

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: October 16, 2012

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 Vince Overmyer, and Commissioners Nassar Moghadam, Michael Perciful, and Greg Vasquez

Invocation and Flag Salute: Chairman Gifford

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A. Minutes of the September 16th, 2012 Meeting

It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Perciful and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Overmyer to approve the minutes of the September 16, 2012 City of Hemet Planning Commission, as presented.

The motion was carried by the following vote:

AYES: Chairman Gifford, Vice Chairman Overmyer, and Commissioners Perciful, Moghadam, and Vasquez

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There were no members of the public who wished to address the Commission regarding items not on the agenda.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

4. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 12-006 (WALGREENS SALE OF ALCOHOL)

APPLICANT: Walgreens
AGENT: Michael Shaw, Store Manager
LOCATION: 1311 E. Florida Avenue
PLANNER: Soledad Carrisoza — (951) 765-2375

DESCRIPTION: A request for Planning Commission review of a Conditional Use Permit for the sale of beer, wine and spirits after 9 p.m. and Finding of Public Convenience and Necessity for the Walgreens located on the southeast corner of Florida Avenue and San Jacinto Street.

CDD Elliano commented that after notification was sent out on the public hearing, the Planning Department received communication from Walgreens and their representative requesting that the matter be tabled for six months or until such time that they are ready to bring the matter back for public hearing.

Chairman Gifford responded for the need of a motion and vote to do so. He asked for discussion regarding any objections as to why the Commission should not move this forward, opening the discussion to both the Commission and the public for response.

Commissioner Moghadam inquired regarding the reasons for the postponement of the item.

CDD Elliano responded that staff was recommending denial on the basis of reports from the police department and over-concentration within that area. She noted that the applicant was aware of this, and therefore requested a continuance since Walgreens was also aware that the Commission was working on the alcoholic beverage ordinance.

Commissioner Overmyer asked if they were not selling alcohol beverages currently.

CDD Elliano responded that they were not.

Chairman Gifford opened the public hearing on Item No. 4 and seeing no comments, asked for a motion for a continuance or other recommendation.

It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Overmyer to table Conditional Use Permit No. 12-006 (Walgreens sale of alcohol) for six months, with a request for clarification from the City Attorney.

Assistant City Attorney Steve McEwen suggested that the item be tabled rather than continued, because there is no date of certainty for which to return at this time, and Walgreens would come back to the Planning Commission when ready.

1 The motion was **SECONDED** by Commissioner Perciful, and carried by the following
2 vote:

3
4 **AYES:** Chairman Gifford, Vice Chairman Overmyer, and Commissioners
5 Perciful, Moghadam, and Vasquez
6 **NOES:** None
7 **ABSTAIN:** None
8 **ABSENT:** None
9

10 **5. SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 11-001 & DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**
11 **(NORTH HEMET SPECIFIC PLAN)**
12

13 **APPLICANT:** Housing Authority of the County of Riverside
14 **LOCATION:** Northwest corner of North State Street and Oakland Avenue
15 **PLANNER:** Ron Running — (951) 765-2375
16

17 **DESCRIPTION:** A request for Planning Commission review and
18 recommendation to the City Council regarding the establishment of a Specific
19 Plan for a 28.6+/- acre site and the proposed Draft Environmental Impact
20 Report establishing a maximum of 525 multi-family residential units (100 units
21 within mixed-use areas), 118,919 square feet of retail commercial, and 16,335
22 square feet of office space.
23
24

25 The staff report was presented by Project Planner Ron Running, who displayed a
26 PowerPoint presentation and provided various details regarding the proposed project.
27

28 Chairman Gifford thanked Mr. Running and staff for the work done on this item. He
29 noted that the Commission had been presented a work study on this project at an
30 earlier date, adding that the CEQA document has been placed on the City's website for
31 the 45-day comment period.
32

33 Planner Running added that the documents are available on the website, as well as at
34 the library and City Hall.
35

36 Chairman Gifford questioned if whether the assumptions for future project development
37 were dependent on having a future Metrolink station nearby.
38

39 Planner Running responded that at some time in the future the Metrolink would be
40 developed in Hemet, as it is on the RCTC master plan.
41

42 Chairman Gifford suggested that the density might be a problem since there is about a
43 third of the land area proposed as high density. Having a Metrolink in this area makes
44 sense, but if the Metrolink does not come in, this will come back to the Commission for
45 some specific issues that will need to be addressed at that time.
46

47 Planner Running commented that all future developments related to the specific plan
48 would come before the Planning Commission for review on an individual basis.
49

50 Chairman Gifford responded that staff should "put a red line" next to that for
consideration since most of the land area under consideration is open land at this point.

