



1 **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

2  
3 **A. TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 32108 (*Continued from 9-21-04*)**

4 APPLICANT: Joseph and Susanne Foster  
5 LOCATION: Southeast corner of Hemet Street and Charlton Avenue  
6 PLANNER: Maureen Losey  
7 DESCRIPTION: A request for approval of a tentative parcel map for the  
8 subdivision of five (5) acres into four (4) parcels ranging  
9 in size from 36,404 square-feet to 69,974 square-feet  
10 and zoned R-A (Residential-Agriculture).  
11

12 Due to the absence of Assistant Planner Losey, Principal Planner Sawyer presented the  
13 staff report, providing the Commission with some details regarding the project.  
14

15 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that per the City Attorney's instruction  
16 a new finding would need to be added to each project resolution this evening, which would  
17 also be standard in all future resolutions. He explained that the addition would be in  
18 Section No. 1 of the resolutions, and that it would be Finding No. 3: MSHCP. He provided  
19 the wording for the additional finding as follows:  
20

21 ***"The project is found to be consistent with the Riverside County***  
22 ***MSHCP. The project is located outside of any MSHCP criteria area and***  
23 ***mitigation is provided through payment of the MSHCP Mitigation Fee."***  
24

25 Chairman Duistermars asked if there were any questions of staff. Since there were none,  
26 he opened the public hearing at 6:04 p.m.  
27

28 Since there were no members of the public who wished to speak regarding the item,  
29 Chairman Duistermars closed the ph at 6:05 p.m. and asked for a motion.  
30

31 It was MOVED by Commissioner Calkins and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to  
32 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 04-62* approving Tentative Parcel Map No.  
33 32108, as amended with the addition of the MSHCP finding.  
34

35 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:  
36

37 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins  
38 and Rhoten  
39 NOES: None  
40 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Searl  
41 ABSENT: None  
42

43 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-45.***  
44

1           **B.     TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 32183**

2           APPLICANT:       Eugene Wilson  
3           AGENT:            Ronald Cote  
4           LOCATION:         Northwest corner of Girard Street and Oakland Avenue  
5           PLANNER:         Loretta Domenigoni  
6           DESCRIPTION:    A request to subdivide 1.89 acres into six (6) lots for the  
7                            future development of single-family homes.  
8

9   The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Domenigoni who provided some  
10 details regarding the project.

11  
12 A discussion ensued regarding whether the project would consist of one-story homes  
13 exclusively, or if two-story homes would also be included.  
14

15 Assistant Planner Domenigoni advised the Commission that the project was currently  
16 conditioned for one-story homes, but that the idea of allowing two-story homes along the  
17 back portion of the project had been entertained.  
18

19 A discussion of the weed-ridden state of the easement that ran along a portion of the  
20 property ensued.  
21

22 Principal Planner Sawyer stated that the project could be conditioned so that the full-  
23 access driveway to the lots, that would be taking access off of this easement, would need  
24 to be paved.  
25

26 Discussion of the drainage of the property ensued.  
27

28 Principal Engineer Biagioni responded to various questions regarding the property  
29 drainage, advising the Commission that there would be no drainage problems.  
30

31 William Stewart, 563 North Girard Street, Hemet, California approached the lectern and  
32 advised the Commission that he had been told that he could not build a fence because of  
33 the flood control channel located in this area. He asked how the other homes were going  
34 to be built with fences when he could not build a fence.  
35

36 Principal Engineer Biagioni explained that the channel itself, as well as the easement, were  
37 outside of the property boundaries that were relative to this project.  
38

39 Chairman Duistermars suggested that Mr. Stewart make a trip to City Hall to discuss his  
40 issue with Principal Engineer Biagioni.  
41  
42  
43  
44

1 Karen Nolan, 1642 E. Oakland Avenue, Hemet, California asked if sidewalks and  
2 streetlights would be installed with this development, and if so, would they extend in front  
3 of her home.

4  
5 Chairman Duistermars responded that the property owner would be conditioned to provide  
6 improvements along his property, but that it was unlikely that they would be responsible  
7 for installing those improvements along any other properties.

