



1  
2 **III. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE**  
3

4 There was no Hemet Unified School District Update due to the absence of a  
5 representative.  
6

7  
8 **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**  
9

10 **A. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 34117 (*Continued from September 5,*  
11 *2006*)**

12 APPLICANT: David Dudek Cap Appraisal  
13 AGENT: Scott Peters – Sterling Land Services  
14 LOCATION: Southeast corner of Thornton Avenue and Buena Vista  
15 Street (525 East Thornton Avenue)  
16 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni  
17 DESCRIPTION: A request for review and approval of a tentative tract  
18 map to convert an existing 16-unit apartment complex  
19 into 16 condominium units.  
20

21 The staff report was presented by Associate Planner Domenigoni, who advised the  
22 Commission that the project had been continued to this meeting from the meeting of  
23 September 5, 2006. She then provided various details regarding the project, including an  
24 update regarding the issues that had been pending. She noted that there were several  
25 conditions with which the applicant was not in agreement, and advised that those were  
26 Condition Nos. 11, 51, 52, 57, 58-61 and 70. She explained that staff was recommending  
27 that the conditions remain, but that the applicant was not happy with that recommendation  
28 and wanted them removed.  
29

30 Chairman Duistermars inquired as to whether Condition No. 39 had been resolved.  
31

32 Associate Planner Domenigoni responded that if the applicant were to close off the  
33 existing drive approach, they would have to close off the one referenced in Condition No.  
34 39 as well. She displayed some photos of the project site.  
35

36 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding how short on parking the project would be if it  
37 had been built today.  
38

39 Associate Planner Domenigoni responded that it would be two (2) parking spaces short  
40 on parking.  
41

42 Commissioner Rhoten asked why the applicant wanted Condition Nos. 58-61 removed.  
43  
44

1 Associate Planner Domenigoni responded that the applicant felt that, because the complex  
2 was already existing, they should not have to make it handicapped compliant. She  
3 explained, however, that the City's Code required it to be brought up to date.

4  
5 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:20 p.m.

6  
7 Larry Bugley of Brubaker & Culton Real Estate approached the lectern as a representative  
8 for the applicant. He advised the Commission that the apartment complex was not age-  
9 restricted, and that nothing would be different than it was currently, except for the fact that  
10 the units would be individually owned. He noted that it would be financially impossible to  
11 bring the project into compliance with the handicap requirements, and that they would have  
12 to stop the project if that were to be required.

13  
14 Associate Planner Domenigoni clarified that the units themselves did not have to be  
15 handicapped accessible, but that the common areas would need to be brought up to code.

16  
17 Dave Dudek approached the lectern and addressed the Commission as the property  
18 owner. He noted that most of the adjacent residents in the neighborhood felt that  
19 condominiums would be better than apartments, and that with the conversion they would  
20 be upgrading various items for the purpose of marketability.

21  
22 Commissioner Mendoza asked if there was access to the adjacent golf course from the  
23 back of the building.

24  
25 Mr. Dudek indicated that there was, noting that the property was separated from the golf  
26 course by a chain link fence with a walkway. He added that a couple of the units actually  
27 overlooked the putting range.

28  
29 Commissioner Mendoza asked if handicapped access would be provided at that location.

30  
31 Mr. Dudek responded that they might not be able to provide handicapped accessibility at  
32 that location, but that they should be able to provide ramps to accommodate the  
33 handicapped for all of the units.

34  
35 Discussion ensued regarding the issue of handicap accessibility.

36  
37 City Attorney Vail indicated that staff had cited AB1025, which added sections to the  
38 government code regarding ADA requirements. He noted that with those requirements in  
39 mind, he would not recommend that the disputed conditions be removed.

40  
41 Further discussion ensued regarding the proposed ADA conditions.

1 Mr. Dudek indicated that he had met with the Building Division staff in detail, and  
2 suggested that the ADA conditions would not be an issue.

3  
4 Chairman Duistermars asked what the issue was with Condition No. 11.