1 He inquired regarding whether the current land owners had been contacted regarding
2 this specific plan.

3
4 Planner Running indicated that notifications were sent to all of the landowners, and
5 advised that the county had been negotiating with the property owners within the
6 project and had held a stakeholder meeting about a year ago as one of the several
7 attempts at community outreach.

8
9 Chairman Gifford noted one property on the corner of Menlo Avenue and State Street
10 that might be replaced with something more attractive and reminded the Commission
11 that staff had been working on this for a number of years. He added a comment that in
12 his review of the EIR report, he was surprised that it didn't address cultural issues. For
13 example, the Hemet Stock Farm was not specified as a cultural resource, and some
14 sort of reference to the Stock Farm should be noted so that any remaining historic
15 buildings are preserved.

16
17 Planner Running explained that this project did not include the Stock Farm within its
18 boundaries.

19
20 Commissioner Moghadam expressed some concerns regarding the density on the
21 northwest side of the site, and the aesthetics and height of the buildings with respect to
22 the single-family homes at that location.

23
24 Planner Running shared that it is hoped that an assisted-living or senior-housing
25 project might be developed at this location, although he noted that the specific plan
26 does allow for conventional multiple-family housing in that area. He added that he
27 would look at the height issue, explaining that three stories, 40 feet high, was the
28 maximum allowed for that area.

29
30 Commissioner Moghadam continued asking about adjacent residences. He wondered
31 if any kind of landscaping or relief would be available or if the plan would be too dense,
32 with people being able to view their neighbor's backyard.

33
34 Planner Running responded that the plan included a ten-foot setback.

35
36 Commissioner Moghadam continued sharing his concern as far as the residential
37 setbacks and the possibility of reducing the heights at that location on the west corner.
38 He wondered about the width of the streets with landscaping and pedestrian areas,
39 along with parking, biking, and car lanes on State Street and Menlo Avenue.

40
41 Planner Running indicated that parking had been removed on State Street to ease this
42 problem.

43
44 Commissioner Moghadam asked if a reduction in the speed limit was considered or if
45 the limits would remain the same.

46
47 Planner Running responded that speed limits were outside the scope of the specific
48 plan document, noting that these types of issues are usually handled through the
49 Engineering Department.

50
Chairman Gifford added that the center divider would promote a slowing of the traffic.

1 Vice Chairman Overmyer commented that for him the important question would be
2 ownership of some of the parcels, and again whether the Metrolink has a specific
3 location designated for development.

4
5 Planner Running responded that there was no specific location planned for the
6 Metrolink, and that staff has only indicated its best guess on the maps.

7
8 Vice Chairman Overmyer agreed with the concerns that had been expressed regarding
9 the high-density issue, although he indicated that if the City is required to have higher
10 density housing this is a good location for it.

11
12 Commissioner Vasquez asked about the time frame for the project.

13
14 Planner Running said that build out of the project could be over a fairly long time frame
15 – probably 15 years. It will largely depend upon market conditions.

16
17 Commissioner Vasquez expressed concern regarding the length of time for project
18 completion, and the impact to the City if the project were not completed. He asked if
19 the time frame might be shortened if a developer were found.

20
21 Planner Running concluded that their hope was to find one major developer, once the
22 market rebounds, and then it would be possible to develop in a much shorter time
23 frame.

24
25 Chairman Gifford commented his belief that the Metrolink would drive this project and
26 wondered when it was anticipated to come in. He further requested a professional
27 opinion regarding when the project was anticipated to begin.

28
29 CDD Elliano responded that there had been approval for the Perris Line connection
30 which is the piece needed before the eastern extension could begin. She shared that
31 as part of the regional documents reviewed earlier this year – called the Regional
32 Transportation Plan or the RTP – as to the prioritizing of the various transportation
33 projects throughout the region, those that are funded have a higher priority. Without
34 funding it could be a 20-year window, but if funding were found, the project would move
35 up as a priority and the window could become as small as perhaps five-years. The
36 majority of the right-of-way that makes the connection from the Perris station is here,
37 and is relatively open land. Although the rail needs upgrading, the RCTC owns all of
38 the right-of-way, which is a huge advantage over some of the other potential
39 connections in the other communities.

