

1 **II. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**

2
3 There were no amendments or additions to the agenda.
4

5
6 **III. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE**

7
8 The Hemet Unified School District (HUSD) Update was given by Facilities Planner, Tina
9 Koonce who advised the Commission that the HUSD was waiting for the EMWD drawing for
10 the landscaping to be approved for the Tahquitz High School / Rancho Viejo Middle School
11 project. She noted that there had been meetings with architects and engineers on Thursday
12 to discuss the catch basin and water issues.

13
14 Regarding the Hamilton 2-story project, Ms. Koonce noted that the classrooms were being
15 prepped for stucco and utility hook-ups, and that once school was out for the summer
16 demolition of the old butler buildings would begin. She added that the project should be
17 completed, with the campus ready for students, in the Fall.

18
19 Ms. Koonce updated the Commission regarding various miscellaneous HUSD department
20 items, including the fact that they would be continuing to work on the summer construction
21 projects at Hemet Elementary School, Cawston Elementary School, Bautista Creek
22 Elementary School and West Valley High School. She noted that Sandy Packham would
23 be returning to the HUSD Facilities office as of Monday, April 10, 2006 on a temporary basis
24 in order to help facilitate summer projects until a new Director could be hired. She further
25 noted that the HUSD was working with the Riverside County Library System to establish a
26 plan for the new Cottonwood Joint Use Library on the campus of the Cottonwood School.

27
28 Ms. Koonce advised the Commission that the plans for the Professional Development
29 Academy had been approved and that the architect would be picking up comments from the
30 City. She added that the plans still needed to be approved by the Fire Marshall.

31
32 Ms. Koonce concluded her report with an update on the status of the Professional
33 Development Service Center, explaining that the City probably knew more than she did
34 about what was going on with the project. She advised that the HUSD would be submitting
35 their application for an address very soon, and that the utility meeting was scheduled for
36 Monday, April 10, 2006. She added that, ironically, all meetings for the Professional
37 Development Service Center and the Professional Development Academy were scheduled
38 for the following day and that she would have a more detailed update regarding those items
39 at the next Planning Commission meeting.
40
41
42
43
44

1 **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

2
3 **A. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 33961**

4 APPLICANT: SunCal Companies
5 AGENT: Tom Nieves - AEI-CASC Engineering
6 LOCATION: Southeast corner of Domenigoni Parkway/Gibbel Road
7 and State Street
8 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni
9 DESCRIPTION: A request for approval of a tentative tract map to
10 subdivide 114.71 acres into five (5) parcels to distinguish
11 Planning Areas within the Phase 2 development area of
12 the McSweeney Farms Specific Plan (SP 01-2).

13
14 The staff report was presented by Associate Planner Domenigoni who provided various
15 details regarding the proposed project. She displayed several renderings indicating the
16 project location, and noted that a separate Site Development Review (SDR) application
17 would be required to go over the project design. She noted that this particular map was
18 being processed for financing purposes relative to the project.

19
20 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the terminology "as-built" that was used in
21 Condition No. 69.

22
23 It was explained, for example, that once the landscaping was completed, an "as-built" plan
24 would be submitted to the City to indicate the landscaping, as installed.

25
26 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:11 p.m.

27
28 Cameron Crenshaw of 40101 Newport Road, Hemet, California approached the lectern as
29 an adjacent resident to the project. He inquired regarding what the zoning designation in the
30 area of Newport Road would be like. He noted that he had heard that the portion of the
31 Specific Plan along Newport Road would be constructed first and stated that he was
32 wondering why the plan had been changed from the original proposal.

33
34 Planning Director Masyczek advised Mr. Crenshaw that the zoning was not being changed.
35 He explained that the property was zoned "Specific Plan" or "SP" for one-acre lots along
36 Newport Road, and that any modification would require City Council approval. He noted that
37 he was not aware of any anticipated changes.

38
39 Vice Chairman Jones inquired regarding the equestrian center.

40
41 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the applicant had not requested any changes
42 to the existing plan at this point in time.

1 Mr. Crenshaw noted that a real estate agent had advised him that the portion of the property
2 along Newport Road would not be horse property and that the neighborhood residents were
3 somewhat concerned with that.

4
5 Planning Director Masyczek reiterated that there had been no change from the original
6 proposal.

7
8 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:18 p.m. and asked for a motion.

