

1 CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

2
3 TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2003

4
5 THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION WAS
6 CONVENED BY CHAIRMAN DUISTERMARS ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2003 AT
7 6:00P.M. AT THE CITY OF HEMET COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 450 EAST LATHAM
8 AVENUE, HEMET, CA.

9
10 Roll Call: Chairman Bob Duistermars, Vice Chairman B.R. Hicks and
11 Commissioners Jim Calkins, Nick Jones and Mayzelle Rhoten

12
13 Absent: None

14
15 Staff Present: Principal Planner Matthew Bassi, Senior Planner Joanna
16 Crombie, Assistant Planner Maureen Losey, Planning Director
17 Richard Masyczek, Minutes Secretary Nancie Shaw, Assistant
18 City Attorney Eric Vail and City Engineer Roland Trietsch

19
20 Invocation and Flag Salute: Commissioner Jones

21
22
23 I. PUBLIC COMMENTS: Anyone who wishes to address the Commission regarding
24 items not on the agenda may do so at this time. Please line up at the lectern when the
25 Chair asks if there are any communications from the public. ***When you are recognized,***
26 ***please give your name, spelling of last name, and address for accurate recording***
27 ***in the minutes.***

28
29 There were no members of the public who wished to address the Commission.

30
31 II. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE: Report given by HUSD Director of
32 Facilities, Sandy Packham.

33
34 Sandy Packham, Director of Facilities at the Hemet Unified School District, reported to the
35 Commission that the school district was very busy, and that they were accomplishing a great
36 deal with their bond money. She advised the Commission that the middle school was underway
37 on State Street, and that construction of the McSweeny and Harmony schools was continuing on
38 with the schools projected to open in September of 2003.

39
40 Ms. Packham reported that the Hemet High School renovation was getting ready to begin this
41 summer, and that the project would fall under the new prevailing wage law. She further reported
42 that the school district had collected developer fees on over 100 homes in the last two days, and
43 that they were preparing to gear for heavy growth. She added that they have placed a request

1 for architectural services for future school development.
2
3

4 Ms. Packham proceeded to advise the Commission that \$8 million in renovations at existing
5 schools were scheduled to take place over the summer in a 72 day period. She explained that a
6 construction trailer would be placed at Hemet High School in March, and at the other schools in
7 April and May. She reported that all of the modernizations have been funded, and that as soon
8 as the school district has 50% of the funds they will be matched by the State and the projects will
9 be underway.

10
11 Ms. Packham advised the Commission that the "permission to enter" letters had all been
12 received for the site north of the Hemet Stock Farm, and that they would be proceeding with the
13 testing of the site in the near future. She stated that the question still remained regarding what
14 had happened to the old septic systems for that site.
15
16

17 **III. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**

18
19 None.

20
21 **IV. CONSENT CALENDAR:**

22
23 No items.
24
25

26 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS:**

27
28 None.
29
30

31 **VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

32
33 None.
34
35

36 **VII. WORK STUDY:**

37
38 **A. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 02-9 - KEYSTONE EDUCATION & YOUTH**
39 **SERVICES** - Maureen Losey

40 _____ A work study session on the expansion of an existing facility to add three modular
41 units, in order to accommodate 120 additional students.
42

43 Assistant Planner Losey approached the lectern as the project planner. She advised the
44 Commission that the project would be coming to them as a public hearing at the next Planning
45 Commission meeting. She addressed the issue of architectural compatibility, stating that the
46 existing building was cement and that there was a question as to whether the modular addition
47 should also be cement.

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

Principal Planner Bassi added, for clarification, that the architecture that was being proposed for the modular addition was wood siding, and that since it was being proposed as a permanent structure, staff felt that it may be more compatible with the existing buildings if it had a cement finish.

Tom Hunt, 1223 University Avenue, Riverside, California, approached the lectern as a representative for Keystone School. He introduced Dina Driskill to speak regarding the project.

Dina Driskill, 145 N. Tahquitz St., Hemet, California, approached the lectern as the Director of Keystone School in Hemet and advised the Commission that the school had been put in place to serve the needs of special children in grades Kindergarten through 12.

Vice Chairman Hicks asked Ms. Driskill what the source of the school's funding was.

Ms. Driskill responded that Keystone receives referrals from local school districts reaching as far as Banning, Beaumont, Temecula and other surrounding areas. She explained that they provide schooling to children that are unable to be accommodated at regular public schools, and that the funding comes primarily from the school districts from which the children are generated.