40
41 Chairman Gifford concluded that a 15-year window to build this project out is
42 unrealistic, especially if we don't have a time frame from Metrolink, who is the driver of
43 this part of the project. He further suggested that even though State Street is the
44 northern gateway to the City, and the City cares how it will develop, the key to it is the
45 Metrolink, along with the City/County government center and library. If the Metrolink
46 happens, it will be self-sustainable.

47
48 Planner Running reported that the proposed Metrolink from San Bernardino to
49 Redlands has an ever-shortening time frame now to within five years because of
50 creative financing and grant funding from the Federal Transportation Administration.

1 He shared his optimism for the Hemet project and the possibility for the high-speed
2 railway to San Diego as a future project.

3
4 CDD Elliano reminded the Commission of the synergistic relationship between land
5 use planning and the Metrolink's priorities. She continued by listing the issues that
6 needed to be considered, such as ridership and land use planning that links to
7 transportation networks. She noted the importance of the specific plan development,
8 since in the specific plan we have an overall infrastructure plan, and land uses that
9 have been crafted for this site that create a potential demand for the metrolink. She
10 further noted that the Commission has ultimate authority and control over the actual
11 building design and construction of the project. Each project that comes forward will
12 have detailed reviews. She again reminded that this is a zoning document, looking at a
13 broad brush picture for the project.

14
15 Chairman Gifford thanked CDD Elliano for her summary.

16
17 CDD Elliano added that even without the Metrolink, future development of this part of
18 town will be achieved much more in keeping with what the City's vision is if there are
19 detailed design standards rather than simply using conventional zoning for each small
20 parcel at a time.

21
22 Vice Chairman Overmyer wondered if the specific plan could be adopted with the
23 current ownership intact.

24
25 CDD Elliano responded in the affirmative, noting that the City has police power to
26 adopt consistent zoning with the General Plan.

27
28 Vice Chairman Overmyer asked if majority ownership is one of the fundamental
29 determinations behind being able to change the zoning.

30
31 CDD Elliano answered by noting that the City always has the ability to enact zoning,
32 whether we have approval or agreement from the property owner or not. However, as
33 a practical matter, the City would prefer to have property owners' support because of
34 respecting private property rights. She believes it is a benefit that the County has the
35 majority ownership.

36
37 Chairman Gifford opened the public hearing on this item.

38
39 Assistant City Attorney McEwen reminded the Commission that this item remains open
40 as a public hearing until December 4th, so a proper motion would be to continue the
41 public hearing.

42
43 Ms. Elizabeth Pierce, 363 Long Street, approached the lectern and commented
44 regarding crime impact studies, noting that if this project was developed as low to
45 middle income it could bring some possible undesired elements into the City. She also
46 wondered what impact this might have on the police and fire departments as perhaps
47 indicated in the Draft Environment Impact Report. She stated that her concern
48 continues regarding the new properties such as mobile homes, what would be the
49 impact of having, for example, assisted living properties if crime already is seen in
50 these areas now, and what level of income is projected for this multi-family living

1 spaces. On another note, she asked about flooding on State Street and Oakland
2 Avenues, and what was anticipated with regards to this.

3
4 Chairman Gifford thanked Ms. Pierce and commented that the CEQA document is
5 open for public review now and for the next 45 days. Many of these concerns have to
6 be addressed in the CEQA document such as flooding impact, police and fire services,
7 etc. If it is not covered adequately, public comments are invited since we need to know
8 the impact to people that live there and are on the ground, so to speak.

9
10 CDD Elliano added her comments in terms of crime and the impact study. She stated
11 that the impact of police and fire are addressed within the EIR and that one of the
12 mitigation measures on police and fire is done at the time of development. Every
13 development unit and all commercial industrial properties have to pay a development
14 impact fee towards police and fire provisions. In addition, there is a mitigation measure
15 that this property would become a part of a public safety Community Facilities District,
16 which means it has an annual assessment that is applied to new development, this
17 property would fall under that. In terms of the affordability levels, the specific plan
18 document itself is the zoning document that establishes the land use and density, not
19 affordability. If, however, the County and the Housing Department were to negotiate
20 with a particular housing developer, they may have a certain affordability criteria they
21 might consider for a senior housing project. We do not have any details at this time
22 and at this level of the project.

