

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

2
3 Chairman Duistermars noted that Vice Chairman Jones would be a little late to the
4 meeting, and asked, therefore, that Agenda Item No. IV. be held off until his arrival.

5
6 The Commission concurred.
7
8

9 **III. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE**

10
11 Sandy Packham, Director of Facilities for the Hemet Unified School District reported that
12 the Aurora Factory, which is where the school district obtained most of their relocatable
13 buildings, had filed for bankruptcy and shut their doors for business, which meant that
14 HUSD was now scrambling to obtain buildings from other factories. She explained that this
15 was causing delays at various schools, including a 3-week delay at Hamilton Elementary
16 School and the West Valley High School wrestling room, and a 30 to 45 day delay for the
17 Adult Education office. She noted that Hamilton Elementary School would now have to go
18 to Plan B for the housing of students, that DSA approvals would have to redone, and that
19 the warranties were gone for the buildings that had already been installed through Aurora.

20
21 Regarding the Jacob Wiens Elementary School site, Ms. Packham reported that the
22 caissons were done and that the underground utilities were in progress. She noted that
23 the off-site tasks, including sidewalks and street improvements, were nearly complete.
24

25 Ms. Packham reported, regarding the modernization project at Santa Fe Middle School,
26 that the street improvements had been completed and the parking lot and flatwork/concrete
27 was in progress. She noted that completion of the items at this site would be right up to
28 the wire. Regarding Ramona and Little Lake Elementary Schools, Ms. Packham reported
29 that the doors and hardware had been on backorder and were just shipped out. She noted
30 that the staff at both schools would be moving back in on the following Monday. She
31 advised the Commission that at Winchester Elementary School the sod had been installed
32 on the playfields and in front of the school, and that the renovation of the student
33 bathrooms had been completed. She noted that the painting of the multi-purpose room
34 and library at Acacia Middle School was in progress and that the office staff would be
35 moving back in on Monday.
36

37 Regarding the relocation of the Santa Fe Middle School, Ms. Packham noted that there
38 was a design competition among three architects that was under review. She added that
39 some of the concepts that had been introduced were very interesting.
40
41
42
43
44

1 Ms. Packham concluded her update with a report that the furniture and equipment was
2 continuing to arrive at Cawston Elementary School, which was set to open on August 30,
3 2004.

4
5
6 **V. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

7
8 **A. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 03-13**

9 APPLICANT: Juniper Villas
10 LOCATION: North side of Stetson Avenue approximately 170-feet
11 east of Palm Avenue
12 PLANNER: Maureen Losey
13 DESCRIPTION: A request for a conditional use permit to develop a 66-
14 unit home for the aged and an adult day health care
15 facility.
16

17 Assistant Planner Losey advised the Commission that the project applicant was enroute
18 to the meeting and asked if this item could be postponed until their arrival.
19

20 The Commission concurred.
21

22 **B. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 04-7**

23 APPLICANT: Herron & Rumansoff Architects
24 LOCATION: 623 E. Latham Avenue (140-feet west of Thompson
25 Street)
26 PLANNER: Maureen Losey
27 DESCRIPTION: A conditional use permit to convert an existing 2,441
28 square-foot single-family residence, demolish the
29 existing garage and construct a new 350 square-foot
30 building for office use.
31

32 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Losey who gave a brief overview of
33 the project.
34

35 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:12 p.m.
36

37 Russell Rumansoff of Herron & Rumansoff Architects, 530 St. Johns Place, Hemet,
38 California approached the lectern and addressed the Commission as the project applicant.
39 He stated that he was in agreement with the conditions of approval for the project and
40 would like to request the that the Commission vote in favor of the project.
41

42 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:13 p.m. and asked for a motion.
43
44

1 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
2 adopt Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 04-51 approving Conditional Use Permit
3 No. 03-13 as presented.
4

5 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
6

7 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Rhoten and Searl

8 NOES: None

9 ABSTAIN: None

10 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioner Calkins
11

12 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-40.***
13

14 **C. ZONE CHANGE NO. 04-7 / TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 32131**

