MEETING MINUTES

DATE: October 18, 2011

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 Overmyer

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Minutes for the Planning Commission Meeting of September 20, 2011

It was MOVED by Vice Chair Deuber and SECONDED by Commissioner Overmyer to
APPROVE the September 20, 2011 Minutes as presented.

AYES: Chairman Gifford, Vice Chairman Deuber and Commissioner Overmyer
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Commissioners David Rogers; Chauncey Thompson (only for those items
presented before he arrived.)
ABSENT: None

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS (None)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

4. DOWNTOWN PROJECT REVIEW (DPR) NO. 11-002

APPLICANT: Simon Chu
LOCATION: Northwest corner of North Harvard Street and East Florida Avenue
PLANNER: Ronald Running – City Planner

DESCRIPTION: A request for Planning Commission review and recommendation
to the City Council regarding proposed facade improvements to the existing
building located on the northwest corner of North Harvard Street and East Florida
Avenue in the D-1 Zone, pursuant to Hemet Municipal Code sections 90-938 and
90-47 for projects in the Downtown, with consideration of an environmental exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301.

Planner Ron Running gave a presentation, accompanied by graphics, of the item and entertained questions from the Commission.

Chairman Gifford asked what design possibility the staff was suggesting the Commission recommend to the City Council and whether the planters should be moveable or permanent.

Planner Running responded that staff was recommending Scheme D with the banding and noted that moveable planters tended to be easier to maintain.

Chairman Gifford suggested wrought-iron borders for the planters to maintain the turn-of-the-century motif for the Downtown district.

Vice Chairman Deuber inquired about the height of the awning and signage.

Planner Running responded that he didn't see a problem with some varying parapet heights and signage differences, such as black, burgundy or rust awnings.

Commissioner Overmyer wanted further explanation on "rusticated" stucco and warned that EPS cornices must have enough foam coating material to discourage birds from pecking holes in them. He also asked about signage that would be lighted lettering.

Planner Running explained that lettering on the signage would be either internally illuminated, individual channeled lettered signs, or pin set where the letters are set out from the building about an inch and then back-lit to maintain the retro look.

Mr. Chu began to offer some explanations, but Chairman Gifford asked that he wait until the public hearing was opened.

Commissioner Rogers inquired regarding the placement of the plaque that staff was recommending.

Planner Running advised that it would be at the entrance on the Harvard Street side of the building. He also commented that there could be a variety in the types of signage.

Vice Chairman Deuber stressed the need for classy signage in this area and commented favorably on the script writing on some of the signs. She noted that she did not want to see a "1950's diner-style" signage appear. She also commented on the lighting with indirect illumination from sconces and lighting in the trees.

CDD Elliano stated that the signage should be in line with the classic traditional architecture, so staff is looking for a facade and signage that is very clean and sophisticated.

Planner Running explained to Vice Chairman Deuber that the sconces were to be placed on the upper portion of the pilaster.
Chairman Gifford opened the public hearing and invited Simon Chu to approach the lectern.

Simon Chu, 111 North Harvard Street, approached the lectern as the project applicant and explained that he had developed an interest in working in the downtown area ten years ago, but became frustrated with the Building Department, so he went to Compton for four or five years, completed the project he was working on there, and is now back in Hemet. He expressed his appreciation for City Planner Running, and all of the help he had received.

Vice Chairman Deuber asked about signage and color scheme.

CDD Elliano advised that there was no sign program as yet, but that Mr. Chu needed to develop one.

Mr. Chu explained that his preference was for light, bright colors, but that he needed to have some interior and exterior design assistance from staff on the colors. He and Vice Chairman Deuber discussed other color, lighting and landscape ideas.

Commissioner Overmyer asked if Mr. Chu was amenable to the layout of the elevation in Scheme D.

Mr. Chu indicated that Scheme D was fine, noting that his main thrust was to see consistency throughout the downtown area relating to signage.