23
24 Chairman Gifford commented for clarification that this is a programmatic document,
25 meaning that it sets the framework while the details – when they come in and actually
26 move to development – must come back to this Commission, and to the public. Details
27 such as who the buyers are and the density must be decided at a later time as we
28 hope this valley will be a destination for young professionals and upper middle class.
29 So with this particular plan, our option is to either do nothing or to do what builds this
30 community so that the face of Hemet to those coming in on State Street, Florida
31 Avenue and Sanderson Avenue is upgraded. We want the Metrolink and a plan that is
32 going to attract people here.

33
34 Chairman Gifford continued sharing his concern for a better Hemet and responded to
35 Ms. Pierce's concern about the length of time it may take for this to be fulfilled and
36 completed.

37
38 CDD Elliano continued the discussion by advising that the Town and Country Mobile
39 Home Park had been part of a redevelopment effort, but when the Redevelopment
40 Agency was dissolved, so was the City's ability to purchase the mobile home park.
41 However, under the proposed plan, it would be designated or zoned for commercial,
42 and the City's anticipation and hope is that because commercial is a higher and better
43 use than what is there now, perhaps someone will see the value at this prime corner
44 for new commercial development.

45
46 Ms. Pierce continued sharing her concern about crime, the challenges of building
47 mansions next to shacks, and current devaluation of existing property.

48
49 Chairman Gifford encouraged the public to take a good look at the CEQA document
50 and the Environmental Impact Report, and then let the Commission know their
thoughts at the December 4th Planning Commission meeting, to which the project is

1 continued.

2
3 Ms. Paula Rangel (no address given) commented on the current state of Hemet and
4 her feelings that this project would not improve the City of Hemet, whose focus should
5 be on current challenges.

6
7 Chairman Gifford agreed with Ms. Rangel's statement regarding the state of the City of
8 Hemet. He added that the State mandates low income housing and the City must
9 comply with the state's policies; however, the plan is that these housing units, should
10 the Metrolink come into existence, will be utilized by young professionals and
11 commuters and that nothing can happen until these projects come back to the
12 Commission for approval.

13
14 Mr. Kelly Estes, 343 Long Street shared a list of his concerns about the current state of
15 Hemet and long-term projections and planning without regard to current conditions.

16
17 Chairman Gifford responded that these individual concerns are in the public record.
18 He again encouraged the public to look at the CEQA document over the next 45 days
19 and come back for the December 4th meeting.

20
21 Ms. Jenny Jones, 366 Socorro Street, shared her concerns about schools, traffic, new
22 construction, lack of school buses, and the state of the economy in Hemet.

23
24 Mr. Mike Pendergast (no address given) identified his issues and suggested trolley
25 service between Hemet and Perris as well as additional manufacturing jobs, and the
26 development of the Stock Farm.

27
28 Chairman Gifford noted his concern and suggested he contact CDD Elliano after the
29 meeting for an update regarding the police department's progress regarding crime in
30 Hemet.

31
32 Mr. Raul Sparz, 115 West Oakland, wanted to know the status of his property, which
33 The County EDA had expressed an interest in purchasing.

34
35 CDD Elliano suggested he contact Planner Running as to information regarding this
36 property.

37
38 An unidentified member of the public wanted to know what would happen to their
39 property since theirs is the only house left in the project area.

40
41 CDD Elliano responded that they would be able to continue to live in their home on
42 their property until such time they should decide to sell that property. At that point it
43 would be incorporated into the surrounding development.

44
45 Chairman Gifford reiterated that this is not subject to eminent domain. There is no
46 requirement that anyone move or sell their property; the City is simply zoning the
47 property.

48
49 City Engineer Biagioni explained that the City has one dog park on Cawston Avenue
50 but it takes funds to maintain one. The City has been spending \$3.7 – \$3.8 million
throughout the city for street improvements and to incorporate new streets for re-

1 paving.

