variance.

36
37 Planning Director Masyczek explained to the Commission that the underparking had
38 occurred with the restaurant use. He noted that the Commission had some options, which
39 included their ability to define the mixed uses. He suggested that within the mixed use
40 buildings the Commission may wish to accept uses such as a Quiznos Sub shop, but that
41 a sit-down/eating facility may not be such a great idea. He noted that, in terms of the
42 amount of parking for a restaurant use, it was determined by the gross square-footage of
43 the building, and that given the size of the site being so small, the parking ratio needed to
44

1 be addressed. He suggested that there be no sit-down type restaurant use in Buildings "A"
2 or "C".
3

4 Don Bender, 4110 E. Florida Avenue, Hemet, California approached the lectern and
5 addressed the Commission as a representative for the applicant. He stated that he would
6 hope that the mixed use would be able to include sandwich-type shops, and asked what
7 would happen if Building "B" were to become a retail use instead of a restaurant use –
8 wanting to know whether they would then be over-exceeding their parking requirement.
9

10 Assistant City Attorney Vail noted that it should be clarified that Buildings "A" and "C" could
11 not be used as a restaurant, but that Building "B" could be converted to retail if the
12 applicant chose to do so. He further noted that the maximum square-footage of the
13 restaurant use should be clarified.
14

15 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that wording be added to the conditions stating that
16 *"The Planning Director may, on a 1:1 ratio, approve exchanges of the uses within the*
17 *facility as long as the overall square-footage for retail and restaurant is not exceeded."* He
18 suggested that this would allow some flexibility in where the restaurant goes, but would not
19 allow them to exceed what they were showing under their site plan.
20

21 Chairman Duistermars asked the applicant if this would be acceptable, or if they would
22 rather just have Building "B".
23

24 Mr. Bender responded that the chances were remote that it would not be a restaurant, but
25 that such things do happen on occasion. With this in mind, he suggested that if Building
26 "B" did change to retail their standards would be off, and asked if this would mean that they
27 could make one of the buildings larger.
28

29 Planning Director Masyczek responded that such a change would require an amendment
30 to the conditional use permit, which would need to be approved at a public hearing before
31 the Planning Commission.
32

33 Mr. Bender pointed out that Condition No. 30 of the conditional use permit conditions
34 required all of the off-site improvements to be done, and that they were also doing all of
35 the on-site improvements. He noted that the applicant would be constructing Buildings "A"
36 and "C" in the first phase, with the restaurant tagging along, possibly at a later date. He
37 further noted that they would be doing all of these improvements, and would be 90% done,
38 but the condition says that if Building "B" is not constructed, even though the Center is
39 substantially complete, they would have to come back to the Commission for further
40 approval or the conditional use permit would expire. He stated that he would hope that
41 they could add to that condition that if the project was substantially completed, and all of
42 the off-site improvements were done for the entire center, and the on-site improvements
43
44

1 were done up to the curb of the pad for this restaurant, that they would be deemed
2 substantially complete and not have to come back before the Commission.

3
4 Planning Director Masyczek responded that he would not mind deleting the condition.

5
6 Principal Planner Sawyer explained that the intent of the condition was due to the fact that
7 developers often come in with two or three phased projects for a conditional use permit
8 and only want to build the first phase right away, but want approval on the other phases
9 as well. He suggested that quite often it's put up on different parcels, or the parcels may
10 be under different ownership, and that while the life of a conditional use permit does run
11 with the land, the approval of the conditional use permit is only good for two years for them
12 to pull their building permits. He further suggested that this presents a gray area for the
13 second or third phase coming in.

14
15 Chairman Duistermars asked what would happen if only part of the project were built.

16
17 Planning Director Masyczek responded that if Buildings "A" and "C" were built and the pad
18 for Building "B" was left vacant, it would need to be hydro-seeded.

19
20 A discussion ensued regarding Condition No. 30 of Conditional Use Permit No. 03-18.

