

1 CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

2
3 TUESDAY, JULY 15, 2003

4
5 THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION WAS
6 CONVENED BY CHAIRMAN DUISTERMARS ON TUESDAY, JULY 15, 2003 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 Commissioner Jim Calkins; Commissioner B.R. Hicks present at 6:35
12 p.m.

13
14 **Absent:** Commissioner Mayzelle Rhoten

15
16 **Staff Present:** Principal Planner Matthew Bassi, Planning Technician Loretta
17 Domenigoni, Assistant Planner Maureen Losey, Planning
18 Director Richard Masyczek, City Planner Ron Running, Minutes
19 Secretary Nancie Shaw, City Engineer Roland Trietsch and
20 Assistant City Attorney Eric Vail

21
22 **Invocation and Flag Salute:** Commissioner Calkins

23
24 Planning Director Masyczek informed the Commission that Commissioner Rhoten would
25 not be in attendance and needed to be excused for this meeting.

26
27 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
28 grant Commissioner Rhoten an excused absence for this meeting.

29
30 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

31
32 **AYES:** Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioner Calkins

33 **NOES:** None

34 **ABSTAIN:** None

35 **ABSENT:** Commissioners Hicks and Rhoten

36
37 **I. PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Anyone who wishes to address the Commission
38 regarding items not on the agenda may do so at this time. Please line up at the
39 lectern when the Chair asks if there are any communications from the public. ***When***
40 ***you are recognized, please give your name, spelling of your last name, and***
41 ***address for accurate recording in the Minutes.***

42
43 There were no members of the public who wished to address the Commission.

44
45 **Planning Commission Minutes**
July 15, 2003

1 **II. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE:** Update given by HUSD
2 Director of Facilities, Sandy Packham

3
4 Director of Facilities, Sandy Packham reported to the Commission that the school district
5 was continuing to move forward with both their new construction and renovation projects.
6 She advised them that on the governing board for approval this evening was the Hemet
7 Stock Farm as the site for the permanent Jacob Weins Elementary School.

8
9 Ms. Packham shared some photos with the Commission of the renovation projects that are
10 currently underway at various schools and gave some details regarding the photos.

11
12 Ms. Packham commented on Agenda Item No. V.A. - Peppertree Specific Plan, advising
13 the Commission that the school district is in support of the project, but stated that she
14 wanted to be sure, since the project is senior-restricted, that the Commission was aware
15 that the project was located across the street from Cawston Elementary School.

16
17
18 **III. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**

19
20 There were no amendments or additions to the agenda.

21
22
23 **IV. CONSENT CALENDAR:**

24
25 **A. MINUTES**

26
27 _____ 1. July 1, 2003

28
29 It was **MOVED** by Vice Chairman Jones and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Calkins to
30 approve the consent calendar as presented.

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

33
34 **AYES:** Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioner Calkins

35 **NOES:** None

36 **ABSTAIN:** None

37 **ABSENT:** Commissioners Hicks and Rhoten

1 **V. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 01-2; SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 01-3; AND**
2 **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 03-19 (Continued from July 1, 2003)**

3 APPLICANT: Kevin Lynch, Lennar Communities

4 LOCATION: Northwest corner of Cawston and Menlo Avenues

5 PLANNER: Matthew Bassi

6 DESCRIPTION: A request for approval of an amendment to the Land Use Map
7 of the General Plan to change the land use designation from
8 R-I (Single-Family Residential) to SP (Specific Plan), and
9 change the zoning from A-2-C (Heavy-Agricultural) to SP
10 (Specific Plan), adoption of the Peppertree Specific Plan, and
11 adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration.
12

13 Principal Planner Bassi presented the staff report, advising the Commission that the
14 changes that had been requested at the last meeting had been made, as indicated in the
15 report. He gave some details regarding those changes.
16

17 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:15 p.m.
18

19 Lynn Vomer, 3872 Florence St., Hemet, approached the lectern and addressed the
20 Commission as an adjacent property owner to the project. She inquired regarding whether
21 the issue of the hiking and riding trail had been addressed, as it had been previously
22 stated that it was a paved path, but horses need a dirt path.
23

24 Chairman Duistermars responded that it was required that there be a Class 4 - Mixed Use
25 Trail, and that the applicant would be providing one that would include a horse trail, and
26 any other requirements that were mandated for such a trail.
27

