



1 Ms. Packham reported that the DPSC review for the new high school was in progress. She  
2 noted that many samples were required for the site, due to its size, and that a great deal  
3 of work would be done for the toxic review. She added that the architect and staff had met  
4 with department heads from the 2 existing high schools in an effort to confirm the design  
5 on the different departments, particularly the specialty departments such as science, art  
6 and theater. She stated that the school district hoped to have their plans submitted to the  
7 Division of State Architect by April, noting that review would take approximately 6 to 8  
8 months. She explained that following that process, the packages would be put together  
9 for the bid process, and that the current schedule indicated that actual construction would  
10 begin in May 2005, with a planned occupancy in July of 2007.

11  
12 Ms. Packham reported that activity might be seen at Hemet Elementary School over the  
13 Christmas break, noting that the new modular office building was being installed. She  
14 explained that the old, condemned building, which was actually the staff lounge, had been  
15 torn down, and that the new building would make up both the staff lounge and the new  
16 administration office. She added that a new communications system was planned to be  
17 installed, since the current one no longer has parts available for repairs, and that electrical  
18 upgrades would be completed along with a new entrance at the front of the school. She  
19 noted that the project would begin over the winter break and was scheduled to be  
20 completed by spring break.

21  
22 Commissioner Calkins asked if Jacob Weins Elementary School would be similar to the  
23 Harmony and McSweeny Elementary Schools.

24  
25 Ms. Packham responded that the floor plan was identical, but that it would have a slightly  
26 different site configuration due to the shape of the property.

27  
28 Commissioner Calkins inquired about the neighborhood response to the stadium being  
29 utilized as the site for the school.

30  
31 Ms. Packham responded that she was not handling that part of the project, but that she  
32 was moving forward with getting approval for the site. She stated that she would be  
33 meeting with the school district's attorney and the property owners on Friday to begin  
34 discussions of acquisition, and that she was in the middle of the approval process, in terms  
35 of getting all the reports back, going through all of the agencies and working on the CEQA.

36  
37 Commissioner Rhoten asked if there had been a great deal of opposition to the school  
38 being located at this site.

39  
40 Ms. Packham responded that there had been some. She stated that she was not at the  
41 meeting the previous evening, but that she understood that it was about 4 to 1 in favor of  
42 the site. She added that the site approval would ultimately be up to the governing board  
43 after all the testing was completed.

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

2  
3 There were no amendments or additions to the agenda.

4  
5  
6 **IV. CONSENT CALENDAR**

7  
8 **A. MINUTES**

9  
10 1. November 4, 2003

11  
12 It was MOVED by Commissioner Calkins and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to  
13 approve the consent calendar as presented.

14  
15 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

16  
17 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins  
18 and Rhoten  
19 NOES: None  
20 ABSTAIN: None  
21 ABSENT: Commissioner Hicks  
22

23  
24 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS**

25  
26 **A. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NO. 03-24**

27 APPLICANT: Mike Best  
28 LOCATION: 345 Juel Lane  
29 PLANNER: Maureen Losey  
30 DESCRIPTION: A request to construct a two-story, 2,700 square-foot  
31 accessory structure garage/guest house in the A-1-C  
32 (Agricultural) zone.  
33

34 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Losey who provided some details  
35 regarding the project. She noted that a revised copy of the staff report and resolution had  
36 been distributed to the Commission, as the Assistant City Attorney had required that the  
37 findings be revised.

38  
39 Assistant City Attorney Vail explained what the revisions entailed.

40  
41 Chairman Duistermars asked if the project met all the requirements for accessory  
42 structures.  
43  
44

1 Assistant Planner Losey responded that it did.  
2  
3 Commissioner Calkins inquired regarding the requirement that limited the size of the  
4 accessory structure in relation to the principal structure on the property.  
5  
6 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the requirement for size limitation had been  
7 waived for the agricultural zone.  
8  
9 Assistant City Attorney Vail pointed out that within the single-family residential zones there  
10 was a "50% requirement", which could be exceeded by Planning Commission review, but  
11 in agricultural areas that requirement had been removed, and the only reason that it would  
12 come before the Commission was if there were an inconsistency or difference between the  
13 General Plan designation and the zoning.  
14  
15 Chairman Duistermars suggested that, unrelated to this structure, there were some pretty  
16 small lots with agricultural zoning. With this in mind, he asked if the size requirement was  
17 being removed from all agricultural zones.  
18  
19 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the ordinance was currently written in that  
20 manner, but that the Commission had retained the ability to review those projects to make  
21 sure that there were no compatibility issues, which narrowed it to a case-by-case basis.  
22  
23 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the size of the property.  
24  
25 Assistant Planner Losey responded that the property was a 1-acre lot.  
26  
27 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the size of the main dwelling.  
28  
29 Assistant Planner Losey responded that the main dwelling was 2,000 square-feet in size.  
30  
31 Chairman Duistermars asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak  
32 regarding the issue.  
33  
34 Since there were none, he asked for a motion.  
35  
36 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Hicks and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Calkins to  
37 adopt ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 03-70*** approving Site Development Review  
38 No. 03-24.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:  
2