9
10 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to adopt
11 *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 06-07* approving Tentative Tract Map No. 33961
12 as presented.

13
14 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

15
16 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride
17 and Rhoten
18 NOES: None
19 ABSTAIN: None
20 ABSENT: Commissioner Mendoza

21
22 ***Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 06-13.***

23
24 **B. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 33824 AND TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO.**
25 **33825**

26 APPLICANT: SunCal Companies
27 AGENT: Tom Nieves - AEI-CASC Engineering
28 LOCATION: Southeast corner of Domenigoni Parkway/Gibbel Road
29 and State Street
30 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni
31 DESCRIPTION: 1) A request for approval of a tentative tract map to
32 subdivide 58.0 acres into 238 single-family reside

33
34 The staff report was presented by Associate Planner Domenigoni who provided various
35 details regarding the proposed project and displayed several renderings indicating the
36 location of the project and the map design. She noted that the applicant had widened the
37 paseo to 50-feet, and that it would open into a neighborhood park and include a foot bridge
38 to allow crossing of the channel, and would then connect to the rest of the paseo system.

39
40 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that an issue had been coming up on
41 tract maps regarding the implementation of on- and off-site improvements. He noted that
42 this was the first time that staff had made an attempt to quantify what would actually be
43 done, explaining that there had never before been a triggering mechanism to ensure that
44

1 requirements were implemented. He further explained how the mitigation measures were
2 proposed to be implemented with these projects, as well as with future projects. He noted
3 that the applicant had been very cooperative in helping to put the system in place, and
4 referred to the addendum to the conditions that he had distributed prior to the meeting.

5
6 Assistant Public Works Director Gow approached the lectern to discuss and explain the
7 various public works requirements that were relative to the project, along with the
8 Development Impact Fees that would be required. He noted that the developer would post
9 funds toward the construction of the off-site improvements.

10
11 Chairman Duistermars referred to the Environmental Impact Report, and asked how a fair
12 share of cost of an improvement was determined when the improvement was required
13 because of the project.

14
15 Planning Director Masyczek provided an explanation regarding the share of cost concept.
16 He then referred to **TR-5** within the addendum to the Conditions (Condition No. 124) that he
17 had distributed prior to the meeting, and advised that, after discussion with the applicant, it
18 was agreed that the wording ***“at Opening Year” should be stricken and that the initial***
19 ***phrase of TR-5 should end with the wording “as warranted:”***.

20
21 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:29 p.m.

22
23 Brent Caldwell of SunCal Companies approached the lectern and advised the Commission
24 that he was present with the rest of his team, and that they were all prepared to answer any
25 questions that the Commission might have.

26
27 Chairman Duistermars noted that he thought the widening of the paseos would help
28 tremendously and that he really liked the bridge.

29
30 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:31 p.m. and asked for a motion.

31
32 It was MOVED by Commissioner McBride and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
33 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 06-08* approving Tentative Tract Map No.
34 33824 with the amended conditions.

35
36 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

37
38 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride
39 and Rhoten

40 NOES: None

41 ABSTAIN: None

42 ABSENT: Commissioner Mendoza

1 **Planning Commission No. 06-14.**

2
3 It was MOVED by Commissioner McBride and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
4 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 06-09* approving Tentative Tract Map No.
5 33825 with the amended conditions.

6
7 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

8
9 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride
10 and Rhoten

11 NOES: None

12 ABSTAIN: None

13 ABSENT: Commissioner Mendoza

14
15 **Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-15.**

16
17
18 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS**

19
20 **A. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NO. 05-25**

21 APPLICANT: Ryland Homes - A Delaware Corporation

22 AGENT: Suzanne Scarborough

23 LOCATION: North side of Devonshire Avenue between Myers Street
24 and Cawston Avenue

25 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni

26 DESCRIPTION: A request for Planning Commission review and approval
27 of the site development plans for 100 single-family
28 residential homes within Tract No. 31970.

29
30 The staff report was presented by Associate Planner Domenigoni who provided various
31 details regarding the proposed project and displayed various renderings indicating the
32 project location and the proposed architectural designs.

33
34 Chairman Duistermars noted that he found some things to be problematic with the design,
35 indicating that the rock had not been brought around the front facade to where the fence
36 intersected the building, and that there were a number of lots where the sides of the homes
37 were visible but had a flat, bleak appearance.