Sabrina Chapman, the owner of Finders Keepers Antiques on Harvard Street, stated that she preferred a color other than black because of the necessity to power-wash the awnings due to bird droppings. She expressed excitement about the work that Mr. Chu was doing and stated that she hoped to be one of his tenants.

Chairman Gifford closed the public hearing, and stated that he was in favor of staff's recommendation.

Vice Chairman Deuber asked about the positioning of the commemorative plaques, to which CDD Elliano stated they should be tastefully done, in a prominent position at eye level.

It was MOVED by Commissioner Overmyer and SECONDED by Commissioner Thompson to ADOPT the Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 11-016 for the Downtown Project Review No. 11-002.

The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

(Approved Planning Commission Resolution No. 11-015.)
5. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NO. 11-002 (CITY OF HEMET GENERAL
PLAN 2030)
APPLICANT: City of Hemet
LOCATION: City-wide
PLANNER: Deanna Elliano / Nancy Gutierrez
DESCRIPTION: A request for Planning Commission review and recommendation
to the City Council regarding the comprehensive update to the City of Hemet
General Plan which establishes city-wide land uses, policies and programs within
ten general plan elements and replaces the city’s existing general plan adopted in
1992. A Program Environmental Impact Report has been prepared for the project
in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (SCH No.
2010061088).

CDD Elliano outlined the history of the formation of the General Plan 2030, including
the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) that was formed in April of 2009, which
included a period of six months in public meetings, culminating in final
recommendations before the City Council in January of 2010, followed by fiscal
analysis, traffic analysis, work on the elements, and preparation of the Draft EIR by the
consultants. She indicated that the two items the Commission would be considering
were the Draft General Plan document and the Draft EIR.

CDD Elliano acknowledged the City Council for their support of the General Plan effort,
the Planning Commission for their extra time and energy in going through all the
elements, and most significantly, the General Plan Advisory Committee for their many
hours of work. She also mentioned community organizations as well as AECOM, the
consultants who provided initial technical data, assisted in the formatting of the
document, and in preparation of the EIR. Finally, appreciation was expressed to the
planning staff, with particular mention of Nancy Gutierrez, Ronald Running, and Carole
Kendrick.

A PowerPoint presentation was then given by CDD Elliano, followed by a ten-minute
recess.

Chairman Gifford requested questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Rogers asked CDD Elliano what metrics staff was using to determine
the effectiveness of the goals they had set out to achieve in the General Plan.

CDD Elliano pointed out that there would be an annual review process to measure the
effectiveness and implementation of the goals. She noted that it would also become
apparent in project reviews, consideration of new city projects or plans, and annual
review of the goals to see if modifications or changes were needed.

Commissioner Thompson asked if the General Plan was audited by the State.

CDD Elliano responded that the only element the State requires reporting on is the
Housing element. She noted that the General Plan is consistent with SB-375 and AB-
32, and explained that as new legislation is adopted by the State, staff will need to be
responsive and amendments could be made during those four periods of time per year.
Commissioner Rogers asked for amplification on the differences between the older General Plan and the new one.

CDD Elliano pointed out the following areas: Preserving and promoting job-based land uses; Highway 79 transportation corridor and Metrolink; introduction of the mixed-use concept, integrating transportation, land use and walkability; and a more appropriate designation of residential densities.

Commissioners Rogers and Thompson applauded staff for the work they had done.

Vice Chairman Deuber asked what was in place to ensure that the General Plan was adhered to.

CDD Elliano responded that it is really a practice that all City government staff needs to make a priority because the General Plan is like the City's constitution or top policy document, and other actions should flow and be consistent with it.

City Attorney Jex explained that every project that comes before the Commission, whether a tract map, conditional use permit, specific plan, or other type of project, has to be consistent with the General Plan. That is one of the findings which must be made by the Commission on every project.

