

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: June 21, 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 Thompson

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Rogers and **SECONDED** by Vice Chairman Deuber to approve the May 3, 2011 minutes, as presented.

AYES: Chairman Gifford, Vice Chairman Deuber, and Commissioners Rogers, Thompson and Overmyer

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS: None

PUBLIC HEARINGS

**4. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 11-001 (VERIZON @ APPLE URGENT CARE)
- Continued from May 17, 2011**

APPLICANT: Los Angeles SMSA LP dba Verizon Wireless

AGENT: Randi Newton Spectrum Surveying & Engineering

LOCATION: 1001 South State Street

PLANNER: Carole Kendrick

DESCRIPTION: A request for Planning Commission review and approval of a conditional use permit to install and operate a ground-mounted wireless facility and associated equipment, consisting of a 60-foot pole camouflaged as a monopalm tree, and equipment.

1 A PowerPoint presentation was given by Assistant Planner, Carole Kendrick,
2 whereupon Chairman Gifford asked for questions from the Commissioners.

3
4 Commissioner Rogers inquired as to how long the recipients had to respond to the
5 letters sent by the applicant.

6
7 Planner Kendrick stated that the letters were sent out on June 2nd and the recipients
8 were asked to respond as soon as possible if they were interested in the proposal.

9
10 Vice Chair Deuber found it curious that the owner of the R-3 property requested the
11 facility be located on his property, and Planner Kendrick responded that they felt it
12 would benefit their residents and they would have better coverage. When Planner
13 Kendrick informed them that they were not zoned appropriately, they indicated they
14 were in support of the project.

15
16 Chairman Gifford, having opened the public hearing and noting that no one responded,
17 asked for a motion on the item.

18
19 It was **MOVED** by Vice Chairman Deuber and **SECONDED** by Commissioner
20 Overmyer to **ADOPT** Planning Commission Bill No. 11-013 **APPROVING** Conditional
21 Use Permit No. 11-001, as presented.

22
23 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

24
25 AYES: Chairman Gifford, Vice Chairman Deuber, and Commissioners Rogers,
26 Thompson and Overmyer

27 NOES: None

28 ABSTAIN: None

29 ABSENT: None
30

31 ***Adopted Planning Commission Resolution No. 11-009.***

32
33 **5. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 11-002 (FAITH WORLD HARVEST CHURCH)**

34
35 **APPLICANT:** Faith World Harvest Church

36 **AGENT:** Jeremy Swizek

37 **LOCATION:** 630 West Latham Avenue

38 **PLANNER:** Soledad Carrisoza

39 **DESCRIPTION:** A request for Planning Commission review and approval of a
40 conditional use permit to partially convert an existing 29,619 square-foot
41 structure to a community church that will include administrative offices,
42 classrooms, a nursery, and a multipurpose room on a 1.29-acre parcel located
43 on the north side of Latham Avenue between Gilbert and Tahquitz Streets, with
44 consideration of an environmental exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines
45 Section 15301.
46

47
48 The staff report was presented by Planning Technician Soledad Carrisoza who also
49 gave a PowerPoint explanation of the Conditional Use Permit application.

50
Chairman Gifford reported that he had been to the site, but had no contact with the
applicant. He asked about the sauna and jacuzzi and what would be done with them.

1 He also asked if the pool would be removed or taken out of service permanently at
2 some time in the future, and wanted to know the meeting schedule.
3

4 Planner Carrisoza reported that the sauna and jacuzzi would remain, but would be
5 blocked off from access or locked. If growth occurs in the future and they propose a
6 fellowship hall, then the doors will be opened, but there is no definite time frame. The
7 area they are proposing is sufficient for their needs at this time. Future growth and
8 funding will determine expansion needs. The facility will be used on Sunday mornings
9 and Wednesday nights for youth and adult class meetings.
10

11 Commissioner Overmyer wanted to know about the reciprocal parking contractual
12 arrangements they have with the medical offices there for the purchased lot on
13 Devonshire Avenue, and should the arrangement changes, if it would render the new
14 lot useless.
15

16 Planner Carrisoza stated that there was an agreement, and that a copy of the contract
17 was part of the Planning Commission packet. The parking requirements, she noted,
18 were indicated in the staff report.
19

20 Commissioner Overmyer commented that based on the many unoccupied areas in the
21 building, he didn't feel that the building suited the requested use. He also noted that
22 this was a nonprofit use and would not generate jobs. It was his hope that in five years
23 the economy would have recovered enough that a business or a club would occupy
24 that space.
25

