

1 CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

2
3 TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 2004

4
5 THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION WAS
6 CONVENED BY CHAIRMAN DUISTERMARS ON TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 2004 AT
7 6:03P.M. AT THE CITY OF HEMET COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 450 EAST LATHAM
8 AVENUE, HEMET, CALIFORNIA.

9
10 Present: Chairman Bob Duistermars and Commissioners Jim Calkins, B.R. Hicks
11 and Mayzelle Rhoten; Vice Chairman Jones present at 6:06 p.m.

12
13 Absent: None

14
15 Staff Present: Principal Planner Matthew Bassi, Principal Engineer Jorge
16 Biagioni, Planning Technician Loretta Domenigoni, Assistant
17 Public Works Director Mike Gow, Assistant Planner Maureen
18 Losey, Planning Director Richard Masyczek, City Planner Ron
19 Running, Principal Planner David Sawyer, Minutes Secretary
20 Nancie Shaw and Assistant City Attorney Eric Vail

21
22 Invocation and Flag Salute: Commissioner Rhoten

23
24 I. PUBLIC COMMENTS: Anyone who wishes to address the Commission regarding
25 items not on the agenda may do so at this time. Please line up at the lectern when
26 the Chair asks if there are any communications from the public. ***When you are***
27 ***recognized, please give your name, spelling of last name, and address for***
28 ***accurate recording in the minutes.***

29
30 Mike Tyler, 3449 Morro Hill Rd., Hemet, California spoke in opposition to the proposed
31 Wal-Mart Super Center at the southwest corner of Sanderson & Stetson Avenues, stating
32 that such a store would not bring the proper element to the adjacent residential
33 neighborhood.

34
35 Sue Fox, 3800 W. Thornton Ave., Hemet, California spoke in opposition to the proposed
36 Wal-Mart Super Center, stating that there were already enough problems with traffic,
37 littering and loitering.

38
39 Gloria Ann Baca, 3573 W. Thornton Ave., Hemet, California spoke in opposition to the
40 proposed Wal-Mart Super Center and expressed her concern, as a current cancer patient,
41 with the possible cancer causing agents that may be present with such a store so close to
42 her neighborhood.

43
44 William Baca, 3573 W. Thornton Ave., Hemet, California spoke in opposition to the
45 proposed Wal-Mart Super Center and expressed concern with the fact that there were no
46 speed limit signs along Thornton Avenue which was going to cause someone to be killed.

1 Karen Paggi, 3876 W. Thornton Avenue, Hemet, California spoke in opposition to the
2 proposed Wal-Mart Super Center, stating that she was adamantly opposed to every aspect
3 of the store being developed in her neighborhood.

4
5 Cathy Myer, 3356 Windmill Way, Hemet, California spoke in opposition to the proposed
6 Wal-Mart Super Center, stating that she had never seen such a store built in such close
7 proximity to a residential neighborhood.

8
9 Julie Tyler, 3449 Morro Hill Rd., Hemet, California spoke in opposition to the proposed
10 Wal-Mart Super Center, expressing her concern with the type of people that such a store
11 would bring to her neighborhood. She added that traffic would be insane.

12
13 Cory Koelker, 3449 W. Thornton Ave., Hemet, California spoke in opposition to the
14 proposed Wal-Mart Super Center, stating that he had been under the impression that there
15 would be an upscale shopping center built at this location.

16
17 Larry Snyder, 3776 W. Thornton Ave., Hemet, California spoke in opposition to the
18 proposed Wal-Mart Super Center, stating that he was wondering why commercial property
19 was located so close to a single-family residential neighborhood, and that he was
20 concerned with the type of people that would be brought into his neighborhood with the
21 addition of such a store.

22
23 Della Lowrance, 1453 Rabbit Peak Way, Hemet, California spoke in opposition to the
24 proposed Wal-Mart Super Center, stating that she had been advised by a police officer that
25 if such a store were constructed at this location the police department would not have
26 enough officers to protect the residents of the adjacent residential neighborhood. She
27 added that her home had depreciated in value due to the proposition of this store.

