



1 The Hemet Unified School District Update was given by Facilities Planner, Tina Koonce,  
2 who advised the Commission that the Hemet High School Stadium project was moving  
3 along with only 200 linear feet left to stamp in the center divider. She added that the poles  
4 for the wrought iron fencing were up, and that County approval had been received for the  
5 landscaping, which the HUSD was getting ready to bid.

6  
7 Regarding the Tahquitz High School/Rancho Viejo Middle School project, Ms. Koonce  
8 noted that the HUSD was ahead of schedule, and that completion of Phase 1 was  
9 anticipated for June of 2007.

10  
11 Ms. Koonce continued her report with an update regarding the Professional Development  
12 Center and the fact that it was in the plan check process at the City.

13  
14 Regarding the Professional Development Academy, Ms. Koonce advised the Commission  
15 that the tenant improvements were currently in the plan check process and that the  
16 HUSD's goal was to start construction on July 1, 2006. She added that they were working  
17 with City staff on traffic issues.

18  
19 Ms. Koonce concluded her update with a report on the HUSD's scheduled summer  
20 projects, including the addition of relocatable buildings at Cawston Elementary School,  
21 Bautista Creek Elementary School, West Valley High School and Cottonwood Elementary  
22 School, which, she noted, were desperately needed to accommodate enrollment growth.

23  
24 The Commission thanked Ms. Koonce for her report.

25  
26  
27 **IV. PUBLIC MEETING**

28  
29 **A. CITY PARCEL CONVEYANCE**

30 **APPLICANT:** City of Hemet  
31 **LOCATION:** Lot 9 that connects "Sketch Alley" with Elk Street  
32 located in the Valley View Apartments near the  
33 southeast corner of Devonshire Avenue and Elk Street  
34 (APN: 442-071-009)  
35 **PLANNER:** Mark Trabing  
36 **DESCRIPTION:** Conveyance of a City-owned parcel (Lot 9) to a Home  
37 Owner's Association, located between two rows of four-  
38 plex apartments. This conveyance is necessary in  
39 order to form the Valley View Apartment Owners  
40 Association.

1 Planning Director Masyczek briefly explained some of the details regarding the proposed  
2 "Conveyance of Parcel 9".

3  
4 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.

5  
6 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Mendoza to  
7 find the conveyance of Lot 9 - Assessor Parcel Number 442-071-009 to be consistent with  
8 the General Plan.

9  
10 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

11  
12 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride,  
13 Mendoza and Rhoten

14 NOES: None

15 ABSTAIN: None

16 ABSENT: None

17  
18  
19 **V. WORK STUDY**

20  
21 **A. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 05-16 - Loretta Domenigoni**

22 A work study session with discussion and possible direction to staff  
23 regarding a proposed conditional use permit, submitted by J. Didion & H.  
24 Roberts, to construct and operate an automotive center with one building  
25 totaling 12,109 square-feet and a second building for food service use  
26 totaling 4,608 square-feet on a 1.59 acre lot located on the north side of  
27 Florida Avenue between Cawston Street and Sanderson Avenue.

28  
29 The work study session was initiated by Associate Planner Domenigoni, who provided  
30 various details and discussed some issues regarding the proposal before turning the  
31 presentation over to the applicant.

32  
33 Deputy City Attorney Jex reminded the Commission that, because this was a work study  
34 session, the Commission should keep their comments limited to suggestions, ideas and  
35 thoughts rather than decisions or final actions. He noted that final actions and decisions  
36 were to be made at the time of the public hearing.

37  
38 Don Wills approached the lectern as the representing broker for Howard Roberts  
39 Development. He provided a detailed description of the proposal and noted that their  
40 intention with the project was to keep away from the noise factors, maintain a clean facility,  
41 including clean restrooms, and construct a facility that would be easy to go to. He noted  
42 that he found this to be a unique project, and that it was difficult to process this type of  
43

1 project according to the City staff's recommendation because they would not be able to  
2 attract the type of tenants that they were looking for who could pay the higher rents that  
3 would be required for the front units.  
4

5 Gary Miller, 350 West Fifth Street, San Bernardino, California approached the lectern as  
6 the landscape architect and noted that he would be conducting a PowerPoint presentation  
7 with the assistance of his associate.  
8

9 Mr. Miller initiated the PowerPoint presentation for the "Flowerwood Retail Center. His  
10 presentation included an explanation of their goals for the Scenic Highway; a display of  
11 photos of the type of facility that they did not want to build; how the project would comply  
12 with their goals for a well-designed automotive center that would enhance the image of the  
13 City; the commercial design guidelines for the project, including location and orientation  
14 and how it would create gathering places with its articulated footprints, the location of the  
15 buildings close to the street and the pedestrian friendly plazas; and the focal points of the  
16 architecture and its strong entry statements.  
17