Commissioner Jones asked why the school wanted to expand in the City of Hemet.

Ms. Driskill responded that Hemet is their home and has been for a long time.

Commissioner Jones asked why Hemet should go out of their way for the other areas.

Lorraine Vaccaro, 11980 Mt. Vernon Ave., Grand Terrace, California responded that they are looking into expanding their facilities in the Temecula and Murrieta areas as well, but have not found an appropriate site at this point. She stated that if and when they do find something, the children from those areas would be transferred to the closer facilities.

Commissioner Jones asked what would happen to the modular facility that they were proposing to open in Hemet if facilities in Temecula or Murrieta were opened.

Mr. Hunt responded that they were requesting the Hemet expansion because there is a need to do so here and now. He explained that the number of children coming from outside cities is not drastic enough to eliminate the need for the modular buildings that were being proposed in Hemet, should other facilities open elsewhere.

Commissioner Jones expressed his feeling that each city should provide facilities for the children in their area.

Mr. Hunt explained that there is not a mass need for facilities in every city to justify the provision of such schools.

Ms. Driskill advised the Commission that one use of the new modular building would be to expand the service that they can provide to autistic children for which there was a great need in the City of Hemet.

1 Vice Chairman Hicks asked how many children were currently in attendance at the school.
2

3 Mr. Hunt responded that they were allowed 48 students under their current conditional use
4 permit, and that they were hoping to expand the facility to accommodate 168 students.
5

6 Vice Chairman Hicks inquired regarding what percentage of the students attending the school
7 were from the City of Hemet.
8

9 Ms. Driskill replied that approximately 70% of the students were from the City of Hemet.
10

11 Mr. Hunt added that most of the students that they were providing for were local, and that their
12 ability to bring in the other 30% of the children from outside areas helps to make the school more
13 cost effective.
14

15 Chairman Duisternars asked for clarification that none of the children remained at the school
16 over night.
17

18 Mr. Hunt responded that they did not.
19

20 Ms. Driskill added that the children were on campus from 8:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. She explained
21 that if there was no facility located in Hemet, the local children would need to be transported
22 somewhere else, and that without the inclusion of the children from the surrounding cities, the
23 cost of the school would go up and Hemet Unified School District would have to bear a higher
24 cost, since the school districts of the other cities provide the funding for the students that are
25 transported here from their cities.
26

27 Vice Chairman Hicks asked what type of modular building was being proposed.
28

29 Mr. Hunt responded that they are called "mobile modulars". He explained that they are modern
30 buildings with wood siding, and that they are the only type of modular unit that is licensed for
31 utilization as a school facility.
32

33 Commissioner Calkins noted that the drawings that were presented indicated that the buildings
34 were offices rather than classrooms
35

36 Vice Chairman Hicks suggested that Sandy Packham might be able to review the type of
37 modular that was being proposed and report back to staff regarding whether or not she would
38 offer her support and approval of the buildings.
39

40 Ms. Packham responded that she would be happy to take a look at the buildings, but that she did
41 not think it would be appropriate for her to try and direct another agency on how to handle their
42 business affairs.
43

44 Vice Chairman Hicks stated that he would simply feel more comfortable knowing that the school
45 district was in support of the buildings.
46

47 Mr. Hunt said that he would welcome the school district's review of the buildings.
48

1 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that the Commission could direct staff to set up a
2 meeting with the school district and the applicant.

3
4 Chairman Duistermars inquired about the parking requirements per classroom.

5
6 Principal Planner Bassi responded that he was not sure of the requirement, but that there would
7 not be a very great need since the children do not drive.

8 Commissioner Calkins noted that the plans indicate a parking area that is also a play area. He
9 expressed his concern with the two being combined.

10
11 Principal Planner Bassi stated that it was his understanding that the vehicles that might be
12 parked within that area would be there all day without being moved. He added that most of the
13 employee parking is outside of the play area, and that the parking area that was within the play
14 area would be primarily designated for vans that belong to the school.

15
16 Commissioner Rhoten asked whether there was a sprinkler system required in the classroom.

17
18 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the number of children at the school was under the
19 amount that would require a sprinkler system.

20
21 **B. CORWIN, INC. / JIM MORRISSEY - Maureen Losey**

22 A work study session of a proposal for a subdivision of 75 acres into 258 single-
23 family lots and one commercial parcel on property located on the southeast
24 corner of Hemet Street and Mountain Avenue.