38
39 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that staff had been involved in
40 numerous discussions with the applicant regarding the product type, noting that Associate
41 Planner Domenigoni had even gone to Temecula to see the product type that had been built
42 there, but that they had been advised that the applicant could not afford to build that type
43 of quality home in Hemet.

1 Vice Chairman Jones stated vehemently that this product was nowhere near what they
2 would like to see. He asked if they should condition it to be brought into compliance, or if
3 they should have it come back to the Commission for another review.

4
5 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that it should come back before the Commission for
6 an additional review.

7
8 A discussion ensued regarding the detention basin, and the fact that it included only a picnic
9 table and a bench, which was unacceptable, as was the proposed fencing.

10
11 Commissioner Rhoten noted that the elevations indicated 6-bedroom homes that included
12 only 2-car garages. She noted that she would think that homes of that size would include
13 more parking.

14
15 Associate Planner Domenigoni noted that there was an option for tandem parking rather
16 than a 6th bedroom.

17
18 Chairman Duistermars inquired as to what the mechanism was to bring the project back
19 before the Commission.

20
21 Planning Director Masyczek indicated that it would need to be continued to a date certain,
22 and suggested that the Commission may want to speak to the applicant.

23
24 Suzy Scarborough of Ryland Homes approached the lectern as a representative for the
25 applicant. She indicated that she thought that they had been working well with Staff, and
26 that she was surprised to find out that they were not on the same page, such as she had
27 thought. Regarding their project in French Valley, she noted that the price was in the mid
28 \$600,000's, which was a price that Hemet could not support, since Hemet's market prices
29 were not in that range at this point in time.

30
31 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that the project be continued to the May 16, 2006
32 Planning Commission meeting.

33
34 Chairman Duistermars advised Ms. Scarborough that they did not see a difference between
35 the regular and the enhanced elevations, explaining that they would like to see more of an
36 "enhancement" on the enhanced elevations. He suggested that some wrought iron and clay
37 pipe on the Spanish style homes would not hurt either.

38
39 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Vice Chairman Jones to
40 continue Site Development Review No. 05-25 to the Planning Commission meeting of May
41 16, 2006.

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

2
3 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride
4 and Rhoten

5 NOES: None

6 ABSTAIN: None

7 ABSENT: Commissioner Mendoza

8
9
10 **VI. WORK STUDY**

11
12 **A. COMMERCIAL USES REPORT - David Sawyer**

13 A work study session with discussion and possible direction to staff regarding
14 commercial uses within the City.

15
16 The work study presentation was given by Principal Planner Sawyer, who noted that the City
17 Council had directed staff to review which commercial uses were permitted versus which
18 were conditionally permitted in the various commercial zones throughout the City.

19
20 Principal Planner Sawyer went over the review process of permitted uses relative to minor
21 additions and remodels, noting that such items were reviewed through the building permit
22 plan check process, which took approximately 2 to 4 weeks.

23
24 Principal Planner Sawyer then referred to projects that were permitted through the Site
25 Development Review and Administrative Use Permit process, which included new
26 construction and major additions & remodels. He noted that many of these projects were
27 approved via site development reviews at the Development Review Committee level or via
28 Planning Director Review, which had a timeline of approximately 13 weeks for minimal
29 projects and 16 to 18 weeks for average projects.

30
31 Principal Planner Sawyer went on to discuss Conditional Use Permits and their timeline
32 requirements. He explained, regarding the Development Review Committee (DRC) process,
33 that a project of this nature took a minimum of seven weeks to receive DRC approval, noting
34 that the first DRC meeting was for completeness, the 2nd meeting was to discuss and resolve
35 design issues and the third meeting was to review the conditions of approval. He explained
36 that due to distribution requirements, any additional DRC meetings that were needed due
37 to incompleteness or design revision would add a minimum of 3 weeks to the process. He
38 noted that following the last DRC meeting a minimum of six weeks was needed to prepare
39 for Planning Commission review.

40
41 Principal Planner Sawyer then embarked on a discussion of typically Permitted uses,
42 including retail uses, financial institutions, professional offices, restaurants, photography
43 studios and etc.

1 Regarding typical Administrative Use Permits, Principal Planner Sawyer explained that
2 video/internet arcades, outdoor sales, recording studios, indoor theaters and arts & crafts
3 stores with light assembly tended to fall under this category.