Chairman Gifford indicated that the Commission has a mandate to adhere to the General Plan, as it is a template for the future. He added that he would like to change the perception of Hemet as a cul-de-sac community — a place to go to, stay a little while, and then leave. Hemet actually has some of the best amenities and assets of any city in the County of Riverside, such as the ongoing reconstruction of downtown Hemet, Diamond Valley Lake with the science center and school of excellence there, an outstanding medical community, and the Ramona Bowl, all of which should make Hemet a destination community. He also mentioned that the city of Hemet is made up of a number of districts, including east side, west side, downtown, hillside, and agriculture, so the challenge was in melding some very different types of communities into one city.

CDD Elliano noted that there are 11 districts within the city, and connecting the major ones, such as downtown, Diamond Valley Lake, West Hemet and the Florida Avenue corridor, is a goal with multi-modal connections, such as bike and pedestrian trails. Also, there is a community design element which includes signage that would address those districts.

Commissioner Overmyer commented that he joined the Commission in the spring exactly for this type of forward-looking goal setting, and he looks forward to implementing the ideas outlined.

Chairman Gifford opened the public hearing and invited the audience to participate in the discussion.

Cash Hovivian, 36051 Tres Cerritos, applauded the work done, but noted that he was not in support of the off-ramp at Tres Cerritos or the realignment of Highway 79 because they would generate thousands of cars per day, which is not compatible with the equestrian-type lifestyle in that area. He stated that he would support an off-ramp
at Devonshire Avenue, with exits and access by way of Warren Road. He also discouraged multi-family dwellings until Hemet has the industry and workforce to support such residences, because at this stage, they turn into crime areas or slum-type neighborhoods.

CDD Elliano responded to Mr. Hovivian’s comments concerning Highway 79 by stating that the final alignment and the on- and off-ramps were going to be under the purview of RCTC and Caltrans, who have not as yet released their EIR. Once the final decision is made through the public hearings with RCTC, then if the off-ramp at Tres Cerritos is removed from theirs, it will be removed from the General Plan.

Chairman Gifford noted that the state requires the multi-family potential, but the good news is the projects still have to come to the Commission before any of those plans get approved.

Vice Chairman Deuber wished to go on record to say that an off-ramp at Tres Cerritos makes zero sense and conflicts with the land uses of the ranches and Reinhart Canyon specifically. She also suggested the need to position the commercial, industrial, and business park elements first before addressing the residential, such as condo complexes or medium- to high-density housing.

CDD Elliano said that would be favorable; however, there are market forces and private property interests that can't be ignored. What would dictate timing would be the provision of infrastructure because there needs to be infrastructure and services to support new development.

Don Digby, 25080 California Avenue, applauded the Commission, the GPAC, CDD Elliano, and staff on the hard work they have done. He added that he hoped the General Plan would be followed because Hemet will then prosper.

Jerry Jaeckels, 35154 Tres Cerritos, was also opposed to the Tres Cerritos off-ramp and suggested it be taken off the plan rather than waiting for the RCTC and Caltrans. He approved Temecula's handling of the freeway and wished Hemet to follow suit.

Chairman Gifford noted the concern about the Tres Cerritos off-ramp and suggested several other avenues of comment should audience members wish to continue the discussion.

Vice Chairman Deuber also suggested that comments should include the history of the multi-million dollar horse ranches in that area, as well as buffalo.

Gene Hike!, chair of the Four Seasons Awareness Committee, applauded the GPAC, staff, and particularly CDD Elliano for her leadership. He noted that a lot of people had contributed to the plan and worked hard to ensure that it was a benefit to all citizens of Hemet. He noted, however, that the off-ramp at Tres Cerritos, which has no access into Hemet, should be relocated to Devonshire Avenue. He also favors limiting multifamily dwellings until Hemet has the job base to support them.