5  
6 Mr. Dudek expressed his feeling that the new property owners should not be taxed for an  
7 existing building.

8  
9 City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that because of the City's mandated response  
10 times, the condition was necessary, and the tax that was proposed to be collected would  
11 be used to help assist with meeting the required response times. He further advised that  
12 removal of this condition would mean that the project would no longer be exempt from  
13 CEQA. He suggested that in order to protect the project and go through the streamlining  
14 review, this condition must be relied on. He noted that an option would be to take the item  
15 off the table and do an environmental review to determine the necessity of the condition.

16  
17 Commissioner Mendoza suggested that it was absolutely fair to charge new buyers the  
18 CFD tax.

19  
20 Chairman Duistermars advised the applicant that this type of tax was extremely important  
21 to the growth of the City, and that the condition should remain. He asked the applicant if  
22 he was in agreement with this condition.

23  
24 Mr. Dudek indicated that he was in agreement.

25  
26 Regarding Condition No. 39 Mr. Bugley indicated that they were not proposing to make  
27 any changes to the driveways, so there should not be an issue.

28  
29 Discussion ensued regarding Condition Nos. 51 and 52, relative to fire sprinklers.

30  
31 Associate Planner Domenigoni explained that the applicant did not want to install fire  
32 sprinklers, but that they were required, by the Fire Department, to be installed since the  
33 building was in excess of 5,000 square-feet.

34  
35 Mr. Dudek indicated that the building was existing with tenants currently living in it, and  
36 that if the project were not approved, the tenants would continue to live in the building  
37 without fire sprinklers. He noted that adding fire sprinklers would be very costly.

38  
39 Chairman Duistermars noted that the code was very clear regarding the requirement,  
40 based on square-footage, and that the only option would be to cut square-footage. He  
41 indicated that unless the applicant could cut the square-footage, the fire sprinkler  
42 requirement would have to stand.

1 Discussion ensued regarding the requirement for a fire alarm, and it was agreed that this  
2 condition would need to be kept in tact as well.

3  
4 Discussion ensued regarding the unresolved conditions of approval.

5  
6 Associate Planner Domenigoni noted, with reference to Condition No. 70, that the city's  
7 plan checker had indicated that if the building were not brought into conformance with the  
8 code as a result of getting the map finalized, that the building would need to be demolished  
9 and re-built in accordance with the City Code.

10  
11 City Attorney Vail noted that the Council had recently discussed condo-conversion and  
12 that their direction was to encourage the conversion of apartments to condominiums. He  
13 suggested that some of the conditions that did not deal with life-safety issues should  
14 possibly be relaxed.

15  
16 It was suggested by Principal Planner Sawyer that wording could be added to Condition  
17 No. 70 so that it would read as follows:

18  
19 **Condition No. 70: "Existing building(s) shall be brought into conformance**  
20 **with current building and zoning regulations, as**  
21 **determined by the Building Official and the Planning**  
22 **Director, for the intended new use of the building(s), or**  
23 **the existing building(s) shall be demolished for life safety**  
24 **issues.**

25  
26 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.

27  
28 It was MOVED by Commissioner Mendoza and SECONDED by Commissioner McBride  
29 to adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 06-19* approving Tentative Tract Map  
30 No. 34117 as amended.

31  
32 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

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

38  
39 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-37.***

40  
41 \_\_\_\_\_

1  
2  
3 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS**

4  
5 **A. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NO. 06-024**

6 APPLICANT: Desert Elite, Inc.  
7 AGENT: Jeff Petrus  
8 LOCATION: North of Commonwealth Avenue and Palomino Way, at  
9 the southwest corner of Esplanade Avenue and Pine  
10 Street  
11 PLANNER: Bernard Chase  
12 DESCRIPTION: A request for Planning Commission review and  
13 approval of a site development review application for  
14 the design review of 13 single-family residences with  
15 three (3) model plans and two (2) design themes, along  
16 with appurtenant landscape and hardscape features for  
17 Vesting Tract Map No. 31280.  
18

19 The staff report was presented by Associate Planner Chase who provided various details  
20 regarding the proposed project.  
21