25
26 Assistant Planner Losey advised the Commission that staff had been working with the applicant
27 regarding the design of the proposed subdivision, and explained some of the details of the
28 project. She stated that the applicant would like to get the Commission's input on the subdivision
29 itself, and that they were also looking for direction regarding whether Smith Road, which would
30 be an issue with a separate subdivision, should end or be made to go through.

31
32 A discussion ensued regarding the issue of Smith Road, as well as the location of the project
33 and whether it fell under the Hemet Unified or San Jacinto Unified School District.

34
35 Jim Morrissey, of Engineering Resources, 3550 E. Florida Ave., Ste. B. Hemet, California pointed
36 out on the displayed map what some of the surrounding areas included. He showed how they
37 had attempted to wind the streets around within the subdivision so as to slow down traffic that
38 might want to cut through the area. He explained that they had tried to resolve drainage issues
39 so that they would empty into the proposed parks that would be located within the project. He
40 advised the Commission that the homes had been designed to face the park so that the parks
41 would be "supervised", so to speak.

42
43 Mr. Morrissey explained that for the paseo system, they had tried to minimize the distance from
44 point A to point B, and had also made an effort to keep the paseos in the side-yards rather than
45 in the rear-yards, which minimizes the distance and makes them more viewable. He further
46 explained that the alignment of the paseo with the road would make it more visible and less
47 isolated, so as to increase safety. He described some of the design features, explaining that lot

1 frontage varies from 63 to 72-feet, with a minimum lot size of 7,200 square-feet and some lots
2 over 10,000 square-feet.

3
4 Mr. Morrissey suggested that the overall issue, per Principal Planner Bassi, City Engineer
5 Trietsch and the Fire Department is that while the Fire Department would like to have through
6 roads within the subdivision, Chief Van Verst had stated that he would not mind Smith Road
7 being designed as a cul-de-sac for the other subdivision. He described some of the options that
8 they were looking at, should it be decided that Smith Road should go through. He explained that
9 there had been a discussion of street widths, and that it had been agreed that the street issues
10 would be worked out with the City Engineer. He suggested that the detriment of Smith Road
11 going through would be to the residents that are already there since there would inevitably be
12 increased traffic for them. He explained that most of the existing homeowners in the area are
13 opposed to the road going through for this reason.

14
15 A discussion ensued regarding the Smith Road issue.

16
17 Bill Corwin, 895 N. Hemet St., Hemet, California approached the lectern and addressed the
18 Commission, stating that many of the residents on Smith Road have been there for at least 15
19 years, and that they live on ½ acre and one-acre lots. He stated that they would prefer to have
20 Smith Road become a private, gated community, and that they definitely did not want to see the
21 road go through.

22
23 Commissioner Jones asked how the Commission could prevent the project from being another
24 “cookie-cutter” project, without it coming to them as a Specific Plan.

25
26 A discussion of the paseo system ensued.

27
28 Commissioner Jones referred to the fact that in the housing tracts by West Valley High School,
29 all of the kids put their portable basketball nets on the sidewalks and play in the street. He
30 suggested that if the applicant of this project could afford to lose a few lots to install a basketball
31 court so that the kids would not have to play in the street, it would be appreciated.

32
33 Mr. Morrissey responded that he hoped the parks would be able to accommodate basketball
34 courts.

35
36 Commissioner Jones said that he hoped so as well, but that if the parks were too far away from
37 some residences, the kids may not want to go all the way to the park.

38
39 Commissioner Calkins suggested that the paseo system would make access to the parks
40 easier than in some areas, which may alleviate the kids’ desire to play in the street.

41
42 A discussion of the alternate design of the project with Smith Road being made to go through
43 ensued, followed by a discussion of how the parks would be maintained.

44
45 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that while a Lighting & Landscaping Maintenance District
46 (LLMD) would support the majority of the areas, there may be a need for a limited Home
47 Owner’s Association. He stated that Council would be voting on a policy regarding this issue at
48 their meeting of February 11, 2003.

1
2 Commissioner Jones asked Mr. Corwin if he would consider the option of not punching Smith
3 Road through, which would require 6 lots, and using those 6 lots for an additional open space
4 area that the children could utilize for play.

5
6 Mr. Corwin responded that he would consider this option.

7
8 Mr. Morrissey asked if this space would be covered under the LLMD.