15 APPLICANT: HCA Investments, Inc.

16 AGENT: Alex Alatorre - Alatorre & Associates

17 LOCATION: North side of Eaton Avenue, approximately 160-feet
18 west of Palm Avenue

19 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni

20 DESCRIPTION: A request to change the zoning classification from A-1-
21 C-1 & A-2-C-5 (Light Agriculture - 1-acre minimum &
22 Heavy Agriculture - 5-acre minimum) to R-A
23 (Residential-Agriculture) and to subdivide 8.91 acres
24 into four 1.88 acre parcels.
25

26 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Domenigoni who gave a brief overview
27 of the project. She noted that staff was recommending an amendment to Condition No.
28 13 which eliminate the requirement for the applicant to come back to the Planning
29 Commission for Site Development Review. She stated that the parcel map was for only
30 four lots that would be 1.88 acres each, and that the applicant was proposing to do custom
31 homes at one per lot. She noted that, with this in mind, it was staff's suggestion that
32 Condition No. 13 be modified to read:
33

34 ***Condition No. 13: "This project shall comply with the City's Single-Family
35 Residential Design Guidelines approved by the City
36 Council on February 25, 2003 (CC Resolution No. 3700).
37 Prior to the issuance of building permits for any lot, the
38 applicant shall submit a detailed site plan for Planning
39 Director review and approval.***
40

41 Chairman Duistermars suggested that a condition allowing rural standards be added to the
42 conditions of approval as well.
43
44

1 The Commission concurred that Condition No. 71 be added as follows:

2
3 **Condition No. 71: “If, prior to the recordation of the final map, the City**
4 **adopts rural street improvement standards, the rural**
5 **standards shall be applied to this map, and revisions shall**
6 **be incorporated on the final map.”**

7
8 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:18 p.m.

9
10 Bruce Anderson of HCA Investments, 237 Kensington Park, Irvine, CA approached the
11 lectern as a representative for the applicant. He stated that he had participated in a
12 meeting with the Principal Engineer Biagioni regarding the provision for four separate
13 detention basins – one for each lot – and sheet flow off of the back. He noted that
14 Conditions No. 55 and 56 required mitigation of off-site flows through the project site to the
15 front streets. He stated that it was, in fact, supposed to flow to the back, and asked if there
16 were some way the conditions could be amended.

17
18 Chairman Duistermars asked Principal Engineer if he was aware of the discussion
19 regarding individual detention basins.

20
21 Principal Engineer Biagioni stated that the discussion had occurred the previous day, and
22 that, due to the fact that they only had four lots, the applicant was proposing to do
23 individual detention basins, which was fine. He stated that there would not be a huge
24 increase in run-off, and that the water was currently draining naturally to the back.

25
26 Chairman Duistermars asked if this meant that he was okay with modifications to the
27 conditions so that it would state that individual detention basins would be installed.

28
29 Principal Engineer Biagioni responded that, yes, he was okay with the revisions. He
30 suggested that Condition No. 55 be eliminated in its entirety, and that Condition No. 56 be
31 modified to read:

32
33 **Condition No. 56: “Cross-lot drainage shall not be allowed. All pads shall be**
34 **designed to drain to the individual detention area on each**
35 **lot. All drainage easements are subject to City acceptance**
36 **for maintenance.”**

37
38 Mr. Anderson stated that the other item that had come to his attention was Condition No.
39 61, which called for domestic sewer service to be provided by EMWD. He noted that there
40 was no sewer service within that particular area, and that he believed the rural designation
41 allowed for septic systems.

1 Chairman Duistermars asked Principal Engineer Biagioni if a septic system would be
2 acceptable, and if there were any wording for a condition that would require sewer hook-up
3 to be added when available.

4
5 Principal Engineer Biagioni responded that if there was any sewer within 600-feet of the
6 project site, the project should connect with that line. He added that they try to discourage
7 any septic systems within the City.

8
9 Chairman Duistermars asked if there was knowledge of the location of the nearest sewer
10 system.

11
12 Mr. Anderson responded that it was several thousand feet away on Lyon Avenue.

13
14 Principal Engineer Biagioni stated that he believed this would be an issue for the health
15 department in this particular case.

16
17 Assistant City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that since the map was only being
18 recommended for approval at this time, the recommendation could be made with a
19 direction to staff to go back and find out the location of the closest sewer line and
20 determine whether it was close enough to hook up to, prior to the City Council meeting.