26 Commissioner Rogers asked if anyone was occupying the building now and if the trash
27 area was to code.
28

29 Planner Carrisoza said she was not aware of a current occupant and that the trash
30 area was not to city standards, so it would be replaced.
31

32 Commissioner Rogers was also concerned about fire and emergency exits, and asked
33 if any of them were located within the areas that would be blocked off.
34

35 Planner Carrisoza stated that an exit would be added.
36

37 Commissioner Thompson noted that there would be traffic congestion on Latham
38 Avenue if 160 people would be exiting all at the same time on a Sunday afternoon.
39

40 Chairman Gifford then opened the public hearing and asked for the architect or
41 representative to approach.
42

43 David Madden, (40984 Oak Creek Rd., Murrieta), responded to Chairman Gifford's
44 question regarding the sound system and soundproofing by stating that the walls were
45 masonry CMU walls, and they would need to put some sort of sound-absorbing
46 devices on the inside, such as wall-curtains and cloth seating. With those
47 modifications the sound should be fairly well contained. The location of the
48 multipurpose room is also on the east side of the building, furthest away from the
49 apartments behind the building.
50

1 Chairman Gifford also asked about the sound system for special meetings and
2 concerts.

3
4 Lisa Swizek (26032 Dumont Road, Hemet) stated that all such events were held
5 concurrently with the regular Sunday and Wednesday meetings. A special concert
6 might be held on a Sunday evening, so it would not disturb the surrounding
7 businesses.

8
9 CDD Elliano noted that conditions were included, in regard to noise, which would
10 pertain to the interior of the building. If at any time they wanted to have an exterior
11 program, they would have to get a temporary use permit, and the city would regulate
12 the noise levels.

13
14 Chairman Gifford noted that although a pool would be a good thing for baptisms, he
15 wanted to know their plans.

16
17 Ms. Swizek stated that they felt it best to remove the pool and saunas for safety
18 reasons.

19
20 Commissioner Overmyer inquired if this location was envisioned as a permanent or
21 transitional location for the church.

22
23 Ms. Swizek stated that it would probably be transitional. The congregation wants to
24 build, but because of the economy and members' loss of employment, the building
25 would work well on a temporary basis.

26
27 Chairman Gifford asked the architect if any of the proposed changes would prohibit the
28 building from being converted back into a gymnasium or club in the future.

29
30 Mr. Madden replied that the basketball court would remain as it is. The section of the
31 building with the pool is in much disrepair, with the ceiling loose, and with mold and rot
32 throughout. The steel frames on the doors are rotted out completely.

33
34 Commissioner Rogers wanted to know about repairs to the outside, such as painting,
35 since there was some graffiti on the front.

36
37 Mr. Madden advised that the following repairs were planned: 1) the eaves will be
38 chopped back a foot to eliminate the wood rot; 2) a patio on the north end of the
39 building would be removed; 3) the roof would be cut back; 4) the slope conditions on
40 the far side back end would be repaired; 5) landscaping would be relocated; 6)
41 sidewalks would be ripped out; and 7) the trash enclosure and side lining would be
42 redone. He noted that since the building was CMU they weren't proposing any painting
43 other than upkeep.

44
45 Vice Chair Deuber asked about Condition Nos. 22 and 111 relating to the housing and
46 feeding of transients.

47
48 Ms. Swizek indicated that they would continue their present practice, which was to go
49 to different locations within the community and distribute groceries and personal items.
50 They do not have staff on the premises to handle such things, so if someone comes to
the church, they are told that the church does not distribute goods in that manner.

1 Commissioner Overmyer wondered if the lease was just for the parking lot or for the
2 building as well.

3
4 Mr. Madden stated that the building was being purchased, but the reciprocal parking
5 was an easement.

6
7 Chairman Gifford closed the public hearing, noting that the building structure would not
8 be changed to a point that it could not be reconverted to a commercial structure,
9 should the economy revive and should the church desire to sell it. He felt that was
10 reasonable.

11
12 Vice Chairman Deuber liked the fact that the ongoing vandalism problem with the
13 building would be resolved with occupation.

14
15 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Rogers and **SECONDED** by Commissioner
16 Thompson to **ADOPT** Planning Commission Bill No. 11-008 **APPROVING** Conditional
17 Use Permit No. 11-002 as presented.

18
19 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

20
21 AYES: Chairman Gifford, Vice Chairman Deuber, and Commissioners Rogers,
22 Thompson and Overmyer

23 NOES: None

24 ABSTAIN: None

25 ABSENT: None

26
27 ***Adopted Planning Commission Resolution No. 11-010.***

28
29 **6. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 35990 (MAP NO. 11-001 – CORWIN RANCH)**

30
31 **APPLICANT:** Corwin, Inc.