2
3 Chairman Gifford queried if flooding improvements are made with funds from the City
4 or from the developers.

5
6 City Engineer Biagioni replied that the developers would be responsible for
7 construction of the basins.

8
9 Chairman Gifford clarified that the developers would be required to pay the fees to
10 improve the streets, including flooding issues.

11
12 City Engineer Biagioni further explained that it is a combination of money and
13 development impact fees, so the City is not spending money from the General Fund.

14
15 Commissioner Moghadam explained that Hemet is a flood zone and that this site is
16 going to contain itself. It is not going to overflow into what exists. He expressed
17 concern regarding the existing part that is flooding.

18
19 City Engineer Biagioni commented that the City has some money for flood control –
20 approximately \$4 million – in the development impact fee funds, which is quite small for
21 a huge storm project. They are expensive to build and there are many concerns
22 because of environmental conditions. The City is very flat and this is a huge challenge
23 for the issue of drainage. He just released a request for proposal to do a study on the
24 west side of the City, so hopefully that will be on-line and we can incorporate those
25 storm drains or channels in order for the developer to build some of them.

26
27 Commissioner Moghadam asked if the City had any plan concerning the slope, which
28 makes a difference in how fast the water goes.

29
30 City Engineer Biagioni replied that there is a master plan for drainage dated from 1984
31 that has identified all those areas. He reiterated that it is a matter of funding.

32
33 Chairman Gifford asked Planner Running the approximate size of the pocket parks in
34 the plan?

35
36 Planner Running responded that each are under an acre in size.

37
38 Chairman Gifford asked if one of those could be designated as a dog park, and
39 questioned whether an acre was enough space for a dog park.

40
41 Planner Running replied that it was, noting that the City had approved the Tres Cerritos
42 East dog park.

43
44 Kelly Estes referred to the City's vision of Menlo Avenue as a four-lane street, and
45 inquired regarding how far west that was proposed to go.

46
47 Planner Running responded that it would go all the way to the western city limit.

48
49 CDD Elliano explained that it is a master plan street in the General Plan, and to the
50 west it would be four lanes all the way out.

1 Mr. Estes stated that the City is asking the property owners to give up a lot of land for
2 this street.

3
4 CDD Elliano notated that it has been designated as a secondary street for a long time
5 now.

6
7 City Engineer Biagioni further clarified that this particular property is going to improve
8 the four lanes for Menlo Avenue within the project limits. There would be a lot of
9 property acquisition.

10
11 Chairman Gifford stated that the City has designated Menlo Avenue as a secondary
12 collector, which means those rights-of-way have been set for a long time. Therefore,
13 they don't have to be acquired if they are already part of the street plan.

14
15 Ms. Linda Pendergast who has lived in Hemet for twenty-seven and a half years
16 commented about the high percentage of businesses that are closing. She asked how
17 the City was proposing to keep the new project open. She felt it was bad timing.

18
19 Chairman Gifford commented that his own father was born in Hemet in 1930 and that
20 his family has been here for four generations. He posed that there are two indications
21 that must be made: 1) we need to invite people who are troublemakers to leave; 2) we
22 need to invite people into this community who will embrace it and become responsible
23 citizens.

24
25 Ms. Pendergast agreed and stated that it has been only in the last five years that their
26 property has been violated.

27
28 Chairman Gifford suggested that a good thing is that the community as a whole is
29 organizing to change things. He noted that there are a lot of good businesses, and that
30 he wished to attract a better entertainment complex.

31
32 Chairman Gifford next asked for a motion to continue the public hearing to December
33 4, 2012 at 6:00 p.m.

34
35 Shawn Roots, a resident off of Florida Avenue, shared that he liked the idea of the
36 development issue. He has been disappointed about the mall on the west side not
37 being successful, but for this side of town the development is a good idea.

38
39 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Overmyer, and **SECONDED** by Commissioner
40 Moghadam to continue the public hearing for Specific Plan 11-001 to the meeting of
41 December 4, 2012.