Robert Righetti, a member of the GPAC and representative of the Diamond Valley Arts Council, 3550 East Florida Avenue, Suite B, commended CDD Elliano and her staff on their work. He noted that Hemet was raising the bar with the addition of Chapter 10 for
the arts. He stated that Hemet should be thought of as a radius point, as a hub, with surrounding cities as visitation sites to be enjoyed as people stay in Hemet. He also suggested making San Jacinto and Hemet into the Center for International Mountain Bike Racing because of the natural elements making this area distinctive. He mentioned that in an appendix to the plan, he was working on a manual on how to implement the chapter on the arts. He also mentioned that he was on the project development team for the Highway 79 project and had been working since 1993 on the routes going through the valley. He stated that engineering and environmental issues are driving such things as elevated highways because of watershed issues, etc., especially because Hemet is pretty flat, and that these engineering decisions are not made on a whim.

Chairman Gifford thanked Mr. Righetti for his input on the HUB of the Valley concept.

Further discussion ensued among staff and the Commission concerning the date for the next public hearing, with the following motion resulting:

It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Deuber and SECONDED by Commissioner Overmyer to CONTINUE the Public Hearing for General Plan Amendment (GPA) No. 11-002, to November 15, 2011.

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

6. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 11-002 (2030 General Plan Draft Program Environmental Impact Report)

APPLICANT: City of Hemet
LOCATION: City-wide
PLANNER: Deanna Elliano / Nancy Gutierrez
DESCRIPTION: A request for Planning Commission review and recommendation to the City Council regarding the Program Draft Environmental Impact Report prepared for the 2030 General Plan Update.

A PowerPoint presentation was given by John Bridges, representative of the City’s General Plan consultant AECOM.

Chairman Gifford complimented Mr. Bridges on the work done, but suggested that approximate numbers be used for census and housing figures rather than exact numbers. He also wanted to see something about water supply assessments and how the Eastern Municipal and Hemet Water districts would issue those.

Commissioner Rogers asked how other cities have dealt with significant unavoidable conditions or impacts.

Mr. Bridges stated that there were a number of methodologies that were typical for preparing these reports, so they apply those methodologies that they feel are most defensible and provide the client (Hemet) the most defensible environmental document, should there be a challenge. He further stated that the significant impacts
associated with Hemet's General Plan are consistent with, or even less than, many other jurisdictions.

Chairman Gifford opened the public hearing on the EIR. There being no members of the public who wished to speak, Chairman Gifford closed the public hearing and asked for comments from the Commission.

Both Commissioners Rogers and Thompson said they needed more time to review it.

CDD Elliano said staff would come back on the 15th of November and give them an update on the comments received, as the EIR comment period ends on November 14th. She noted that the Commission did not need to continue the public hearing, as there was no legislative requirement to have a public hearing, nor does the Commission need to give recommendations, only direct staff and consultants to prepare responses to comments in the final EIR.

## WORK STUDY ITEMS

### 7. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 11-004 (Jasmine Gardens)

**APPLICANT:** 1027 Wilshire Associates c/o Denley Investments  
**AGENT:** Kenneth Bank  
**LOCATION:** South side of Johnston Avenue, west of State Street and east of Gilbert Street  
**PLANNER:** Carole Kendrick  
**DESCRIPTION:** A work study session with discussion and possible direction to staff regarding a proposed conditional use permit for the construction of a three-story senior apartment complex, including 124 units, to be built in two phases, located on Johnston Avenue, east of Gilbert Street and west of State Street.

A PowerPoint presentation was given by Planner Kendrick regarding the proposed conditional use permit.

In response to Vice Chair Deuber's question concerning fire department issues, Planner Kendrick explained that there was a need for two access points for fire equipment, and that the second access in Phase 1 would be a punch-out in one driveway, which will be closed when Phase 2 is constructed with its own access way.

Vice Chair Deuber also expressed concern regarding the seismic hazards of this site, noting fault lines only a few blocks away. With the possibility of elevators being shut down during quakes, she mentioned the danger to disabled seniors living on the third floor with no access to elevators.

Commissioner Thompson commented regarding the podium style not being appropriate for this community. He felt a lower roof line would fit better. He also wanted to know why there wasn't build-out on the full property, and expressed concern that the 14 guest and employee parking spaces would not be sufficient.