21
22 The Commission concurred that Condition No. 30 could be deleted.

23
24 Chairman Duistermars asked if the applicant would prefer to have some flexibility to have
25 the restaurant square-footage of 5,600 square-feet located anywhere within the center.

26
27 Mr. Bender responded that they would prefer this allowance.

28
29 Principal Planner Sawyer noted the changes that were to be made to the conditions of
30 approval for the conditional use permit, which included the **deletion of Condition No. 30**,
31 the **modification of Condition No. 55**, and the addition of Condition Nos. 56 and 57 as
32 follows:

33
34 **Condition No. 55: "Food service use in Buildings "A" and "B" shall be**
35 **limited to food service use without dine-in service.**

36
37 **Condition No. 56: "The site plan is approved as submitted on July 6, 2004,**
38 **and as conditioned therein."**

39
40 **Condition No. 57: "The Planning Director may address the location of uses**
41 **on a one square-foot to one square-foot basis as a**
42 **modification of this conditional use permit."**

1 The Commission concurred with the revised conditions, as did the applicant.

2
3 Mr. Reeves noted that he would like to have Condition No. 52 of the parcel map conditions
4 deleted, since he had confirmed with Principal Engineer Biagioni that this was acceptable.

5
6 Principal Engineer Biagioni confirmed for the Commission that he was in agreement with
7 the **deletion of Condition No. 52 of the Tentative Parcel Map conditions**.

8
9 A discussion ensued regarding the provision for a bus turnout, as per Condition No. 19 of
10 the conditional use permit conditions of approval.

11
12 Assistant City Attorney Vail suggested that if the Commission intended for a shelter to be
13 included, the condition should specify such.

14
15 Planning Director Masyczek stated that a shelter was not required.

16
17 Assistant City Attorney Vail suggested that **Condition No. 19** should then be modified to
18 add the wording **“(not a shelter)”** after the words **“bus turnout”**.

19
20 The Commission and the applicant concurred with this change.

21
22 A discussion ensued regarding Condition No. 65 of the tentative parcel map conditions.

23
24 It was agreed that, in **Condition No. 65** of the **tentative parcel map conditions**, the word
25 **“if”** should be added before **“a 60-foot yard agreement”** and **“is required as determined**
26 **by the City of Hemet Building Official”** after the words **“60-foot yard agreement”**.

27
28 A discussion of delivery and delivery hours ensued.

29
30 Planning Director Masyczek recommended that an additional condition (No. 58) be added
31 to the conditional use permit conditions of approval, regarding the delivery hours.

32
33 **Condition No. 58: “Delivery hours shall be limited to off-peak hours as**
34 **approved by the Planning Director prior to issuance of**
35 **certificates of use and occupancy, based on operating**
36 **characteristics provided by the applicant.”**

37
38 The Commission and the applicant concurred with the condition.

39
40 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 7:12 p.m.

41
42 Commissioner Calkins asked if the architectural portion of the project would be reviewed
43 again.

1 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that it would not, as it would be approved with the
2 conditional use permit.

3
4 Commissioner Calkins expressed his dismay with this fact, since the architectural form
5 continued to look like all of the others, with no distinctive characteristics to make it stand
6 out.

7
8 Principal Planner Sawyer noted that the project had already gone through the Design
9 Review process, but that if the Commission wished to alter the design of the architecture
10 the project should be brought back before the Commission for approval.

11
12 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.

13
14 Assistant City Attorney Vail noted that both motions should be "as amended".

15
16 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
17 adopt Resolution Bill No. 04-40, approving Tentative Parcel Map No. 31992, as amended.

18
19 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

20
21 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Rhoten and Searl

22 NOES: Commissioner Calkins

23 ABSTAIN: None

24 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones

25
26 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-34.***

27
28 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
29 adopt Resolution Bill No. 04-41, approving Conditional Use Permit No. 03-18, as amended.