42
43 The motion was carried by the following vote:

44
45 **AYES:** Chairman Gifford, Vice Chairman Overmyer, and Commissioners
46 Perciful, Moghadam, and Vasquez

47
48 **NOES:** None

49
50 **ABSTAIN:** None

ABSENT: None

REVIEW AND ACTION ITEMS

1
2
3 **6. REQUEST TO INITIATE PRE-ZONING FOR A PORTION OF THE WEST**
4 **HEMET AREA-** *Community Development Director Elliano*
5

6
7 Request for Planning Commission initiation of a pre-zoning application for
8 940.63 acres of property located east of California Ave. to the city limits,
9 generally south of Stetson Ave., and north of Domenigoni Parkway, and within
10 the City's adopted Sphere of Influence.

11
12 The staff report was presented by Project Planner Nancy Gutierrez, who gave a
13 PowerPoint presentation and provided various details regarding the proposal.
14

15 Chairman Gifford asked if there was a downside to the Commission not agreeing to
16 mediate the pre-zoning project.
17

18 CDD Elliano explained that staff has the ability to continue without the Planning
19 Commission's action, but the question is whether the pre-zoning has merit, and
20 whether staff time and resources should be utilized to process it. The downside is
21 when the individual property owners request this, it will be more time-consuming and
22 costly to do it individually than to do it as a large effort. She stated that she is a
23 believer of local control and since the City spent so much time studying this area in
24 the General Plan, if we don't start down that pathway, eventually, as the market
25 picks up it will develop in the county and we will have lost our opportunity to guide
26 how we think the development should occur. Right now we have willing property
27 owners, a General Plan, a good EIR, and staff willing to do it. In her professional
28 opinion, she thinks this is a good time to move forward.
29
30

31 Commissioner Moghadam stated that this was a good idea and a very good plan to
32 continue on.
33

34 Vice Chairman Overmyer asked, with respect to the Airport Land Use Commission, if
35 either of the two partial owners that did not respond were contacted.
36
37

38 Project Planner Gutierrez responded that one of them was within that area and it is
39 their hope that it would be possible to negotiate a fair way for the fee to be shared.
40

41 Melissa Donahoe who lives along the South Creek was concerned about odor and
42 pollutants.
43

44 CDD Elliano explained that MWD property is located within the area that the City is
45 pre-zoning. There were conceptual ideas that they might want to do some pilot
46 farming techniques out there, but they have not come forward with a proposal yet,
47 and they are still trying to figure out what they are going to do with their different land
48 holdings. The City will keep the Commission informed on that.
49
50

1 Chairman Gifford stated that this is a preliminary planning stage. Nothing can be
2 built out there on new development unless it comes through the CEQA and planning
3 processes, which would require review before this Commission.
4

5 Commissioner Moghadam inquired regarding whether they tilled the ground around
6 the property to eliminate a fire hazard.
7

8 Ms. Donahoe stated that she had noticed some tilling and planting, but that it sits as
9 dust and dirt through the hot season.
10

11 Commissioner Moghadam responded that there are steps that every contractor has
12 to take to mitigate the dust that's going to kick up.
13

14 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Moghadam and **SECONDED** by Commissioner
15 Perciful to initiate the pre-zoning for the Southwest Hemet area.
16

17 The motion was carried by the following vote:
18

19
20 **AYES:** Chairman Gifford, Vice Chairman Overmyer, and Commissioners
21 Perciful, Moghadam, and Vasquez

22 **NOES:** None

23 **ABSTAIN:** None

24 **ABSENT:** None
25

26 **WORK STUDY ITEMS**

- 27
28 **7. WORK STUDY REGARDING ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE LAND USE**
29 **REGULATIONS** — *Community Development Director Elliano*
30 Work Study to review existing and proposed zoning code requirements for the
31 sale of alcoholic beverages.
32
33

34 The work study session was introduced by CDD Elliano, who explained that its
35 purpose was to review the City zoning regulations and update the code regarding
36 establishments that sell alcoholic beverages, with the overall intent of improving the
37 public health, safety, and welfare. It is also a component of the Hemet ROCS
38 (Restoring Our Community Strategy) program.
39

40 CDD Elliano went on to advise that the state department of Alcoholic Beverage
41 Control (ABC) is the agency that has exclusive authority to license and regulate the
42 sale, purchase, possession, and transportation of alcoholic beverages within the
43 state. She then embarked on a comprehensive PowerPoint presentation.
44

45 Commissioner Moghadam gave a history of his background with alcohol sales and
46 expressed concerns over making decisions that would be difficult to change at a
47 later date.
48

49 Chairman Gifford expressed his feeling that there is already an over-concentration of
50 places that sell alcohol, and it is prudent to have a bit more control and oversight.