32 **AGENT:** Matt Brudein – Engineering Resources of So. CA, Inc.

33 **LOCATION:** 895 North Hemet Street

34 **PLANNER:** Carole Kendrick

35 **DESCRIPTION:** A request for Planning Commission review and approval of a
36 tentative tract map for the subdivision of 2.54 acres into 12 lots for the future
37 development of single-family residential units located at the northwest corner of
38 Hemet Street and Annisa Avenue, with consideration of an environmental
39 exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15332.

40
41 Assistant Planner Kendrick presented the staff report, including a PowerPoint
42 presentation. She advised that the applicant was not proposing any homes or
43 architecture at this time, but simply a subdivision of lots, and that they would be
44 required to do a site development review, consistent with existing standards.

45
46 Commissioner Overmyer asked about the position of the wood fences, and Planner
47 Kendrick indicated that they would apply to interior sites

48
49 Commissioner Overmyer requested that staff review the fencing and specify masonry
50 walls.

1 CDD Elliano indicated that they could do that as a condition on the tentative tract map,
2 as an alternative, add the condition of having the site development review come back
3 to the Commission when they have a builder that's ready with a product, and then the
4 Commission could look at the fencing plan, as well as the single-story and two-story
5 mix. Otherwise, it would be staff level review, which would require consistency with
6 existing ordinances and design guidelines.

7
8 Chairman Gifford opened the public hearing and invited the applicant's representative,
9 Jim Morrissey, to the lectern.

10
11 Jim Morrissey (41738 Fulton Avenue, Hemet), approached the lectern and advised the
12 Commission that the property owner was not proposing to develop the property
13 himself, so it would be available for sale. The subsequent owner would propose the
14 home designs. He stated that he would like Condition Nos. 52 and 53 on page 8 to be
15 eliminated, as these are individual lots. He also had a question on Condition No. 55
16 and asked the City Engineer to clarify.

17
18 City Engineer Jorge Biagioni stated that Condition Nos. 52 and 53 could be eliminated.
19 Condition No. 55, he explained, was the result of problems that the city was having
20 with nuisance water in gutters, so the City Council passed the condition for city
21 standards that indicated that new development had to put small catch basins every 600
22 feet to pick up nuisance water. In this case, he didn't think they had anything nearby to
23 connect that would warrant that, so the condition was essentially a moot point and
24 could be removed.

25
26 Commissioner Rogers asked the intent of the City Council in making that requirement.

27
28 City Engineer Biagioni stated that it was primarily a maintenance issue that created
29 standing water because the slope in the streets was minimal and water accumulated in
30 the gutters, creating problems, such as moss.

31
32 Mr. Morrissey indicated that they did not have any problem with the remaining
33 conditions.

34
35 When Vice Chair Deuber asked about Condition No. 8 and requiring masonry walls as
36 a condition, Mr. Morrissey stated that it was probably not appropriate for him to
37 respond because they would not be the developer. He noted, however, that if
38 everyone in like developments throughout the city would be required to do that, they
39 would comply. However, if it's only applied on a case-by-case basis, he didn't think that
40 was the proper thing to do.

41
42 CDD Elliano suggested that the best solution might be to modify Condition No. 8 to
43 have it require that at the time of site development review with the project returning to
44 the Planning Commission for review of the fencing and the architecture. Since it is
45 unknown whether the property will be developed within one year or ten, it's possible
46 that the city fencing standards will have changed, so the Commission will have an
47 opportunity to look at the project in terms of existing standards at that time.

48
49 After discussion between Vice Chair Deuber, Planner Kendrick and CDD Elliano, it was
50 decided to move Condition No. 8 to be part of the site development review, modify

1 Condition No. 18 to be a Planning Commission review, delete Conditions 52, 53, and
2 55, and add Condition 101.

3
4 It was **MOVED** by Vice Chair Deuber and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Overmyer to
5 **ADOPT** Planning Commission Bill No. 11-014 **APPROVING** Tentative Tract Map No.
6 35990, with modifications to the Conditions of Approval as follows:

- 7
8 • Move Condition No. 8 to be located under Design Review as Item C
9
10 • Modify Condition No. 18 to read as follows:

11
12 18. *Prior to the issuance of a building permit for any house on any lot, the*
13 *applicant shall submit a site development plan that is consistent with the*
14 *Single Family Residential Design Guidelines for Planning Department*
15 *review and approval by the Planning Commission Community Development*
16 *Director. After approval of the plot plan, the Planning Director shall have*
17 *the authority to adjust up to 20% of the home plot plans. The plans shall*
18 *show:*