8  
9 Randall Russell, 514 North Girard St., Hemet, California inquired as to how the homes  
10 would be situated and if they would be facing Girard Street.

11  
12 Assistant Planner Domenigoni displayed a map of the project and it was noted that there  
13 would be four (4) homes facing Girard St.

14  
15 Tommy Nolan, 1642 East Oakland Avenue, Hemet, California approached the lectern as  
16 an adjacent resident to the project. He noted that his house was next to the vacant lot, and  
17 asked about the fencing. He explained that they already had fencing, and asked if it would  
18 be removed, and if so, would another fence be installed.

19  
20 Chairman Duistermars inquired of staff regarding whether in-fill projects were conditioned  
21 for block walls, or if there was a different type of scenario for them.

22  
23 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that in-fill projects were conditioned for block walls,  
24 and that many times a project developer would coordinate with the residents, who may  
25 already have existing fencing, to see if they wanted to keep their existing fence or if they  
26 had a problem with having it replaced.

27  
28 Chairman Duistermars asked Mr. Nolan if this answered his question.

29  
30 Mr. Nolan responded that it did, and stated that they would have no problem with the  
31 addition of a block wall.

32  
33 Chairman Duistermars closed the Public Hearing at 6:25 p.m.

34  
35 Vice Chairman Jones asked for clarification that the project would be comprised of single-  
36 story homes exclusively.

37  
38 Assistant Planner Domenigoni advised the Commission that this was correct.

39  
40 The applicant briefly advised the Commission that he was not aware that the project would  
41 be conditioned to allow only single-story homes.

1 A discussion regarding this issue ensued, and it was agreed that the project would, indeed,  
2 be restricted to single-story homes exclusively.

3  
4 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.

5  
6 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to  
7 adopt Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 04-52 approving Tentative Tract Map No.  
8 32183, as amended with the addition of the MSHCP finding.

9  
10 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

11  
12 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,  
13 Rhoten and Searl

14 NOES: None

15 ABSTAIN: None

16 ABSENT: None

17  
18 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-46.***

19  
20 **C. ZONE CHANGE 04-9 & TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 32519**

21 APPLICANT: Daniel and Patricia Marana

22 AGENT: Rick Thomsen, The Thomsen Company

23 LOCATION: Southwest corner of San Jacinto Street and Johnston  
24 Avenue

25 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni

26 DESCRIPTION: A request to change the zoning designation from R-1  
27 (Single-family) and S-1 (Church) to R-1-7.2 (Single-  
28 family, 7200 sq. ft. minimum lots) and to subdivide 1.55  
29 acres into eight (8) lots for the future development of  
30 single-family homes.

31  
32 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Domenigoni who provided the  
33 commission with some details regarding the project.

34  
35 Commissioner Searl inquired as to how the property had been zoned with a Church  
36 designation to begin with.

37  
38 Assistant Planner Domenigoni responded that she did not know how this zoning  
39 designation had been applied to the property, and that she was not aware of any church  
40 ever wishing to locate there.

41  
42 Planning Director Masyczek noted that since the site was way too small for the  
43 development of a church, it would be unusable with the current zoning designation.  
44

1 A discussion of the flag lot that was indicated on the displayed map ensued.

2  
3 Commissioner Calkins asked if Lot Nos. 5 and 6 would present a siting problem.

4  
5 Assistant Planner Domenigioni responded that they would not and discussion ensued  
6 regarding this issue.

7  
8 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:33 p.m.

9  
10 Marissa Roman-Luna, 900 Marlyce Lane, Hemet, California asked if Shellie Lane would  
11 be made to go all the way through with this project or if the development would actually be  
12 on San Jacinto Street and Johnston Avenue.

13  
14 Assistant Planner Domenigioni explained indicated on the map where Shellie and Grace  
15 Lanes were, and explained that a full cul-de-sac would be created at that location, with a  
16 portion of it being at somewhat of a right angle. She noted the two lots that would take be  
17 accessible from the cul-de-sac, and stated that Shellie Lane would not be made to go all  
18 the way through.