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

5 NOES: None

6 ABSTAIN: None

7 ABSENT: None  
8  
9

10 **VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

11  
12 **A. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 03-6 (Continued from December 2,**  
13 **2003)**

14 APPLICANT: Starbridge/Sprint PCS

15 LOCATION: 701 North Sanderson Avenue

16 PLANNER: Maureen Losey

17 DESCRIPTION: A request for a conditional use permit to co-locate  
18 twelve (12) cellular antennae on an existing 67.5-foot  
19 stealth monopine telecommunications facility on  
20 property within the R-1-7.2 (Single-Family Residential)  
21 zone district.  
22

23 Assistant Planner Losey advised the Commission that the applicant had requested that the  
24 item be tabled, pending their consideration of the submittal of a necessary zone change  
25 for the property.  
26

27 Chairman Duistermars referred to the letter that had been submitted by the applicant,  
28 noting that *“Planning Director Masyczek stated that the subject parcel would need a zone*  
29 *change in order for the project to be re-considered by the Planning Commission.”* He  
30 asked to be filled in on this issue, as the new requirements had only recently gone into  
31 effect. He asked if there was a consideration of re-zoning the church.  
32

33 Planning Director Masyczek responded that he had advised the applicant that under the  
34 new cellular guidelines, an expansion in an R-1 zone was not permitted, and therefore staff  
35 would have to recommend denial of the project. He noted that the only way that the  
36 Commission could consider the project, was if there was a zone change to the designation  
37 of “S-1” on the property. He pointed out that the only way the applicant could proceed was  
38 with the zone change, noting that it appeared that the applicant was, indeed, planning to  
39 pursue that option, and submit for a zone change to “S-1” for the site.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

1 Commissioner Hicks suggested that the Commission should consider whether or not they  
2 would be open to a zone change for the property, so that they could offer the applicant an  
3 idea of whether or not he should bother proceeding.

4  
5 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.

6  
7 The Commission concurred that they would be in favor of a zone change to "S-1".

8  
9 Chairman Duistermars asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak  
10 regarding the item.

11  
12 Since there were none, Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:35 p.m. and  
13 asked for a motion to table the item and remove it from the calendar, pending submittal of  
14 a zone change for the property.

15  
16 It was MOVED by Commissioner Hicks and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to table  
17 Conditional Use Permit No. 03-6 and remove it from the calendar.

18  
19 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

20  
21 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,  
22 Hicks and Rhoten

23 NOES: None

24 ABSTAIN: None

25 ABSENT: None

26  
27 **B. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT NO. 03-11**

28 APPLICANT: City of Hemet

29 LOCATION: City-wide

30 PLANNER: David Sawyer

31 DESCRIPTION: An amendment of Sections 90-57 and 90-66 of the  
32 Hemet Municipal Code, clarifying non-conforming rights  
33 of multiple-family dwellings.

34  
35 The staff report was presented by Principal Planner Sawyer, who provided some details  
36 regarding the zoning ordinance amendment.

37  
38 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:44 p.m. and asked if there were any  
39 members of the public who would like to speak regarding the item.

40  
41 Since there were none, Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:44 p.m. and  
42 asked for a motion.

1 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Hicks to adopt  
2 **"Planning Commission Resolution No. 03-65"** recommending approval of Zoning  
3 Ordinance Amendment No. 03-11 to the City Council.  
4

5 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:  
6

7 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,  
8 Hicks and Rhoten

9 NOES: None

10 ABSTAIN: None

11 ABSENT: None  
12

13 **C. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 03-6 / ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-12 /**  
14 **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 03-57**

15 APPLICANT: City of Hemet

16 LOCATION: Area A: The area bounded on the north by Kimball  
17 Avenue, to the south by Acacia Avenue, to the east by  
18 Franklin Street.