30
31 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

32
33 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Rhoten and Searl

34 NOES: Commissioner Calkins

35 ABSTAIN: None

36 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones

37
38 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-35.***

1 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS**

2
3 **A. KIRBY STREET TRAFFIC REDUCTION ACT OF 2004**

4 Review of the proposed initiative with a request for Planning Commission
5 comments to be forwarded to the City Council.
6

7 Commissioner Searl excused himself from participation in the discussion of this item due
8 to a conflict of interest as a nearby property owner of the affected area.
9

10 The staff report was presented by Planning Director Masyczek who explained that
11 comments and suggestions of the Planning Commission were to be forwarded to the City
12 Council at their special meeting of July 21, 2004.
13

14 Assistant City Attorney Vail clarified for the Commission what was being requested of
15 them, as allowed by the Elections Code. He explained that no personal opinions were
16 either needed or optional, and that the recommendation could be phrased as *"We find that*
17 *the initiative will have the following impacts..."*
18

19 Chairman Duistermars noted that on the "pro" side of the initiative, any time housing could
20 be provided it was a positive thing, and that staff should look into what impact losing the
21 area as potential employment opportunities for citizens in the future would have on the
22 community.
23

24 Commissioner Calkins stated that if the property were developed as single-family homes
25 it may deter the adjacent property from developing according to its current zoning
26 designation for fear of complaints being made by the residents. He suggested that there
27 may be some likelihood that adjacent properties would then remain vacant.
28

29 Chairman Duistermars referred to Page 4 of the initiative, under "concepts", and asked
30 what was considered to be "balance".
31

32 A discussion ensued regarding this question.
33

34 Planning Director Masyczek referred to 2K on Page 5 under "issues", referring to
35 modifications to the General Plan. He pointed out some additional ways that the General
36 Plan would be amended.
37

38 A discussion ensued regarding the initiative's purpose and what it was attempting to
39 accomplish.
40

41 Assistant City Attorney Vail referred back to Page 4, A.1.D., "concepts", and explained how
42 the Commission might provide feedback to the different items.
43
44

1 Commissioner Calkins stated that he was wondering if the 43 acres of additional residential
2 development was necessary, noting that it was his thought that it would limit the future
3 development of the adjacent property.

4
5 Regarding 2.K. Issues / Page 5, Chairman Duistermars asked for comments.

6
7 Commissioner Calkins noted the comments that he had just made.

8
9 Regarding 3. Concepts, Chairman Duistermas asked for comments.

10
11 Commissioner Calkins expressed the same concern.

12
13 Regarding Page 7, B.2., Concepts, Chairman Duistermars asked for comments.

14
15 Commissioner Calkins continued to express the same basic concerns.

16
17 Regarding Page 8, C.1. Concepts, Paragraph #3, Chairman Duistermars asked for
18 comments.

19
20 A discussion ensued regarding this area being interpreted differently.

21
22 Assistant City Attorney Vail discussed the ALUC analysis.

23
24 Chairman Duistermars asked if the analysis was correct, or if the City was just deeming it
25 to be so.

26
27 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the City was deeming it to be correct. He
28 explained that there were a couple of different areas to focus in on, which were the
29 compliance level and the policy level, and that the primary issue was regarding how it
30 would affect the City's implementation of the General Plan.

31
32 Chairman Duistermars asked Charles McLaughlin, who was present in the audience and
33 responsible for the generation of the initiative, to speak regarding the issue.

34
35 Charles McLaughlin, 20 Saltsburg, Newport Beach, California approached the lectern. He
36 noted that the project he was trying to develop was in Area 6, which had an unlimited
37 allowance for residential development, and was not a high hazard area. He further noted
38 that the Planning Commission had already approved some projects with utilization of the
39 new guidelines, and that the old analysis was more restrictive.

1 Ric Stephens, 4520 Champagne, Riverside, California approached the lectern. He advised
2 the Planning Commission that he was the Airport Land Use Commission Chairman, and
3 that if the project were to come back before the ALUC they would not be using the
4 CALTRANS Handbook in their review.