19  
20 Rick Thomsen, 2587 South San Jacinto Street, San Jacinto, California approached the  
21 lectern as a representative for the applicant, and asked what the impacts of the MSHCP  
22 finding would be on the project.

23  
24 Planning Director Masyczek advised Mr. Thomsen that there would be no impact, and  
25 explained that the finding that the Commission was making was that the project would not  
26 have an impact on the MSHCP. He noted that the MSHCP imposed a requirement that  
27 all projects from this date forward have a finding that either the project is within a criteria  
28 area, or that the project is outside of one and must pay the necessary fee.

29  
30 Mr. Thomsen asked for clarification that no fee was required with this project.

31  
32 Planning Director Masyczek responded that fees would need to paid with this project.

33  
34 Mr. Thomsen reiterated his question of what the impact would be.

35  
36 Planning Director Masyczek stated that the only impact was payment of the MSHCP  
37 mitigation fee.

38  
39 Mr. Thomsen inquired as to the manner in which the fee was assessed.

40  
41 Planning Director Masyczek responded that he believed the fee was in the range of \$1,650  
42 per house.

43  
44

1 Chairman Duistermars asked Mr. Thomsen if he was aware of the single-story condition.

2  
3 Mr. Thomsen stated that he was, and that he believed the property owner was also aware  
4 of it.

5  
6 Since there were no other questions or comments, Chairman Duistermars closed the public  
7 hearing at 6:38 p.m. and asked for a motion.

8  
9 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONED by Commissioner Searl to adopt  
10 *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 04-54* recommending approval to the City Council  
11 of Zone Change No. 04-9.

12  
13 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

14  
15 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,  
16 Rhoten and Searl

17 NOES: None

18 ABSTAIN: None

19 ABSENT: None

20  
21 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-47.***

22  
23 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Searl to adopt  
24 *Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-55* recommending approval to the City Council  
25 of Tentative Tract Map No. 32519, as amended with the addition of the MSHCP finding.

26  
27 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

28  
29 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,  
30 Rhoten and Searl

31 NOES: None

32 ABSTAIN: None

33 ABSENT: None

34  
35 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-48.***

36  
37 **D. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 04-8 AND ENVIRONMENTAL**  
38 **ASSESSMENT NO. 04-27**

39 \_\_\_\_\_ APPLICANT: Wentworth Self-Storage

40 AGENT: James Goodman, AIA

41 LOCATION: North side of Wentworth Drive between Scaramella  
42 Circle and Sanderson Avenue

1 DESCRIPTION: A request to remove 714 square-feet of the existing  
2 56,526 square-foot mini-storage building and add 999  
3 square-feet for a total of 56,901 square-feet in Phase 1,  
4 and to construct two (2) additional phases consisting of  
5 10 new buildings totaling 92,154 square-feet for an  
6 overall build-out of 26 buildings totaling 149,055 square-  
7 feet, with adoption of a Negative Declaration for the  
8 project.

9  
10 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Domenigoni, who provided the  
11 Commission with some details regarding the project.

12  
13 Commissioner Calkins referred to Attachment No. 3 of the staff report, and the reference  
14 to Street "A".

15  
16 Assistant Planner Domenigoni stated that she believed that street had been vacated, and  
17 it was confirmed by Principal Engineer Biagioni that this was correct.

18  
19 Commissioner Searl inquired regarding the 2-hour firewall.

20  
21 Battalion Chief Van Verst noted that there had been an issue with the original design, but  
22 explained that they had worked with the project developer and had come up with indicated  
23 plan as a resolution to the original issues.

24  
25 Further discussion of Street "A" ensued.

26  
27 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:44 p.m.

28  
29 Jim Goodman of James Goodman Associates, 31732 Rancho Viejo Road., Suite E, San  
30 Juan Capistrano, California approached the lectern as the project applicant. He provided  
31 the Commission with some photo simulations of what the project was proposed to look like  
32 once completed.

33  
34 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:46 p.m. and asked for a motion.