Planner Kendrick responded that the applicant was proposing a multi-phased plan. She noted that the applicant felt that the covered parking would not be fully utilized, so some of those spaces could be designated for guests.
Commissioner Rogers also expressed concerns about the parking, the FAR, and the color scheme.

CDD Elliano explained that because the project was residential, it would be defined by dwelling units per acre, and that it was consistent with the General Plan.

Commissioner Overmyer suggested that podium-style projects for 55 and older were appropriate because they tend to hide parking and conserve on space. He felt most 55+ seniors could navigate stairs, but if there were many disabled persons, perhaps more elevators would be appropriate. He also felt the location was appropriate because it was within a half mile of stores and people without cars could walk there.

Commissioner Thompson inquired about the number of elevators in the Oasis Sahara building, to which Planner Kendrick responded that there were two in each building.

Commissioner Rogers inquired regarding staff’s position as to the roof line style.

Planner Kendrick noted that the applicant was proposing a butterfly roof, which is a very modern style in an older area, so staff was concerned about how it would fit in with the neighborhood.

Vice Chairman Deuber asked if a 3,300 square-foot community center would be big enough for close to 300 tenants in eight two-bedroom units and 54 one-bedroom units.

Chairman Gifford invited the applicant’s representative to speak to the issues.

David Bolour, 1710 North McCadden Place, Los Angeles, 90028, handed out some drawings and reviewed the PowerPoint. He pointed out that they have increased the elevators per building to two. He went on to state that this project was offering below market-rate rents, and they have rent control and income restrictions for a period of 55 years. Their goal is to develop this under-utilized and vacant property within the city of Hemet, fulfilling the city’s objective for the General Plan.

Mr. Bolour stated further that Jasmine Gardens will feature 124 units of senior housing built in two phases of 62 units per phase. Each phase will be built as three two-story type 5 buildings over tucked-under parking, which includes secure storage areas for bicycles and other storage. He went on to describe the area and amenities, such as the community center, pool, pergola with barbecue area, gardens, monitoring via CCTV, coded entries, fencing, butterfly roofing to maximize solar heating for water, shading, and cooling of the structures. He noted, in response to comments, that the roofline has been adjusted so that it is not one straight line. There will be two elevators in each phase. He clarified that this was a senior living community, not assisted living, so they are expecting citizens to be in good health. There are also going to be solar units on the roof to heat water in particular.

Chairman Gifford suggested they work with staff to soften some of the harshness of the building lines so that it would be a better fit into the neighborhood.

Commissioner Rogers asked if there were options regarding the colors. He also commended them on going for the green initiatives and LEEDS.
Mr. Bolour indicated they could work with colors and try to find a good balance for all.

Commissioner Overmyer asked what LEED accreditation they were going to get for the project, to which Mr. Bolour responded that it would be LEED certification.

Mr. Kenneth Bank, project manager, explained that in order to be competitive for tax credits from the state of California, they have to adopt enterprise's green communities criteria, which mirrors LEED.

Chairman Gifford asked for an explanation of "affordability."

Mr. Bank advised that the rent matrix for the project was going to be from 50 percent to 30 percent of area median income. That works out to a one-bedroom unit renting for $350 for income-qualified tenants, and then up to about $625.

Chairman Gifford noted that the Commission had been wrestling with high density projects because they do not wish to overload the valley with a lot of density and low income housing. However, he felt senior housing was an exception. His biggest concern is the design and fit into the existing community.

Mr. Bank stated that the average parking ratio in senior projects is about three-quarter per unit, and down to half in some municipalities. This project is parked at one to one, which is why they feel there will be leftover spaces.

Vice Chairman Deuber asked if the butterfly roof design was to accommodate the solar panels and for the LEED certification.

Ann Cash explained that it was designed at that angle to support a solar roof panel that is also a stationary panel.

There was further discussion with Vice Chairman Deuber about stairway pitch, numbers of trees, exterior and interior design, types of solar roofing, rental prices, maintenance issues, solar panels on the ground, etc.

Mr. Bolour stated that what they are looking at now is a two-phase development on roughly five and a half acres. There is an additional Phase 3 that they are currently undecided on how to proceed with.

