

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  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

**PLANNING**  **COMMISSION**

---

**MEETING MINUTES**

**DATE:** May 3, 2011

**CALLED TO ORDER: 6:00 P.M.**

**MEETING LOCATION:** City Council Chambers  
450 East Latham Avenue  
Hemet, CA 92543

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**PRESENT:** Chairman John Gifford, Vice Chairman Sharon Deuber, and Commissioners Vince Overmyer, David Rogers and Chauncey Thompson

**ABSENT:** None

**Invocation and Flag Salute:** Commissioner Overmeyer

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None**

**3. PUBLIC COMMENTS: None**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**4. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT 10-005 – AMENDMENTS TO THE ZONING CODE REGARDING THE DOWNTOWN OVERLAY ZONE AND THE D-1 AND D-2 ZONES**

**APPLICANT:** City-initiated

**LOCATION:** Downtown area between Inez Street and Buena Vista Street; and Kimball Avenue and properties north of Devonshire Ave.

**PLANNER:** Ron Running

**DESCRIPTION:** A zoning ordinance amendment of Chapter 90, Articles II, XXVI and XXVII, of the Hemet Municipal Code to revise the development standards, permitted uses, and review procedures for the D-1 and D-2 zones.

The staff report was presented by City Planner Running.

1 Community Development Director (CDD) Elliano handed out a revision list and stated  
2 that none of the revisions were substantive, but more for clarification purposes. The  
3 10-foot setback, she explained, would be an average of 10 feet, as some of the  
4 sidewalks or insets are less than 10 feet. Also on page 11, she pointed out, it refers to  
5 downtown zones development standards, which essentially are the same as they were  
6 in the D-1 and D-2 zones, but she suggests adding, in note 3 regarding alleyways, "*In*  
7 *locations where the existing adjacent properties are set back less than 10 feet, a*  
8 *reduced setback may be considered, provided that clear visibility for vehicular travel is*  
9 *maintained.*"

10  
11 Chairman Gifford reminded the audience and Commission that this is the continuation  
12 of an item begun in April, and that the discussion should be restricted to the ordinance  
13 itself, and not specific projects in the area. He asked Planner Running if the downtown  
14 design guidelines had been prepared yet.

15  
16 Planner Running responded that they were still in process; however, the commercial  
17 design guidelines had been established, and next would be to modify and expand the  
18 HUB of the Valley guidelines for downtown.

19  
20 Chairman Gifford also wanted to know about existing uses that would not be allowed  
21 under the revised zoning ordinance, such as pawn shops, and what would be done  
22 with them.

23  
24 Planner Running responded that they would be able to continue in operation until such  
25 time that they ceased. Then there is a six-month period during which they can  
26 reactivate, and if they don't, then they are unable to re-establish.

27  
28 There ensued a discussion regarding prohibition of signs painted on buildings and can  
29 signs, defined as a sign affixed to a wall within a frame, plexiglass, with text painted on,  
30 but illuminated from within. Most Commission members were in favor of murals or  
31 paintings on walls of historic buildings depicting the historic background of the city,  
32 further delineated as art and culture versus advertising.

33  
34 CDD Elliano suggested that, for tonight, in subsection B, the first portion should simply  
35 be deleted and should say, "***can signs are prohibited.***" When staff comes back  
36 with the sign ordinance for the downtown and with the downtown guidelines, they will  
37 have appropriate examples of what "painted on the building" would mean.

38  
39 Vice Chair Deuber asked if it would be appropriate to say "*signs painted on buildings*  
40 *for the purpose of advertising are with city approval only.*"

41  
42 Planner Running stated that perhaps painted signs could be allowed with Planning  
43 Commission review.

44  
45 Vice Chair Deuber also inquired about the 1920-vintage historic bungalows on Harvard  
46 Street, asking if adding the verbiage in A-1 of "refurbish" (or restore the history) would  
47 be more accurate than "remodel" (or change the architecture).

48  
49 CDD Elliano clarified that in the D-1 and D-2 zones, which were established in 2001,  
50 no residential structures had been built because it is a commercial zone, but if  
somebody wanted to refurbish, restore, or rehabilitate their single-family home that was

1 already existing before 2001, they could do so. However, if it is torn down and no walls  
2 are left standing, then it's a new home and that type of construction would not be  
3 allowed.

4  
5 Planner Running suggested inclusion, in the site development section, of a paragraph  
6 explaining the limitations that pertain to the refurbishing of existing single-family  
7 structures.

8  
9 Chairman Gifford felt that page 14, Section 90-47.1 already covers that issue, as it  
10 states that a reconstruction of any existing structure or facade of more than 20 percent  
11 requires a permit for conditional use.

12  
13 City Attorney Jex agreed that this section would apply to both commercial and  
14 residential structures.

15  
16 Commissioner Thompson asked about natural disasters (fire, earthquake) rendering a  
17 house structurally unsound. Would the owner have to rebuild as commercial?

18  
19 Planner Running stated that they could rebuild because it is a permitted use existing  
20 prior to 2001 and would be under the legal nonconforming section.

21  
22 CDD Elliano explained that what the plan is trying to accomplish was a recognition of  
23 what is on the ground – to let people enjoy the use of their property. However, when  
24 they are ready to transition to some other use, then it needs to be consistent with the  
25 goals and code requirements for downtown. In case of a natural disaster, the rebuild  
26 would essentially be replacing the structure. Planner Running further explained that in  
27 the HUB of the Valley section under parking, page 11, Section 90-935, there is a  
28 provision that in case of a fire, a property owner could rebuild up to 120 percent of what  
29 had been existing prior to the fire, but he felt there should probably be a paragraph in  
30 the ordinance relating to residential uses.