19 Area B: The area bounded on the north by Florida  
20 Avenue, to the south by Kimball Avenue, to the east by  
21 Santa Fe Street, and to the west by Buena Vista Street.

22 PLANNER: David Sawyer

23 DESCRIPTION: Amend the Hemet General Plan Map and Zoning Map,  
24 changing the zoning of the properties located south of  
25 Florida Avenue and to the south and east of the current  
26 D-1 zone to better reflect the existing uses and  
27 character of the area. The proposed zoning includes D-  
28 1, R-1-D and S-1 with the specific zoning of each  
29 property dependent upon the location and existing use  
30 of the property and surrounding neighborhood.  
31

32 Principal Planner Sawyer presented the staff report, pointing out that all three items were  
33 interrelated, and that they had been in the November 18, 2003 agenda package. He  
34 stated that it was his understanding that the public hearing had been opened at that  
35 meeting, and that the Commission had some questions. He apologized for being unable  
36 to attend that meeting. He explained that the proposal included the "Downtown Residential  
37 Re-zoning", which had begun as the "D-3 idea", and had gone into a re-zone and General  
38 Plan Amendment, which would convert much of the properties in both Areas A and B, to  
39 match the existing uses in those areas. He noted that the change would address the  
40 single-family nature of the neighborhoods as well as the historic residential character.  
41  
42  
43  
44

1 Chairman Duistermars advised Principal Planner Sawyer that there had been a number  
2 of residents present at the November 18, 2003 meeting, who had expressed some  
3 concerns about artificially forcing some professional/commercial types of uses into areas  
4 where they were not currently present. He asked if this issue had been resolved, and  
5 whether the parking problems were being resolved through a different process other than  
6 re-zoning.

7  
8 Principal Planner Sawyer suggested that what was probably being referenced was the  
9 original discussions regarding have mixed uses in these areas. He explained that the  
10 mixed-use concept had been completely taken out of this amendment, and that the primary  
11 use was single-family exclusively. He pointed out that there were a couple of revisions to  
12 the amendment that staff would like to have the Commission consider for inclusion in their  
13 recommendation. He noted that the first amendment was to the Resolution indicated as  
14 Attachment No. 2 - Page 57. He stated that staff would like to add two (2) additional  
15 "WHEREAS'S" to the resolution, and read them into the record as follows:

16  
17 ***"WHEREAS, the reduction is consistent with the***  
18 ***adopted General Plan, including the Housing Element,***  
19 ***including policies for adequate provisions of housing (No.***  
20 ***5), and policies to preserve existing neighborhoods and***  
21 ***rehabilitate existing housing stock (No. 1)."***

22  
23 ***"WHEREAS, Area A and Area B are 95% developed,***  
24 ***and the remaining sites identified in the Housing Element***  
25 ***are adequate to accommodate the jurisdiction's share of***  
26 ***the regional housing needs per Section 65584 of the***  
27 ***California Code."***

28  
29 Principal Planner Sawyer then pointed out a correction to the General Plan map. He  
30 indicated a specific property on the map, explaining that it had been under preparation for  
31 awhile on the corner of Carmalita Street and Kimball Street. He noted that the property  
32 owner would like to have that property changed to the D-1 zone, which had been  
33 accommodated on the zone change, but had been inadvertently left out of the General  
34 Plan. He explained that the Commission would recommend that "Lot 22 of Block 30" be  
35 included in the "Office to Commercial" change.

36  
37 Assistant City Attorney Vail asked Principal Planner Sawyer if the "Whereas's" that had  
38 been added were intended to address the Dutra Bill findings.

39  
40 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that they were, and that there was one additional  
41 finding that he believed was already included, which stated that the project was consistent  
42 with the General Plan.

1 Assistant City Attorney Vail noted that, since the legislation actually requires specific  
2 findings rather than just recitals of fact, an additional finding would need to be added to  
3 Resolution No. 03-68, Section 2, found on Page 71, where the zone change findings are  
4 indicated. He stated that Finding No. 4 should be added to read:

5  
6 ***“The remaining sites identified in the Housing Element are***  
7 ***adequate to accommodate the jurisdiction’s share of the***  
8 ***regional housing need pursuant to Section 65584 of the***  
9 ***Government Code.”***

10  
11 Assistant City Attorney Vail explained that the “Whereas’s” had been added to the  
12 resolution with regard to the General Plan, and that they could stay, but that the Finding  
13 he had read needed to be added to the resolution regarding the zone change and that the  
14 text of the two (2) “Whereas’s” or recitals could actually be used as the supporting  
15 paragraph under that finding.