28 Planning Director Masyczek advised Ms. Vomer that a Class 4 trail is 15-foot wide with
29 open space on both sides and that it is intended to provide for a variety of mixed use trail
30 systems, which include equestrian, bicycle and pedestrian.
31

32 Ms. Vomer asked if this meant that a dirt trail would be provided.
33

34 Planning Director Masyczek responded that it would.
35

36 Principal Planner Bassi indicated an exhibit in the street cross-sections, stating that the
37 actual implementation of the trail would be completed when the subdivision map comes
38 in. He pointed out that it would run from the MWD easement, along Menlo Avenue and up
39 to Cawston Avenue, where it can then go further north and further south, depending on
40 development of the adjacent properties. He added that within the 25-foot enhanced
41 landscape area would be the 15-foot multi-use trail. He stated that this would be shown
42 on the Vesting Tentative Tract Map that would be before the Planning Commission
43 sometime in the near future.
44

1 Susan Lazernik, 520 N. Cawston Ave., Hemet, inquired about the square-footage and
2 prices of the housing that would be constructed.

3
4 Chairman Duistermars responded that the square-footage of the lots had been discussed,
5 but that prices had not been addressed.

6
7 Ms. Lazernik asked if the square-footage would go in line with the other senior
8 developments that were currently being built in the area, such as the Four Seasons project
9 on California Avenue.

10
11 Chairman Duistermars responded that, in terms of a senior community, the lot sizes were
12 fairly standard for such developments. He added that the housing stock would likely also
13 be within those standards. He explained that a variety of housing and housing sizes were
14 being proposed, including multiple-family use, single-family and small bungalows.

15
16 Marvin Lazernik, 520 N. Cawston Ave., Hemet, approached the lectern and addressed the
17 Commission as the husband of Ms. Lazernik and also an adjacent property owner to the
18 project. He indicated that in the previous Sunday's business section of the Riverside
19 newspaper it was listed that homes, within the zip code area "92545", could be priced at
20 \$104.96 per square-foot. He asked if this development would be that price or more per
21 square-foot.

22
23 Chairman Duistermars advised Mr. Lazernik that the applicant would need to respond to
24 this question.

25
26 Ms. Lazernik asked if any of the facilities within the community would be open to the
27 public, or if you would need to reside within the community to use them.

28
29 Chairman Duistermars responded that since it was a gated Community it would be up to
30 the Home Owner's Association that would be in place for the community.

31
32 Ms. Lazernik asked what type of gating would be installed.

33
34 Chairman Duistermars responded that it would probably be a rolling gate that would
35 require a code for entrance.

36
37 She asked for clarification that a block wall would enclose the community.

38
39 Chairman Duistermars responded that it would.

40
41 She inquired as to where the entrance to the community would be located.
42
43
44

45
Planning Commission Minutes
July 15, 2003

1 Chairman Duistermars advised her that the applicant would need to respond to that
2 question also.

3
4 Kevin Lynch of Lennar Communities, 391 N. Main Street, Corona, approached the lectern
5 and addressed the Commission as the project applicant. He responded to the questions
6 of Mr. & Mrs. Lazernik, stating that the square-footage of the bungalows and the other
7 single-family detached homes are roughly in the 1,500 square-foot range, with an option
8 of another 300 square-feet. He added that their pricing is currently in the \$105 per square-
9 foot range. He explained that the community would be a highly amenitized one with a
10 large recreation center offering activities for those who are members of the Home Owner's
11 Association, and pools and landscaping included throughout. He addressed the question
12 of the entryway location, stating that there were two entrances – one off of Cawston
13 Avenue and one off of Menlo Avenue. He displayed an exhibit indicating the location of
14 the entrances.

15
16 Commissioner Calkins addressed the fact that the Minutes stated that Principal Planner
17 Bassi had said that there would be 2 parking spaces per unit as required by the zoning
18 code, but that it had been clarified later in the meeting that the senior-restricted apartments
19 required only one space per unit.

20
21 Mr. Lynch confirmed that this was correct.

22
23 Commissioner Calkins further addressed the fact that the Minutes stated that the setbacks
24 between homes would be 8-feet, but that it would not necessarily be 4-feet and 4-feet, but
25 could be 6-feet and 2-feet, or any other combination that would total 8-feet. He stated that
26 it was his understanding that later in the meeting it had been clarified that the setbacks
27 would be only 4-feet and 4-feet.