28
29
30 **II. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE:** Update given by HUSD
31 Director of Facilities, Sandy Packham

32
33 No update given due to the absence of Ms. Packham.

34
35
36 **III. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**

37
38 There were no amendments or additions to the agenda.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

1 **IV. CONSENT CALENDAR:**

2
3 **A. MINUTES**

- 4
5 1. June 17, 2003
6 2. December 2, 2003
7

8 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Hicks to
9 approve the Consent Calendar as presented.

10
11 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

12
13 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,
14 Jones and Rhoten
15 NOES: None
16 ABSTAIN: None
17 ABSENT: None
18
19

20 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS**

21
22 There were no Public Meeting items on the agenda for approval.
23
24

25 **VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

26
27 **A. TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 31718**

28 _____ APPLICANT: Gas Plus / Barry Stone
29 LOCATION: Southeast corner of Warren Road and Florida Avenue
30 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni
31 DESCRIPTION: A request to subdivide 2.5 acres into two (2)
32 commercial parcels located at the southeast corner of
33 Warren Road and Florida Avenue.
34

35 The staff report was presented by Planning Technician Domenigoni who noted a minor
36 change that needed to be made to the staff report and resolution, which was the removal
37 of any reference made to the word "Vesting".
38

39 Assistant City Attorney Vail noted the locations within the staff report and resolution of the
40 word "Vesting", which needed to be deleted.
41

42 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:42 p.m.
43

44 Ric Thomsen approached the lectern as a representative for the applicant and asked if the
45 Commission had any questions.
46

47 There were none.
48

1 Since there were no other members of the public who wished to speak regarding the
2 project, Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:43 p.m. and asked for a
3 motion.
4

5 It was MOVED by Commissioner Hicks and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
6 adopt Resolution Bill No. 04-4 approving Tentative Parcel Map 31718.
7

8 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
9

10 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,
11 Hicks and Rhoten

12 NOES: None

13 ABSTAIN: None

14 ABSENT: None
15

16 ***Project Approved: Resolution No. 04-2.***
17

18 Commissioner Hicks excused himself from the meeting at 6:47 p.m.
19
20

21 VII. WORK STUDY

22 A. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 03-19

23 _____ A work study session with Glen Pierce (Walgreen's Drug Store) to discuss
24 a proposed Conditional Use Permit to construct a 14,820 square-foot drug
25 store with a drive-thru pharmacy located within the Page Plaza Specific
26 Plan (SP 00-1).
27
28

29 The work study session was initiated by Assistant Planner Losey, who displayed the
30 elevations for the proposed Walgreens. She stated that staff was recommending that the
31 stone be carried around the edge on the west elevation. She added that there were some
32 issues with the entrance and circulation of the existing drive-thru, and that staff had been
33 working with the applicant to resolve these issues. She indicated the changes that had
34 been proposed by the applicant.
35

36 Commissioner Jones inquired regarding whether any additional traffic studies had been
37 completed that would indicate the impacts that might accompany a Walgreens and a Wal-
38 Mart Super Center.
39

40 Planning Director Masyczek responded that when the original traffic study had been
41 completed, the provider of the use had not been considered, but the square-footage of the
42 use had. He explained that the total square-footage of the project had not changed. He
43 added that the trip generation rates for a shopping center of this size had been reviewed,
44 and that no additional environmental studies were necessary in staff's opinion.
45
46
47
48

1 Chairman Duistermars asked if staff was comfortable with the changes that were being
2 proposed by the applicant in response to the issues that had been brought up.

3
4 Assistant Planner Losey responded that staff was continuing to work with the applicant.

5
6 Chairman Duistermars asked if there was any deviation from the approved architectural
7 plan.

