

1 Regarding the Tahquitz High School and Rancho Viejo Middle School project, Ms. Koonce
2 reported that the Administration and Library building was currently in the framing stage and
3 that the windows and door frames would be next. She noted that Building Nos. 300, 400
4 and 500 were in varied levels of completion, including drywall and taping, windows and
5 door frames, roughed-in utilities and stucco. She further noted that the theater, which was
6 also known as the "200 Building", was half-way built using masonry block instead of wood
7 framing, and that the sunken orchestra pit had been poured and was sporting a curved
8 concrete wall. She added that the all-masonry gymnasium was approaching full height
9 with just a few rows to go.

10
11 Ms. Koonce advised the Commission that the HUSD had met with the Development
12 Review Committee regarding the Professional Development Service Center, and that the
13 they were currently in the process of fine-tuning their plans for submittal to the Planning
14 Department.

15
16 Ms. Koonce concluded her update, advising the Commission that the Professional
17 Development Academy was currently in plan check.

18
19 The Commission thanked Ms. Koonce for her report.
20

21 22 **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

23 24 **A. VESTING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 30602 (Continued from 12-06-** 25 **05)**

26 APPLICANT: Lock Piatt - Frey and Associate
27 AGENT: Jim Unland - James Unland & Associates
28 LOCATION: North side of Wentworth Drive approximately 480-feet
29 east of Cawston Avenue with a portion of the property
30 located on the east side of Cawston Avenue
31 approximately 375-feet north of Wentworth Drive.
32 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni
33 DESCRIPTION: A request to subdivide 19.10 acres into eight (8) lots for
34 future industrial development.
35

36 The staff report was presented by Principal Planner Sawyer, who advised the Commission
37 that the applicant was requesting that the public hearing be continued to the March 7,
38 2006 meeting in order to allow them to meet with Staff to discuss certain stipulations. He
39 distributed the written request for a continuance.
40

41 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.
42
43

1 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Mendoza to
2 continue Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 30602 as an open public hearing to the Planning
3 Commission meeting of March 7, 2006.

4
5 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

6
7 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride,
8 Mendoza and Rhoten

9 NOES: None

10 ABSTAIN: None

11 ABSENT: None

12
13 **B. ZONE CHANGE NO. 04-12, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 32700 &**
14 **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 04-45**

15 APPLICANT: Daniel Persichetti

16 AGENT: Russell Rumansoff

17 LOCATION: Northwest and Southwest corners of Wentworth Drive
18 and Sanderson Avenue

19 PLANNER: Tamara Alaniz

20 DESCRIPTION: A 2.75-acre zone change from M-2 (Heavy-
21 Manufacturing) to C-M (Commercial-Manufacturing) on
22 the northwest corner of Wentworth Drive and
23 Sanderson Avenue (456-040-033, -034 & -035) in order
24 to implement Site Development Review 04-10 – 35,510
25 square-foot of commercial floor area on a 128,502
26 square-foot lot as an economic catalyst for an industrial
27 business park on the proposed parcel map; and a 7.96-
28 acre Tentative Parcel Map on the southwest corner of
29 Wentworth Drive and Sanderson Avenue, splitting three
30 parcels (456-040-028, -029 and -030) into sixteen (16)
31 lots for industrial business park development.

32
33 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Alaniz, who provided the Commission
34 with various details regarding the project and its background.

35
36 A discussion ensued regarding the relationship of the two projects and the desire to keep
37 some M-2 (Heavy-Manufacturing) zoning within the immediate area to allow for industrial
38 development. It was noted that an option was to change the zoning on the corner from
39 Industrial to C-M (Commercial-Manufacturing).

40
41 City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that the property owner(s) could impose upon
42 themselves a deed restriction for a certain type of zoning, but that the City could not
43

1 impose such a restriction. He added that he was hesitant to say whether or not this was
2 a feasible mechanism to obtain the desired result.

3
4 Chairman Duistermars indicated that he wanted to know what was happening with the
5 project and have some assurance that what was proposed is what would be built. He
6 noted that in reading the Staff Report he could not see any tie between the two sides of
7 the street.

8
9 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that even under a Specific Plan the
10 two sides of the street could not be tied together, and that the only way that he could think
11 of that might accomplish the desired result was through a Development Agreement.

12
13 City Attorney Vail expressed some uncertainty as to whether a Development Agreement
14 was a practical tool to utilize.

15
16 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:19 p.m.

17
18 Dan Persichetti, 28358 Aerie Road, Valley Center, California approached the lectern as
19 the project applicant. He noted that the property affected by the projects was under two
20 separate ownerships, both of which he was in control. He explained that his intention was
21 to develop the entire site, including the southern as well as the northern property. He
22 added that he would not have a problem entering into an agreement restricting
23 development to manufacturing only, and noted that he was planning to enhance both
24 corners.

25
26 City Attorney Vail stated that the only thing that could accomplish what was being
27 discussed would be an instrument that was recordable against the property.

28
29 Chairman Duistermars indicated that he would be content with the addition of a condition
30 of approval requiring simply that the applicant meet with staff to explore the possibility of
31 coming up with some type of an agreement that would tie the property to a manufacturing
32 use.

33
34 A discussion continued regarding the northern parcel versus the southern parcel, their
35 relationship to one another and the concept of processing the projects together under a
36 Specific Plan.

37
38 City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that they did not have the ability to condition
39 the project to be processed under a Specific Plan.

40
41 Commissioner Mendoza inquired regarding what type of industries the applicant was
42 hoping to entice in the future.