1 The City is adding a CUP process to allow these places to come to the Commission
2 for approval.

3
4 Commissioner Perciful questioned whether there was not already a system in place
5 to deal with over-concentration.
6

7
8 CDD Elliano responded that there is no formal system to review such issues. There
9 is no one at either the staff or administrative level looking at these in detail and
10 making recommendations to the ABC. She noted that the City does not have any
11 processes, regulations, or standards currently in place, and is trying to get more
12 structure with flexibility so there is something to review. There are code
13 requirements in place that if an establishment that sells alcohol is open after 9 p.m.
14 they must have a CUP, but that seems outdated and in need of change. In addition,
15 she added that this could be streamlined even more at the ABC and staff level than
16 just the CUP.
17

18 With regard to the staff recommendation, CDD Elliano added that if the Commission
19 thought there was community benefit and interest in the number of liquor stores,
20 then a review process like the CUP would be imperative.
21

22
23 Commissioner Perciful felt the free market system would control the number of liquor
24 stores or smoke shops in Hemet.

25
26 Chairman Gifford posited the City's need to close loopholes in existing regulations
27 because there is still concern about the location of these facilities, such as near
28 schools.
29

30
31 Commissioner Moghadam commented on the cost of obtaining a license. He
32 questioned whether the charge of a CUP fee would bring more money to the City.

33
34 Commissioner Perciful asked if having a liquor store on the county side of Florida
35 Avenue would result in a loss of income for the City.
36

37
38 Chairman Gifford agreed that this was an issue to consider.

39
40 Commissioner Vasquez inquired as to why staff had brought this before the
41 Commission and asked what the Hemet ROCS Citizen Advisory Commission felt
42 needed attention.

43
44 Chairman Gifford at this point requested that the Commission take Item No. 10 out
45 of order since CDD Elliano had been present at the Hemet ROCS Citizen Advisory
46 Committee and could answer this question.
47

48
49 CDD Elliano explained that this topic had come up in the ROCS executive
50 committee, which is composed of the City Manager, the Mayor, the Council
members, the Police Chief and herself, as one of the things they wanted to look at to
acquire better regulations and control. They specifically requested that staff
investigate what Temecula and surrounding communities do in this regard.

1 Temecula recently prohibited liquor stores entirely. They grandfathered the ones that
2 were already there, but prohibited the establishment of any additional stores. At this
3 point staff is not proposing to take that path. Murrieta has many requirements,
4 including the hours of operation. Also, there were some members of the ROCS
5 Citizens Advisory Committee that work with youth and have concerns about alcohol
6 abuse in the community.
7

8
9 Commissioner Vasquez asked if this was a nuisance problem and therefore seen as
10 necessary for the City to address, or just a blanket statement that liquor stores are
11 bad for the community.

12
13 CDD Elliano stated that the concern was at least to have a process and some
14 regulations in place as opposed to what we now have, which, she suggested, in her
15 opinion is not effective.
16

17 Commissioner Vasquez questioned how much say the City has in whether or not
18 someone is going to be granted a permit as opposed to ABC's authority.
19

20 CDD Elliano explained that the ABC will not issue a license if a CUP is required and
21 the City has not issued one. This is an attempt to address the over-concentration
22 issue.
23

24
25 Commissioner Perciful stated that if an ordinance does get drafted it must be
26 consistent with the county and City of San Jacinto because they are bordering our
27 city.
28

29 CDD Elliano commented that right now both the county and San Jacinto are more
30 restrictive than Hemet.
31

32 Chairman Gifford invited the public to comment.
33

34
35 Hemet resident, Melissa Donahoe, stated that there are many obviously intoxicated
36 people walking the streets of Hemet, and an excessive amount of drunk driving
37 related accidents. If this ordinance can help, she felt it was something that the City
38 should do for the sake of our children and the residents.
39

40 Vice Chairman Overmyer questioned whether additional liquor stores would lead to
41 more alcohol use and abuse, and would the ordinance appreciably change how
42 much liquor is being consumed. On one side the City is trying to bring in new
43 business, and on the other side we are limiting businesses.
44

45 Chairman Gifford suggested that if consensus was the goal, then it may not be
46 achievable, but there might be ideas to share.
47

48
49 CDD Elliano indicated that staff would draft the ordinance to the best of their ability
50 based on the information the Commission had provided, and that it would either go
back to the Commission or to ROCS. She noted that when the overview was given
to the ROCS group, they were in favor of the process and of separation standards.