5
6 Assistant City Attorney Vail explained that cities and counties, with specific findings, could
7 override ALUC decisions.

8
9 Chairman Duistermars asked, in terms of the City's normal process, if there would be a
10 discussion of the impacts and the possibility of moving the property out of one area and
11 into another. He inquired as to whether the City was obligated to take on the liability of
12 overriding the ALUC's decision.

13
14 A discussion ensued.

15
16 Chairman Duistermars asked Mr. McLaughlin why he was wanting to develop with the
17 higher densities, using 6,000 square-foot lots.

18
19 Mr. McLaughlin responded that the smaller lot sizes were more consistent with the
20 surrounding neighborhoods.

21
22 A discussion ensued regarding the proposed 6,000 square-foot lot sizes, and the fact that
23 the City's policy was to require 7,200 square-foot lot sizes unless a Specific Plan was
24 submitted with the provision of various amenities to offset the smaller lot sizes.

25
26 Sue Fox, 3800 W. Thornton Ave., Hemet, California approached the lectern. She noted
27 that three of the corners in that area were already residential, and suggested that in order
28 to keep residential properties together, the 4th corner should also be developed as a
29 residential use. She added that commercial and industrial areas should be located with
30 other commercial & industrial areas.

31
32 Bobbie Christie, 320 Juel Lane, Hemet, California approached the lectern and expressed
33 her opinion that the property should be left with a commercial zoning designation. She
34 suggested that the City needed more commercial and industrial uses, and that if over 300
35 homes were built at that location, the traffic would likely be far greater than if it were to
36 remain as a commercial property. She further suggested that the word should go out to
37 the public that they needed to look at the overall picture before making decisions.

38
39 Mr. McLaughlin advised the Commission that the positive aspects of the initiative included
40 the benefit that it would have to the community since the residents had expressed their
41 preference with it being changed to residential. He noted that residential, as compared to
42 industrial, would generate more revenue for the City via Development Impact Fees,
43 Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees and School Fees. He agreed that he had heard
44

1 different views regarding the traffic issue, but stated that an industrial or commercial project
2 would generate four to five times more traffic than a residential project. He referred to the
3 concerns of the residents in the surrounding neighborhood, noting that they were not
4 exclusive to traffic counts, but inclusive of cumulative impacts. He suggested that the
5 Planning Commission consider and include in their report the positive aspects of the
6 initiative.

7
8 Chairman Duistermars expressed his appreciation for Mr. McLaughlin's participation in the
9 discussion.

10
11 Commissioner Searl rejoined the meeting.

12
13
14 **VI. CONSENT CALENDAR**

15
16 **A. MINUTES**

- 17
18 _____ 1. October 7, 2003
19 2. June 15, 2004

20
21 Assistant City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that they should vote separately on
22 each of the two sets of Minutes on the Consent Calendar, since all Commissioners had not
23 been present for both meetings.

24
25 Chairman Duistermars pulled the October 7, 2003 Minutes from the Consent Calendar to
26 be voted on separately.

27
28 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Rhoten and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Calkins to
29 approve the Consent Calendar as amended.

30
31 The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote:

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

37
38 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion on the October 7, 2003 Minutes.

39
40 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Rhoten and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Calkins to
41 approve the October 7, 2003 Planning Commission Minutes as written.

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
2

3 AYES: Chairman Duisetermars and Commissioners Calkins and Rhoten

4 NOES: None

5 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Searl

6 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones
7
8

9 **VII. UPDATE OF CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS ON PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS**
10

11 **A. RURAL DESIGN STANDARDS**

12 _____ A work study session regarding the possible establishment of rural design
13 standards, with discussion and possible direction to staff.
14

15 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that this item would be back before
16 them in August.
17

18 Chairman Duistermars asked if the Public Works Department would be involved in the
19 establishment of the Rural Design Standards.
20