1 Mr. Persichetti responded that his plan was to create a large industrial condominium
2 complex. He explained that there were many businesses that could not afford to locate in
3 larger buildings and install their own parking, landscaping, and etc., and that this situation
4 would offer a more affordable industrial opportunity for such businesses. He noted that
5 he had surveyed several industrial parks in the Hemet and San Jacinto Valley within the
6 past couple of years, many of which were run down and crowded with their equipment
7 located in their parking lots, and that a large number of the businesses that he had spoken
8 with expressed interest in this type of proposal.

9
10 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:34 p.m. and asked for a motion.

11
12 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Mendoza to
13 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill Nos. 05-05EA, 05-35 and 05-36*,
14 recommending approval to the City Council of Environmental Assessment No. 04-45, ZC
15 No. 04-12 and Tentative Parcel Map No. 32700 with reservation pertaining to the desire
16 for industrial development.

17
18 City Attorney Vail asked the Commission if they would like their reservation expressed to
19 the City Council.

20
21 The Commission concurred that they would.

22
23 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

24
25 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride,
26 Mendoza and Rhoten

27 NOES: None

28 ABSTAIN: None

29 ABSENT: None

30
31 ***Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 06-03EA, 06-07 and 06-08.***

32
33
34 **V. WORK STUDY**

35
36 **A. COMPREHENSIVE SIGN ORDINANCE UPDATE - Richard Masyczek**

37 A work study session with possible direction to staff regarding the
38 comprehensive update of the City of Hemet Sign Ordinance.

39
40 The work study session was initiated and presented by Planning Director Masyczek who
41 gave a PowerPoint presentation highlighting what the City was hoping to accomplish with
42 the Comprehensive Sign Ordinance Update. He offered a comparison between the City
43

1 of Hemet's sign ordinance versus the Cities of Redlands and Rancho Cucamonga as well
2 as the Cities of Corona, Lake Elsinore, Murrieta and others. He discussed what Staff
3 would like to propose relative to pylon/pole signs, monument signs, wall signs, window
4 signs, freestanding signs, temporary signs, subdivision signs, directional signs and etc.

5
6 A discussion of the human-moving signs ensued.

7
8 City Attorney Vail noted that the only moving signs that were currently permitted were on
9 private property and for specific purposes.

10
11 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that an Ad-Hoc Committee would be
12 created to allow the community to participate in the update of the sign ordinance. He went
13 over a matrix that he had prepared and distributed noting what the existing ordinance
14 allowed and what was being proposed. He discussed flags, balloons, penants, the color
15 and materials of signs, heritage signs, logos, etc.

16
17 Chairman Duistermars left the meeting at 6:53 p.m.

18
19 Planning Director Masyczek concluded his presentation and asked the Commission if they
20 felt that staff was heading in the right direction.

21
22 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that an Interim Urgency Ordinance be adopted to put the
23 proposed sign ordinance into effect pending its completion.

24
25 City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that they could direct the Planning Director to
26 request that the Council adopt such an Interim Urgency Ordinance at the Planning
27 Commission's recommendation.

28
29 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion to do so.

30
31 It was MOVED by Commissioner McBride and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
32 direct the Planning Director to request that the City Council adopt an Interim Urgency
33 Ordinance to put the proposed sign ordinance revisions in effect until such time that the
34 zoning ordinance amendment was completed.

35
36 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

37
38 AYES: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride, Mendoza and Rhoten
39 NOES: None
40 ABSTAIN: None
41 ABSENT: Chairman Duistermars

1 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that he would try to have this request
2 placed on the City Council agenda of February 28, 2006.

3
4 **VI. CONSENT CALENDAR**

5
6 **A. MINUTES**

- 7 1. January 17, 2006
8

9 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner McBride to
10 approve the consent calendar as presented.

11
12 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

13
14 AYES: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride and Rhoten

15 NOES: None

16 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Mendoza

17 ABSENT: Chairman Duistermars
18

19 **VII. UPDATE OF CITY COUNCIL ACTION ON PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS**

20
21 **A. CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 23, 2006**

- 22 1. Application Submittal Requirements
23

24 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the revised application submittal
25 requirements had been approved at the City Council meeting of January 23, 2006.
26
27

28 **VIII. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**

29
30 **A. MAJOR PROJECTS UPDATE**

31 To be provided at the first meeting of each month.
32

33 Planning Director Masyczek and Principal Planner Sawyer provided the Commission with
34 an update regarding several of the various major projects being processed and/or
35 proposed within the City of Hemet.
36

37 A question and answer session ensued.
38

39 **B. LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES 2006 PLANNERS INSTITUTE & MINI-
40 EXPO**

41 Scheduled for Wednesday, March 22nd thru Friday, March 24th, 2006.
42
43

1 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission regarding the dates of the upcoming
2 League of California Cities 2006 Planners Institute and Expo, and asked if any members
3 of the Commission were interested in attending, noting that he knew that Chairman
4 Duistermars was planning to attend.

5
6 Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride and Mendoza all confirmed that they
7 would like to attend.

8
9 Commissioner Rhoten noted that she had not decided yet.

10
11
12 **IX. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

13
14 Commissioner Mendoza inquired as to whether the City of Hemet had explored the
15 concept of green building.

16
17 A discussion ensued regarding this subject.

18
19 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that it would be best addressed in the
20 Conservation Element of the General Plan.

21
22
23 **X. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

24
25 There were no future agenda items requested.

26
27
28 **X. ADJOURNMENT**

29
30 It was MOVED by Commissioner Mendoza, SECONDED by Commissioner McBride and
31 unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 7:11 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City
32 of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **Tuesday, February 21, 2006 at 6:00 p.m.**
33 to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue,
34 Hemet, California 92543.

35
36
37
38
39
40 _____
41 **Nick Jones, Vice Chairman**
42 **Hemet Planning Commission**

43 **ATTEST:**

44 _____
City of Hemet Planning Commission Minutes
FEBRUARY 7, 2006

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

**Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary
Hemet Planning Commission**