8
9 City Planner Running displayed a copy of the original site plan, and addressed the problem
10 with the rear portion of the buildings backing onto Stetson Avenue at that time. He
11 explained that when the Miscellaneous Project was reviewed, that problem had been fixed.
12 He displayed a copy of the site plan that was subsequently approved by the Planning
13 Commission at a later meeting, followed by a copy of a revised site plan that had been
14 reviewed by the Commission at a previous work study session regarding this project.

15
16 A discussion of the gas station that was indicated in the site plan ensued.

17
18 Assistant City Attorney Vail referred to the Development Agreement and the site plan that
19 was attached to that agreement. He explained to the Commission that the Development
20 Agreement may allow the Commission some discretion in the location of some of the
21 businesses on the property, via the required conditional use permit process.

22
23 City Planner Running displayed an illustration of the proposed landscaping.

24
25 Mike Tyler re-approached the lectern and suggested that a block wall with ivy growth would
26 be the preferred form of screening along Thornton Avenue.

27
28 Chairman Duistermars advised Mr. Tyler that the Walgreens, which was the project
29 currently under discussion, was proposed along Stetson Avenue rather than Thornton
30 Avenue.

31
32 Planning Director Masyczek added that block walls had been opposed from the beginning,
33 as they tend to encourage crime. He explained that berms were the preferred type of
34 screening.

35
36 Gloria Ann Baca re-approached the lectern and stated that the right thing to do would be
37 to install a block wall to screen the entire project from the adjacent residential area.

38
39 William Baca re-approached the lectern stating that a decorative wall or even a fence with
40 ivy would be preferred to simple landscaping.

41
42 Cynthia Storey-Jones, 3574 Murray Hill Way, Hemet, California spoke in concurrence with
43 the other residents regarding a decorative block wall being the preferred type of screening.

44
45 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding what the mechanism would be for discussing a
46 wall as a possible type of screening.

1 Planning Director Masyczek responded that a street scape scene had been approved, so
2 he was hesitant to discuss walls as a type of screening.

3
4 Assistant City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that the Specific Plan and
5 Development Agreement would need to be reviewed and amendments would need to be
6 made, if necessary, in order to change the type of screening.

7
8 Mark Cooper of Page Plaza Partners approached the lectern as the project applicant. He
9 stated that Wal-Mart had made a decision to purchase half of the property based on the
10 entitlements that had been granted, and that he was happy to have them there. He further
11 stated that Walgreens was a great catch from a retail standpoint, and that he felt a gas
12 station would be an asset in this section of town. He added that he was at the present
13 meeting because Walgreens wanted to have a drive-thru pharmacy which required a
14 conditional use permit, and that he felt that an acceptable middle-ground had been
15 reached regarding the project design. He stated that he would need approval from the
16 Commission for the drive-thru portion of the facility and for a satellite dish. He explained
17 that with the location of the Walgreens there would be no problem with visibility into the
18 center, and that the project would be smaller, from a square-footage standpoint, than what
19 the environmental studies had been completed for.

20
21 Commissioner Jones asked if there were any elevations that indicated the satellite dish.

22
23 Glen Pierce, 19762 MacArthur St., Irvine, California approached the lectern as the project
24 architect. He indicated the satellite dish on the displayed elevation, and discussed the
25 elevations relative to materials, lighting, landscaping, etc.

26
27 The work study session concluded following a discussion regarding the aesthetics of the
28 building design.

29
30 The Commission thanked Mr. Cooper and Mr. Pierce for their participation.

31
32
33 **B. DEVELOPMENT REVIEW REQUIREMENTS - Richard Masyczek**

34 A work study session to discuss additional submittal items that may be
35 needed by the Planning Commission for review of projects.