21
22 Mr. Anderson stated that if he had to bring sewer lines over 2,000 feet to four separate lots
23 it would be cost prohibitive to the project. He added that the reason that he had gone with
24 the larger lots was primarily because the neighborhood was very unique, with all of the lots
25 being one acre in size or larger, which tend to be horse lots and/or agricultural type lots.
26 He added that he would like to keep the project rural, and that it was his understanding that
27 the rural designation allowed for septic systems. He noted that, obviously, if sewer service
28 did become available to Eaton Avenue at some point in the future, the homeowners could
29 hook-up to the sewer line.

30
31 Planning Director Masyczek noted that the city ordinance, which he believed was under the
32 Uniform Building Code, required that if there was sewer service available within 600-feet,
33 the homes should be hooked up to that service whether it was in a rural area or not. He
34 suggested that the Commission may want to add a condition stating that **“septic could be
35 permitted subject to the approval of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control
36 Board”**, since they were the agency that essentially would have to approve a septic
37 system as well. He further suggested that it could be stipulated in the condition that **“as
38 sewer service is made available adjacent to the site, future sewer hook ups will be
39 provided.”** He stated that this would take care of the contingency in case it came through
40 in the future.

1 Alejandro Alatorre, of Alatorre & Associates, 1520 S. San Jacinto Ave., San Jacinto,
2 California approached the lectern as the project engineer. He advised the Commission
3 that he was preparing the plans for the subject project as well as the plans for the map that
4 was contiguous to the project on the north side. He noted that all of the lots of the
5 contiguous map were on septic systems, as in agreement with the rural standards of the
6 city. He further noted that he had also been retained by another party to design four
7 additional lots, at the corner of Commonwealth Avenue and Lyon Street, following the
8 exact same pattern of rural standards. He pointed out, therefore, that all of the
9 requirements, and the idea of drainage being retained within the lot as well as the septic
10 system concept, was the way these projects had been contemplated and reviewed. He
11 stated that he would like to stress that all requirements had been met, and that the space
12 and the conditions were such that they would allow for that kind of development.

13
14 Vice Chairman Jones joined the meeting at 6:25 p.m.

15
16 Chairman Duistermars advised Mr. Alatorre that they were not asking him to do anything
17 different than that, except that he would need to get the appropriate approvals for the
18 septic system. He noted that he believed the condition stated that if he obtained those
19 approvals he could install a septic system, but without them he could not.

20
21 Principal Planner Sawyer suggested that a slight amendment be added to the Planning
22 Director's recommended condition, which would require that the homes be plumbed for
23 both septic and sewer, with the stud lines extending out to the street so that the future
24 homeowners would have the existing plumbing in place in order to make the future hook-up
25 to the sewer more acceptable.

26
27 Chairman Duistermars asked Mr. Anderson if this would be acceptable.

28
29 Mr. Anderson responded that it would.

30
31 It was agreed that Condition No. 61 would be modified to read:

32
33 ***Condition No. 61: "Domestic sewer service will be provided by EMWD. If the***
34 ***sewer main is more than 600-feet away from the property,***
35 ***septic could be permitted subject to the approval of the***
36 ***Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. Sewer***
37 ***hook-ups shall be provided on each lot for future***
38 ***connection to a sewer main when it is made available."***
39

40 Mr. Anderson asked the Commission if they knew what the time frame was for
41 implementation of the rural standards.

1 Chairman Duistermars responded that they working on them now, but that this project
2 might very well be done by the time they were through the entire process. He stated that
3 it would probably be around 90 to 120 days before the rural standards would actually be
4 in effect.

5
6 Mel Haugen, 1333 Clydesdale Court, Hemet, California approached the lectern as an
7 adjacent resident. He stated that he was very much in favor of the project, and that he and
8 many of his neighbors felt it would be a complement to the community. He stated that he
9 would like to offer any assistance that he could in the expedition of the approval of the rural
10 standards.

11
12 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:29 p.m.

13
14 Assistant City Attorney Vail reminded the Commission that three separate motions would
15 be required for the project, and that the last resolution, Resolution Bill No. 04-49, would
16 need to be approved *as amended* with regard to Conditions Nos. 13, 55, 56, 61 and 71,
17 as recommended by staff and discussed on the record.

18
19 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
20 approve *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 04-13EA* recommending approval to the
21 City Council of Environmental Assessment No. 04-15 for Zone Change No. 04-7 and
22 Tentative Tract Map No. 32131.