22 Jeff Petrus of Desert Elite approached the lectern as a representative for the project  
23 applicant. He offered some additional details regarding the project proposal, indicating  
24 that all homes would be single-story and that he had tried to be very cognizant of non-  
25 garage denomination. He noted that he would be including 5-foot high vinyl fencing.  
26

27 Discussion ensued regarding the building material, and it was noted that on the units that  
28 included stone, the material would wrap around to the side of the building as required by  
29 the Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines.  
30

31 Mr. Petrus asked if he would be allowed any discretion regarding which units needed to  
32 include stone.  
33

34 A discussion ensued regarding this concept.  
35

36 Chairman Duistermars indicated that this issue could be left to the Planning Department  
37 staff's discretion.  
38

39 A discussion ensued regarding drainage and it was determined that the drainage pathways  
40 were satisfactory.  
41  
42  
43  
44

1 Loretta Domenigoni, 1260 Garry Lane, Hemet, California approached the lectern as an  
2 adjacent resident to the project site. She advised the Commission that she was in support  
3 of the project, but that she wanted to make sure that no drainage from the project would  
4 come onto her property or that of her neighbors.

5  
6 It was confirmed that drainage should not affect those properties.

7  
8 Shauli Rosen-Rager of 42275 Oak Canyon Road, Hemet, California approached the  
9 lectern and addressed the Commission as a concerned resident. He noted that he  
10 appreciated the Commission's attention to appearance and aesthetics, but that he would  
11 also like to ask them to consider environmental issues, such as energy consumption. He  
12 expressed his concern with development relative to global warming.

13  
14 Rita Reiman of 1102 Chenise Court, Hemet, California approached the lectern and  
15 addressed the Commission as a concerned resident. She noted that she had heard  
16 something about homes being heated by the sun if properly aligned, and that while she did  
17 not know much about this concept, she thought it would be nice if it could be looked into.

18  
19 Chairman Duistermars agreed that it would be a great idea for energy-efficient homes to  
20 be considered for future developments. He advised Ms. Reiman that the City appeared  
21 to be moving in that direction.

22  
23 It was MOVED by Commissioner McBride and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to  
24 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 06-36* approving Site Development Review  
25 No. 06-024 as presented.

26  
27 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

28  
29 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners McBride, Mendoza and Rhoten  
30 NOES: None  
31 ABSTAIN: None  
32 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones

33  
34 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-38.***

35  
36  
37 **VI. WORK STUDY**

38  
39 **A. PRE-APPLICATION FOR GUARANTY BANK - *Bernard Chase***

40 A work study session to introduce a proposed 12,800 square-foot, two-story  
41 bank with drive-through element on a 52,000 square-foot portion of a 93,400  
42 square-foot site at the southeasterly corner of Florida and Cawston Avenues.  
43

1 The work study presentation was initiated by Associate Planner Chase, who provided  
2 some details regarding the proposal and then turned the presentation over to the  
3 applicant.

4  
5 Russell Rumansoff of Herron & Rumansoff Architects approached the lectern as a  
6 representative for the project applicant and provided various details regarding the  
7 proposed bank development. He displayed several renderings.

8  
9 Discussion ensued regarding various aspects of the proposal.

10  
11 Chairman Duistermars expressed his concerns regarding the drive-through portion of the  
12 project as well as the signage. He asked for input from the rest of the Commission.

13  
14 Traffic was discussed briefly.

15  
16 Mr. Rumansoff noted that the building would be comparable to the Guaranty Bank building  
17 in Murrieta.

18  
19 Principal Planner Sawyer asked if the building could be pulled back 3 or 4 feet so that  
20 some berming could be added, and so that the cars queuing in the drive-through could be  
21 somewhat hidden.

22  
23 Mr. Rumansoff indicated that he would make that change to the design.

24  
25 Chairman Duistermars noted that he would like to see the cars in the drive-through portion  
26 of the bank kept off of Florida Avenue as much as possible.

