

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: AUGUST 6, 2013

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 Greg Vasquez, and Commissioners Rick Crimeni and Michael Perciful

ABSENT: Commissioner Vince Overmyer (with notice)

Invocation and Flag Salute: Chairman John Gifford

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A. Minutes for the Planning Commission Meeting of July 16, 2013

It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Rick Crimeni and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Michael Perciful to **APPROVE** the July 16, 2013 Planning Commission Minutes.

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

AYES: Chairman John Gifford, Vice Chairman Greg Vasquez, Commissioners Michael Perciful and Rick Crimeni

NOES: None

ABSENT: Vince Overmyer

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS: (None)

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

4. SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 13-001 (SP 87-28, HEMET AUTO MALL)

Owner: Gosch Auto Group Inc.

Agent: Eric Gosch

Planner: Emery J. Papp, Principal Planner

Location: Hemet Auto Mall - Southeast corner of Florida Ave and Warren Rd

1 Planner Papp replied that they have a 36 foot wide drive aisle and parking spaces, with
2 the nearest residences another 13 feet on the other side of the wall. He also explained
3 the entire Auto Mall Specific Plan has sub-areas - specifically A, B, C, and D. This
4 particular area falls in Area A, which is intended primarily for automobile dealerships.
5

6 Chairman Gifford opened the public hearing and invited Mr. Marc Gosch to the lectern,
7 who explained that the present block wall is currently five feet tall, with a three-foot
8 wrought iron extension. The proposed wall, as a result of the noise study completion,
9 will be 11 feet, reducing the decibel level to 55 percent.
10

11 When asked by Chairman Gifford if the other five conditions were acceptable, Mr.
12 Gosch replied that they were.
13

14 Frank Gorman of GW Engineering, 800 East Florida Avenue, was asked to respond to
15 Chairman Gifford's question regarding why the bays are facing east. Mr. Gorman
16 noted that 25 years ago when the plan was introduced, there was not a template for
17 dealerships, so considering the WQMD requirements concerning storm drains and
18 electrical easements, it made the initial plan of putting a 20-foot high building 15 feet off
19 the property line infeasible. This is an extremely narrow lot and works best with having
20 the bays in the back.
21

22 Vice Chair Vasquez queried Mr. Gorman about the effects of the project on Auto Mall
23 Drive.
24

25 Mr. Gorman explained that when the Auto Mall was originally built, all the
26 improvements were put in. There will be more staff parking added, and some areas set
27 aside for bio-retention, which are new WQMD requirements. So there really will not be
28 much difference along Auto Mall Drive than what presently exists.
29

30 Robin Lowe (8075 Carnosic Avenue, Hemet), representing Hemet West, mentioned
31 several issues, most particularly the Time Warner boxes on the wall, but indicated
32 there had been discussion of the other issues, and Hemet West was appreciative of the
33 efforts made by the Gosch team to eliminate the concerns. She also expressed
34 gratitude for the work of the Planning Division team and the foresight shown by the
35 Specific Plan 25 years ago. She withdrew the request for a continuance.
36

37 CDD Elliano noted some last minute language additions in the Specific Plan regarding
38 the property line wall, page 7, No. 3, Service Areas, (b) to read as follows: "*Perimeter
39 walls constructed for sound wall purposes along the eastern boundary shall be
40 consistent with design, material, and height as appropriate.*"
41

42 The applicant and Ms. Lowe approved the language addition, and Chairman Gifford
43 closed the public hearing and asked for further comments from Commissioners.
44

45 Vice Chair Vasquez, Commissioner Perciful and Chairman Gifford agreed that the
46 issue had been handled well by Hemet West, the Gosch group and the planning staff.
47

48 Vice Chair Vasquez questioned the reason for the amendment that provided the
49 Community Development Director the ability to make decisions on modifications on
50 anything less than 10 percent and also asked what an "accessory structure" was.