35  
36 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Searl to adopt  
37 *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 04-14EA*, approving Environmental Assessment  
38 No. 04-27 for Conditional Use Permit No. 04-8.

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

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

5 NOES: None

6 ABSTAIN: None

7 ABSENT: None

8  
9 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-11EA***

10  
11 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Searl to adopt  
12 *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 04-53* approving Conditional Use Permit No. 04-  
13 8, as amended with the addition of the MSHCP finding.

14  
15 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

16  
17 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,  
18 Rhoten and Searl

19 NOES: None

20 ABSTAIN: None

21 ABSENT: None

22  
23 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-49.***

24  
25 **E. ZONE CHANGE NO. 04-8 AND TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 32274**

26 APPLICANT: Habitat For Humanity

27 AGENT: Sharon Desgro

28 LOCATION: Southwest corner of Rosalia and Western Streets

29 DESCRIPTION: A request to change the zoning designation from R-3  
30 (Multiple-family) to R-1-D (Single-family - Downtown)  
31 and to subdivide 0.55 acres into three (3) 7,200 square-  
32 foot lots for the future development of single-family  
33 homes.

34  
35 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Domenigoni who provided some  
36 details regarding the project.

37  
38 Planning Director Masyczek explained that the project had come before the City Council  
39 as part of an agreement with the Habitat for Humanity organization.

40  
41 Chairman Duistermars asked if the homes would be single-story.

42  
43 Assistant Planner Domenigoni responded that they would.

1 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:51 p.m.

2  
3 Since there were no members of the public who wished to address the Commission,  
4 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:52 p.m.

5  
6 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the applicant would be exempt  
7 from the MSHCP fees.

8  
9 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Searl and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Calkins to  
10 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-58* recommending approval to the City  
11 Council of Zone Change No. 04-8.

12  
13 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

14  
15 **AYES:** Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,  
16 Rhoten and Searl

17 **NOES:** None

18 **ABSTAIN:** None

19 **ABSENT:** None

20  
21 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-50***

22  
23 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Searl and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Rhoten to  
24 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 04-59*, recommending approval to the City  
25 Council of Tentative Parcel Map No. 32274.

26  
27 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

28  
29 **AYES:** Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,  
30 Rhoten and Searl

31 **NOES:** None

32 **ABSTAIN:** None

33 **ABSENT:** None

34  
35 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-51***

1 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS**

2  
3 **A. A DETERMINATION OF USE TO ALLOW A PRE-PACKAGED FOOD**  
4 **DISTRIBUTION CENTER AS A CONDITIONALLY PERMITTED USE IN**  
5 **THE C-1 (NEIGHBORHOOD-COMMERCIAL) ZONE** - Maureen Losey

6 \_\_\_\_\_ This Determination of Use is in response to a written request from the St.  
7 Vincent De Paul Society to relocate their office, and direction from the  
8 Council to refer the item back to the Planning Commission.

9  
10 Due to the absence of Assistant Planner Losey, the staff report was presented by Principal  
11 Planner Sawyer who provided some background regarding the item, and explained some  
12 of the details of the request.

13  
14 Commissioner Calkins inquired regarding from where the food would be distributed.

15  
16 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that he did not have an answer to that question, which  
17 would need to be addressed by the future applicant who was not present for this meeting.  
18 He advised the Commission that this Determination of Use would apply to any future  
19 requests of this type, and not to this one exclusively.

20  
21 Chairman Duistermars indicated that he had a problem with adding this type of use in  
22 either of those particular zoned.

23  
24 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.

25  
26 Chairman Duistermars suggested that staff return to the Commission with some zones that  
27 might be more compatible for this type of use, such as in the area of Wentworth Drive.

28  
29 **B. SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DESIGN GUIDELINES** - Richard Masyczek  
30 Review and discussion of the draft revision of the single-family residential  
31 design guidelines and recommendation to the City Council.

32  
33 Planning Director Masyczek presented the draft revision of the Single-Family Residential  
34 Design Guidelines, noting that if the Commission was in agreement with them, they would  
35 be presented to the City Council for approval. He described in some detail, some of the  
36 changes that had been made to the guidelines, and displayed some photos of the Ladera  
37 Ranch area in Irvine, relative to landscaping that provided screening of two-story homes  
38 along project perimeters.