28
29 Mr. Lynch confirmed that this was correct.

30
31 A discussion ensued regarding the parking provisions for the project, and the fact that
32 there are many senior couples that have two cars, and would need parking for both.

33
34 Mr. Lynch explained that market studies would be completed prior to construction, as they
35 would not be able to sell homes with single-car parking if the market was looking for 2-car
36 parking. He explained that there could be an option for 2-car parking, or if it was
37 determined that this was what a majority of the market desired, the footprint could be
38 changed to include 2-car parking for every unit.

39
40 Commissioner Hicks joined the meeting at 6:35 p.m.

41
42 A discussion ensued regarding the portion of the site where no development was to occur,
43 which was indicated on the displayed site plan in green.

44
45 **Planning Commission Minutes**
July 15, 2003

1 Planning Director Masyczek explained that this area was an archaeological site that would
2 need to be preserved.

3
4 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:39 p.m.

5
6 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Calkins and **SECONDED** by Vice Chairman Jones to
7 adopt **Resolution No. 03-9EA** recommending approval to the City Council of
8 Environmental Assessment No. 03-19 for a Mitigated Negative Declaration for General
9 Plan Amendment No. 01-2 and Specific Plan No. 01-3.

10
11 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

12
13 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins
14 and Hicks

15 NOES: None

16 ABSTAIN: None

17 ABSENT: Commissioner Rhoten

18
19 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Calkins and **SECONDED** by Vice Chairman Jones to
20 adopt **Resolution No. 03-27** recommending approval to the City Council of General Plan
21 Amendment No. 01-2.

22
23 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

24
25 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins
26 and Hicks

27 NOES: None

28 ABSTAIN: None

29 ABSENT: Commissioner Rhoten

30
31 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Calkins and **SECONDED** by Vice Chairman Jones to
32 adopt **Resolution No. 03-28** recommending approval to the City Council of Specific Plan
33 No. 01-3.

34
35 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

36
37 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins
38 and Hicks

39 NOES: None

40 ABSTAIN: None

41 ABSENT: Commissioner Rhoten

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

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

5 NOES: None

6 ABSTAIN: None

7 ABSENT: Commissioner Rhoten

8
9 **C. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 03-1 / ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-3 /**
10 **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 03-18**

11 APPLICANT: S.V. Investments

12 AGENT: Kevin Cozad & Associates, Inc.

13 LOCATION: West side of Soboba Street between Florida and
14 Lincoln Avenues

15 PLANNER: Maureen Losey

16 DESCRIPTION: A proposal to change the General Plan Land Use
17 designation from R-R (Rural-Residential) to R-I (Up to
18 7 du/ac), and a Zone Change from R-A (Residential-
19 Agriculture) to R-1 (Single-Family Residential) and
20 adoption of a Negative Declaration for a 2.25 acre site.
21

22 Assistant Planner Losey presented the staff report, advising the Commission that the
23 project had been previously work studied before them and explaining some of the details.

24
25 Chairman Duistermars asked how the street alignment had been resolved.

26
27 City Engineer Trietsch approached the lectern and responded to the Commission that
28 there was a solution to the street alignment question which was that it was of slight
29 significance to the volume of traffic that would occur on that street, and the potential for
30 conflicts with the street across from it. He added that he would not say that it was nil or
31 none, but that the potential was not very high to have opposing traffic in conflict with each
32 other as they exit their streets. He displayed a map indicating the appearance of the site
33 across the street, and explained further why there would not be a significant potential for
34 conflicts of traffic.

35
36 Commissioner Calkins asked if there had been any consideration for noise abatement from
37 the auto repair facility to the south.

38
39 Assistant Planner Losey responded that there was to be a 6-foot block wall installed along
40 the entire perimeter on the south side of the subdivision, and added that applicant who has
41 Phil's Auto Clinic was responsible for that.

42
43 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:48 p.m.
44

1 Since there were no members of the public who wished to speak regarding the project,
2 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:49 p.m.

3
4 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Hicks to adopt
5 **Resolution No. 03-18EA** recommending to the City Council approval of Environmental
6 Assessment No. 03-18 for a Negative Declaration for General Plan Amendment No. 03-1
7 and Zone Change No. 03-3.