1 CDD Elliano explained that under the current Specific Plan, any change in any
2 structure is supposed to come before the Planning Commission, but not necessarily as
3 a public hearing. Staff felt if it was a significant change, it should come as a public
4 hearing, but minor changes consistent with the plan need not come to the Commission.
5 She defined an "accessory structure" as something that is a modest building, such as a
6 small structure or addition such as solar panels.
7

8 Vice Chair Vasquez noted that 10 percent is relative because if it's a large
9 development, that could be a significant number.
10

11 CDD Elliano added that 10 percent is based on the original building size and that the
12 Commission could change that to a square footage benchmark if they felt
13 uncomfortable with the 10 percent number. Staff was just trying to limit the number of
14 minor issues coming before the Commission.
15

16 Commissioner Perciful asked if parking lots were included in the 10 percent.
17

18 CDD Elliano clarified that the 10 percent applies to existing buildings or structures.
19 Parking lot expansion would be under the auspices of the Community Development
20 Director, not a public hearing issue.
21

22 Chairman Gifford offered to entertain a motion, with two changes, one to Section 3(b)
23 regarding the wall; the other to Section 5(a)2, to define the 10 percent as 10 percent
24 increase to the original floor space of the buildings that were approved.
25

26 It was **MOVED** by Vice Chair Vasquez and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Crimeni to
27 **APPROVE** Specific Plan Amendment No. 13-001, with the two above-mentioned
28 clarifications.
29

30 The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote:
31

32 **AYES:** Chairman John Gifford, Vice Chair Greg Vasquez, Commissioners
33 Michael Perciful and Rick Crimeni.
34

35 **NOES:** None

36 **ABSENT:** Commissioner Vince Overmyer
37

38 ***(Adopted Planning Commission Resolution No.13-011)***

39
40 **5. ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NO. 13-001: HOUSING ELEMENT COMPLIANCE-**
41 **MULTIPLE FAMILY ZONE (R-4) ZONE CHANGES**

42 **APPLICANT:** City of Hemet

43 **PLANNER:** Carole L. Kendrick, Assistant Planner

44 **LOCATIONS:** Site 1: Located on the east side of Myers Street, south of
45 Devonshire Avenue and north of Florida Avenue (448-120-010). Site 2: Located
46 on the south side of Latham Avenue, east of Lyon Avenue (442-060-046). Site
47 3: Located on the south side of Stetson Avenue, east and west of Elk Street
48 (464-270-002, 464-270-005, 464-270-006). Site 4: Located on the south side of
49 Johnston Avenue and the east side of Gilbert Street (446-280-005, 446-280-
50 016, 446-380-017). Site 5: located on the southeast corner of State Street and
Johnston Avenue and the northwest corner of Buena Vista Street and Stetson

1 Avenue (446-300-001 thru 003, 446-300-005, 446-300-007, 446-300-008, 446-
2 300-011). Site 6: Located on the east side of State Street between Thornton
3 Avenue and Chambers (451-100-022, 451-100-026 and 451-100-036).
4

5 **DESCRIPTION:** A City-initiated Zone Change to rezone six (6) different sites
6 (18 individual parcels) identified as Very High Density Residential (VHDR) on
7 the General Plan Land Use Map to Multiple Family Residential (R-4) on the
8 City's official Zoning Map in compliance with the City's Housing Element and
9 State law requirements.
10

11 (Powerpoint presentation by Planner Kendrick)
12

13 Chairman Gifford clarified that these changes needed to be done in strategic locations
14 to meet the requirements of the State in order to certify the Housing Element
15 Compliance. He also asked for an explanation of the difference between Very High
16 Density and the R-4 zone.
17

18 Planner Kendrick explained that the newly adopted R-4 zoning code accommodates
19 the General Plan designation of very high density at 30.1 units per acre.
20

21 There is a recommendation that Site 6 be removed per the request of Transtech or
22 Eagle Development, who want to put in a 250-unit multifamily housing development.
23 CDD Elliano was perplexed as to why they want it removed, but they do have drainage
24 issues. Staff received a letter, which was given to the Commission members, at 5 p.m.
25 this evening with the request. Therefore, staff is outlining three options: 1) move
26 forward as proposed; 2) contact the developer between now and the City Council
27 meeting and pull it out at the council meeting if they don't want to go forward; or 3) the
28 Commission can honor their request, and recommend pulling it out and spreading the
29 units to other sites.
30

31 Planner Kendrick also commented that when they develop, they will have to do a
32 General Plan Amendment if they want to keep the zoning they have.
33

34 Commissioner Crimeni asked when the deadline is for the Housing Element
35 Compliance plan with the State.
36

37 CDD Elliano stated the drop-dead date for all the cities in Southern California is
38 October 1, 2013. If Site 6 is included, no changes need to be made in the plan. If it is
39 excluded, staff has to have a backup plan devised, but the Housing Element is going
40 forward, either way.
41

42 Chair Gifford opened the public hearing and Pamela Schein, 870 South Inez Street,
43 Hemet, approached the lectern and asked a question regarding a zoning clarification
44 for a site now located behind the Salvation Army downtown. She note that the site is
45 presently designated for senior housing only, but such a designation is now considered
46 age discrimination.
47

48 CDD Elliano responded that the city used to have an S-3 zone, which was senior
49 multifamily, but subsequent state and federal legislation required that the city repeal
50 that designation, and now R-3 is the same density designation, but for all ages.