39  
40 Commissioner Calkins referred to the wording regarding a "one-story" element, stating that  
41 it was unclear to him what was meant by the language.

1 Planning Director Masyczek displayed a photo of what he was referring to regarding a  
2 “one-story” element.

3  
4 Vice Chairman Jones stated that the section of the guidelines relative to lot sizes was  
5 confusing. noting that it had been his understanding that a percentile would be included  
6 regarding lot sizes.

7  
8 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that a percentile could be added, but that a definite  
9 mix had not been established. He noted that he had come up with a density of no more  
10 than 5 units per acre, which generally will refer to 7,200 to 6,000 square-foot lots. He  
11 noted that, essentially, hitting that mix allows an applicant to come in with 5,000 square-  
12 foot lots, but balance them with lot sizes of up to 8,000 square-feet or greater, which  
13 contains the mix within a density range. He reiterated that if the Commission so desired,  
14 a definite percentile mix could be established, but stated that he believed that at the last  
15 discussion it had been decided to come in with a density range within the Specific Plan  
16 documents.

17  
18 Vice Chairman Jones noted that it had also been discussed to have larger stuff to offset  
19 some of the smaller stuff. He further noted that it was his opinion that they had left with  
20 a bad impression a couple of months ago when all that was discussed was the small lot  
21 sizes, rather than the larger lot sizes, which was very frustrating to him as well as some of  
22 the developers who were present.

23  
24 Chairman Duistermars asked what would prevent a developer from doing the entire build-  
25 out of a project at five dwelling units per acre.

26  
27 Planning Director responded that there was nothing to prevent this, except for the provision  
28 that they should provide a variety of lot sizes and dwelling unit types. He suggested that  
29 this provision could be modified to be more specific, such as requiring that an average lot  
30 size of 7,200 square-feet be maintained. He suggested the following:

31  
32 **Strike No. iv. under No. 2.a. and replace it with “Gross densities for any**  
33 **Specific Plan shall not exceed a 7,200 square-foot lot average.”**

34  
35 A discussion ensued regarding this concept.

36  
37 Planning Director Masyczek noted an addition to the guidelines that had been suggested  
38 by Bob Osborne:

39  
40 **Add to Section No. 1 as “h”: “All projects shall demonstrate how architectural**  
41 **styles will be compatible with adjoining existing neighborhoods in terms of**  
42 **massing, building height and setbacks. Where necessary, strict application**  
43  
44

1 **of these guidelines may be deviated from in order to maintain compatibility**  
2 **with adjoining homes.”**  
3

4 The Commission concurred with this addition.  
5

6 Chairman Duistermars invited members of the public to speak regarding the proposed  
7 guidelines.  
8

9 Doug Avis of Benchmark Pacific, 550 Laguna Drive, Carlsbad, California approached the  
10 lectern and asked for clarification regarding a couple of issues. He referred to the density  
11 issues and suggested that it might be handled better in the way that it was written to  
12 require average lot sizes.  
13

14 Chairman Duistermars noted that what they had been seeing in the community was  
15 perhaps a variety of development that was not of the same quality that Benchmark Pacific  
16 is accustomed to providing. He explained that the Single-Family Residential Design  
17 Guidelines were being revised in an effort to prevent some of the lower quality developers  
18 from providing the undesirable type of projects that they had been providing.  
19

20 Discussion of the R.V. storage portion of the guidelines ensued.  
21

22 It was agreed that in Item No. 2.V., **2 hours** should be changed to **24 hours**.  
23

24 Planning Director Masyczek continued with his presentation of the revisions to the  
25 residential design guidelines, and displayed more photos that provided examples of his  
26 references.  
27

28 A discussion ensued regarding some additional aspects of the guidelines, relative to “living  
29 space forward”.  
30