8
9 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

10
11 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins
12 and Hicks

13 NOES: None

14 ABSTAIN: None

15 ABSENT: Commissioner Rhoten

16
17 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Hicks to adopt
18 **Resolution No. 03-30** recommending approval to the City Council of General Plan
19 Amendment No. 03-1.

20
21 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

22
23 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Hicks and Commissioners Calkins
24 and Hicks

25 NOES: None

26 ABSTAIN: None

27 ABSENT: Commissioner Rhoten

28
29 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Hicks to adopt
30 **Resolution No. 03-31** recommending approval to the City Council of Zone Change No.
31 03-3.

32
33 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

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

37 NOES: None

38 ABSTAIN: None

39 ABSENT: Commissioner Rhoten

1 **VI. WORK STUDY:**

2
3 **A. PROPOSED SUBDIVISION OF LAND - Maureen Losey**

4 A future proposal for a single-family residential subdivision consisting of 19
5 one (1) acre lots with a zone change to A-1 for the property located on the
6 west side of Palm Avenue, north and south of Commonwealth Avenue.
7

8 Assistant Planner Losey opened the work study session by briefly describing the intentions
9 of the proposal to the Commission

10
11 Commissioner Calkins stated that at a Traffic Commission meeting it had come up that
12 when a subdivision, such as this one, was being presented in the manner indicated, the
13 surrounding uses are not always apparent, and the fire and police departments have
14 asked that we give consideration to requesting, in addition to the actual tentative map, a
15 little more information regarding the surroundings so that they could review a street
16 pattern, as they are very concerned about through streets for ingress and egress for
17 emergency vehicles.

18
19 Assistant Planner Losey responded that she believed Commonwealth was planned to go
20 through. She then turned the presentation over to the applicant.

21
22 Mel Haugen, 1333 Clydesdale Court approached the lectern as the applicant for the
23 proposed project. He gave the Commission some details regarding the proposal and
24 explained that while the plan that the Commission is currently reviewing indicates 20 lots,
25 there will probably only be 18 or 19 lots with wider lots being provided. He added that the
26 homes that they were planning to build would be 2,750 to 3,100 square-feet, and all would
27 have three-car garages.

28
29 Lynn Vomer, 3872 Florence Street, Hemet, approached the lectern and asked if any bridal
30 trails were proposed to be included with this project.

31
32 She was advised that they were not.
33

34 June Bassington, 4921 Esplanade Avenue, Hemet, approached the lectern and advised
35 the Commission that she resided on a 1-acre parcel, so she was pro-horse property. She
36 explained that with all of the development that is going on she is concerned with the
37 increased traffic, as it is already difficult to get out of her driveway. She suggested that
38 some provisions be included to resolve traffic problems with all new development.
39

40 Christy Pirot, 1380 Eaton Avenue, approached the lectern and asked if the homes would
41 be one- or two-story.

42
43 Principal Planner Bassi responded that they would be single-story.
44

1 Since there were no other questions or comments, Chairman Duistermars thanked Mr.
2 Haugen for his presentation.

3
4 **B. ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-6 / VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 31280 -**

5 Maureen Losey

6 A work study session to review a proposed zone change from A-1-C-1 to R-1
7 and a subdivision of 25 acres into 97 lots located at the northeast corner of
8 Lyon and Commonwealth Avenues.

9
10 Vice Chairman Jones asked why the project had not been stopped at the front counter.

11
12 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the applicant wished to proceed with the
13 project, even though staff had advised them that the density was an issue.

14
15 The Commission concurred as a group that there was not much need to go into discussion
16 on this particular item, as there was no way that it could be approved or even considered
17 as currently proposed.

18
19 A majority of the audience expressed their appreciation for this fact, and the work study
20 session was subsequently ended.

21
22 **C. ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-2 / VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 31188 -**

23 Matthew Bassi

24 A work study session to discuss a single-family residential subdivision
25 consisting of 28 lots on 13.9 acres located on the southwest corner of Palm
26 and Eaton Avenues.

27
28 Principal Planner Bassi opened the work study session, providing some brief details of the
29 proposal to the Commission.

30
31 There was discussion regarding the fact that the subdivision would be surrounded by
32 property owners who own horses and other animals, and that the odor and bugs that often
33 accompany animal property could become an issue.