1 Ms. Schein then asked for an explanation as to where the proposed senior oriented
2 Jasmine Gardens Development is to be located, if the proposal goes through.

3
4 Planner Kendrick replied that it's located in front of Johnston Avenue, and they are
5 required to do a lot line adjustment.

6
7 Chair Gifford closed the public hearing, and Commissioner Crimeni indicated he
8 thought Site 6 should remain in the proposal, to which Chair Gifford agreed.

9
10 Vice Chair Vasquez asked if the developer had plenty of notification, to which CDD
11 Elliano responded that they had notification since July 8th and were aware of the
12 General Plan designation.

13
14 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Crimeni and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Perciful
15 to **ADOPT** the Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 13-014, recommending
16 **APPROVAL** of Zone Change No.13-001 (Ordinance Bill No. 13-039) to the City
17 Council.

18
19 The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote:

20
21 **AYES:** Chairman John Gifford, Vice Chair Greg Vasquez, Commissioners
22 Michael Perciful and Rick Crimeni.

23 **NOES:** None

24 **ABSENT:** Commissioner Vince Overmyer

25
26 *(Adopted Planning Commission Resolution No. 13-012)*
27

28 WORK STUDY ITEMS

29
30
31 6. **WORKSTUDY: PRELIMINARY REVIEW NO. 13-004 (COPENHAGEN COURT**
32 **GARDEN APARTMENTS)**: A Workstudy Session for the Planning Commission to
33 review and provide input regarding the submittal of a future Site Development
34 Review Application to allow the construction and use of 8 single-story multiple-
35 family residential apartment buildings containing 40 units totaling 53,600 square
36 feet, located on the east side of Copenhagen Street, south of Sydney Street and
37 north of Anchorage Street.

38
39 **Applicant:** Nader Khoshniyati

40 **Agent:** Jim Morrissey

41 **Location:** East side of Copenhagen Street, south of Sydney Street and north
42 of Anchorage Street

43 **APN:** 448-210-005 thru 014 and 448-210-016 thru 018
44

45 (Powerpoint presentation by Planner Carole Kendrick)
46

47 Chairman Gifford had questions concerning fire truck turnaround, pavement finishing,
48 driveway access, common space, Home Owners Association/property management.
49

50 Planner Kendrick explained that the pavement is asphalt in the parking lot, that the two
driveways open onto Copenhagen, that property management or an HOA will maintain

1 the common areas, and that there hasn't yet been a decision as to whether these will
2 be apartments or condos.

3
4 Commissioner Crimeni wanted to know about the street that dead-ends into the fire
5 turnaround, and how that was going to be finished off, as well as whether there would
6 be playgrounds or common areas for children.

7
8 Planner Kendrick said they were waiting to hear from the applicant as to the fire access
9 configuration and that there is no common area for children. As yet there has not been
10 a decision as to whether these will be apartments or condos. Guest parking will be in
11 designated spaces, and each unit comes with a two-car garage.

12
13 Jim Morrissey, 41738 Fulton Avenue, was called to the lectern, as the applicant, to
14 answer questions. He stated that this is essentially an apartment project with an
15 appearance similar to single-family units. The initial proposal to staff was for 43 units,
16 but a recent change in multiple-family development standards caused a reduction of
17 units to 40. They are looking now at the feasibility of the project, as start-up costs will
18 be over a million dollars.

19
20 The fire department accepted the present configuration, and the developer will have
21 that paved and landscaped. It can be dedicated to the city, if that is desired, but the
22 present plan is to keep it. He reiterated that they are still in the planning process and
23 welcome questions and comments from the Commission.

24
25 Chair Gifford and Commissioner Perciful voiced concerns about the street that turns
26 into nowhere which is currently chained off. They suggested making it a cul-de-sac or
27 including a small gazebo or picnic bench.

28
29 CDD Elliano explained that it's an offset street that looks like an incomplete design or
30 afterthought as opposed to going with the turnaround. It would be nice to have the lot
31 area serve a dual purpose, and have some amenity.