16  
17 Chairman Duistermars asked if there were any members of the public who wished to  
18 address the Commission.

19  
20 Since there were none, Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:57 p.m. and  
21 asked for a motion.

22  
23 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to  
24 adopt ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 03-24EA*** recommending approval of  
25 Environmental Assessment No. 03-57 to the City Council, for the adoption of a Negative  
26 Declaration for General Plan Amendment No. 03-6 and Zone Change No. 03-12.

27  
28 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

29  
30 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,  
31 Hicks and Rhoten

32 NOES: None

33 ABSTAIN: None

34 ABSENT: None

35  
36 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Hicks to  
37 adopt ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 03-67*** recommending approval of General  
38 Plan Amendment No. 03-6 to the City Council, as amended.

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

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

5 NOES: None

6 ABSTAIN: None

7 ABSENT: None

8  
9 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to  
10 adopt **Planning Commission Resolution No. 03-68** recommending approval of Zone  
11 Change No. 03-12 to the City Council, as amended.

12  
13 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

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

17 NOES: None

18 ABSTAIN: None

19 ABSENT: None

20  
21  
22 **VII. WORK STUDY**

23  
24 **A. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31970 - Matthew Bassi**

25 A work study session to discuss a proposed subdivision map consisting of  
26 the subdivision of 25.7 acres into 109 lots for future single-family residential  
27 development located on the south side of Devonshire Avenue between  
28 Cawston and Meyers Avenues.

29  
30 The work study session was initiated by Principal Planner Bassi who provided some details  
31 regarding the proposal.

32  
33 The discussion focused on parks, densities and lot sizes.

34  
35 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the retention basin next door  
36 was owned by Valley-Wide, and that there had been some discussion regarding whether  
37 or not it would become a park. He noted that Jeff Petrus had been conditioned to provide  
38 a 6-acre park on Cawston Avenue as part of his tract map. He explained that the current  
39 General Plan required the provision of a passive park of 1-acre or less within 1/4 mile of  
40 any subdivision, and a 5- to 20-acre park within 1/2 mile of any subdivision. He noted that,  
41 with this in mind, this project did not currently meet the General Plan park siting criteria.

1 Chairman Duistermars pointed out that one of the concerns that the Commission continued  
2 to have was the whole relationship of City projects as proposed, to the General Plan and  
3 the Park and Trail system. He stated that he knew this would take time to resolve, but that  
4 in the meantime, projects continued to come in which were maximized for the site, but  
5 which were not addressing open space, parks or any of the amenities that the Commission  
6 finds important. He advised the applicant to work very closely with staff as the study  
7 process for the projects occurs. He suggested that they take a look at what could be done  
8 to open up the project and provide some open space, and/or meandering sidewalks if the  
9 project ended up being tied to another park down the road.

10  
11 Commissioner Calkins suggested that it would be helpful if the Commission could look at  
12 something more definitive regarding what was directly around the site, and how the project  
13 would relate to those uses.

14  
15 Chairman Duistermars stated that the densities appeared to be reasonable. He noted,  
16 however, that he was aware of some concern regarding remaining parcels, and the  
17 consideration of a 10,000 square-foot minimum lot size unless amenities are provided  
18 within a project. He suggested that the applicant work with staff on this issue as well.

19  
20 Commissioner Calkins noted that the applicant should be aware that on lots with a 65-foot  
21 width, they would not be able to construct 3-car garages, which could be critical in the sale  
22 of homes.

23  
24 Chairman Duistermars advised the applicant that, as always, landscaping would be very  
25 important, with entry monuments, stamped concrete, and no two-story homes on the major  
26 streets within the subdivision.

27  
28 **B. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 03-4 / ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-10 -**

29 Matthew Bassi

30 A work study session with Charlie McLaughlin (Athalon Properties) to review  
31 his Industrial Absorption Market Study for the project located on the west  
32 side of Kirby Avenue, approximately 600-feet south of Acacia Avenue.

33  
34 The work study session was initiated by Principal Planner Bassi who provided some details  
35 and background regarding the proposal.

36  
37 Due to the absence of the applicant, discussion occurred regarding moving the item to be  
38 presented at the end of the work study sessions.

39  
40 The Commission declined to move the item and expressed their annoyance at the fact that  
41 the applicant was not yet present.

1 Principal Planner Bassi explained that the absorption study had been completed at the  
2 Commission's direction from a previous work study session, as the Commission was  
3 concerned with whether the loss of industrial land was going to significantly impact the  
4 City's future industrial uses in that area.