18 Mr. Miller indicated that the Flowerwood Retail Center would comply with goals via quality  
19 design, towers, quality materials, plazas, focal points, articulated plans, strong entry  
20 statements, a sense of place, trellises and colonnades. He displayed theoretical photos  
21 of the service bays and their appearances, which, he noted, were present in many of the  
22 finest cities in the United States. He referred to the "Summerline" center in Las Vegas and  
23 its attractive design, and the "Northwood" center in Irvine and the fact that its recessed  
24 auto bays tended to diminish their presence. He referred to the berms and landscaping  
25 that they were intending to provide, and explained that the doors would not be visible  
26 because they would be recessed. He noted that the Flowerwood Retail Center would  
27 include three times the landscaping that was provided by most retail centers, and that it  
28 would actually be hard to tell if the facade was that of a store front or a service bay. He  
29 displayed a photo of the berms and hedgegrows that were included at a facility in Rancho  
30 Santa Margarita for comparison. He then displayed the landscape plan for the proposed  
31 building and referred to the abundant parkway landscaping that was being proposed. He  
32 provided some verbal details regarding the landscaping. He compared the proposed  
33 project to the nearby Hampton Inn, which included 12 trees within approximately 460 feet,  
34 averaging out to one tree being placed every 38 feet, with parking in the front of the  
35 building. He noted that the Flowerwood Retail Center, in contrast, would have 23 trees  
36 within 230 feet, which would average out to one tree every 10 feet, and noted that the  
37 parking was proposed to be in the rear of the facility, which would also include superior  
38 building materials.  
39

40 Mr. Miller noted that the trees and berms would screen the bays, and that in each view the  
41 berm would obscure the bottom portion of the building to a height of approximately eight  
42  
43  
44

1 (8) feet, and that the additional three layers of trees would be effective in screening the  
2 service bays from the street.

3  
4 Mr. Miller indicated, by use of renderings, how effective the landscape screening would  
5 be. He displayed a rendering of a view looking to the west with a two-year tree growth and  
6 a ten-year tree growth, followed by a rendering of a view looking to the east with a two-  
7 year tree growth and a ten-year tree growth.

8  
9 Mr. Miller concluded his presentation with a note that the uses that they were proposing  
10 within the Flowerwood Retail Center were approved uses in the C-2 zone. He further  
11 noted that 16 of the uses that were allowed in the C-2 zone included service bay doors.  
12 He suggested that it needed to be recognized that auto service was, in fact, a retail  
13 business, and that denying this use for street frontage would be a defacto denial. He  
14 added that if it was the will of the City to prohibit auto service uses along the frontage of  
15 a retail center, then they should simply not permit such uses in the zone so that developers  
16 would not have any false hopes. He pleaded with the Commission to consider allowing  
17 well-designed automotive uses on this portion of Florida Avenue.

18  
19 Chairman Duistermars commended Mr. Miller on a presentation well-done, but noted that  
20 he remained concerned about the auto bays.

21  
22 Vice Chairman Jones noted that the facility was very close to a hotel, and that, as a hotel  
23 guest, the last thing that he would want was the noise from an auto shop. He inquired as  
24 to whether this was the best location for this type of a business.

25  
26 Mr. Miller responded that there was a whole parcel of land between their site and that of  
27 the hotel, noting that the hotel was easily 300-feet from the proposed facility. He added  
28 that the street noise would far exceed any noise that the proposed facility would create,  
29 and that the sound from the facility would dissipate far sooner than the noise from Florida  
30 Avenue.

31  
32 Mr. Wills added that it was typical for auto service hours to begin around 8:00 a.m. and  
33 cease around 5:00 p.m. He noted that there would not be any extended hours for the  
34 project.

35  
36 Chairman Duistermars referred to the fact that the photos in the presentation were  
37 shadowed, so it was a bit hard to consider what the facility would look like with the sun  
38 beating down on it. He asked if there was any way to move the building in order to cut the  
39 line of site.

1 Mr. Wills noted that their facility was proposed to be a mixed development, and that it was  
2 important to consider than an auto service center could be a nice, attractive, landscaped  
3 building, rather than something negative.

4  
5 Planning Director Masyczek briefly discussed ordinance requirements and provided some  
6 clarification regarding such.

7  
8 Commissioner Mendoza suggested that too much landscaping would cover the beauty of  
9 the building itself. He further suggested that the applicant consider using landscaping that  
10 would conserve water, adding that there were too many trees being proposed.

11  
12 Mr. Miller noted that the street angle was not 45 degrees, as was stated, but was less than  
13 15 degrees. He provided the Commission with a rendering of the buildings placed in  
14 different locations on the site.