34
35 Commissioner Hicks suggested that the buyers of the homes should simply be advised
36 that they would be moving into a neighborhood where various types of animals were
37 present, and that there may be some odors and bugs that are caused by such a presence,
38 which would likely invade the community in which they were buying.

39
40 Mr. Haugen approached the lectern and stated that he was familiar with the site, and that
41 it was his opinion that the area from the north side of Fruitvale Avenue up to Esplanade
42 Avenue, and from the east side of Palm Avenue over to Lyon Avenue should be an area

1 that the Planning Commission and Planning staff should be careful with, adding that they
2 should consider the long range plan when reviewing projects for this area. He stated that
3 by doing a split zoning for the area they would be opening Pandora's box, and that they
4 would end up with other property owners coming in with 5-acres, 4-acres or 2-acres, who
5 would try to get split-zoning and residential with 7,200 square-foot lots, and they would use
6 this zone change as setting a precedence for their ability to do so. He added that it was
7 his opinion that this particular site at the corner of Palm and Eaton Avenues could easily
8 do away with one lot and still have approximately 20,000 square-foot lots that could be
9 kept with a zoning designation of Agriculture.

10
11 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.

12
13 Bob Osborne of Osborne Development approached the lectern as the applicant for the
14 proposed project, and advised the Commission that he had conducted two meetings with
15 the community, and had also performed a market study, and that it had been concluded
16 that only a small portion of the people who were likely to buy in this community would not
17 have animals, with the majority of them wanting the larger lots to keep animals on.

18
19 Vice Chairman Jones agreed that there had not been any opposition to the project at the
20 community meeting, which he had attended.

21
22 Mr. Haugen explained that his issue was not with the size of the lots, but rather with the
23 zoning. He stated that the problem could occur down the road, by throwing R-1 property
24 into an agricultural area. He suggested that Mr. Osborne could keep his current design,
25 but suggested that the agricultural zoning designation not be changed.

26
27 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that this may be an opportunity to add an overlay
28 zone to this area, which would modify some of the regulations for development purposes,
29 such as this, in the future.

30
31 Blaine Womer, of Womer Engineering approached the lectern as the engineer for the
32 project. He explained that the proposed zoning was for minimum lot sizes of 15,000
33 square-feet, which would be consistent with the surrounding neighborhoods.

34
35 Commissioner Hicks stated that he wanted to know more about how many lots would be
36 lost in order to expand the lot sizes of this project to 20,000 square-feet, suggesting that
37 perhaps there could be a different lot configuration that would not cause the applicant to
38 lose more than one or two lots.

39
40 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that a lot study could be required.

41
42
43
44
45

Planning Commission Minutes
July 15, 2003

1 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that if a modified lot configuration could keep the lot sizes
2 at 20,000 square-feet and eliminate the need to change the zoning, he would like to see
3 that done.

4
5 Mr. Osborne advised the Commission that they had already tried to come up with a
6 configuration that would allow them to keep the lot sizes at 20,000 square-feet or greater,
7 and that the project would not be economically feasible with such a design.

8
9 Vice Chairman Jones stated that the surrounding homeowners were in favor of the project
10 and that it was definitely better than what had been previously proposed. He added that
11 it would be an enhancement to the area, and that staff should see what they would need
12 to do to get an overlay added to the area so the project could move forward.

13
14 Chairman Duistermars concurred, and asked what they needed to do to make that happen.

15
16 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the project could be presented as an overlay
17 project to the City Council, requesting that the area be established as a rural community
18 with certain standards that would be applicable. He suggested that it could be reviewed
19 by the Council at their first meeting in August.

20
21 Don Stuart, 940 North Palm Avenue, Hemet, approached the lectern and advised the
22 Commission that he was directly across the street from the proposed project. He stated
23 that since he had lived there, there had been 4 or 5 attempts by developers to re-zone the
24 property and that this was the best of all the proposals that he and his neighbors had seen.
25 He expressed his support for the project.

26
27 **D. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 02-6 (West Coast Faith Center) - Maureen**

28 Losey

29 A work study session to discuss a 15,000± square-foot expansion to an
30 existing church located at the southwest corner of State and Stetson
31 Avenues (Diamond Valley Shopping Center).