19
20
21 a. *The plotting of the proposed home on the lot and shall indicate a*
22 *minimum 10-foot by 10-foot, or 8-foot by 12-foot patio area, or alternative*
23 *patio area acceptable to the Planning Commission outside of the*
24 *required setback area for each home plotted.*

25
26 b. *Landscaping plans shall show planting for all slopes over 5 feet in height*
27 *and shall show the location of all walls throughout the subdivision. The*
28 *planting shall consist of 5-gallon shrubs, ground cover spaced at 12-*
29 *inches on-center. Hydro-seeding of slopes in conjunction with other*
30 *planting may be acceptable when approved by the Planning*
31 *Commission.*

32
33
34 c. *Maximum 6-foot high masonry walls for each home shall be installed in*
35 *accordance with the City of Hemet Municipal Code and Single Family*
36 *Residential Design Guidelines, on the exterior side and/or rear property*
37 *lines of each lot. The color of walls shall match or be complimentary to*
38 *the color of the homes. Maximum 6-foot high walls, including wood*
39 *fences, shall be installed in accordance with the City of Hemet Municipal*
40 *Code and Single Family Residential Design Guidelines, on the interior*
41 *side and rear property lines of each lot. If wood fences are utilized, then*
42 *the wood fences shall be installed in compliance with applicable City of*
43 *Hemet standards including, but not limited to, any wood fence details as*
44 *approved by the City of Hemet.*

- 45
46 • Strike Condition Nos. 52, 53, and 55
47
48 • Add Condition No. 101 to read as follows:

49
50 101. *Prior to the approval of any final map, the property shall be annexed to a*
Community Facilities District ("CFD") established under the Mello-Roos

1 Community Facilities Act of 1982 (Government Code § 53311 et seq.)
2 established by the City of Hemet for the provision of police, fire and
3 emergency medical services (collectively "Public Safety Services") and
4 shall be subject to the special tax approved with the formation of the
5 CFD. The City of Hemet Resolution 3193 establishes mitigation fees for
6 all new development to reduce the impact of development on city
7 services.
8

9 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
10

11 AYES: Chairman Gifford, Vice Chairman Deuber, and Commissioners Rogers,
12 Thompson and Overmyer
13 NOES: None
14 ABSTAIN: None
15 ABSENT: None
16

17 ***Adopted Planning Commission Resolution No. 11-011.***
18

19 **7. SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 06-001 & ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**
20 **NO. 06-019 (Tres Cerritos East)**
21

22 **OWNERS:** Signal Family Hemet, LLC; Omni Financial, LLC; and MJ&M,
23 LLC
24 **AGENT:** Mel Mercado
25 **LOCATION:** Northwest corner of Cawston and Devonshire Avenues
26 **PLANNER:** Ron Running
27 **DESCRIPTION:** A request for Planning Commission review and
28 recommendation to the City Council regarding a proposed amendment to the
29 Hemet Valley Country Club Estates Specific Plan (SP 90-009) modifying the
30 eastern 146 acres adding 221 residential units to the existing Specific Plan, for a
31 total of 931 dwelling units, allocating the dwelling units in various density
32 categories, providing for public and private park sites and trails, and the addition
33 of a 16.9 acre site, with re-adoption as the Tres Cerritos Specific Plan 90-009,
34 along with an Environmental Impact Report for the proposed changes.
35
36

37 Commissioner Rogers recused himself because of his residential proximity to the
38 project site.
39

40 ***(10-minute recess called by Chairman Gifford.)***
41

42 City Planner Ron Running gave a PowerPoint presentation outlining the history of the
43 project.
44

45 Chairman Gifford clarified that Commissioner Overmyer had not been on the
46 Commission last year, at which time the project had come before the Commission
47 three times. An ad hoc committee was formed, with then-Chairman Larry Smith and
48 then-Vice Chairman Gifford as the members, and they met several times with the
49 applicant to go over items of concern. They gave a report back to this Commission in
50 April of 2010. He wanted the audience to know that this item had been through an
extensive review by the Commission and by staff.