DEPARTMENT REPORTS

8. CITY ATTORNEY REPORTS: *Verbal reports from Assistant City Attorney Steven McEwen on items of interest to the Planning Commission.*

Assistant City Attorney McEwen had no report to provide.

9. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORTS:

A. Verbal Report on City Council actions from the September 25, 2012 and October 9, 2012 meetings

CDD Elliano reported regarding the September 25th City Council meeting that there had been a lengthy work study presentation which had lasted approximately three hours, in an effort to respond to the community's concerns regarding a number of issues and related questions. Following that, the zoning ordinance regarding tobacco stores and smoking lounges was officially adopted.

At the October 9th City Council meeting there was an update regarding the Hemet ROCS Citizens Advisory Committee, which was originally scheduled to be in place for an estimated six-month period. The Council asked, and the CAC concurred, that they would be willing to continue their efforts for an additional seven months or less, in order to complete their work efforts. The extension was so authorized, and an additional member was added to the CAC – Larry Graves – who will be representing mobile home park communities.

Additionally, action was taken on a reimbursement agreement prepared for the benefit of the Valley Wide Recreation and Park District to build a concession and restroom facility at the Diamond Valley Park site, in the middle of the ball field complex. This will provide permanent restrooms, as well as lockers and storage. Also, the upper story will include a meeting room and outdoor observation deck. The City has directed Development Impact Fees in the amount of \$260,000 to be allocated to the restroom facility. The total construction costs are estimated at \$1.3 million.

B. Schedule for November and December 2012 Planning Commission Meetings

CDD Elliano discussed the schedule for Planning Commission meetings through November and December, indicating that staff would bring the ordinance regarding alcoholic beverage regulations to the next meeting, along with any other city-generated projects that might be ready.

Chairman Gifford proposed that the next Commission meeting be scheduled for December, unless pressing issues were to come up.

CDD Elliano noted that the next meeting would be potentially scheduled for December 4th.

1 **C. Inland Empire Quarterly Economic Report**

2
3 It was noted that this report had been received and filed.

4
5 **10. HEMET ROCS CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT** - *Chairman John*
6 *Gifford*

7
8 CDD Elliano indicated that most of the issues from the latest ROCS meeting were
9 already reported in the previous discussions; however, it would be good to mention
10 that the ROCS implementation teams are moving forward, and the City's website
11 includes a citizens concern form with a checkbox that goes directly to the police
12 department or code enforcement. In addition, there is a volunteer form to see how
13 and where citizens might like to help out in the city. CAC meetings have reverted
14 back to their prior time of 3:30 p.m.

15
16
17 **11. PLANNING COMMISSIONER REPORTS**: *Commissioner reports on meetings*
18 *attended or other matters of Planning interest*

- 19
20 A. Chairman Gifford – Chairman Gifford thanked the Commissioners for
21 coming to the meetings in a prepared and professional manner.
22 B. Vice Chair Overmyer – Nothing to report
23 C. Commissioner Moghadam – Nothing to report
24 D. Commissioner Perciful – Nothing to report
25 E. Commissioner Vasquez – Nothing to report
26

27
28 **12. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**: *Items to be scheduled for upcoming Planning*
29 *Commission Meetings were noted as follows:*

- 30
31 A. Report on Industrial Development Opportunities
32 B. Proposed Fence Ordinance- Part II
33 C. Temporary Sign Provisions- Part II
34

35
36 **13. ADJOURNMENT**: It was unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 9:06
37 p.m. to the regularly scheduled meeting of the City of Hemet Planning Commission
38 scheduled for **December 4, 2012 at 6:00 p.m.** to be held at the City of Hemet
39 Council Chambers located at 450 East Latham Avenue, Hemet, CA 92543.
40

41
42
43
44
45 
46 John Gifford, Chairman
47 Hemet Planning Commission

48 ATTEST:

49 
50 Nancie Shaw, Records Secretary
Hemet Planning Commission