32
33 Assistant Planner Losey opened the work study session explaining some details regarding
34 the project to the Commission. She explained that one of the issues that had come up
35 during staff's review of the project was the impact on parking, since the expansion was
36 proposed to be quite large. She added that another issue was the loss of retail space
37 available to the community.

38
39 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that this would be an ideal use of a shopping center that
40 had gone downhill over the years, but that the concern regarding the loss of retail space
41 for the future was a valid one. He added that he would assume the Church would like to
42 have a campus of their own in the future, and asked if there was a way to impose a time
43 limit for the proposed project.

1 Assistant Planner Losey responded that the project would be coming back to the
2 Commission as a Conditional Use Permit, and that as part of the process, staff could work
3 with the church to see if there were a window or time frame that would be acceptable, in
4 order for the Commission to reevaluate the proposal to see if things had changed.

5
6 Commissioner Hicks asked if anyone had spoken with the other tenants of the shopping
7 center.

8
9 Assistant Planner Losey responded that a person who was not in favor of the project had
10 spoken with other tenants, but that they were not very vocal in their opposition because
11 it would bring more business to the center.

12
13 A discussion of placing a sunset clause on the project ensued.

14
15 Commissioner Calkins commented that a shopping center is a shopping center, and that
16 if you start changing the use of the spaces within it you lose the sense of it being a
17 shopping center. He added that this particular shopping center had indeed had problems
18 with rental spaces, as some of the initial tenants had disappeared, but stated that in his
19 opinion this was temporary, and that with the lake nearby, and the addition of recreational
20 amenities that were being added, a whole new class of tenants could take over the
21 shopping center. He added that he did not feel a shopping center was an appropriate
22 place for a church, being a mis-use of commercial property.

23
24 Chairman Duistermars stated that he would be in favor of the expansion, only if the sunset
25 clause were imposed.

26
27 Commissioner Calkins suggested that the applicant may not want to fund the expansion
28 if it were only to be on a short-term basis.

29
30 Rhonda Wesson, 1285 South State Street, Hemet, approached the lectern as a member
31 of the church, the wife of the church's pastor, and thus a representative for the applicant.
32 She stated that the location that they were occupying had sat vacant for many years prior
33 to their moving into the building. She conveyed some of the activities of the church,
34 explaining that they were a positive aspect of the community, that they had a good rapport
35 with the other tenants of the shopping center, and that the owners of the center were
36 dependent on their lease payment to keep the property maintained. She advised the
37 Commission that the church did hope to build and relocate in the future, but that she could
38 not put a time frame on the relocation at this time.

39
40 Commissioner Hicks asked if they would object to a sunset clause.

41
42
43
44
45

Planning Commission Minutes
July 15, 2003

1 Ms. Wesson responded that she would not be in favor of the clause because they were
2 not certain how much time they would need before they could relocate, and that 2-years
3 may not be enough time.

4
5 Commissioner Hicks stated that the time frame of the sunset clause could be negotiated.

6
7 Leland Wesson approached the lectern as the pastor of the church, and stated, regarding
8 the sunset clause, that they have already invested a great deal of money into the church,
9 and that a short-term clause was not something that he would be in favor of if he were
10 going to spend additional money on their expansion.

11
12 Assistant City Attorney Vail clarified for the Commission that it was not permissible to tie
13 a sunset clause to the surrounding economic conditions. He suggested that a sunset
14 clause would be appropriate to review how the operational characteristics of the business
15 and their parking requirements are impacting the site, given expansion in the area and the
16 addition of other tenants to the shopping center that might occur.

17
18 Commissioner Hicks stated that this was what he had in mind, to review how the church
19 was functioning and how the co-tenants of the shopping center were functioning with the
20 parking situation and other aspects that were affected by the expansion.

21
22 Assistant City Attorney Vail added that he wanted to be sure that, when the project comes
23 back before them as a public hearing, the Commission talks about the project in the correct
24 terms. He explained that since this was a work study session they could discuss these
25 ideas, but that they would not want to talk in terms of justifying their decision to require a
26 sunset clause based on the economics of the shopping center, as that is a business
27 decision for the property owner.

28
29 Chairman Duistermars asked for other comments.

30
31 Since there were none, he advised the applicant that they should give staff a time frame
32 that they would be comfortable with for the placement of a sunset clause, and that
33 something could be negotiated through the approval process.