1 Chairman Gifford and Vice Chairman Deuber stated that they had both visited the site
2 and met with the applicant. Commissioners Thompson and Overmyer had visited the
3 site, but have had no contact with applicant.
4

5 Planner Running noted that there were 17 additional conditions added, of which the
6 applicant was aware, that could require modification to the specific plan, but most were
7 editorial concerning details of the specific plan to ensure consistency throughout. He
8 further noted that the project was also consistent with the mitigation monitoring plan.
9

10 Chairman Gifford inquired about the park situation because of a concern by Valley
11 Wide for a consolidated park and wondered if the area to the southwest had been
12 added as a result of that concern.
13

14 Planner Running indicated that Valley Wide was suggesting a 10-acre park. Because
15 of the Quimby Act, they are only required to have about 4.3 acres, so the two acres
16 they're proposing would be a start, and then the additional funding would help create
17 the larger park that could be 10 acres to the west.
18

19 Chairman Gifford asked about changes in the density ratios, and Planner Running said
20 the overall unit count had dropped by 20 - 30 units from the initial proposal. Anything
21 under 4,000 square-feet had been eliminated.
22

23 Commissioner Thompson had questions regarding access to the property, and Planner
24 Running responded that the primary access was off Devonshire Avenue, but that there
25 was a secondary access off Menlo Avenue. He added that there was no frontage of
26 homes on Menlo.
27

28 Commissioner Overmyer decried the elimination of the golf course, but asked if this
29 project had an HOA that would maintain the parks and recreation center, and if it would
30 pertain to all 754 units.
31

32 Planner Running indicated that there was an HOA covering all units, parks and
33 recreation facilities. He also discussed the three-story units, but specified that only
34 about 25 percent of those units could be popped up to three-stories – not the entire
35 envelope of the homes – to afford them some view opportunities.
36

37 Vice Chair Deuber had questions about the inability of mitigation of air quality during
38 construction and inquired about what constitutes a threshold. In addition, she inquired
39 as to the coverage ratio for commercial development.
40

41 Planner Running indicated that the number of acres and units creates the over-the-
42 threshold issue in terms of short-term air quality impacts. Larger scale commercial
43 developments would have the same impacts and would need overrides. In commercial
44 developments, you can usually achieve a 25-percent lot coverage without structured
45 parking, and in this project, his guesstimate was 35 or 40 percent coverage of building
46 area. In commercial, usually the impermeable surface coverage is 90 percent.
47

48
49 Chairman Gifford opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to the lectern.
50

Tom Shollin approached the lectern and introduced the co-applicants as Martin Boone,
David Leonard, David Jeffers and Mel Mercado – part of the team that has been

1 involved in the project since 2005. In response to Commissioner Overmyer's question
2 concerning time estimates for beginning the project, Mr. Shollin said he couldn't say
3 with any certainty, but sometime in the future when they could get a loan.
4

5 Chairman Gifford thanked the applicant and invited the public to speak, limiting their
6 time to three minutes each.
7

8 Diane Norberg (4092 Via Barcelona, Hemet) expressed her concerns about the project
9 as limiting the view of the mountains by residents on Cawston and Devonshire
10 Avenues, as well as Via Barcelona because of a tall line of trees, a concrete drainage
11 channel, more trees, and three-story houses. She felt the value of their homes would
12 diminish, their taxes would increase due to the need for maintaining streets, traffic
13 lights, and utilities to accommodate 931 new homes, and the project would contribute
14 to the air pollution. Her concerns also included the inadequacy of the proposed
15 retention basin, the lack of necessity for more housing due to the unfilled Pepper Tree
16 gated community and the 31146 tract that was unfinished and unfilled. She requested
17 the Commission to reconsider the "no project" alternative.
18

19 James Crase (388 Casper Drive, Hemet), a member of the Four Seasons Community
20 Awareness Committee, felt that this development needed to be scaled back to reduce
21 the density, emphasizing quality, not quantity. His concern was that Hemet was
22 developing into a transient community where people moved to, as part of their plan to
23 move somewhere else. He asked the Commission not to set a precedent by approving
24 this project and setting a less-than-desirable standard.
25

26 John Torres (7775 Couples Way, Hemet) said Hemet, in the past, was known for its
27 premier school district, for providing high quality police and fire services, for providing
28 one of the best communities for senior citizens, and for having over 50 percent of the
29 total bank deposits in the County of Riverside. He felt this specific plan amendment
30 increased density, and would lead to a decline in property values, and cause future
31 stress on city services.
32

33 Gary Page (8647 Mann Lane, Hemet) pointed out that proposed developments can put
34 greater stress on the city's physical ability to provide services than they can generate in
35 property taxes. This development includes a lot of undevelopable land, so the density
36 is much higher than actually shown, and he recommended that over-capacity of the
37 existing fire station and other city services demands that the density be reduced.
38

39 Gene Heikel (8405 Singh Court, Hemet) is the chairman of the Four Seasons
40 Community Awareness Committee and noted that the density has increased in this
41 proposed project from 710 to 931 homes, and they are putting 750 homes in half the
42 area that was going to have 710 homes originally. He was also concerned about the
43 product type, air pollution issues, and that this project has no economic benefit since
44 there is no shortage of housing in the area, and no social value because the product
45 does not upgrade Hemet.
46

47 Nancy Warters (578 Zaharias Circle, Hemet) stated she is opposed to the project.
48

49 Susan Lewen (282 Finnhorse Street, Hemet) felt others had stated her issues
50 pertaining to her opposition of the project.