23
24 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

25
26 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Rhoten
27 and Searl

28 NOES: None

29 ABSTAIN: None

30 ABSENT: Commissioner Calkins

31
32 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-10EA.***

33
34 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
35 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 04-48* recommending approval to the City
36 Council of Zone Change No. 04-7.

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
2

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

5 NOES: None

6 ABSTAIN: None

7 ABSENT: Commissioner Calkins
8

9 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-41.***
10

11 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
12 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 04-49*, recommending approval to the City
13 Council of Tentative Tract Map No. 32131 as amended by staff and discussed on the
14 record.
15

16 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
17

18 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Rhoten
19 and Searl

20 NOES: None

21 ABSTAIN: None

22 ABSENT: Commissioner Calkins
23

24 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-42.***
25

26
27 **IV. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**
28

29 **A. UPDATE ON POLICIES & STANDARDS FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE**
30 **CITY OF HEMET WITH DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE DIRECTION TO**
31 **STAFF**
32

33 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the Planning Department was
34 currently being inundated with various development projects, while at the same time going
35 through a litany of updates to various standards, including the residential design guidelines,
36 an update to the subdivision ordinance, the development review process, and etc. He
37 noted that many of the standards that were being put on a back burner were the standards
38 that were needed to approve projects, particularly since the same issues kept coming up
39 over and over again. He stated that he would like to focus, with the Planning Commission,
40 over the next several meetings on making any modifications to the standards that might
41 be necessary, explaining that this would take them out of the cycle of reviewing projects
42 without clear guidelines.
43
44

1 Commissioner Searl stated that this was a great idea, noting that the Commission keeps
2 running into discrepancies within the guidelines. He added that he would like to see them
3 resolved once and for all.

4
5 Chairman Duistermars concurred with Commissioner Searl, noting that while it was not
6 their intention to delay projects, he felt that resolving the issues with the standards and
7 guidelines was an important part of being able to review projects efficiently.

8
9 Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioner Rhoten stated that they would also be in favor
10 of proceeding with an update.

11
12 Chairman Duistermars suggested that staff set aside as many projects as possible while
13 proceeding with revisions to the appropriate guidelines.

14
15 Assistant City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that the conclusion had been made
16 that they could move most projects along and still meet the time constraints that they were
17 operating under. He suggested that the next 2 to 3 meetings be utilized to focus on the
18 guidelines.

19
20 **B. MSHCP**

21
22 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that he had been working with the
23 City Council regarding the processing of the MSHCP, and that there were currently two
24 projects under review that were located within an MSHCP area. He explained that the
25 MSHCP requires that any project that is within an acquisition area must go through a
26 process where an application is submitted and appropriate studies are prepared, but that
27 rather than going directly to the Planning Commission the project would go into a
28 negotiation process. He explained that staff would have to make a determination, which
29 would be done at an administrative level once the process was approved by the City
30 Council, of acquisition, such as how much of the property would need to be acquired. He
31 noted that this would essentially require a 45-day review period, during which time it would
32 be determined whether all, or just a portion of the site would need to be acquired.
33 Following the review period, negotiations for acquisition and/or project modification could
34 be entered. He pointed out that one of the things that would be of interest to the
35 Commission was the fact that the acquisition could include density averaging and bonus
36 programs, as built into the MSHCP for acquiring property. As an example he stated that
37 if there were a 40-acre parcel that was to be developed as one-acre lots, but the City
38 needed to acquire half of the site per the MSHCP process, the lot sizes might be reduced
39 to ½-acre in size. He noted that with this concept, the property owner would have the
40 same density, but only half of the property would actually be developed. He explained that
41 where this process would tend to have a tremendous impact was not only on the projects
42 themselves that are within the acquisition area, but more importantly on what was occurring
43 right outside of the criteria area. He added that some of the extended studies that the
44