36
37 Planning Director Masyczek discussed the idea of requiring more detailed vicinity maps
38 and radius maps as submittal requirements for future projects, as well as various other
39 items, including: project maps which show adjacent lots and any structures on those lots;
40 colored street scene elevations; colored landscape elevations; traffic studies for residential
41 projects of over 100 homes, for commercial or industrial projects over 5-acres in size, and
42 for General Plan Amendments or zone change requests; conceptual grading plans and
43 various other items. He stated that he needed the Commission's input regarding these
44 requirements because they would need to add these items to the project application
45 checklists if they were to be included as submittal requirements. He further discussed the
46 idea of including with future reports, aerial photographs and maps showing recently
47
48

1 approved (but not yet built) projects, including a site plan of those projects. He asked that
2 the Commission notify him of any additional items that they would like to see included with
3 future staff reports.

4
5 Chairman Duistermars stated that he would like to see some sort of evidence that the
6 applicant has had a community meeting with the residents of adjacent areas.

7
8 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.

9
10 Mike Tyler addressed the Commission regarding notification of residents.

11
12 Cynthia Storey-Jones suggested that the standard public notification radius should be
13 increased.

14
15 Assistant Public Works Director Gow discussed the issue of drainage, suggesting that a
16 requirement be added for a preliminary drainage study to be included with project
17 submittals.

18
19 **C. FENCING / SCREENING MATERIALS FOR COMMERCIAL &**
20 **INDUSTRIAL USE - Richard Masyczek**

21 A work study session to discuss the possibility of a zoning ordinance
22 amendment to provide for tighter fencing and screening materials for
23 commercial and industrial uses.

24
25 The Commission concurred that there was a need for better fencing and screening
26 materials for commercial and industrial uses, and that they would like to see a zoning
27 ordinance amendment completed to address this issue.

28
29 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that a zoning ordinance amendment
30 was scheduled for public hearing at the February 3, 2004 Planning Commission meeting
31 to establish regulations for outdoor storage areas in commercial and industrial areas.

32
33 Discussion of modifying that zoning ordinance amendment to include the issue of fencing
34 and screening materials ensued.

35
36 It was agreed that Principal Planner Sawyer would address this issue in his zoning
37 ordinance amendment.

38
39 **D. REQUIREMENTS FOR BUS TURNOUTS - Richard Masyczek**

40 A work study session to discuss the requirements for bus turnouts
41 (requested by Vice Chairman Nick Jones).

42
43 The Commission inquired as to whether Assistant Public Works Director Gow had any
44 requirements for bus turnouts.

1 Assistant Public Works Director Gow advised the Commission that the City would be
2 including bus turnouts within the Page Plaza project.

3
4 Commissioner Jones stated that he had noted bus turnouts being added along already
5 developed portions of Van Buren Blvd. in Riverside and asked if this could be done in
6 Hemet.

7
8 Assistant Public Works Director Gow responded that this was a possibility that the City
9 could take a look at.

10
11 Chairman Duistermars asked who it was that decided where bus stops were located.

12
13 Assistant Public Works Director Gow replied that he believed it was RTA that made those
14 decisions.

15
16 Chairman Duistermars asked how a requirement could be imposed for future projects to
17 include bus turnouts.

18
19 A discussion of amending the standard conditions of approval ensued.

20
21 All concurred that there was a need for the addition of bus turnouts along Florida Avenue.

22
23 Chairman Duistermars clarified that from this work study session he understood that a
24 future discussion would be agendized regarding possible retrofitting, bus standards and
25 an amendment to the standard conditions of approval. He asked when the Commission
26 could expect to see this brought back before them.

27
28 It was agreed that February 17, 2004 was a tentative date to bring this item back to the
29 Commission for an update.

30
31 Commissioner Jones excused himself from the meeting at 8:23 p.m.