31 Chairman Duistermars referred to past discussions based on the 40/60 rule, and a  
32 discussion ensued.  
33

34 Planning Director Masyczek noted that the 40/60 rule could not adequately be applied to  
35 any lot size under 7,200 square-feet, and a discussion ensued regarding this issue.  
36

37 Commissioner Calkins asked if the abandonment of the 12-foot side-yard requirement  
38 should be a consideration, and a discussion ensued.  
39

40 Planning Director Masyczek continued his presentation and explanation of the revisions  
41 to the Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines. He noted that a provision had been  
42 added, per State Code, that at least one of the model homes in a new subdivision should  
43 include a xeriscape type of landscaping.  
44

1 Chairman Duistermars asked that they jump back to the garage issue. He suggested that  
2 Mr. Avis was correct when referring to the provision of different types of home frontages,  
3 noting that if everything were built alike a neighborhood would appear monotonous.

4  
5 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that he could write up some modified language  
6 regarding this issue while the Commission was taking comments from the public.

7  
8 Vice Chairman Jones referred to the issue of landscaping, asking what the requirements  
9 for tree sizes were.

10  
11 Planning Director Masyczek noted that 36-inch box trees were required for certain areas,  
12 and a discussion of landscaping ensued.

13  
14 Chairman Duistermars inquired of Mr. Avis regarding energy efficient developments, asking  
15 where in design guidelines or city ordinances those types of things could be found, or if  
16 they were provided on a voluntary basis.

17  
18 Mr. Avis responded that it tended to vary amongst cities and communities, explaining that  
19 it was often a public works issue. He suggested that one thing that could be voluntarily  
20 done by a developer was the design of their own public street system.

21  
22 A discussion ensued regarding this issue and various other issues relative to the design  
23 guidelines.

24  
25 Planning Director Masyczek noted some further changes to the guidelines relative to  
26 density, lot sizes and garages.

27  
28 Commissioner Searl noted that he had some trouble with the wording on Section No. 1.g.,  
29 which referred to major streets being defined as streets with a design width "**greater than**  
30 **66-feet**". He pointed out that 66-feet is the City's standard, and suggested that the  
31 wording be modified to read "**greater than 65-feet**".

32  
33 It was agreed that the change would be made to read "**greater than 65-feet**".

34  
35 Planning Director Masyczek noted that under Section No. 4.b., regarding meandering  
36 sidewalks, there had been a lot of discussion regarding whether, for example, a 10-foot  
37 sidewalk should be made to meander. He advised the Commission that since it had been  
38 agreed that 10-feet was too tight of an area to meander, the right-of-way should go to 15-  
39 feet. He further noted that a "**backbone system within the project**" should also be  
40 provided. He explained that a backbone system was defined as traversing the length of the  
41 project and hooking into the parks and the different amenities within the project itself.

1 Planning Director Masyczek referred to the final change under Section No. 7.b., which had  
2 not been part of the earlier discussion but was being included for Commission  
3 consideration, as xeriscape landscaping. He noted that State Law requires that at least  
4 one model home in a model home complex have a xeriscape demonstration project. He  
5 explained that this requirement had not yet been codified, but was being added to the  
6 guidelines by saying ***“Xeriscape landscaping is encouraged for all residential projects  
7 in the City of Hemet. At least one home in any model home complex shall include  
8 a xeriscape plan for demonstration purposes.”*** He noted that this could include  
9 drought-resistant landscaping.

10  
11 Vice Chairman Jones asked if the issue of gray water being utilized for irrigation could be  
12 reviewed.

13  
14 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.

15  
16 Vice Chairman Jones: suggested that smart-wiring of homes for computerization should  
17 be considered.

18  
19 Planning Director Masyczek agreed that this was an option, and noted where in the design  
20 guidelines it could be added.

21  
22 Chairman Duistermars suggested that some ordinances be initiated that were geared  
23 towards conservation.

24  
25 Planning Director Masyczek stated that staff could work with the Public Works division  
26 regarding such issues.

27  
28 Chairman Duistermars stated that with the changes that had been made, he believed the  
29 Commission was ready to make their recommendation of approval of the revised Single-  
30 Family Residential Design Guidelines to the City Council.

