

1 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni
2 DESCRIPTION: A request for approval of a conditional use permit to
3 construct a new shopping center consisting of three (3)
4 multi-tenant buildings totaling 87,992 square-feet,
5 located on the south side of Florida Avenue between
6 Sanderson Avenue and Kirby Street (directly adjacent
7 to In & Out Burger).
8

9 The Staff Report was introduced by Planning Technician Domenigoni, who provided some
10 details regarding the project.
11

12 Commissioner Calkins noted that the exhibit did not quite match the site plan that was
13 provided, as the site plan indicated that the proposed project would extend all the way over
14 to the Bell Tower Plaza.
15

16 Planning Technician Domenigoni explained that the office building was exclusive of the
17 project, but that the project did, in fact, extend all the way over to the Bell Tower Plaza.
18 She added that the applicant was proposing to remove the current Bell Tower Plaza sign
19 and replace it with a new monument sign to identify the office buildings in the back, as well
20 as the new shopping center.
21

22 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:06 p.m.
23

24 Charlie Smith of Westrust approached the lectern as the project applicant and stated that
25 he would be happy to answer any questions, as would the rest of the group that was with
26 him.
27

28 Scott Lorenz of Westrust approached the lectern and advised the Commission that the
29 proposed project had been developed in close communication with several of the tenants
30 that they were working with. He noted that they did not have signed leases yet and could,
31 therefore, not release the names of those tenants, but added that all three were new to
32 Hemet.
33

34 Assistant Planner Domenigoni displayed a photo of the existing sign, which was intended
35 to be removed.
36

37 Commissioner Searl expressed his interest in the grading plan.
38

39 Principal Engineer Biagioni responded to some of Commissioner Searl's concerns, and a
40 discussion ensued regarding the grading and fill for the project.
41

42 Milford Raleigh of Carter + Burgess approached the lectern as the project
43 architect/engineer and discussed the drainage pattern for the project.
44

1 Commissioner Searl asked how the lighting and noise factor for the buildings to the south
2 would be mitigated.

3
4 Mr. Raleigh responded that the lighting would be directed in such a way that it would not
5 be reflected onto adjacent residences.

6
7 Mr. Lorenz added that an acoustical report had been completed which indicated that
8 nothing beyond the current design would be necessary.

9
10 Planning Director Masyczek noted for the Commission that the project would be
11 conditioned to have limited times for delivery and stocking, which would mean that there
12 would be minimal noise concerns.

13
14 Don and Loretta Landry approached the lectern as nearby residents of the project and the
15 new owners of the Casa Del Sol R.V. Resort. Mr. Landry expressed concern with the
16 drainage ditch behind their property, and whether it would be sufficient to handle the
17 drainage. He asked whether the road that ran behind Casa Del Sol would be eliminated
18 or remain in place.

19
20 Commissioner Searl responded that the road would remain in place.

21
22 Mr. Landry inquired regarding the gate in the back of Casa Del Sol that includes a gate that
23 accesses the shopping center. He asked if his understanding was correct that there would
24 be a second wall installed by Westrust, which would make two walls standing between the
25 project and Casa Del Sol. He suggested that the height of the wall be increased instead
26 of building a second wall.

27
28 Mr. Lorenz advised Mr. Landry that there would not be two walls, but rather that
29 improvements would be made to the existing wall.

30
31 Ms. Landry expressed concern with the noise from the construction that may disturb her
32 existing tenants.

33
34 Planning Director Masyczek advised Mr. Landry that there were limited hours of
35 construction, per the Hemet Municipal Code, so there should be relatively little disturbance.

36
37 Chairman Duistermars asked if there was some way that things could be perked up a little
38 on the east elevation, since there were a large number of people who would be accessing
39 the office building on that side.

40
41 Sam Saludo of Carter + Burgess approached the lectern and addressed the idea of
42 enhancing the east elevation. He suggested that they could enhance it through color, or
43
44

1 that they could add a lattice type treatment with plants and vines growing on it. He went
2 on to offer other ideas of enhancement.

3
4 Commissioner Rhoten asked if they could do something such as what was proposed for
5 the south elevation.

6
7 Chairman Duistermars suggested that the blank wall be broken up somehow, noting that
8 if the drawing was proportional he had a problem with it. He stated that he did not like the
9 idea of a blank wall on the east elevation at all.

10
11 Mr. Lorenz stated that they could take a look at adding a pilaster or two, every 30 or 40
12 feet, to dress the east side up.

13
14 The Commission agreed that this would be an acceptable idea.

15
16 Commissioner Calkins expressed his concern with whether the project had been reviewed
17 by the Engineering Division from the standpoint of a driveway on Florida Avenue, noting
18 that there were so many driveways going in and out of the adjacent shopping center that
19 he could foresee a problem with those trying to enter versus those trying to exit.

20
21 Planning Director Masyczek responded that it appeared that the distance between
22 driveways was greater than most.

23
24 Principal Engineer Biagioni advised the Commission that no new driveways would be
25 created with this project, noting that the existing driveways would be utilized.

26
27 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that a traffic analysis had been
28 performed, which did not indicate any conflicts or additional recommendations.

29
30 Chairman Duistermars asked if the driveways would be "right-turn-only".