32
33 **E. GENERAL PLAN CIRCULATION ELEMENT AND PARK ELEMENT -**

34 Richard Masyczek

35 A review and discussion of the Circulation and Park Element of the
36 General Plan.

37
38 Planning Director Masyczek gave a presentation to the Commission regarding the
39 Circulation and Park Elements of the General Plan. He explained that the City was fairly
40 well covered when it came to large parks, but that they were sorely lacking when it came
41 to smaller, neighborhood parks. He discussed the fact that while the City's population had
42 increased dramatically since the last General Plan update in 1992, the addition of
43 neighborhood parks had not increased accordingly.

1 Planning Director Masyczek addressed Parkland issues, including the following: 1) The
2 cost of building parks is not supported by DIF fees; 2) Who will maintain the parks? The
3 City or Valley Wide Recreation? 3) Who will build the parks? The City or the developers?
4 4) The fact that there is no clear cut policy or ordinance stating how much parkland goes
5 to local, neighborhood, community or regional parks.
6

7 A discussion ensued regarding Simpson Park being included as a "city park".
8

9 Planning Director Masyczek offered several Park Analysis Recommendations, including:
10 1) the initiation of a General Plan Amendment to show regional, community and
11 neighborhood parks on the General Plan and/or show park locations on a map as part of
12 a Master Plan of Parks; 2) develop or adopt standards which show what type of facilities
13 are needed in the City and under what setting they should be in; 3) either follow radius
14 requirements of the General Plan for all new subdivisions or initiate a General Plan
15 Amendment to change them; 4) consider implementing the existing General Plan
16 recommendation for giving public park credit for private space areas; 5) establish 1/3 - 1/3 -
17 1/3 rule for parks (1/3 community and above, 1/3 neighborhood parks and 1/3 local and/or
18 private parks).
19

20 Planning Director Masyczek went on to say that the 2+2 Committee had recommended that
21 the Planning Department initiate the process of establishing a Master Plan of Parks. He
22 explained that this would need to be approved by the City Council because of the fact that
23 Quimby Act fees were involved.
24

25 Chairman Duistermars suggested the formation of a committee to include two (2) Planning
26 Commissioners, two (2) members of the Parks Commission, whomever the Public Works
27 Department would like to involve, and a representative from Valley Wide Recreation.
28

29 Planning Director Masyczek stated that he would work with the Public Works Department
30 to get this committee established.
31

32 Planning Director Masyczek then delved into a discussion regarding the Circulation
33 Element of the General Plan. He suggested that a traffic model needed to be established
34 for the City, and explained how such a model is utilized as a tool. He stated that staff
35 would need to get a budget of approximately \$250,000 established to move forward with
36 such a plan. He displayed an outline of how such a plan would be implemented, and
37 explained the time line that it would follow. He discussed options of what areas such a
38 model should include, and whether it should be based on a micro-scale or macro-scale.
39

40 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.
41

42 Planning Director Masyczek made a recommendation to begin the solicitation process with
43 the City Council.
44

45 The Commission concurred.
46
47
48

1 Mike Tyler spoke regarding traffic mitigation studies, discussing the fact that it is easier for
2 people on the west side of town to go to Temecula to shop than it is for them to try to reach
3 the shopping areas on the east side of town, due to the heavy traffic flow.
4
5

6 **VIII. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**
7

8 **A. UPDATE ON MULTI-SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN**
9

10 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the City Council had approved
11 the Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan, and stated that he could provide the
12 Commission with more information if they wished.
13
14

15 **IX. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**
16

17 No items.
18
19

20 **X. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**
21

22 No future agenda items were requested.
23
24

25 **XI. ADJOURNMENT:** It was MOVED by Commissioner Calkins, SECONDED by
26 Commissioner Rhoten and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 8:39
27 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City of Hemet Planning Commission, scheduled
28 for Tuesday, February 3, 2004 at 6:00 p.m. to be held at the City of Hemet Council
29 Chambers, 450 East Latham Avenue, Hemet, California, 92543.
30
31
32
33
34

35 _____
36 Bob Duistermars, Chairman
37
38

39 ATTEST:
40
41
42
43

44 _____
45 Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary
46
47
48