31  
32 The balance of the Commission concurred.

33  
34  
35 **VI. WORK STUDY**

- 36  
37 **A. CODE ENFORCEMENT POWERPOINT PRESENTATION** - Greg Flannery  
38 A powerpoint presentation give by Senior Code Enforcement Officer Greg  
39 Flannery to brief the Commission on the current efforts and  
40 accomplishments of the City of Hemet’s Code Enforcement Unit.

41  
42 Senior Code Enforcement Officer Flannery provided the Commission with a PowerPoint  
43 presentation regarding the activities and goals of the Code Enforcement Unit of the  
44

1 Planning Department. He initiated the presentation by displaying the Code Enforcement  
2 Mission Statement, followed by the display of a group photo fo the code enforcement team  
3 as well as individual photos of each member. He noted the various duties that the code  
4 enforcement team was responsible for, and referred to the types of cases and violations  
5 that the unit tended to deal with. He displayed some action photos of what the various  
6 code enforcement officers and the Code Action Team (CAT) dealt with on a daily basis,  
7 and provided descriptions of what the photos entailed.  
8

9 Following the presentation, Senior Code Enforcement Officer Flannery entertained a brief  
10 question & answer period.  
11

12 The Commission thanked him for his presentation.  
13  
14

## 15 **VII. CONSENT CALENDAR**

### 16 **A. MINUTES**

- 17  
18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 1. September 21, 2004  
20

21 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to  
22 approve the consent calendar as presented.  
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: Commissioner Calkins  
30 ABSENT: None  
31  
32

## 33 **VIII. UPDATE OF CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS ON PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS -** 34 **Update given by Planning Director Richard Masyczek** 35

### 36 **A. ZONE CHANGE NO. 04-7, TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 32131 AND** 37 **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 04-15** 38

39 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that this item had been approved by  
40 the City Council with a unanimous vote. He further noted that the Council had expressed  
41 their appreciation of the larger lot sizes.  
42  
43  
44

1 **IX. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**

2  
3 There were no Planning Director Items scheduled on this agenda.  
4

5  
6 **X. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

7  
8 **A. DISCUSSION OF STARBUCKS @ STATE STREET & STETSON AVENUE**

9 - Nick Jones

10  
11 Vice Chairman Jones inquired regarding the approval of what was currently being seen on  
12 the new Starbucks building, referring particularly to the unscreened panels on the east side  
13 elevation.  
14

15 Planning Director Masyczek noted that this issue was under discussion with Starbucks, and  
16 that they had installed various things that were not approved on their plans. He noted that  
17 they would be installing some screening around those panels and would then be required  
18 to install additional landscaping to further screen the areas that were of concern.  
19

20 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding how this type of project, which included a drive-  
21 thru, could be approved without Planning Commission review.  
22

23 Planning Director Masyczek read the section of the zoning ordinance that indicated the  
24 permission of an Administrative review of a project to occur, and explained that requests  
25 from the City Manager's office often came through asking for consideration of an expedited  
26 process, in which case a project would often be reviewed by the Planning Director through  
27 the Administrative Use Permit process, and approval therefore granted within a much more  
28 expedient time frame.  
29

30 A discussion ensued regarding this process and the negative aspects of its utilization.  
31  
32

33 **XI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

34  
35 Vice Chairman Jones asked if it would be appropriate to invite the City Council, following  
36 the election, to participate in a joint meeting, particularly since there would be new Council  
37 members joining the City.  
38

39 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that the Commission allow them some time to settle  
40 in prior to extending such an invitation.  
41

42 Chairman Duistermars agreed that it would indeed be appropriate to have such a joint  
43 meeting.  
44

1 **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

2  
3 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl, SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten and  
4 unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 8:36 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City  
5 of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 19, 2004**  
6 at the City of Hemet Council Chambers, located at 450 East Latham Avenue, Hemet,  
7 California, 92543.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

13 \_\_\_\_\_  
14 **Bob Duistermars, Chairman**  
15 **Hemet Planning Commission**  
16

17 **ATTEST:**

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