Mr. Banks noted that the city's design guidelines call for 1,500 square feet for a senior center, and that they were proposing 3,300. He noted that they would also make it available for clubs or nonprofit organizations to hold functions.

Chairman Gifford stated that the Commission did not want to major on minors or to miss the point, but that the major concern seems to be the design and conformity with the rest of the community in terms of outward architectural design and neighborhood fit.

Commissioner Overmyer stated that he didn't see anything wrong with it, but that it needs more time to address the issues.
Vice Chairman Deuber indicated that the city had been trying to steer away from the urbanized modern retrofit look. She felt that what they were trying to do was commendable, to give seniors an upscale, safe home within walking distance of amenities.

Chairman Gifford proposed that the item go back to staff for further consideration and work. He suggested that the applicant strive for an architectural style that was less "Jetsons" and more "Waltons" in order to better mesh with the surrounding residential areas.

DEPARTMENT REPORTS

8. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORTS

A. Report on City Council actions from the September 27th and October 11th meetings.

CDD Elliano reported that there were no reportable actions on the September 27th meeting and only two items on the October 11th meeting. One was a park commission item regarding maintaining the trails in Simpson Park and having it available for the use of community groups and the general public. An attractive kiosk signage program in the park would be an identifier of trail opportunities. A community group was responsible for the design, and was also willing to install it.

The other item was regarding CR&R being the franchisee for the city solid waste services. The issue is not poor service by the city, but the expenditures that would be necessary to comply with state regulations in terms of air quality, fueling, and recycling. There would need to be a 37 percent increase in trash rates to bring the city services up to speed. The contract with the trash company would effectuate no rate increase the first year, a maximum of 5 percent increase the second year, and thereafter, it would only be raised according to the CPI. They would also offer all current city trash employees employment under their current salaries, with benefits.

B. Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

CDD Elliano reported that the General Plan would be continued to the 15th of November. There would be no meeting held on November 1st.

C. Medi-City Project Status Report

CDD Elliano noted that the CUP for Medi-City was due to expire on October 20th, but that contact had been made, and the intention of the applicant was to file an extension of time to keep the project alive. At that time they can get an idea of where the project is going.

9. CITY ATTORNEY REPORTS: (None)
10. PLANNING COMMISSIONER REPORTS:

A. Chairman Gifford (None)
B. Vice Chairman Deuber

Vice Chairman Deuber reported that she had attended the San Jacinto visionary meeting on Saturday morning that was coordinated by the City's Economic Development department. It was a four-hour session chaired by Steve Harding, examining the assets of the valley and how to market them effectively. The meeting was attended by about 30 people. Also discussed was the lack of hospitality facilities in the valley. A joint council meeting will be held on November 15th. After discussion among Commissioners, Vice Chairman Deuber offered to go to the meeting for the purpose of reporting back to the Planning Commission if the Hemet Planning Commission had a quorum for their meeting on November 15th. She also noted that a number of realtors had attended the Saturday meeting and were planning to meet again on Thursday regarding the 8,000 vacant properties from Beaumont to Temecula, brainstorming as realtors on potentially buying some of these homes and turning them into B&Bs. They had a chat with Rose Salgado about pursuing Native American financing for the project.

C. Commissioner Overmyer (None)
D. Commissioner Rogers (None)
E. Commissioner Thompson (None)

11. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS: Items to be scheduled for upcoming Planning Commission Meetings

A. Report on "Human Signs" and other temporary signage in the City
B. Zoning Ordinance Amendment for Special Housing Classifications
C. Status report on Hemet ROCS
D. Status report on foreclosure activity & housing market
E. Report on Industrial Development Opportunities

12. ADJOURNMENT: To the regular meeting of the City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for November 15, 2011 at 6 p.m. to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet, California 92543.

ATTEST:

[Signature]
John Gifford, Chairman
Hemet Planning Commission

Nancie Shaw, Records Secretary
Hemet Planning Commission