34
35 Ms. Wesson explained that the project had been on hold for 2 years, and that they would
36 really like to expedite the project if at all possible, so if they could get some idea regarding
37 what type of time frame the Commission might be willing to approve it would be helpful to
38 them.

39
40 Chairman Duistermars suggested that Ms. Wesson meet with Principal Planner Bassi and
41 Assistant Planner Losey regarding this issue.

42
43
44
45

Planning Commission Minutes
July 15, 2003

1 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that the sunset clause could include the allowance
2 for a time extension at the end of its initial time period.

3
4 **E. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 01-6 - A1 (Spirit of Joy Church) -**

5 Maureen Losey

6 A work study session to discuss a proposal to establish a day-care center
7 within an existing church consisting of 188 children located at the northeast
8 corner of Sanderson and Johnston Avenues.

9
10 Assistant Planner Losey opened the work study session explaining some details of the
11 proposed amendment to the Commission. She explained that while the applicant would
12 not need to appear before the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC), a study would be
13 required which would indicate how the applicant would be conforming with the Safety
14 Element of the Airport Land Use Plan.

15
16 Chairman Duistermars stated that he felt the project should go before the ALUC, and that
17 he would not be in favor of a full-time child care center at this site because of its proximity
18 to the airport. He added that it had been his understanding at the time of the original
19 approval that the church did not intend to have a full-time child care center, and that he did
20 not want to see one there now.

21
22 The balance of the Commission concurred that they would not be in favor of a full-time
23 child care center at the site.

24
25 Chairman Duistermars asked Assistant Planner Losey to convey this concurrence to the
26 applicant.

27
28
29 **VII. DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**

30
31 **A. CITY COUNCIL DIRECTION TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW**
32 **PROCESS TO INCLUDE CONTEXT SENSITIVE DESIGN**

33
34 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that staff had done a work study at
35 the last City Council meeting regarding Context Sensitive Design. He explained that there
36 were currently no findings within the City's zoning ordinance that require compliance with
37 design guidelines, so staff had suggested to the City Council that a finding be added
38 requiring all projects to comply with design guidelines, which would essentially give teeth
39 to the residential and multiple-family design guidelines. He explained that staff was also
40 recommending that every project be reviewed to make sure that it is in sync with the
41 surrounding neighborhood. He advised the Commission that the Council had concurred
42 with both of those suggestions, and that it would be brought before the Commission in late
43 August and go back to the Council in September.

1 Chairman Duistermars asked if this was the same thing as a compatibility ordinance, but
2 using different wording.

3
4 Planning Director Masyczek responded that this was correct, but that this would be added
5 as a finding, and would include a policy on how the guidelines would be implemented.

6
7 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the approval status of the Commercial Design
8 Guidelines.

9
10 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the City Council had continued this item three
11 times, and that the with the most recent continuance they had included a direction for staff
12 to work with the City Attorney. He added that an Ad Hoc Committee had been created,
13 consisting of Council Members Marge Tandy and Robin Lowe, to work with staff. He
14 explained that the concern that had been expressed was that the design guidelines
15 appeared to be a circumvention of the zoning ordinance, and they wanted some
16 clarification of how exactly the guidelines would be done in implementation with the zoning
17 ordinance vs. their being in conflict with it.

18
19
20 **VIII. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS:**

21
22 Commissioner Calkins shared with the Commission some details of the Traffic and Parking
23 Commission, including the request of West Valley High School to change the name of
24 Harrison Street to Mustang Way. He added that there would be a work study session next
25 Wednesday regarding circulation, that he would be attending, and that the entrance into
26 the Diamond Valley Lake recreation area was now known as Searl Parkway.

27
28 Chairman Duistermars reminded Commissioner Hicks that they were to meet with the
29 Parks Commission at 4:00 p.m. on July 28, 2003 at the Council Chambers.

30
31
32 **IX. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

33
34 No future agenda items were requested.

35
36
37 **X. ADJOURNMENT:** It was MOVED by Commissioner Hicks, SECONDED by
38 Commissioner Calkins and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 9:08
39 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City of Hemet Planning Commission, scheduled
40 for August 5, 2003 at 6:00 p.m. to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers
41 located at 450 East Latham Avenue, Hemet, California 92543.
42
43
44

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
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
45

Bob Duistermars, Chairman

ATTEST:

Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary

**Planning Commission Minutes
July 15, 2003**