21 Planning Director Masyczek responded that they would.
22

23 Chairman Duistermars asked if their presence could be requested when the item came
24 back before the Commission.
25

26 Planning Director Masyczek agreed that they should attend the meeting and noted that he
27 would ask them to do so.
28

29 **B. CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS FOR ALL COMMERCIAL PROJECTS**

30 A work study session to consider the possibility of requiring conditional use
31 permits for all commercial development in the City of Hemet, with discussion
32 and possible direction to staff.
33

34 Planning Director Masyczek advised the commission that an Interim Urgency Ordinance
35 was to be adopted for this item at the City Council's meeting on July 13, 2004, to allow staff
36 time to go through the normal process of changing the ordinance.
37

38 Commissioner Calkins asked if the Commission would have the opportunity to review the
39 architecture of new commercial buildings through the conditional use permit process.
40
41
42
43
44

1 Planning Director Masyczek responded that, no, the Commission would not have that
2 opportunity, noting that architecture is typically reviewed under a Site Design Review, and
3 that Conditional Use Permits were a mechanism to review the uses of commercial projects.
4 He stated that the process could be modified in the future to include the ability to review
5 architecture, if the Commission so desired.
6
7

8 **VIII. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**

9 10 **A. DISCUSSION OF PLANNING COMMISSION TOUR OF TEMECULA**

11
12 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that they needed to decide on a date
13 to adjourn this meeting to, for the tour of Temecula that had been previously discussed.
14

15 Commissioner Searl stated that in order for him to attend it would need to be scheduled
16 prior to July 24, 2004.
17

18 It was suggested that the tour could take place beginning at 1:00 p.m. on the next regular
19 meeting day of July 20, 2004, and that the regular meeting could then resume at the City
20 Council Chambers following the tour.
21

22 **B. KB HOMES PARK SITE FOR VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO.** 23 **30560** 24

25 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that Metropolitan Water District did
26 not want to see any organized sports happening at the park site, and that they were
27 considering the installation of a 3rd pipeline. He noted that other cities were allowing open
28 space uses, such as golf courses, on these types of sites. He further noted that City
29 Planner Ron Running would be arranging a meeting with MWD after he returned from his
30 vacation.
31

32 **IX. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

33
34 Commissioner Calkins advised the Commission and staff that he had done a count of all
35 of the cars parked on the street at the Riverdale Apartments that were located on Cawston
36 Street at Thornton Avenue, and that he had come up with a total of 71 cars, 1 boat and 1
37 trailer outside of a 96-unit apartment complex. He noted that every unit had a garage and
38 a carport, as well as visitor parking. He further noted that he had seen 18-wheel trucks
39 parked on Thornton Avenue which had been there all weekend.
40

41 Planning Director Masyczek stated that he would take a look at the parking ordinance to
42 see if there was anything that could be done, and that he would also send a Code
43
44

1 Enforcement officer to check out the issue of the 18-wheel trucks being parked on
2 Thornton Avenue.

3
4 Commissioner Calkins mentioned that the Curtis Frame property on Stetson Avenue
5 between Lyon and Palm Avenues had been sold, which might create an issue in the future
6 with the truck parking that was being permitted there. He suggested that this location
7 might need to be reassessed.

8
9 **X. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

10
11 There were no future agenda items discussed or requested.

12
13
14 **XI. ADJOURNMENT**

15
16 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Searl, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Calkins and
17 unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 8:24 p.m. to the Special Meeting of the
18 Planning Commission scheduled for **Tuesday, July 20, 2004 at 1:00 p.m.** beginning at the
19 City of Hemet City Hall, 445 E. Florida Avenue, Hemet, California to embark on a tour of
20 subdivisions in Temecula, and to be followed by the regular meeting of the City of Hemet
21 Planning Commission at **6:00 p.m.** at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450
22 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet, California 92543.

23
24
25
26
27 _____
28 Bob Duistermars, Chairman
29 Hemet Planning Commission

30 ATTEST:

31
32
33
34 _____
35 Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44