4
5 As far as Conditionally Permitted Uses were concerned, Principal Planner Sawyer indicated
6 that shopping centers, drive-thru facilities, gasoline stations, auto sales and/or services,
7 hotels/motels, equipment rentals and tattoo parlors should fall into this category. He noted
8 that a work study had been held before the City Council regarding these issues at their
9 March 14, 2006 meeting, and that staff was expecting to bring the item back to the
10 Commission for a recommendation to the City Council at their meeting of May 2, 2006, with
11 the item going to the City Council for a public hearing on May 23, 2006.

12
13 A discussion ensued regarding big-box users, and it was agreed that there was no benefit,
14 timewise, between an Administrative Use Permit and a Conditional Use Permit.

15
16 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that staff was hoping to find out from the
17 Planning Commission exactly what items they felt should be processed as Conditional Use
18 Permits so that they would be included in the review and approval process.

19
20 Planning Director Masyczek noted that what was currently under consideration was the fact
21 that there was a process in place that tended to treat everybody the same. He explained
22 that in the existing system, a florist would have to go through the same type of review as a
23 tattoo parlor. He explained that the City Council did not want to make it too difficult for the
24 simple projects, but not too easy for the uses that were not necessarily desirable. He
25 suggested that anything over "x" amount of square-feet could be required to undergo
26 Planning Commission review. He noted that in many cities items that were typically
27 approved through the Planning Director Review process could be bumped up to require
28 Planning Commission review at the Planning Director's discretion. He explained that there
29 were some mechanisms that could be added into the review process that would allow this
30 to happen, but that not everyone should have to go through Planning Commission approval.

31
32 City Attorney Vail then advised the Commission that the Conditional Use Permit process was
33 not supposed to include a review of what the outside of the building would look like, but
34 rather the use that was going into the building, and whether that use was appropriate for the
35 site. As an example he referred to a liquor store that might be a small size, but should have
36 the Commission review it anyway, due to the type of use. He indicated that a tattoo parlor
37 fell under the same criteria. He noted that perhaps large stores should require Planning
38 Commission review because of the large trucks that would provide delivery of merchandise
39 during late night hours. He noted that the Commission should think about what it was that
40 they really wanted to regulate, and that they should consider whether their concerns were
41 with the proximity of the use to a residential neighborhood, the noise, the availability of
42 alcohol, or etc.

1 Planning Director Masyczek added that the Commission should be aware that a use that
2 was categorized as "permitted" in a specific zone, was permitted anywhere in that zone.

3
4 A discussion ensued regarding big-box users, their life expectancy and how they could blight
5 a community in the long run.

6
7 Chairman Duistermars indicated that he would like to see uses that might have community-
8 wide impacts come before the Commission as Conditional Use Permits, such as liquor
9 stores and bars. He noted that he felt that the determination should include the breath of
10 impact.

11
12 Principal Planner Sawyer noted that since there was such a short turn-around time for this
13 project, he would like to get some input from the Commission at the present time.

14
15 City Attorney Vail indicated that he had noticed that there were various pet projects that the
16 Commission liked to review, such as carwashes on corners, and that the Commission should
17 take a moment to consider which projects they would like to see reviewed as Conditional
18 Use Permits.

19
20 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that Conditional Use Permits should be required for
21 anything that was automobile related, as well as shopping centers, bars, tattoo parlors,
22 hookah lounges and big-box users.

23
24 Principal Planner Sawyer suggested that any use that included live entertainment should
25 require a Conditional Use Permit.

26
27 A discussion ensued regarding some of the items that should possibly require conditional
28 use permits and how to distinguish them from related uses, such as restaurants that serve
29 beer & wine with dinner versus restaurants with bars that have different hours than the
30 restaurant as a whole.

31
32 Vice Chairman Jones left the meeting at 7:18 p.m.

33
34 Chairman Duistermars indicated that if a restaurant included a full-service bar or a stage
35 and/or a dance floor it should definitely require a conditional use permit.

36
37 Commissioner McBride noted that many establishments served food & alcohol during the
38 day, but had the bar & nightlife type of use at night.

39
40 Chairman Duistermars indicated that he would also like to see gas stations, carwashes and
41 anything that included a bay area as a conditional use permit. He noted that he did not think
42 that uses that were located on corners necessarily need a conditional use permit, but that
43 they should be reviewed as an administrative use permit, rather than just a permitted use.
44

1 City Attorney Vail referred to a business that had moved into town earlier in the year that
2 offered some uncertainty as to whether it would be an adult business or not. He noted that
3 there was often a gray area regarding certain adult-type businesses versus actual adult
4 businesses. He further noted that it would be difficult to define such uses, but asked if the
5 Commission would be interested in having this type of business require a conditional use
6 permit review, suggesting that this might be a way to capture such businesses.