31  
32 Chairman Gifford suggested that because timing was critical and there were a few  
33 changes that the Commission wanted made, that staff be allowed to make the changes  
34 and apply them correctly. Then, if Commissioners disapprove, they could go to the  
35 City Council when the item appears and object at that time.

36  
37 Commissioner Rogers asked why the downtown collaborative was being eliminated  
38 and why it was established in the first place.

39  
40 Planner Running responded that the downtown collaborative was unwieldy and they  
41 were trying to streamline the review process. He explained that while it was  
42 established in the spirit of community involvement and concern for the downtown area,  
43 it was not a review body, like the Commission or Council, the way it was written. The  
44 review process and community involvement are now facilitated here, by the public  
45 review process in place, which is more in keeping with planning practices.

46  
47 Chairman Gifford inquired as to whether the residents and businesses had been given  
48 notice of the meeting.

49  
50 Planner Running responded that they had.

1 Chairman Gifford opened the public hearing and invited James Calkins to approach the  
2 lectern.

3  
4 Mr. Calkins, 1631 Calathea Rd., Hemet, California approached the lectern and  
5 addressed the Commission, stating that he felt the ordinance would be a big help not  
6 only to developers, but also to staff in order to accelerate the development process,  
7 which had been cumbersome, misleading, inconsistent and incompatible. He also  
8 mentioned that the collaborative effort had never materialized, partly because so many  
9 of the property owners resided out of town.

10  
11 Paul Wutzler, 296 North Cornell, Hemet, California indicated the location of his  
12 property on the map, and asked if it would be affected by the ordinance. He was told  
13 by Planner Running that his property was outside the D-1/D-2 zones, so the ordinance  
14 would not govern his property.

15  
16 Chairman Gifford closed the public hearing and asked for a motion.

17  
18 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Rogers and **SECONDED** by Vice Chair Deuber to  
19 adopt Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 11-007, **approving** Zoning Ordinance  
20 Amendment No. 10-005 with revision to Chapter 90-934, Subsection B, removing the  
21 painted sign provision, and adding a paragraph dealing with natural disaster  
22 destruction of residential structures.

23  
24 The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote:

25  
26 **AYES:** Chairman Gifford, Vice Chairman Deuber, and Commissioners Overmyer,  
27 Rogers and Thompson  
28 **NOES:** None  
29 **ABSTAIN:** None  
30 **ABSENT:** None  
31

32 *(Adopted Planning Commission Resolution No. 11-004.)*  
33

## 34 DEPARTMENT REPORTS

### 35 36 37 **5. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORTS:**

#### 38 39 **A. Report on City Council actions from the April 26, 2011 meeting**

40  
41 CDD Elliano reported that the City Council had adopted the shopping cart ordinance  
42 with a fee that covers about 50 percent of the City's cost to review and inspect the cart  
43 retrieval plan. Although there was an amnesty period before the fees were enacted, no  
44 retailer picked up abandoned carts that had been taken to the city yard, so they were  
45 all taken to a recycler.

46  
47 Another item discussed at City Council meeting as the Redevelopment Agency was the  
48 governor's proposal to end redevelopment. The city took action to support some of the  
49 alternative proposals being advanced.  
50

1           **B. Upcoming events and informational items**

2  
3 CDD Elliano reported that Patricia Yepremian, current operator of the Saturday  
4 morning Farmer's Market, had requested a Wednesday night market. This requires an  
5 administrative use permit, and the applicant is hoping to start the market by the end of  
6 May or beginning of June.  
7

8  
9 **6. CITY ATTORNEY REPORTS:     None**

10  
11  
12 **7. PLANNING COMMISSIONER REPORTS:**

13  
14       **A. Chairman Gifford:**

15  
16 Chairman Gifford reported that he had attended the grand opening of the rebuilt  
17 McDonald's on Florida Avenue, assessing it as a big success, particularly the  
18 landscaping. He also wondered about the progress of the acute care hospital that had  
19 been approved for 18 months.  
20

21 CDD Elliano responded that the last staff had heard, they weren't making much  
22 progress.  
23

24       **B. Vice Chair Deuber: Nothing to report.**

25  
26       **C. Commissioner Overmyer:**

27  
28 Commissioner Overmyer requested that a report be given regarding the "human  
29 signage" in the downtown area. He was told that staff and the City Attorney would  
30 return with a report on that because there are some free speech constitutional issues  
31 involved.  
32

33       **D. Commissioner Rogers:**

34  
35 Reported that he had been through the McDonald's also and commended the  
36 landscaping, lighting, and the wrought iron gate recommended by Vice Chair Deuber.  
37

38       **E. Commissioner Thompson: Nothing to report.**

39  
40 **8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

41  
42       **A. Extension Of Time 11-001 for CUP 05-002 (Senior Apartments at NWC of**  
43       **Sanderson & Devonshire Aves.)**

44       **B. CUP 10-008 for an addition at the Inland Valley Baptist Fellowship**

45       **C. CUP 10-014 for a Europrecast Concrete (a manufacturer of walls)**

46       **D. CUP 11-001 (Verizon at Apple Urgent Care at 1011 S. State Street)**

47       **E. Site Development Review (Downtown Project Review) 11-001 for the burned**  
48       **building at NWC of Florida & Carmelita Aves.**

49       **F. Tres Cerritos will probably be ready in June**  
50

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  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

9. **ADJOURNMENT:** It was the consensus of the Planning Commission that the meeting be adjourned at 6:53 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **Tuesday, May 17, 2011 at 6:00 p.m.** to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 East Latham Avenue, Hemet, CA 92543.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John Gifford, Chairman  
Hemet Planning Commission

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Nancie Shaw, Records Secretary  
Hemet Planning Commission