1 Michael Barnes (2991 West Fruitvale, Hemet) said the new development would cost all
2 the homeowners increased water bill rates, as the city would have to purchase more
3 water. He felt the Planning Commission was being steamrolled by developers, one of
4 whom was bankrupt, was involved in Granite Rock, which has failed, and is now in
5 litigation with the City of Fresno. He also stated that none of the principals of the firm
6 were from Newport Beach, as had been reported, adding that an LLC that Sherman
7 Boone owned went bankrupt, and Omni Financial was involved with a 22 million dollar
8 lawsuit with the City of Fresno. He also stated that the debt included \$200,000 of
9 claims.

10
11 Liz Belloso (450 B Street, Suite 1900, San Diego) representing the court-appointed
12 receiver, Douglas P. Wilson on behalf of PCG Pepper Tree, LP, deferred her minutes
13 to the receiver's counsel.
14

15 Bill Tate (3161 Michelson Drive, Suite 1500, Irvine) of the law firm of Bryan Cave, LLP
16 (home address: 10970 Turn Leaf Lane, Irvine) stated the Pepper Tree owner, on
17 August 31, 2009, had requested notice of any proceedings involving this project, and
18 they had only received notice of tonight. It had been represented to them that any
19 realignment to Menlo Avenue, a primary access to the Pepper Tree project, would not
20 be approved without an agreement in place with respect to the Pepper Tree
21 transaction. He had received the notice of this meeting on the 13th of June, which was
22 not enough time to digest the tremendous amount of material. He felt there were
23 issues with respect to Menlo Avenue curb and gutter, drainage, sewer, bonds and
24 completion, changes with respect to grade, and access.
25

26 Ronald Norberg (4092 Via Barcelona, Hemet) requested his time be given to Ryan
27 Meeker.
28

29 Ryan Meeker (4092 Via Barcelona, Hemet) was opposed to the project because of the
30 following issues: Environmental impacts will be catastrophic to the natural wetland;
31 pollution from construction and increased traffic from the widening of Cawston Avenue
32 will be damaging to air and noise quality; flood control issues are massive; perceived
33 visual quality impact is high; and native endangered species will be killed.
34

35 Joshua Meeker (4092 Via Barcelona, Hemet) elected to pass.
36

37 Joshua Valencia (4163 Davenport Court, Hemet), a lifelong resident of Hemet, felt the
38 site was a joke, and the density was ridiculous, especially with at least 600 homes
39 within the Hemet city limits already vacant. The flood channel, he felt, was the biggest
40 joke. He stated that he would sue the city if water flooded his home as a result of this
41 project. He also felt three-story homes were inappropriate in Hemet.
42

43 Charles Ball donated his time to Eugene Heikel and stated that he was in support of
44 what John Torres had said, as well as most everyone else.
45

46 Eugene Heikel (8405 Singh Court, Hemet) reiterated the issue of air pollution and
47 smog in the valley, and not just during construction. He also felt this product type was
48 inappropriate because Hemet needs to attract a higher quality of people. He stated
49 that since Hemet is in the process of creating a new General Plan and the flavor of the
50 west end (west of Sanderson) is to have housing for people that want a really nice

1 environment, we need to send a message to developers that we want something better
2 than what's here.

3
4 Brian Rubin (1694 Via Simpatico, Hemet) focused his comments on density issues,
5 stating that the original development had 2.1 units per acre on the original 336 acres.
6 Now 11+ units per acre were being proposed. He suggested keeping it at about 3.6
7 units per acre. He also thought adding more amenities for a community of this size
8 was necessary, including more parking spaces, etc.

9
10 Michael Hirschbein (602 Zaharias Circle, Hemet) narrowed his comments to the
11 drainage on Devonshire Avenue and the traffic increase to both Cawston and
12 Devonshire Avenues with this development.