27  
28 Mike Sevelle approached the lectern and addressed the Commission as the construction  
29 manager for Guaranty Bank. He indicated that he would also prefer not to have the  
30 parking in the front of the building, but that it's placement was for security reasons. He  
31 noted that it was preferred to have the drive-through section somewhat visible for security  
32 reasons as well, since if it was hidden it would be much easier for robberies to occur. He  
33 added that there were also standards that they must meet, as a bank, per their insurance  
34 company, which was the Federal Government, relative to the ATM and Night Drop. He  
35 further noted that the proposed building was planned to be the bank's Southern California  
36 Regional Center.

37  
38 Commissioner Mendoza asked if there would be new employees, or if existing employees  
39 would be transferred.

40  
41 Mr. Sevelle responded that some employees would be transferred, but that there would be  
42 new employees hired as well.

1 Chairman Duistermars asked if there was any other input regarding the project.

2  
3 Since there was none, he thanked the applicant and his representative for their  
4 presentation.

5  
6 **B. RURAL STANDARDS - *Ron Running***

7 A work study session with discussion and possible direction to staff  
8 regarding Rural Design Guidelines.

9  
10 Postponed to a future Planning Commission meeting.

11  
12  
13 **VII. CONSENT CALENDAR**

14  
15 **A. MINUTES**

16  
17 \_\_\_\_\_ 1. August 15, 2006

18  
19 It was MOVED by Commissioner McBride and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to  
20 approve the consent calendar as presented.

21  
22 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

23  
24 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners McBride, Mendoza and Rhoten  
25 NOES: None  
26 ABSTAIN: None  
27 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones  
28

29  
30 **VIII. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**

31  
32 **A. UPDATE REGARDING LIST OF STREETS WITH TRAFFIC LEVEL OF**  
33 **SERVICE "F" AS REQUESTED BY VICE CHAIRMAN JONES**

34  
35 Postponed to future agenda to allow Vice Chairman Jones to be present.

36  
37 **B. UPDATE ON STATUS OF RE-PLANET RECYCLING FACILITY LOCATED**  
38 **AT PALM & FLORIDA AVENUES AS REQUESTED BY VICE CHAIRMAN**  
39 **JONES**

40  
41 An update regarding the Re-Planet Recycling Facility at Palm and Florida Avenues in the  
42 Albertson's Shopping Center was provided by Principal Planner Sawyer, who noted that  
43

1 an application for a Conditional Use Permit had been submitted, but was currently  
2 incomplete. He described some of the requirements that would need to be met if the  
3 project were to be approved.  
4  
5  
6

7 **C. DISCUSSION REGARDING THE PERCENTAGE OF AVAILABLE**  
8 **COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL LAND WITHIN THE CITY AS**  
9 **REQUESTED BY COMMISSIONER MENDOZA**

10  
11 Postponed to a future agenda to allow Planning Director Masyczek to be present.  
12  
13

14 **IX. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**  
15

16 Chairman Duistermars referred to the City Council's General Plan meeting that had  
17 occurred the previous evening. He suggested that there were many good things that he  
18 saw coming out of the General Plan update, but that there were also a few things that he  
19 was not so pleased with. He noted that he had observed competing political interests  
20 relative to the west end properties, and that he would like to encourage the City Council  
21 to be more firm with their decisions regarding what the land uses should be on the west  
22 end, rather than referring to them as being just "residential-ish", as was noted at the  
23 meeting.  
24

25  
26 **X. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**  
27

28 Commissioner Mendoza requested that inclusionary zoning be added to a future agenda.  
29  
30

31 **XI. ADJOURNMENT**  
32

33 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten, SECONDED by Commissioner Mendoza and  
34 unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 7:55 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City  
35 of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **Tuesday, October 3, 2006 at 6:00 p.m.** to  
36 be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet,  
37 California 92543.  
38  
39  
40

41 \_\_\_\_\_  
42 **Bob Duistermars, Chairman**  
43 **Hemet Planning Commission**  
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

**ATTEST:**

---

**Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary  
Hemet Planning Commission**