32
33 Chair Gifford asked what the price point would be, but Mr. Morrissey said they really
34 didn't know at this point. The owner wants to see how favorable the design is.

35
36 Vice Chair Vasquez indicated his concerns about the project, but wondered if any
37 thought had been given to making this a senior citizen type of residence development.
38 He felt the development appeared condensed and crowded, and that if it became a
39 rental property, it could turn into a problem area for the police department and would
40 negatively impact the neighborhood.

41
42 Mr. Morrissey responded that the senior housing issue had not been raised. The
43 property owner has not yet decided whether this will be a condo or apartment complex.
44 He did feel, however, that because there were garages for each unit, the rental rates
45 might be higher than other homes across the street because they are an older
46 development; some are now rentals because of default problems, etc. He reiterated
47 that there has been no analysis done.

48
49 Vice Chair Vasquez said the Commission is charged with making sure that future
50 projects are in line with the General Plan, which is positive. He stated that this reminds

1 him of the projects he grew up in, although newer and a lot nicer. He wanted to know if
2 the police department had indicated any feedback about the project.
3

4 Chairman Gifford indicated his feeling that best use of the project was for senior living.
5 Since most of the units are less than a thousand square feet, they are not going to be
6 high priced, which will be popular with seniors. If it's just advanced to the general
7 public, it will be considered low income.
8

9 Commissioner Perciful recommended either extending the road to make it curve, or
10 making the project a gated community.
11

12 Russell Rumansoff explained that the turnaround is actually for the existing fourplexes.
13 The developer is really giving up the property for the fourplexes to be serviced by the
14 fire department. He added that a basketball court on the turn-around lot is probably a
15 good idea.
16

17 DEPARTMENT REPORTS

18
19
20 **7. CITY ATTORNEY REPORT BY ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY STEVE MCEWEN:**
21 (Nothing to report.)
22

23 **8. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORTS:**
24

25 **A. Summary report regarding City Council Meeting of July 23, 2013**

26
27 CDD Elliano reported that the Zoning Ordinance Amendment for Housing Element
28 compliance had unanimous adoption of Planning Commission's recommendation on
29 the emergency shelters and small lot zone and the ordinance creating the R-4 zone.
30

31 **B. Update on Planning Projects and Informational Items**
32 (No report given at this time.)
33

34 **C. Development Process Roundtable Report**
35

36 A Development Workshop was conducted on July 25th by the Planning, Building, Fire,
37 and Engineering Departments, with approximately 50 people in attendance. An
38 overview of the city's processes was given and a roundtable discussion ensued,
39 delineating how the processes could be improved to be more efficient. Questions and
40 issues came up which will be responded to in writing to those in attendance, and efforts
41 will be made to enact some of the changes suggested. The mission was to let the
42 development community know that the city wishes to partner with them, keeping in
43 mind the need for compliance with state and federal laws and health and safety codes.
44

45 **9. PLANNING COMMISSIONER REPORTS:**
46

47 **A. Chairman Gifford reported a meeting he had with the City Manager**
48 **concerning bringing businesses to the city and other things the city is**
49 **working on. He reported that it seems to the City Manager that the staff is**
50 **focused and there are some good things in the works.**

B. Vice Chair Vasquez (Nothing to report.)

C. Commissioner Perciful (Nothing to report.)

- D. Commissioner Overmyer (Absent)
- E. Commissioner Crimeni (Nothing to report.)

10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

- A. General Plan Consistency Zoning Updates
- B. Landscaping and Fencing Zoning Ordinance
- C. GPA-13-001: Proposed 2014-2021 Housing Element Update
- D. DAA - Tres Cerritos West DA Amendment

CDD Elliano reminded the Commission that Tres Cerritos West is the hillside development that was graded, but never completed, and the project had stalled during the recession.

There is now a lot of interest by new developers to come and take that over, so they want to extend their timelines and the development agreement. This will come to the Commission as a public hearing, at the next meeting.

E. SDR for the Hemet Auto Mall

CDD Elliano stated that the since the Commission is moving forward on the SPA for the Auto Mall, at the next meeting the Site Development Review for this specific project will be presented.

11. ADJOURNMENT:

It was unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 7:56 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **August 20, 2013 at 6:00 p.m.** to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet, CA 92543.