13
14 Bryan Leroy (11355 W. Olympic Blvd., Los Angeles), a land use attorney with Manatt
15 Phelps, represents Central Pacific Bank, a lender on the Pepper Tree project. His
16 request was a continuance to further examine three particular areas of concern: (1)
17 Utility easement capacity along the Menlo Avenue right-of-way, if this project will be
18 tapping into any of the utilities, and how the realignment affects sidewalks, curbs,
19 gutters, and catch basins along the north side of Menlo; (2) traffic, capacity and
20 circulation of feeder streets off realigned Menlo Avenue; (3) drainage issues along
21 Cawston and Menlo Avenues.

22
23 Marvin Lazernik (520 North Cawston Avenue, Hemet) is an original owner of his home.
24 His concerns focused on Cawston Avenue and the fact that it was still a two-lane road
25 after being promised by the City that lanes would be added, the drainage issues, and
26 the ineffective methods used to avert the water, creating "Lake Cawston."

27
28 Susan Lazernik (520 North Cawston Avenue, Hemet) mentioned the accidents which
29 have occurred on Cawston Avenue as residents have tried to back out of their
30 driveways, and the danger posed by the "Lake" when children going to and from school
31 waded in the lake and ride motorcycles on the property. It also promotes the
32 propagation of mosquitoes and bugs, which is unsafe.

33
34 Bobbi McLaughlin (486 Lyle Drive, Hemet) wished to add her voice to the Four
35 Seasons Association in opposition of the project.

36
37 Gary Page (8647 Mann Lane, Hemet) addressed the issue of school capacity with the
38 1,000 additional children. He felt that hadn't been considered and should be.

39
40 George Leeb (459 Garcia, Hemet) stated his feeling that with the foreclosures and
41 unfinished developments already in Hemet, such as Stoney Mountain Ranch, no
42 further development was needed at this time. He also decried the situation on
43 Cawston Avenue during the hours when schools open and let out, and the impossibility
44 of using the streets during those times. His last concern was the flooding of the high
45 school area off Cawston Avenue and the fact that when it rains, it's difficult to use
46 either Cawston or Devonshire Avenue because of the pumps, etc.

47
48 Chairman Gifford then closed the public hearing. He stated his position, that although
49 he had probably spent more time looking at this project, since he was on the ad hoc
50 committee, he still had some concerns that may not ever go away, although he was not

1 sure that they were fatal; He added that he was ready to make a decision on the
2 project tonight, but not ready to make a recommendation on the EIR.

3
4 Commissioner Thompson also felt because of the complexity and volume of
5 information, he was not ready to make a recommendation.

6
7 Commissioner Overmyer stated that although his livelihood was directly related to
8 construction, his role as a city official was to make decisions for the betterment of
9 Hemet; therefore, he stated his opinion that the density was too high, and that he
10 would like more time to study the EIR.

11
12 Vice Chairman Deuber commended the staff on their efforts and empathized with the
13 applicants, but she shared a former commissioner's concerns that were brought up in
14 2007 and haven't substantially changed. She referred to the GPAC draft dated
15 October of 2009 of the Land Use Element, Chapter 2, reflecting that Hemet's vision, as
16 outlined in these references, was that *"Hemet conserves and enhances its natural
17 scenic, environmental, historical, and recreational resources for existing and future
18 generations to enjoy. Hemet embraces balance and appropriate growth to meet the
19 city's housing and employment needs in a manner that retains or enhances the desired
20 levels of public services, facilities and infrastructure."*

21
22 Further, Vice Chairman Deuber stated that, in the Land Use Element, Section 15.2, it
23 requires that development of West Hemet occur in an orderly manner and adheres to
24 the city's vision; and in Section 8.5, it requires the development of high quality,
25 attractive development surrounding the new alignment of State Route 79. Therefore,
26 she would like to see the density reduced by 25 percent. She noted that if she had to
27 decide tonight, her vote would be to deny the project as they were reviewing it now on
28 paper. She felt the addition of 3,016 additional people in a very compacted space with
29 zero amenities for kids was unwise.

30
31 Chairman Gifford stated the procedure would be either accepting or rejecting the EIR
32 and the Specific Plan or continuing the item for a maximum of 30 days.

33
34 Chairman Gifford reopened the public hearing to give the applicant a chance to
35 respond, and Tom Shollin, representing the applicant, stated that they were really
36 surprised that the EIR document, which was sent out for circulation in 2008, didn't get
37 reviewed adequately by the Commission. He was also disappointed that the Pepper
38 Tree folks were not kept in the loop. He felt that they, as the applicants, would be able
39 to dispute many of the comments made, but it didn't look like tonight was the time to do
40 it. Therefore, he agreed with the Commission continuing the hearing for not more than
41 30 days.