9
10 Planning Director Masyczek explained what the City Council would be voting on at their next
11 meeting, and how it might affect this project regarding those areas. He further explained why
12 there may need to be a limited Home Owner's Association in place to take over maintenance, in
13 the event that the residents should ever decide to vote themselves out of the LLMD.

14
15 A discussion ensued regarding various options for the 6 lots that Commissioner Jones had
16 mentioned.

17
18
19 Vice Chairman Hicks advised the applicant that he thought they had done a great job with their
20 project design, but that he felt it could be taken up a notch by using a few lots as open space
21 areas for basketball courts or similar uses, near those portions of the project that are furthest
22 from the park.

23
24 Commissioner Calkins asked what would happen with Soboba Road if the re-design of the
25 Ramona Expressway turned out to be 20 years away, stating that they would end up with a dead
26 end.

27
28 Mr. Morrissey agreed that this was a good question and stated that he did not have an answer at
29 this time.

30
31 Vice Chairman Hicks suggested that two lots could be knocked off and a temporary cul-de-sac
32 could be created with the understanding that when the Ramona Expressway was made to go
33 through, the street would open up to it.

34
35 Commissioner Jones asked if the area could be made into a green belt, pending the installation
36 of the expressway.

37
38 Mr. Morrissey responded that this option could be considered.

39
40 The Commission thanked the Corwins and Mr. Morrissey for their presentation.

41
42
43 **VIII. DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**

44
45 **A. TW2'S - "THE WEEK THAT WAS"**

- 46
47 1. January 17, 2003

1
2 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that he would be distributing these new
3 reports with every agenda. He stated that if there were any questions he would be happy to
4 answer them.

5
6 Vice Chairman Hicks inquired about the status of McSweeny Farms.

7
8 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the applicant needed to look at more than just
9 buffering, and that a meeting was being arranged with Chairman Duistermars and
10 Commissioner Jones to discuss changes to the project. He added that he had heard rumors
11 that they had been considering working with the County of Riverside on the project.

12
13 **B. DISCUSSION ON XERISCAPE ORDINANCES**

14
15 Planning Director Masyczek discussed the possibility of creating a xeriscape ordinance, which
16 includes drought tolerant plants and ground cover. He noted the location in the City's General
17 Plan that lists the requirement to amend the code to include water saving irrigation systems and
18 xeriscape landscaping in all new development, as well as the allowance for installation of gray
19 water recycling systems for residences.

20
21
22 Planning Director Masyczek distributed copies of City Council Resolution No. 3015, which was
23 adopted in January 1993 but never implemented, as well as a handout regarding the "Seven
24 Principles of Xeriscape" which deals with Landscape Water Conservation.

25
26 A discussion ensued.

27
28
29 **IX. PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

30
31 Commissioner Jones expressed his concern regarding motels within the City that are being
32 rented on a monthly basis. He asked if the City had any regulations that limit the amount of time
33 a person could stay at a motel.

34
35 Planning Director Masyczek responded that there were no regulations currently in place, but that
36 the zoning code could be amended to limit the stay. He noted that the City of Temecula currently
37 limits motel/hotel stays to 30 days, and that their code department enforces the ordinance.

38
39 Chairman Duistermars asked if the stay could be limited to less than 30 days.

40
41 Assistant City Attorney Vail responded that he did not know if you could restrict someone to a
42 stay of less than 30 days, but stated that he would be looking into it, as the Council had also
43 asked him to do so.

44
45 Commissioner Calkins asked if there was anything in the works on commercial fencing or
46 screening.

1 Planning Director Masyczek responded that there was not at this point in time.

2
3 Commissioner Calkins expressed his concern with the many unsightly commercial areas that
4 should have some fencing or screening. He asked if this could be discussed at a future
5 meeting.

6
7 Planning Director Masyczek assured him that it would be placed on an agenda in the near future.
8
9

10 **X. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

11
12 It was agreed to add a discussion on commercial fencing and screening to a future Planning
13 Commission agenda.
14
15

16 **XI. ADJOURNMENT**

17
18 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Hicks and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to adjourn
19 the meeting at 7:38 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City of Hemet Planning Commission,
20 scheduled for Tuesday, February 18, 2003 at 6:00 p.m. to be held at the City of Hemet Council
21 Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet, California 92543.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 _____ Bob Duistermars, Chairman
29

30
31 ATTEST:

32
33
34
35 Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary