



1 Vice Chairman Jones asked if there might be a CEQA issue if there was a drainage  
2 problem.

3  
4 City Attorney Vail suggested that it might be appropriate to place this item on the City  
5 Council agenda, as the Commission could not waive City Standards. He recommended  
6 that Mr. Wilson discuss the issue with the City Engineer and have it brought before the City  
7 Manager.

8  
9  
10 **II. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**

11  
12 There were no amendments or additions to the agenda.

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

16  
17 The Hemet Unified School District update was given by Facilities Planner Tina Koonce,  
18 who reported that on-site registration had begun at Jacob Wiens Elementary School, with  
19 school having started on August 24<sup>th</sup>. She noted that the punch-list work was currently  
20 being completed.

21  
22 Regarding the Hemet High School Stadium project, Ms. Koonce advised that the visitor  
23 bleachers had been started with the home bleachers to follow, and that the final grading  
24 was underway. She added that the synthetic turf was on its way, and that the base  
25 installation had been completed. She further noted that the Riverside County Flood  
26 Control was finishing their work, and that the street work had started.

27  
28 Regarding the West Valley High School pool project, Ms. Koonce reported that the framing  
29 on the block buildings was underway, and that the installation of the tile on the sidewalls  
30 and the bottom of the pool was in progress. She noted that they had received notification  
31 that their grant application for the shade structure had been accepted and that the  
32 recipients would be announced sometime during the month of September.

33  
34 Regarding the West Valley High School Turf project, Ms. Koonce advised that the turf was  
35 currently in the process of being installed.

36  
37 Ms. Koonce provided an update regarding the Tahquitz High School and Rancho Viejo  
38 Middle School projects, reporting that the grading was continuing and the underground  
39 utilities had been started. She added that the footings and slabs had been placed for  
40 some of the buildings and that the off-site improvements were 40% complete.

1 Regarding the relocatable buildings, Ms. Koonce advised the Commission that 28  
2 classroom and 3 restroom facilities had been placed in various schools throughout the  
3 Hemet Unified School District over the summer and were now operational.

4  
5 Ms. Koonce advised the Commission that they were requesting letters from the Planning  
6 Department Staff confirming that some of their new school sites were in accordance with  
7 the City of Hemet General Plan. She added that they were currently working on eight sites  
8 that were in various stages of processing, including testing for toxicities, biological testing,  
9 geotechnical testing relative to seismic, flood and hazard possibilities, and the processing  
10 of CEQA for the sites.

11  
12 Ms. Koonce concluded her report with an update regarding the Hamilton 2-story classroom  
13 building, which would add new classrooms, a library, a computer lab and restrooms to the  
14 Hamilton K-8 campus. She advised the Commission that bids for the project had been  
15 opened, and were on the Governing Board's agenda for this evening. She noted that after  
16 installation of the building was completed, they would be demolishing some very old Butler  
17 buildings that were still in existence on the campus.

18  
19  
20 **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

21  
22 **A. TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 32132 - (Continued from 08-16-05)**

23 APPLICANT: Glen and Anna Marie Dalbey  
24 AGENT: Alex Alatorre - Alatorre & Associates  
25 LOCATION: West side of Soboba Street approximately 223-feet  
26 south of Lincoln Avenue  
27 DESCRIPTION: A request for approval of a tentative parcel map to  
28 subdivide 3.99 acres into four (4) lots for the future  
29 development of single-family homes.  
30

31 The staff report was presented by Associate Planner Domenigoni who provided some  
32 background and details regarding the project.

33  
34 Commissioner Mendoza thanked the applicant for doing his own outreach to the  
35 surrounding community.

36  
37 Chairman Duistermars closed the previously opened public hearing at 6:13 p.m. and asked  
38 for a motion.

39  
40 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Mendoza to  
41 adopt Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 05-33, approving Tentative Parcel Map No.  
42 32132 with the changes that were made to the map.  
43  
44

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

2  
3 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Mendoza  
4 and Rhoten

5 NOES: None

6 ABSTAIN: None

7 ABSENT: None

8  
9 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-27.***

10  
11 **B. TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 33522**

12 \_\_\_\_\_ APPLICANT: Jaime Suarez

13 AGENT: CES Consultants, Inc.

14 LOCATION: Northwest corner of Central Avenue and Ramona  
15 Street

16 PLANNER: Tamara Alaniz

17 DESCRIPTION: A request for approval of a tentative parcel map to  
18 develop an existing 29,565 square-foot lot into two (2)  
19 single-family residential parcels of 10,069 square-feet  
20 each (APN: 446-041-015).

21  
22 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Alaniz who provided some details  
23 regarding the staff report. She noted that a letter had been received that day from a Mr.  
24 Robert W. Scott, in response to the public hearing notice. She read the letter for the  
25 Commission, and offered a response to the letter's inquiry. She noted that the letter had  
26 brought to light some issues within the conditions, and advised the Commission of a  
27 modification that had been made to the Conditions of Approval.

28  
29 Chairman Duistermars suggested that perhaps the zone should be changed for the project  
30 site, since the use was being changed to an R-1 use. He pointed out that the General Plan  
31 Land Use designation was R-3, and that the zoning designation was R-2, and that it did not  
32 seem consistent to have an R-1 use within such an area.

33  
34 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.

35  
36 City Attorney Vail explained why the Commission could not hold up this particular map  
37 simply due to their concern with the zoning issue.

38  
39 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:25 p.m.

40  
41 Jamie Suarez, 9641 Richmond Avenue, Downey, California approached the lectern as the  
42 project applicant. He inquired as to exactly what the Commission was concerned with  
43 regarding the project.

1 Chairman Duistermars explained that they were merely wanting a continuance in order for  
2 Staff to come back and advise the Commission of the uses that they would be able to have  
3 at this location under the current zoning, noting that they did not want to see any type of  
4 multiple-family use occur at this location.

5  
6 Principal Planner Sawyer explained that the applicant was currently allowed to have a  
7 duplex or two single-family homes on the lot as it stood, with approval of a conditional use  
8 permit. He explained that the R-2 zone would require a minimum of 3,000 square-feet for  
9 each unit on the lot.

10  
11 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.

12  
13 Principal Planner Sawyer noted that individual single-family homes would not be brought  
14 to the Planning Commission for approval, but that any type of multiple-family project would.

15  
16 Chairman Duistermars inquired as to how the Commission could find a way to refrain from  
17 allowing a particular use that they found unsuitable for an area, if the zoning and General  
18 Plan land use designations allowed that use.

19  
20 City Attorney Vail responded that they would have to look at the Residential Design  
21 Guidelines or other policies and standards that were in place, including the findings, to see  
22 how the unsuitable use could be avoided. He added that he did not believe that the  
23 Commission had the authority this evening to tell the applicant that they could not get their  
24 project approved since it was consistent with all of the standards and requirements of the  
25 City. He continued with a detailed explanation.

26  
27 Vice Chairman Jones asked whether, if they were to proceed with this project, they could  
28 have staff review the guidelines for the area, so that if the applicant were to sell the  
29 property or decided to come back to the Commission in the future with something other  
30 than single-family development, the Commission would have the ability to review the  
31 project in a more intelligent manner.

32  
33 A discussion ensued regarding this concept.

34  
35 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:36 p.m. and asked for a motion.

36  
37 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to  
38 adopt Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 05-39, approving Tentative Parcel Map No.  
39 33522, as amended, and with the stipulation that Staff review the guidelines for the area  
40 so that if the property were to change hands in the future or if the applicant were to  
41 propose any type of development other than single-family residential, the Planning  
42 Commission would be able to review the project in a more intelligent manner.

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

2  
3 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Mendoza  
4 and Rhoten

5 NOES: None

6 ABSTAIN: None

7 ABSENT: None

8  
9 **Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-28.**

10  
11  
12 **V. WORK STUDY**

13  
14 **A. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 05-11 - (Continued from 08-16-05) -**

15 Tamara Alaniz

16 A work study session with discussion and possible direction to staff for a  
17 request for approval of a conditional use permit to develop an 81 unit  
18 apartment complex on 5.79 acres located north of Acacia Avenue and one  
19 parcel east of Yale Street, west of the City/County border.

20  
21 The work study was initiated by Assistant Planner Alaniz, who provided a brief synopsis  
22 of the project and turned the presentation over to the applicant.

23  
24 Troy Molaug of Cozad & Fox approached the lectern and addressed the Commission as  
25 a representative for the applicant. He distributed some renderings of the project, and  
26 discussed them with the Commission, providing various details of the proposal.

27  
28 Vice Chairman Jones asked if the Fire or Police Department had been given the  
29 opportunity yet to review the plans, and if so, what their thoughts were.

30  
31 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that the project was currently going  
32 through the beginning phases of the Development Review Committee process, and that  
33 this work study was extremely preliminary.

34  
35 Mr. Molaug explained some of the issues that they had attempted to resolve in response  
36 to comments that had been made by the police department. He noted that they were  
37 hoping for some input from the Commission as to what direction they would like to see the  
38 project go.

39  
40 A discussion ensued regarding the project proposal.

41  
42 The Commission was not receptive to what was being proposed.

1 Mr. Molaug distributed some additional alternatives that were reviewed by the Commission.

2  
3 Chairman Duistermars asked Lieutenant Cabrera if it was better to have all of the  
4 apartments located within one area, or spread out.

5  
6 Lieutenant Cabrera indicated that he would prefer to have them condensed.

7  
8 Rick Cheney, 4230 Douglas Avenue, Granite Bay, California approached the lectern as the  
9 project applicant. He explained that they were simply attempting to comply with the  
10 direction that had been given to them several months earlier by the Commission. He  
11 expressed some frustration with the fact that they were going back and forth with Staff and  
12 the Commission who could not seem to give them any clear direction.

13  
14 City Attorney Vail suggested that Staff work with the applicant to do whatever needed to  
15 be done to find a satisfactory project design with an acceptable density. He noted that  
16 once the acceptable project design was found, Staff and the Commission could then  
17 promote the appropriate General Plan Amendment to make sure the project would be in  
18 compliance with the land use designations, the surrounding neighborhood and the Valley  
19 as a whole.

20  
21 A discussion ensued regarding this suggestion.

22  
23 Principal Planner Sawyer explained that the processing of a General Plan Amendment  
24 would be a time consuming one, but that Staff could begin working on this if the  
25 Commission wished for them to do so.

26  
27 Additional discussion ensued.

28  
29 Principal Planner Sawyer indicated that Staff could work with the applicant regarding the  
30 amendment of the conceptual design. He suggested that the two-story aspect of the  
31 project be eliminated, and that a single-story project be introduced to see how the density  
32 would pan out.

33  
34 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that the project be designed in a way that would work and  
35 be the best for everyone.

36  
37 Mr. Cheney inquired as to how the Commission would feel about an affordable housing  
38 community, or similar type of development.

39  
40 Chairman Duistermars suggested that they consider condominiums or something along  
41 those lines.

1 City Attorney Vail explained to the Commission that the density ranges that were  
2 designated by the General Plan were the ultimate consideration for a project as far as  
3 density was concerned.

4  
5 Additional discussion ensued, and the Mr. Cheney thanked the Commission for their input.  
6

7  
8 **VI. CONSENT CALENDAR**

9  
10 **A. MINUTES**

- 11 1. March 15, 2005  
12 2. May 31, 2005  
13 3. August 16, 2005  
14

15 Commissioner Mendoza noted that he would need to abstain from voting on the March 15,  
16 2005 Minutes as he had not been present at that time.

17  
18 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Vice Chairman Jones to  
19 approve the Consent Calendar as presented.

20  
21 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

22  
23 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Mendoza  
24 and Rhoten

25 NOES: None

26 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Mendoza abstained from voting on the March 15, 2005  
27 Minutes Only

28 ABSENT: None  
29  
30

31 **VII. UPDATE OF CITY COUNCIL ACTION ON PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS**

32  
33 **A. AUGUST 23, 2005 CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

- 34  
35 1. **A TWENTY-MONTH AND 15 DAY EXTENSION OF INTERIM**  
36 **URGENCY ORDINANCE NO. 1734 PROVIDING TEMPORARY**  
37 **DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS FOR THE WEST HEMET**  
38 **PLANNING AREA**  
39

40 Assistant City Attorney Vail provided a limited update for the Commission regarding the  
41 Interim Urgency Ordinance. He noted that any additional update would need to be  
42 provided by Planning Director Masyczek at the next meeting.  
43  
44

1                   2.    ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT NO. 05-01 - DENSITY  
2                    BONUSES

3  
4 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that the ordinance approving the  
5 amendment had been introduced for its first reading.  
6

7                   3.    ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT NO. 05-06 -  
8                    TELECOMMUNICATIONS ORDINANCE

9  
10 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that the ordinance approving the  
11 amendment had been introduced for its first reading.  
12

13  
14 **VIII. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

15  
16 There were no comments made by the Planning Commission.  
17

18  
19 **IX. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

20  
21 There were no future agenda items requested.  
22

23  
24 **XI. ADJOURNMENT**

25  
26 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten, SECONDED by Commissioner Mendoza and  
27 unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 7:09 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City  
28 of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for ***Tuesday, September 20, 2005 at 6:00 p.m.***  
29 to be held in the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue,  
30 Hemet, California 92543.  
31

32  
33  
34 \_\_\_\_\_  
35 Bob Duistermars, Chairman  
36 Hemet Planning Commission

37 ATTEST:

38  
39  
40 \_\_\_\_\_  
41 Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary  
42 Hemet Planning Commission  
43  
44