1 Commission was getting were due to the fact that approximately one-third of the City was
2 under something called an "indemic plant survey criteria area", which meant that prior to
3 the Commission reviewing any project, detailed biological studies were necessary to
4 determine whether or not there were plants on the property that were listed as critical. He
5 explained that what was difficult about that concept is that rainfall was needed in order to
6 do the habitat assessments. He advised the Commission that over the next several
7 months some very complicated projects would be reviewed, including Tres Cerritos, that
8 would be known as "edge effect" projects. He stated that these projects would need to
9 incorporate, within the project themselves, design considerations regarding how they would
10 get water through the project, what would need to be mitigated on site, and what types of
11 surveys would need to be done. He noted that what the Commission would probably see
12 over the next several months to years were radically different projects than what they were
13 used to in terms of hydrology and how they the projects were designed. He suggested that
14 another good example regarding the MSHCP process was with reference to plants, and
15 explained that if a project was adjacent to a vernal pool complex the developer would not
16 be able to put in standard crab or bermuda grass, but would rather only be able to put in
17 native plants in that subdivision. He discussed the fact that in the wildland interface areas
18 the fire department would like to see a 70-foot clearance around development projects, but
19 explained that per the MSHCP that could not be done. He noted that what would probably
20 end up being required was that a large portion of the residential projects in those areas
21 would have to be sprinklered, interior to the building. He stated that if the Commission
22 would like additional information regarding the MSHCP process he could bring in the maps,
23 and noted that the process would probably have a fairly significant impact on how the
24 Commission would do business in the future.

25
26 Vice Chairman Jones asked if Planning Director Masyczek could delve into utilizing some
27 of these areas as trails systems, to give some continuity and open space throughout the
28 valley, using wetlands as a resource and not a hinderance. He stated that he would really
29 like to see these areas maximized as open space areas.

30
31 Planning Director Masyczek responded that he could bring some concepts back for
32 Planning Commission consideration.

33
34 Commissioner Rhoten asked if it would be possible to get a map of the trail system.

35
36 Planning Director Masyczek responded that it would.

37
38 Chairman Duistermars turned the meeting over to Vice Chairman Jones and left the
39 meeting at 6:45 p.m.

1 **V. PUBLIC HEARINGS (*Continued*)**

2
3 **A. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 03-13**

4 APPLICANT: Juniper Villas

5 LOCATION: North side of Stetson Avenue approximately 170-feet
6 east of Palm Avenue

7 PLANNER: Maureen Losey

8 DESCRIPTION: A request for a conditional use permit to develop a 66-
9 unit home for the aged and an adult day health care
10 facility.

11
12 Planning Director Masyczek noted that this particular conditional use permit had been in
13 the Planning Department for quite some time, and that what was unique about it was that
14 it was for the joint use of a facility as both a 66-unit home for the aged and an adult day
15 health care facility. He pointed out that, unfortunately, the City's zoning ordinance did not
16 provide clear-cut direction on the parking requirements for an adult day health care facility.
17 He stated that they had worked with the applicant on taking a look at the approximations
18 within the City. He further stated that, to be fair to the Commission and after reviewing the
19 staff report several times since it had been distributed, it was his feeling that staff had
20 inadvertently put the Commission in a box that says that they are *recommending approval,*
21 *definitely* and *here are the findings, definitely.* He suggested that this was an unfair
22 position for the Commission to be in, and thus staff was recommending that the item be
23 continued. He suggested that the Commission should open the public hearing, at their
24 discretion, but noted that he felt that the staff report should be re-written in a manner that
25 would give the Commission a little more flexibility in the review of the project. He stated,
26 again, that his recommendation would be for the Commission to open the public hearing,
27 ask any questions that they would like to ask, and direct staff to come back with a modified
28 staff report.

29
30 Vice Chairman Jones opened the public hearing at 6:47 p.m.

31
32 Assistant Planner Losey advised the Commission that the applicant was present.

33
34 Commissioner Searl asked what kind of care would be given at the facility, if it was going
35 to be strictly an assisted living facility, or whether it would be a Skilled Nursing Facility.

36
37 Rica Burton, 7211 Santa Monica Blvd. Suite 700, Los Angeles, California approached the
38 lectern as a representative for the applicant. She noted that she was a consultant that
39 specialized in this type of program, which was a public/private partnership between the
40 State of California and Healthcare/Residential-care providers. She stated that there were
41 two very distinct endeavors involved with this project, which included a retirement/senior
42 apartment residential area on the second and third floor, and that on the ground floor would
43
44

1 be a fully licensed and permitted separately, Adult-Day Health Care facility. She added
2 that there would be a capacity of 150 persons for this portion of the project.