15  
16 A discussion ensued regarding the location of the buildings.

17  
18 Mr. Miller advised the Commission that he had grouped a significant amount of  
19 landscaping so that the bays would not be visible from the street.

20  
21 Vice Chairman Jones observed that there was a great deal of effort being made to block  
22 the view from Florida Avenue, which would thereby take away the advantage of the street  
23 frontage anyway. He asked why they did not want to just move the service bays away from  
24 the front.

25  
26 A discussion ensued regarding the possibility of the shuffling of the building uses.

27  
28 Chairman Duistermars suggested that the service bay doors be kept closed. He added  
29 that there was a lot of opportunity to move things around, and suggested that the building  
30 could be shifted a bit to cut down on the site line, and the landscaping could be cut back  
31 to conserve water.

32  
33 Mr. Miller responded that they had been attempting to screen the bays with the  
34 landscaping, but not the actual retail component.

35  
36 Chairman Duistermars made some additional suggestions regarding the building  
37 movement.

38  
39 Jerry Gann of Howard Roberts approached the lectern. He noted that, in looking at some  
40 of the centers along Florida Avenue he could understand the concern of the Commission.  
41 He suggested, however, that by approving a project as high-quality as this one would be,  
42 the Commission would be giving an incentive for other centers to be replaced someday.

1 He explained that if something that was of a higher-quality was not approved, the existing  
2 centers would not have any reason to improve because they would continue to do well in  
3 their current state. He noted that the excessive landscaping was being proposed only to  
4 screen the bays, which would only be visible for a moment when traveling west. He  
5 indicated that from any other direction the bays would not be visible at all. He added that  
6 the root of the landscape plan was the Scenic Highway, and that he would love to reduce  
7 the landscaping in an effort to allow view of the two different uses that were being  
8 proposed within the center. He suggested that moving the alignment of the automotive  
9 sight might work, but that moving the uses to the back would keep people from seeing  
10 them, and hence, they would not know that the auto services were there until they'd  
11 actually utilized them. Because of this, he noted, being in the front was somewhat of an  
12 advertising factor.

13  
14 Mr. Miller prepared a sketch of a slightly different alignment of the buildings and shared  
15 it with the Commission.

16  
17 A discussion ensued regarding the modification.

18  
19 Mr. Wills noted that his group could take a look at what Mr. Miller had drawn up to see if  
20 it would work for them economically, and then come back to the Commission for a  
21 discussion.

22  
23 The Commission concurred with this proposal and thanked the group for their  
24 presentation.

25  
26  
27 **B. COMMERCIAL USES REPORT - David Sawyer**

28 A workstudy session with discussion and possible direction to staff regarding  
29 commercial uses within the City.

30  
31 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that this item be continued since Principal Planner  
32 Sawyer could not be present at the meeting.

33  
34 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion to continue the work study item to the April 4,  
35 2006 agenda.

36  
37 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

38  
39 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride,  
40 Mendoza and Rhoten

41 NOES: None

42 ABSTAIN: None

1 ABSENT: None  
2  
3

4 **VI. CONSENT CALENDAR**  
5

6 **A. MINUTES**

7 1. February 21, 2006  
8

9 It was MOVED by Commissioner McBride and SECONDED by Commissioner Mendoza  
10 to approve the consent calendar as presented.  
11  
12

13  
14 /////  
15 /////  
16

17 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:  
18

19 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride  
20 and Mendoza

21 NOES: None

22 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Rhoten

23 ABSENT: None  
24  
25

26 **VII. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**  
27

28 There were no Planning Commission comments made.  
29  
30

31 **VIII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**  
32

33 There were no future agenda items requested.  
34  
35

36 **IX. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT**  
37

38 **A. PARKING**  
39

40 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that, at the request of the Mayor, the  
41 Commission and Staff were being asked to take a look at substandard parking for non-  
42 conforming uses. He added that he would like to place this item, for discussion, on a  
43

1 future agenda.

2  
3 The Commission concurred that this was an issue that needed to be addressed.

4  
5 Planning Director Masyczek suggested, and it was agreed, that the item be placed on the  
6 April 18, 2006 Planning Commission agenda.

7  
8  
9 **X. ADJOURNMENT**

10  
11 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten, SECONDED by Commissioner Mendoza and  
12 unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 6:57 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City  
13 of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **Tuesday, April 4, 2006 at 6:00 p.m.** to be  
14 held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet,  
15 California 92543.

16  
17 (Signatures on following page)

18  
19  
20  
21  
22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 **Bob Duistermars, Chairman**  
24 **Hemet Planning Commission**

25  
26  
27 **ATTEST:**

28  
29  
30 \_\_\_\_\_  
31 **Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary**  
32 **Hemet Planning Commission**