John Gifford, Chairman
Hemet Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Melissa Couden, Records Secretary
Hemet Planning Commission

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: AUGUST 6, 2013

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 Greg Vasquez, and Commissioners Rick Crimeni and Michael Perciful

ABSENT: Commissioner Vince Overmyer (with notice)

Invocation and Flag Salute: Chairman John Gifford

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A. Minutes for the Planning Commission Meeting of July 16, 2013

It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Rick Crimeni and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Michael Perciful to **APPROVE** the July 16, 2013 Planning Commission Minutes.

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

AYES: Chairman John Gifford, Vice Chairman Greg Vasquez, Commissioners Michael Perciful and Rick Crimeni

NOES: None

ABSENT: Vince Overmyer

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS: (None)

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

4. SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 13-001 (SP 87-28. HEMET AUTO MALL)

Owner: Gosch Auto Group Inc.

Agent: Eric Gosch

Planner: Emery J. Papp, Principal Planner

Location: Hemet Auto Mall - Southeast corner of Florida Ave and Warren Rd

1 Planner Papp replied that they have a 36 foot wide drive aisle and parking spaces, with
2 the nearest residences another 13 feet on the other side of the wall. He also explained
3 the entire Auto Mall Specific Plan has sub-areas - specifically A, B, C, and D. This
4 particular area falls in Area A, which is intended primarily for automobile dealerships.
5

6 Chairman Gifford opened the public hearing and invited Mr. Marc Gosch to the lectern,
7 who explained that the present block wall is currently five feet tall, with a three-foot
8 wrought iron extension. The proposed wall, as a result of the noise study completion,
9 will be 11 feet, reducing the decibel level to 55 percent.
10

11 When asked by Chairman Gifford if the other five conditions were acceptable, Mr.
12 Gosch replied that they were.
13

14 Frank Gorman of GW Engineering, 800 East Florida Avenue, was asked to respond to
15 Chairman Gifford's question regarding why the bays are facing east. Mr. Gorman
16 noted that 25 years ago when the plan was introduced, there was not a template for
17 dealerships, so considering the WQMD requirements concerning storm drains and
18 electrical easements, it made the initial plan of putting a 20-foot high building 15 feet off
19 the property line infeasible. This is an extremely narrow lot and works best with having
20 the bays in the back.
21

22 Vice Chair Vasquez queried Mr. Gorman about the effects of the project on Auto Mall
23 Drive.
24

25 Mr. Gorman explained that when the Auto Mall was originally built, all the
26 improvements were put in. There will be more staff parking added, and some areas set
27 aside for bio-retention, which are new WQMD requirements. So there really will not be
28 much difference along Auto Mall Drive than what presently exists.
29

30 Robin Lowe (8075 Carnosic Avenue, Hemet), representing Hemet West, mentioned
31 several issues, most particularly the Time Warner boxes on the wall, but indicated
32 there had been discussion of the other issues, and Hemet West was appreciative of the
33 efforts made by the Gosch team to eliminate the concerns. She also expressed
34 gratitude for the work of the Planning Division team and the foresight shown by the
35 Specific Plan 25 years ago. She withdrew the request for a continuance.
36

37 CDD Elliano noted some last minute language additions in the Specific Plan regarding
38 the property line wall, page 7, No. 3, Service Areas, (b) to read as follows: "*Perimeter
39 walls constructed for sound wall purposes along the eastern boundary shall be
40 consistent with design, material, and height as appropriate.*"
41

42 The applicant and Ms. Lowe approved the language addition, and Chairman Gifford
43 closed the public hearing and asked for further comments from Commissioners.
44

45 Vice Chair Vasquez, Commissioner Perciful and Chairman Gifford agreed that the
46 issue had been handled well by Hemet West, the Gosch group and the planning staff.
47

48 Vice Chair Vasquez questioned the reason for the amendment that provided the
49 Community Development Director the ability to make decisions on modifications on
50 anything less than 10 percent and also asked what an "accessory structure" was.

1 CDD Elliano explained that under the current Specific Plan, any change in any
2 structure is supposed to come before the Planning Commission, but not necessarily as
3 a public hearing. Staff felt if it was a significant change, it should come as a public
4 hearing, but minor changes consistent with the plan need not come to the Commission.
5 She defined an "accessory structure" as something that is a modest building, such as a
6 small structure or addition such as solar panels.

7
8 Vice Chair Vasquez noted that 10 percent is relative because if it's a large
9 development, that could be a significant number.

10
11 CDD Elliano added that 10 percent is based on the original building size and that the
12 Commission could change that to a square footage benchmark if they felt
13 uncomfortable with the 10 percent number. Staff was just trying to limit the number of
14 minor issues coming before the Commission.

15
16 Commissioner Perciful asked if parking lots were included in the 10 percent.

17
18 CDD Elliano clarified that the 10 percent applies to existing buildings or structures.
19 Parking lot expansion would be under the auspices of the Community Development
20 Director, not a public hearing issue.

21
22 Chairman Gifford offered to entertain a motion, with two changes, one to Section 3(b)
23 regarding the wall; the other to Section 5(a)2, to define the 10 percent as 10 percent
24 increase to the original floor space of the buildings that were approved.

25
26 It was **MOVED** by Vice Chair Vasquez and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Crimeni to
27 **APPROVE** Specific Plan Amendment No. 13-001, with the two above-mentioned
28 clarifications.

29
30 The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote:

31
32 **AYES:** Chairman John Gifford, Vice Chair Greg Vasquez, Commissioners
33 Michael Perciful and Rick Crimeni.

34 **NOES:** None

35 **ABSENT:** Commissioner Vince Overmyer

36
37 **(Adopted Planning Commission Resolution No.13-011)**

38
39
40 **5. ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NO. 13-001: HOUSING ELEMENT COMPLIANCE-**
41 **MULTIPLE FAMILY ZONE (R-4) ZONE CHANGES**

42 **APPLICANT:** City of Hemet

43 **PLANNER:** Carole L. Kendrick, Assistant Planner

44 **LOCATIONS:** Site 1: Located on the east side of Myers Street, south of
45 Devonshire Avenue and north of Florida Avenue (448-120-010). Site 2: Located
46 on the south side of Latham Avenue, east of Lyon Avenue (442-060-046). Site
47 3: Located on the south side of Stetson Avenue, east and west of Elk Street
48 (464-270-002, 464-270-005, 464-270-006). Site 4: Located on the south side of
49 Johnston Avenue and the east side of Gilbert Street (446-280-005, 446-280-
50 016, 446-380-017). Site 5: located on the southeast corner of State Street and
Johnston Avenue and the northwest corner of Buena Vista Street and Stetson

1 Avenue (446-300-001 thru 003, 446-300-005, 446-300-007, 446-300-008, 446-
2 300-011). Site 6: Located on the east side of State Street between Thornton
3 Avenue and Chambers (451-100-022, 451-100-026 and 451-100-036).
4

5 **DESCRIPTION:** A City-initiated Zone Change to rezone six (6) different sites
6 (18 individual parcels) identified as Very High Density Residential (VHDR) on
7 the General Plan Land Use Map to Multiple Family Residential (R-4) on the
8 City's official Zoning Map in compliance with the City's Housing Element and
9 State law requirements.

10
11 (Powerpoint presentation by Planner Kendrick)
12

13 Chairman Gifford clarified that these changes needed to be done in strategic locations
14 to meet the requirements of the State in order to certify the Housing Element
15 Compliance. He also asked for an explanation of the difference between Very High
16 Density and the R-4 zone.
17

18 Planner Kendrick explained that the newly adopted R-4 zoning code accommodates
19 the General Plan designation of very high density at 30.1 units per acre.
20

21 There is a recommendation that Site 6 be removed per the request of Transtech or
22 Eagle Development, who want to put in a 250-unit multifamily housing development.
23 CDD Elliano was perplexed as to why they want it removed, but they do have drainage
24 issues. Staff received a letter, which was given to the Commission members, at 5 p.m.
25 this evening with the request. Therefore, staff is outlining three options: 1) move
26 forward as proposed; 2) contact the developer between now and the City Council
27 meeting and pull it out at the council meeting if they don't want to go forward; or 3) the
28 Commission can honor their request, and recommend pulling it out and spreading the
29 units to other sites.
30

31 Planner Kendrick also commented that when they develop, they will have to do a
32 General Plan Amendment if they want to keep the zoning they have.
33

34 Commissioner Crimeni asked when the deadline is for the Housing Element
35 Compliance plan with the State.
36

37 CDD Elliano stated the drop-dead date for all the cities in Southern California is
38 October 1, 2013. If Site 6 is included, no changes need to be made in the plan. If it is
39 excluded, staff has to have a backup plan devised, but the Housing Element is going
40 forward, either way.
41

42 Chair Gifford opened the public hearing and Pamela Schein, 870 South Inez Street,
43 Hemet, approached the lectern and asked a question regarding a zoning clarification
44 for a site now located behind the Salvation Army downtown. She note that the site is
45 presently designated for senior housing only, but such a designation is now considered
46 age discrimination.
47

48 CDD Elliano responded that the city used to have an S-3 zone, which was senior
49 multifamily, but subsequent state and federal legislation required that the city repeal
50 that designation, and now R-3 is the same density designation, but for all ages.

1 Ms. Schein then asked for an explanation as to where the proposed senior oriented
2 Jasmine Gardens Development is to be located, if the proposal goes through.

3
4 Planner Kendrick replied that it's located in front of Johnston Avenue, and they are
5 required to do a lot line adjustment.

6
7 Chair Gifford closed the public hearing, and Commissioner Crimeni indicated he
8 thought Site 6 should remain in the proposal, to which Chair Gifford agreed.

9
10 Vice Chair Vasquez asked if the developer had plenty of notification, to which CDD
11 Elliano responded that they had notification since July 8th and were aware of the
12 General Plan designation.

13
14 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Crimeni and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Perciful
15 to **ADOPT** the Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 13-014, recommending
16 **APPROVAL** of Zone Change No.13-001 (Ordinance Bill No. 13-039) to the City
17 Council.

18
19 The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote:

20
21 **AYES:** Chairman John Gifford, Vice Chair Greg Vasquez, Commissioners
22 Michael Perciful and Rick Crimeni.

23 **NOES:** None

24 **ABSENT:** Commissioner Vince Overmyer

25
26 *(Adopted Planning Commission Resolution No. 13-012)*

27
28
29 **WORK STUDY ITEMS**

30
31 6. **WORKSTUDY: PRELIMINARY REVIEW NO. 13-004 (COPENHAGEN COURT**
32 **GARDEN APARTMENTS)**: A Workstudy Session for the Planning Commission to
33 review and provide input regarding the submittal of a future Site Development
34 Review Application to allow the construction and use of 8 single-story multiple-
35 family residential apartment buildings containing 40 units totaling 53,600 square
36 feet, located on the east side of Copenhagen Street, south of Sydney Street and
37 north of Anchorage Street.

38
39 **Applicant:** Nader Khoshniyati

40 **Agent:** Jim Morrissey

41 **Location:** East side of Copenhagen Street, south of Sydney Street and north
42 of Anchorage Street

43 **APN:** 448-210-005 thru 014 and 448-210-016 thru 018

44
45 (Powerpoint presentation by Planner Carole Kendrick)

46
47 Chairman Gifford had questions concerning fire truck turnaround, pavement finishing,
48 driveway access, common space, Home Owners Association/property management.

49
50 Planner Kendrick explained that the pavement is asphalt in the parking lot, that the two
driveways open onto Copenhagen, that property management or an HOA will maintain

1 the common areas, and that there hasn't yet been a decision as to whether these will
2 be apartments or condos.

3
4 Commissioner Crimeni wanted to know about the street that dead-ends into the fire
5 turnaround, and how that was going to be finished off, as well as whether there would
6 be playgrounds or common areas for children.

7
8 Planner Kendrick said they were waiting to hear from the applicant as to the fire access
9 configuration and that there is no common area for children. As yet there has not been
10 a decision as to whether these will be apartments or condos. Guest parking will be in
11 designated spaces, and each unit comes with a two-car garage.

12
13 Jim Morrissey, 41738 Fulton Avenue, was called to the lectern, as the applicant, to
14 answer questions. He stated that this is essentially an apartment project with an
15 appearance similar to single-family units. The initial proposal to staff was for 43 units,
16 but a recent change in multiple-family development standards caused a reduction of
17 units to 40. They are looking now at the feasibility of the project, as start-up costs will
18 be over a million dollars.

19
20 The fire department accepted the present configuration, and the developer will have
21 that paved and landscaped. It can be dedicated to the city, if that is desired, but the
22 present plan is to keep it. He reiterated that they are still in the planning process and
23 welcome questions and comments from the Commission.

24
25 Chair Gifford and Commissioner Perciful voiced concerns about the street that turns
26 into nowhere which is currently chained off. They suggested making it a cul-de-sac or
27 including a small gazebo or picnic bench.

28
29 CDD Elliano explained that it's an offset street that looks like an incomplete design or
30 afterthought as opposed to going with the turnaround. It would be nice to have the lot
31 area serve a dual purpose, and have some amenity.