3
4 Commissioner Searl asked Ms. Burton what licenses were required for the facility.

5
6 Ms. Burton responded that they would have to go through all levels of local authority,
7 including Building & Safety, Planning & Zoning and Fire Safety & Prevention. She stated
8 that they would have to go through various procedures, starting with a series of
9 documentation and qualification of the people who would be operating the facility. She
10 noted that this would include fingerprint & criminal clearances. She added that they would
11 then be certified by the Department of Aging. Following the certification, Ms. Burton noted
12 that they would be inspected or "surveyed" so that they could be licensed by the California
13 Department of Health. She added that in June of 2005 the program would be open to both
14 Medicare and Medical, so they would need to work with a certain amount of speed.

15
16 Commissioner Rhoten asked if the second and third floor would be licensed through RCFE.

17
18 Ms. Burton responded that it would not.

19
20 Commissioner Rhoten asked if it was under the Department of Social Services or Riverside
21 County Health.

22
23 Ms. Burton responded that it was under the State of California Department of Health
24 Services for the licensing and the State Department of Aging for the certification process.

25
26 Commissioner Rhoten asked if the ground floor was the floor that Medicare and Medical
27 would be done on.

28
29 Ms. Burton responded that this was correct, but that until June of 2005 it would be only a
30 Medical pilot project.

31
32 Commissioner Searl inquired regarding staff ratios.

33
34 Ms. Burton responded that the ratios were 1:15, and that since they were asking for 150,
35 they were projecting 10 staff members to meet regulations. She noted that, because
36 needs are so unpredictable, they always recommend to be conservative and look at a staff
37 of 15 to reduce the ratio to 1:10.

38
39 Commissioner Searl asked for clarification that this was for the ground floor only.

40
41 Ms. Burton clarified that it was for a *portion* of the bottom floor, as only 12,000 square-feet
42 of the ground floor would be allocated to the Adult Day Health Care facility.

43
44

Planning Commission Minutes
August 17, 2004

1 Commissioner Searl asked how many more employees would be on staff for the 66-units
2 that would be on the second and third floors.

3
4 Ms. Burton responded that the second and third floors would be for standard residential
5 apartment living, rather than assisted living.

6
7 Commissioner Searl asked for clarification that they would not be providing meals for the
8 residents on the second and third floors.

9
10 Ms. Burton clarified that this was correct, but noted that they were required to provide, at
11 the very least, one hot meal per day for the participants of the Adult Day Health Care
12 program.

13
14 Commissioner Rhoten asked where the deliveries would be brought in to.

15
16 Ms. Burton stated that she would need to refer this question to the architect.

17
18 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Searl to table
19 Conditional Use Permit No. 03-13 for re-notification of the public.

20
21 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

22
23 AYES: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Rhoten & Searl

24 NOES: None

25 ABSTAIN: None

26 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Duistermars and Commissioner Calkins

27
28
29 **VI. PUBLIC MEETINGS**

30
31 **A. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NO. 04-14**

32 APPLICANT: James & Michelle Scott

33 AGENT: Marilyn Parker

34 LOCATION: North side of Park Avenue between Stanford and
35 Meridian Avenues

36 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni

37 DESCRIPTION: A request to construct a 780 square-foot home with an
38 attached 3,200 square-foot garage/workshop which will
39 be in excess of 50% of the future home located on the
40 north side of Park Avenue between Stanford and
41 Meridian Avenues.

1 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Domenigoni who gave a brief overview
2 of the project.

3
4 Vice Chairman Jones noted that the lot was extremely large.

5
6 Assistant Planner Domenigoni concurred, and advised the Commission that a lot line
7 adjustment had also been completed, and was in the process of being recorded. She
8 pointed out what the revised lot configuration would be once the lot line adjustment was
9 recorded.

10
11 Vice Chairman Jones stated that he would be in favor of what their long term plan was, but
12 expressed concern with what could be done to ensure that the long term plan was carried
13 out, and that a real home would be built on the property, with the currently proposed
14 residence not being used for a home at a later date.

15
16 Planning Director Masyczek responded that there was no control over whether their long
17 term plan would be carried out, but he noted that the structure, if it were to remain a stand-
18 alone structure, would fully comply with the existing zoning ordinance. He explained that
19 with this in mind, there would still be a legal structure in place.