7
8 It was agreed that any novelty stores should require a conditional use permit.

9
10 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that if a use tended to require a conditional use
11 permit, but was located within a zone that was surrounded by commercial uses, perhaps it
12 should only require an administrative use permit.

13
14 Chairman Duistermars expressed his disagreement with this thought, as the community
15 impact would still be there. He noted that residents could go to restaurants that served
16 alcohol in commercial zones, but that they would still get back into their cars when they were
17 finished consuming that alcohol and theoretically impact the entire community.

18
19 Principal Planner Sawyer indicated that he would put a list of uses together, based on the
20 Commission's input, and bring them back as a public hearing on May 2, 2006, for
21 recommendation to the City Council.

22
23
24 **VII. CONSENT CALENDAR**

25
26 **A. MINUTES**

- 27 1. March 21, 2006

28
29 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner McBride to
30 approve the consent calendar as presented.

31
32 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

33
34 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners McBride and Rhoten

35 NOES: None

36 ABSTAIN: None

37 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioner Mendoza

1 **VIII. UPDATE OF CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS ON PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS**

2
3 **A. CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF MARCH 28, 2006**

- 4 _____ 1. Zone Change No. 04-12, Tentative Tract Map No. 32700 &
5 Environmental Assessment No. 04-46 (Dan Persichetti - Northwest
6 corner of Wentworth Drive and Sanderson Avenue).

7
8 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that Zone Change No. 04-12 and
9 Tentative Tract Map No. 32700 with Environmental Assessment No. 04-46 had been
10 approved as presented. He noted that the Commission's concerns had been relayed, but
11 would likely be addressed as part of the Comprehensive General Plan Update.

12
13
14 **IX. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**

15
16 **A. MAJOR PROJECTS UPDATE**

17 To be provided at the first meeting of each month.

18
19 A written copy of the update was distributed, and Planning Director Masyczek offered to
20 answer any questions.

21
22 There were no questions asked.

23
24 **B. CITY OF HEMET GENERAL PLAN GOALS AND POLICIES**

25 A review of the existing policies and standards of the City of Hemet General
26 Plan.

27
28 Planning Director Masyczek referred to the document that had been distributed with the
29 Planning Commission packet, and explained to the Commission what he would like them to
30 do with it.

31
32
33 **VIII. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

34
35 Chairman Duistermars indicated that he would like to approach the City Council regarding
36 design guidelines for industrial uses.

37
38 Planning Director Masyczek responded that such a discussion was coming up with the
39 Council the following week.

40
41 A discussion ensued regarding the relocation of the Hemet Unified School District
42 Administration offices.

1 Planning Director Masyczek indicated that the school project was proposing three (3) metal
2 shades that included no design at all.

3
4 Chairman Duistermars inquired as to whether the buses had been moved yet.

5
6 Planning Director Masyczek responded that they had not.

7
8 Chairman Duistermars inquired about the project that had been reviewed at one of the
9 recent Planning Commission meetings that included the bays and asked whether the
10 applicant was intending to move his building as the Commission had suggested.

11
12 Principal Planner Sawyer indicated that staff had not heard anything back from him yet.

13
14 Commissioner McBride inquired regarding the status of the proposed senior complex
15 between Devonshire Avenue and Madrid Street.

16
17 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the property owner had indicated that he would
18 be submitting a mixed use concept, but that it was possible that he was trying to circumvent
19 the ordinance to avoid the 3-acre minimum requirement for a multiple-family use.

20
21 A discussion ensued regarding the proposal for that property.
22

23
24 **IX. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

25
26 There were no future agenda items requested.
27

28
29 **X. ADJOURNMENT**

30
31 It was MOVED by Commissioner McBride, SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten and
32 unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 7:40 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City
33 of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **Tuesday, April 18, 2006 at 6:00 p.m.** to be
34 held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet,
35 California 92543.
36

37
38 _____
39 **Bob Duistermars, Chairman**
40 **Hemet Planning Commission**

41 **ATTEST:**

42
43 _____
44 **Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary**
Hemet Planning Commission