32
33 Chair Gifford asked what the price point would be, but Mr. Morrissey said they really
34 didn't know at this point. The owner wants to see how favorable the design is.

35
36 Vice Chair Vasquez indicated his concerns about the project, but wondered if any
37 thought had been given to making this a senior citizen type of residence development.
38 He felt the development appeared condensed and crowded, and that if it became a
39 rental property, it could turn into a problem area for the police department and would
40 negatively impact the neighborhood.

41
42 Mr. Morrissey responded that the senior housing issue had not been raised. The
43 property owner has not yet decided whether this will be a condo or apartment complex.
44 He did feel, however, that because there were garages for each unit, the rental rates
45 might be higher than other homes across the street because they are an older
46 development; some are now rentals because of default problems, etc. He reiterated
47 that there has been no analysis done.

48
49 Vice Chair Vasquez said the Commission is charged with making sure that future
50 projects are in line with the General Plan, which is positive. He stated that this reminds

1 him of the projects he grew up in, although newer and a lot nicer. He wanted to know if
2 the police department had indicated any feedback about the project.

3
4 Chairman Gifford indicated his feeling that best use of the project was for senior living.
5 Since most of the units are less than a thousand square feet, they are not going to be
6 high priced, which will be popular with seniors. If it's just advanced to the general
7 public, it will be considered low income.

8
9 Commissioner Perciful recommended either extending the road to make it curve, or
10 making the project a gated community.

11
12 Russell Rumansoff explained that the turnaround is actually for the existing fourplexes.
13 The developer is really giving up the property for the fourplexes to be serviced by the
14 fire department. He added that a basketball court on the turn-around lot is probably a
15 good idea.

16 17 **DEPARTMENT REPORTS**

18
19
20 **7. CITY ATTORNEY REPORT BY ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY STEVE MCEWEN:**
21 (Nothing to report.)

22 23 **8. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORTS:**

24 25 **A. Summary report regarding City Council Meeting of July 23, 2013**

26
27 CDD Elliano reported that the Zoning Ordinance Amendment for Housing Element
28 compliance had unanimous adoption of Planning Commission's recommendation on
29 the emergency shelters and small lot zone and the ordinance creating the R-4 zone.

30 31 **B. Update on Planning Projects and Informational Items** 32 (No report given at this time.)

33 34 **C. Development Process Roundtable Report**

35
36 A Development Workshop was conducted on July 25th by the Planning, Building, Fire,
37 and Engineering Departments, with approximately 50 people in attendance. An
38 overview of the city's processes was given and a roundtable discussion ensued,
39 delineating how the processes could be improved to be more efficient. Questions and
40 issues came up which will be responded to in writing to those in attendance, and efforts
41 will be made to enact some of the changes suggested. The mission was to let the
42 development community know that the city wishes to partner with them, keeping in
43 mind the need for compliance with state and federal laws and health and safety codes.

44 45 **9. PLANNING COMMISSIONER REPORTS:**

46
47 **A. Chairman Gifford reported a meeting he had with the City Manager**
48 **concerning bringing businesses to the city and other things the city is**
49 **working on. He reported that it seems to the City Manager that the staff is**
50 **focused and there are some good things in the works.**

B. Vice Chair Vasquez (Nothing to report.)

C. Commissioner Perciful (Nothing to report.)

- D. Commissioner Overmyer (Absent)
- E. Commissioner Crimeni (Nothing to report.)

10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

- A. General Plan Consistency Zoning Updates
- B. Landscaping and Fencing Zoning Ordinance
- C. GPA-13-001: Proposed 2014-2021 Housing Element Update
- D. DAA - Tres Cerritos West DA Amendment

CDD Elliano reminded the Commission that Tres Cerritos West is the hillside development that was graded, but never completed, and the project had stalled during the recession.

There is now a lot of interest by new developers to come and take that over, so they want to extend their timelines and the development agreement. This will come to the Commission as a public hearing, at the next meeting.

- E. SDR for the Hemet Auto Mall

CDD Elliano stated that the since the Commission is moving forward on the SPA for the Auto Mall, at the next meeting the Site Development Review for this specific project will be presented.

11. ADJOURNMENT:

It was unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 7:56 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **August 20, 2013 at 6:00 p.m.** to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet, CA 92543.



John Gifford, Chairman
Hemet Planning Commission

ATTEST:



Melissa Couden, Records Secretary
Hemet Planning Commission