20
21 Assistant Planner Domenigoni added that if the applicant wanted to leave the 780 square-
22 foot structure as a home they would have to apply for an Accessory Dwelling Unit
23 application with the City, and would need to meet certain qualifications in order to leave the
24 structure as an accessory dwelling.

25
26 Vice Chairman Jones asked what they had to preclude them from being able to split off the
27 lot.

28
29 Planning Technician Domenigoni explained that, according to how the lot would be laid out
30 with structures, there would be the main house to one side, and the proposed building on
31 the other side. She noted that if they left the proposed accessory structure as a dwelling
32 they could split the lots in the center, and still have two legal lots. She further noted that
33 such a lot division would require Planning Commission approval. She pointed out that
34 since the zoning was R-A, the lot sizes would need to remain at 20,000 square-feet.

35
36 Assistant City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that there was no means to make
37 sure that the applicant would build a larger residence in the future, and that when
38 approving the project the Commission should ask themselves whether they would be
39 happy with the project if this were all that ever got built.

40
41 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.

42
43 Vice Chairman Jones asked for a motion.

44

Planning Commission Minutes
August 17, 2004

1 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
2 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 04-50* approving Site Development Review
3 No. 04-14.

4
5 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

6
7 AYES: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Rhoten and Searl

8 NOES: None

9 ABSTAIN: None

10 ABSENT: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioner Calkins

11
12 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-43***

13
14
15 **VII. WORK STUDY**

16
17 There were no work study items on the agenda.

18
19
20 **VIII. CONSENT CALENDAR**

21
22 **A. MINUTES**

23 _____ 1. August 3, 2004

24
25 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Searl to
26 approve the consent calendar as presented.

27
28 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

29
30 AYES: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Rhoten and Searl

31 NOES: None

32 ABSTAIN: None

33 ABSENT: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioner Calkins

34
35
36 **IX. UPDATE OF CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS ON PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS**

37
38 **A. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT NO. 04-2 AND DETERMINATION OF**
39 **A STATUTORY EXEMPTION (MOVING SIGNS)**

40
41 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the City Council had approved
42 Zoning Ordinance Amendment No. 04-2 with modifications. He noted that one of the
43 modifications was regarding a concern with precluding non-profit groups from car washes
44

1 and other such events, such as students on private property. He explained that the
2 moving ordinance was modified to only be applicable to signs within the public right-of-way.
3 He stated that it would prevent the person on the street corner from displaying signs, but
4 would not prevent the people holding car washes from doing so. He explained that this
5 would be regulated by requiring anyone holding a carwash to obtain a temporary use
6 permit, and that signs would be regulated based on the applicable use of the property. He
7 noted that if someone wanted to do a used car sale on private property in San Jacinto, it
8 would not be permitted for them to advertise with signage in the City of Hemet. A sign
9 could only be displayed for an event being held on the property where the sign would be
10 located.

11
12 Regarding enforcement, Vice Chairman Jones noted that it was his understanding that the
13 Council had graced the department with two new code enforcement officers.

14
15 Planning Director Masyczek affirmed that one had been hired and one was in the process
16 of being interviewed.

17
18 Vice Chairman Jones stated that many people in the community had brought it to his
19 attention that it was a moot issue, as the Council could give them any number of officers,
20 but unless someone calls and complains about something in the community, the code
21 enforcement division would not act on it. He asked if this was correct.

22
23 Planning Director Masyczek responded that this was not correct. He confirmed that prior
24 to receiving the additional staff they had been involved with a reactive program, but
25 assured the Commission that with the new staff they were now moving into a proactive
26 program. He noted that there were code officers working on both Saturdays and Sundays
27 now, and that a banner sweep had been completed the previous week. He stated that the
28 direction that they were getting, particularly with the latest, fourth code officer, which was
29 not on board yet, was that 25%, or one out of the four code officers, of the entire
30 department would be strictly proactive.

31
32 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that the police department, since they see so many
33 different areas throughout the day, could forward any code issues along to the code
34 enforcement division for action.

35
36 Police Lieutenant Cabrera approached the lectern and advised the Commission that much
37 of that is happening currently and that they refer a large number of items to the code
38 division already. He noted that there was definitely a lot to do for a proactive person.