31
32 Planning Director Masyczek responded that they more than likely would, but noted that
33 until medians were installed on Florida Avenue, left turns would continue to be an issue.

34
35 A discussion ensued regarding the existing driveways and landscaping.

36
37 Mr. Lorenz stated that the existing driveway would definitely be improved.

38 Chairman Duistermars asked if there were any other members of the public who wished
39 to speak regarding the project.

40
41 Since there were none, Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:33 p.m.

42
43 A gentleman from the audience stated that he had a question regarding the signage.
44

1 Chairman Duistermars re-opened the public hearing at 6:33 p.m. and asked the gentleman
2 to come forward to the lectern and ask his question on the record.

3
4 John O'Carroll approached the lectern as the soon-to-be adjacent property owner of the
5 office complex at the Bell Tower Plaza. He stated that he had been notified several weeks
6 ago that the signage was proposed to be changed. He noted that it was his understanding
7 that there were three property owners who had concerns regarding the signage. He
8 advised the Commission that if there was going to be a change to the signage in any way,
9 he would like to have a say in what was going on since he would be an existing property
10 owner.

11
12 Chairman Duistermars advised Mr. O'Carroll that he was welcome to come forward and
13 take a look at the signage that was being proposed, but noted that signage was not being
14 considered as a part of this project, and was, in fact, dealt with under a different type of
15 permit.

16
17 Mr. O'Carroll reiterated that he would like to be involved in any changes that were being
18 proposed to the signage. He explained that several years ago the City had wanted the Bell
19 Tower Plaza sign upgraded, and noted that approximately \$10,000 had been spent on the
20 upgrading of the sign at that time. He stated that he could not understand how it could be
21 in disrepair after the extensive upgrades.

22
23 Chairman Duistermars responded that the sign was, indeed, in disrepair, noting that it
24 might not be cosmetically, but that structurally there were some problems.

25
26 Mr. O'Carroll expressed his appreciation regarding the Commission's requirement to add
27 enhancement to the east elevation of the proposed building.

28
29 Mr. Lorenz noted that, while the sign was on their property, they did not have unilateral
30 rights to the sign.

31
32 Mr. O'Carroll stated that there was a need to differentiate between the monument itself and
33 the sign, noting that there were two different issues involved.

34
35 Planning Director Masyczeks advised Mr. O'Carroll that he would be dealing with staff on
36 that issue.

37
38 Chairman Duistermars re-closed the public hearing at 6:40 p.m. and asked for a motion.

39
40 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
41 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 04-16EA*, approving a Negative Declaration
42 for Conditional Use Permit No. 04-12.

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
2

3 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Rhoten and Searl
4 NOES: None
5 ABSTAIN: None
6 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones
7

8 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-14EA.***
9

10 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
11 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 04-78* approving Conditional Use Permit
12 No. 04-12, as amended.
13

14 Planning Director Masyczek read the changes into the record as follows:
15

16 ***Condition No. 88: "The delivery hours shall be limited from between 6 a.m.
17 and 10 p.m., seven days per week."***
18

19 ***Condition No. 89: "Revised east side elevations shall be submitted to the
20 Planning Director for review and approval showing the
21 addition of at least two pilasters."***
22

23 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
24

25 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Rhoten and Searl
26 NOES: None
27 ABSTAIN: None
28 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones
29

30 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-79.***
31
32

33 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS**
34

35 There were no public meetings sheduled on the agenda.
36
37

38 **VI. WORK STUDY**
39

40 There were no work study items scheduled on the agenda.
41
42
43
44

1 **VII. CONSENT CALENDAR**

2
3 There were no consent calendar items on the agenda.
4

5
6 **VIII. UPDATE OF CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS ON PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS**

7
8 **A. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 03-7 / ENVIRONMENTAL**
9 **ASSESSMENT NO. 04-2 (JOHN PETTY / JDP DEVELOPMENT)**

10
11 **B. SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 03-3 / ENVIRONMENTAL**

12
13 **C. ZONE CHANGE NO. 04-10 / VARIANCE NO. 04-2 / TENTATIVE PARCEL**
14 **MAP NO. 32678 - (REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT)**

15
16 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that Item Nos. VIII. A. B. & C. had
17 all been approved by the City Council at their meeting of December 14, 2004.
18

19
20 **IX. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**

21
22 There were no Planning Director items scheduled on this agenda.
23

24
25 **X. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

26
27 **A. RETENTION BASINS, DRY WELLS AND DROUGHT TOLERANT**
28 **LANDSCAPING - Vice Chairman Jones**

29
30 Chairman Duistermars noted that the Commission was asking that some landscaping
31 issues and water conservation issues be formally placed on an upcoming agenda, where
32 scheduled and times can be discussed.
33

34 Planning Director Masyczek stated that this would be placed on the next agenda.
35

36 Commissioner Rhoten noted that she was still trying to get a copy of the Trails section of
37 the General Plan.
38

39
40 **XI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**
41
42
43
44

1 **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

2
3 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
4 adjourn the meeting at 6:41 p.m. to the regularly scheduled meeting of January 4, 2005 at
5 6:00 p.m. at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 East Latham Avenue,
6 Hemet, California 92543.

7
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**