5  
6 Planning Director Masyczek noted that the City Council had directed staff to do an  
7 industrial inventory, as there were a couple of issues that could have an effect on the  
8 inventory, including the possible adoption of the MSHCP.

9  
10 City Council member, Marge Tandy advised the Commission, as a member of the Airport  
11 Land Use Commission(ALUC) that the ALUC had denied the project the previous  
12 Thursday.

13  
14 An employee with Alfred Gobar Associates and a representative of the applicant advised  
15 the Commission that he had prepared the economic overview of industrial demand, not  
16 only within the City of Hemet but within the southwest region. He gave the Commission  
17 an overview, noting that they do a variety of market studies, and that this one had been  
18 completed on a long-term basis.

19  
20 Discussion ensued regarding the availability of industrial land within the city.

21  
22 **C. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 03-15 - Loretta Domenigoni**

23 A work study session to discuss the construction of two mini-storage units  
24 totaling 13,290 square-feet at an existing storage facility located at 1181 N.  
25 State Street (Lock-A-Way Storage).

26  
27 The work study session was initiated by Planning Technician Domenigoni who provided  
28 some details regarding the proposal.

29  
30 The Commission reviewed the expansion plans and limited discussion occurred.

31  
32 The Commission concurred that they did not have any issues with the proposal.

33  
34 **D. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 03-17 - Maureen Losey**

35 A work study session to discuss a conditional use permit request from  
36 Farmer Boys Food, Inc. for construction of a 3,120 square-foot drive-thru  
37 restaurant located within Page Plaza on the southwest corner of Sanderson  
38 and Stetson Avenues.

39  
40 The work study session was initiated by Assistant Planner Losey who provided some  
41 details regarding the proposal.

1 Discussion focused on the appearance of the facade and drive-thru portions of the project.

2  
3 Direction was give to bring the drive-thru down and modify the facade accordingly.

4  
5 **E. DEVONSHIRE COMMERCIAL PROJECT - Matthew Bassi**

6 A work study session to review a proposal for a 20,025 square-foot  
7 commercial retail center located on the north side of Devonshire Avenue  
8 approximately 600-feet west of Sanderson Avenue.

9  
10 The work study session was initiated by Principal Planner Bassi who provided some details  
11 regarding the proposal.

12  
13 Discussion ensued and the viability of a commercial project off of Sanderson Avenue at  
14 that location was questioned.

15  
16 The Commission concurred that they would rather see the site developed as an R-P site  
17 than a commercial site, with a professional, office-type scenario, and the parking in the  
18 back so that it was not located on Devonshire Avenue.

19  
20 **F. TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 31668 - Ron Running**

21 A work study session to discuss a proposed commercial subdivision of 10.9  
22 acres at the southeast corner of Sanderson and Devonshire Avenue.

23  
24 The work study session was initiated by City Planner Running who provided some details  
25 regarding the proposal.

26  
27 Discussion of access, circulation and parking ensued.

28  
29 The Commission suggested that the architecture should be located near the street, with  
30 the gas tanks in the back. It was also noted that drive-thru restaurants were not desirable,  
31 and that the uses should be upscaled.

32  
33  
34 **VIII. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**

35  
36 There were no Planning Director items discussed.

1 **IX. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

2  
3 Chairman Duistermars reported that he and Vice Chairman Jones had met with the 2+2  
4 Committee, which was also comprised of Council Members Lowe and Alberg. He noted  
5 that there had been fruitful discussion regarding process and policy, and that the Council  
6 had asked the Planning Commission to develop its own vision for the City, in terms of a  
7 Park & Trails Plan and Traffic Circulation. He asked for this to be agendized as a  
8 discussion item at the next meeting.

9  
10 Discussion occurred regarding communication issues between the Planning Commission  
11 and the City Council.

12  
13  
14 **X. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

15  
16 There were no future agenda items requested.

17  
18  
19 **XI. ADJOURNMENT**

20  
21 It was MOVED by Commissioner Calkins, SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten and  
22 unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 7:52 p.m. to the regular meeting of the  
23 City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **Tuesday, January 6, 2004 at 6:00**  
24 **p.m.** to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue,  
25 Hemet, California 92543.

26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 \_\_\_\_\_  
32 Bob Duistermars, Chairman

33  
34 ATTEST:

35  
36  
37 \_\_\_\_\_  
38 Myrna Kasick, Minutes Secretary