39
40 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that a cooperative venture was being
41 held this evening and noted that they were beginning to target areas for code enforcement
42 sweeps. He explained that part of the funding for the fourth code officer was through
43 CDBG, which meant they needed to go into the low- and low to moderate income areas.
44

Planning Commission Minutes
August 17, 2004

1 He stated that the Commission should be seeing some changes in the near future. He
2 further advised that there were some ordinances that needed to be updated to assist in the
3 proactive effort of the Code Enforcement Division.
4

5 **B. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NO. 03-28 (VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT**
6 **MAP NO. 30560 (AUTUMN RIDGE PARK SITE)**
7

8 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the applicant had made all of the
9 modifications as requested by the Planning Commission and that the City Council had
10 approved Site Development Review No. 03-28 as the park site for Vesting Tentative Tract
11 Map No. 30560, which would be called "Autumn Ridge".
12

13 **C. CORPORATE COLORS TO COLOR PALETTE**
14

15 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission regarding the addition of corporate
16 colors to the color palette. He noted that the City Council had looked at the trim colors on
17 the existing palette, and were considering an update to the ordinance allowing the addition
18 of certain colors with Planning Commission approval.
19

20 Vice Chairman Jones stated that he hoped staff would articulate to the City Council that
21 the corporations would change their colors if the city did not agree to their corporate colors.
22 He suggested that some examples be given to the Council.
23

24 Commissioner Rhoten stated that she did not think the City should have any "give" on that
25 issue.
26

27 Planning Director Masyczek stated that he would communicate these concerns to the City
28 Council and show them some examples.
29

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

33 Planning Director Masyczek introduced the Planning Department's new Associate Planner,
34 Michael McCoy, who had started with the City of Hemet the previous day and had come
35 from the City of Colton.
36

37 The Commission welcomed Mr. McCoy to the City of Hemet
38

39 Assistant City Attorney Vail introduced Rob Crissell, who, he advised was working with
40 Burke, Williams and Sorenson and would be joining the firm as soon as he passed the
41 BAR exam. He noted that Mr. Crissell would be coming to observe many future meetings.
42

43 The Commission welcomed Mr. Crissell to the City of Hemet.
44

1 Vice Chairman Jones asked if there were any new projects that the Commission should
2 be aware of.

3
4 Planning Director Masyczek noted that the Bell Tower site had been purchased and a
5 conditional use permit had been submitted and was moving forward.

6
7 Vice Chairman Jones asked what would be done with the sign.

8
9 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the applicant had asked for input regarding
10 whether or not the community was interested in keeping the sign, and so far the
11 resounding answer had been to remove the sign.

12
13 Vice Chairman Jones asked what businesses were proposing to locate there.

14
15 Planning Director Masyczek responded that there was the possibility of a Marshall's, an
16 Office Depot and a PetSmart, along with some other minor tenants. He further noted that
17 the Penfolds Restaurant by the mall was to be torn down and that a Chilis Restaurant
18 would be assuming that location. He added that Lowes was expected to open in
19 September or October, and that the Wal-Mart Supercenter was scheduled to open in late
20 fall. He also noted that the Chrysler center would soon be moving to the Auto Mall and
21 there were some proposals for a retail center to possibly locate there.

22
23 Vice Chairman Jones advised the Commission that on State Street, south of Johnston
24 Avenue where the car wash was located, the wall behind it was falling over and appeared
25 to be unsafe.

26
27 Planning Director Masyczek stated that he would have code enforcement take a look at it
28 the following day.

29
30 Vice Chairman Jones inquired regarding whether the gas station/mini-mart on Stetson
31 Avenue at Gilbert Street would ever be in compliance.

32
33 Planning Director Masyczek responded that they should be submitting their landscaping
34 plans soon, if they had not done so already. He stated that he would follow-up on the
35 issue.

36
37
38 **XI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

39
40 There were no future agenda items requested by the Commission.

1 **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

2
3 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten, SECONDED by Commissioner Searl and
4 unaniously approved to adjourn the meeting at 7:23 p.m. to the special meeting of the
5 City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **Tuesday, August 31, 2004 at 5:30**
6 **p.m.** at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet,
7 California 92543.
8
9
10
11
12

13 _____
14 Nick Jones, Vice Chairman
15 Hemet Planning Commission

16 ATTEST:

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