42
43 Commissioner Overmyer commented that he agreed with Vice Chairman Deuber that
44 the issue was density, not just the EIR.

45
46 Mr. Shollin responded that the density for this project was compatible with the density
47 of the project that those folks live in who are opposed to the project.

48
49 Mr. Heikel urged the Commissioners to remember the comments from the people who
50 spoke tonight, even if they were not there 30 days from now, because they were the
representatives of the people.

1 Chairman Gifford assured the audience that the Commissioners would keep those
2 comments in mind, and after asking if there were any more comments, closed the
3 public hearing.
4

5 CDD Elliano stated that a 30-day continuance would take them to the July 19 meeting
6 and requested that the Commissioners direct staff to provide information that they were
7 interested in receiving as soon as possible so they could respond timely and/or allow
8 the applicant time to gather the appropriate material.
9

10 Vice Chair Deuber asked for clarification of the alternatives in the staff report.
11

12 CDD Elliano responded that the alternatives listed at Page 53 of the staff report are in
13 response to the EIR and are the project alternatives that are addressed in the EIR.
14 Therefore, the alternatives include the "no project" alternative; the project under the
15 currently adopted specific plan (not adopting a new plan, but retaining the old one); and
16 a reduced intensity alternative, somewhere in the neighborhood of 543 units.
17

18 It was **MOVED** by Vice Chair Deuber and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Thompson to
19 **CONTINUE** Specific Plan Amendment No. 06-001 and Environmental Assessment No.
20 06-019 to the Planning Commission meeting scheduled for July 19, 2011.
21

22 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
23

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

30 ***Continued to Planning Commission Meeting of July 19, 2011.***
31

DEPARTMENT REPORTS

8. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORTS:

A. Report on City Council actions from the May 24th and June 14th meetings

38 CDD Elliano reported that the City Council unanimously approved, on May 24th, the
39 Downtown Zoning Ordinance Amendment, with the provision to allow music and art
40 studios to be permitted by right as opposed to administrative use permit.
41

42 On June 14th there was a work study on the Riverside County Habitat Conservation
43 Authority, which basically dealt with the Stephens Kangaroo Rat. Ms. Elliano reported
44 that the rat was doing well.
45

46 Also on June 14th was a work study of the city's preliminary budget, showing a 3.8
47 million dollar deficit, most of which was caused by outside forces, such as PERS,
48 Workers' Comp, medical costs, and the continuing decline in the property tax base. A
49 short-term loan from the water fund is proposed.
50

1 Public hearing items included the Site Development Review for the building at
2 Carmalita Street and Florida Avenue – the burned-out building – which was approved
3 by the Council.
4

5 **B. Upcoming events and informational items**
6

7 CDD Elliano invited all members to the 4th of July parade and to be on the float with
8 the San Jacinto Planning Commissioners.
9

10 **C. Cancellation of July 5, 2011 meeting**
11

12 CDD Elliano recommended cancellation of the July 5th meeting and adjournment to the
13 19th of July.
14

15 The Commission concurred.
16

17 **9. CITY ATTORNEY REPORTS:** (No report given)
18

19 **10. PLANNING COMMISSIONER REPORTS:**
20

21 **A.** Chairman Gifford – requested an update on the hospital project at the old
22 Wal-Mart building.
23

24 **B.** Vice Chair Deuber –Nothing to report.
25

26 **C.** Commissioner Overmyer – would like to discuss, at a future meeting, the
27 concept of bringing industrial parks and enterprise to Hemet.
28

29 **D.** Commissioner Rogers – Absent for this item.
30

31 **E.** Commissioner Thompson – Nothing to report.
32

33 **11. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**
34

35 **A.** Report on "Human Signs" and other temporary signage in the City – will be
36 brought to the Commission in the future as a work study.
37

38 **B.** Amendment to the Development Agreement for Stoney Mountain Ranch –
39 because of a disagreement about TUMF fees with WRCOG, the amendment
40 to the Stoney Mountain Ranch Development Agreement will be coming to
41 the Commission for a public hearing.
42

43 **C.** Zoning Ordinance Amendment for Special Housing Classifications – a new
44 ordinance amendment called "Special Housing Classifications", having to do
45 with group homes and other complex issues, will be coming to the
46 Commission for consideration.
47

48 **D.** Comprehensive General Plan Update and Draft EIR – will be sent to the
49 Commission as soon as it is ready for public release, and a work study or
50 public meeting will follow the release within a few weeks thereafter.

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

12. ADJOURNMENT: It was the consensus of the Planning Commission that the meeting be adjourned at 9:39 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **Tuesday, July 19, 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