

1 CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

2  
3 TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 2004

4  
5 THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION WAS  
6 CONVENED BY VICE CHAIRMAN JONES ON TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 2004 AT 6:00 P.M.  
7 AT THE CITY OF HEMET COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 450 EAST LATHAM AVENUE,  
8 HEMET, CALIFORNIA.

9  
10 Present: Vice Chairman Nick Jones and Commissioners James Calkins,  
11 Mayzelle Rhoten and Patrick Searl; Chairman Bob Duisternars  
12 present at 6:39 p.m.

13  
14 Absent: None

15  
16 Staff Present: Police Captain Rudy Cabrera, Assistant Planner Maureen  
17 Losey, Planning Director Richard Masyczek, City Planner Ron  
18 Running, Principal Planner David Sawyer, Minutes Secretary  
19 Nancie Shaw, Assistant City Attorney Eric Vail and Fire Captain  
20 Dave Van Verst

21  
22 Invocation and Flag Salute: Commissioner Calkins

23  
24  
25 I. PUBLIC COMMENTS

26  
27 There were no members of the public who wished to address the Commission.

28  
29  
30 II. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA

31  
32 There were no amendments or additions to the agenda.

33  
34  
35 III. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE - Update given by Hemet Unified  
36 School District Director of Facilities, Sandra Packham.

37  
38 Sandy Packham, Director of Facilities for the Hemet Unified School District, reported to  
39 the Commission that bids had opened for the construction of a portion of the Jacob  
40 Wiens Elementary School. She noted that the school district had been expecting the bids  
41 to be high due to what was happening in the industry, but that they had, in fact, exceeded  
42 the budget by approximately \$2.5 million. She further noted that the Governing Board  
43 would be considering the bids at their meeting on June 22, 2004.

1 Ms. Packham reported that the two (2) new relocatable buildings had been delivered to  
2 the Alternative Learning Center, and that site work on the parking lot was continuing to  
3 progress. She further reported that construction of a grant funded fitness area had also  
4 begun.

5  
6 Regarding the modernization projects for the Summer of 2004, Ms. Packham reported  
7 that the asbestos removal had been completed over the week-end and that the air was  
8 now being tested. She stated that the interior demolition of the areas was scheduled to  
9 begin on Saturday, with the exterior demolition already underway.

10  
11 Ms. Packham advised the Commission that the relocatable buildings for the Bautista  
12 Creek Elementary School were being craned into the school the following week. She  
13 added that the relocatable moves from Acacia Middle School to West Valley High School  
14 and from Whittier Elementary School to Hemet High School were in progress.

15  
16 Ms. Packham reported, regarding the new Hemet High School stadium, that the  
17 Governing Board was expected to give final approval of the site acquisition at their  
18 meeting this evening, and that the CEQA process was continuing. She noted that plans  
19 were being prepared for submission to DSA, and that the school district was continuing  
20 to work with Riverside County Transportation on signals and road improvements.

21  
22 Ms. Packham concluded her report with a discussion of the new high school, advising the  
23 Commission that the clean-up by the developer was making progress. She noted that the  
24 school district was working on combined high school and middle school funding with  
25 OPSC, and explained that combined funding would allow the school district to mass  
26 grade the site and install all curbs, gutters, sidewalks and utilities. She added that the  
27 school district was meeting with the City of Hemet to discuss road improvements, and that  
28 they were working with EMWD on reclaimed water.

29  
30  
31 **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

32  
33 **A. VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31280 / ENVIRONMENTAL**  
34 **ASSESSMENT NO. 03-32 (Continued from May 4, 2004)**

35 \_\_\_\_\_ APPLICANT: Orangewood Investment Partners  
36 LOCATION: West side of Pine Avenue between Commonwealth  
37 and Esplanade Avenues  
38 PLANNER: Maureen Losey  
39 DESCRIPTION: A request to subdivide 16.18 acres into 13 lots for  
40 single-family residential development with adoption of  
41 a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project.  
42

43 Assistant Planner Losey advised the Commission that staff was requesting a continuance  
44 for this project to the Planning Commission meeting of July 20, 2004.

45  
46 Vice Chairman Jones asked for a motion to continue.  
47  
48

1 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to  
2 continue Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 31280 / Environmental Assessment No. 03-32  
3 to the Planning Commission meeting of July 20, 2004.

4  
5 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

6  
7 AYES: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins, Rhoten and Searl  
8 NOES: None  
9 ABSTAIN: None  
10 ABSENT: Chairman Duistermars

11  
12 **B. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31737 (Continued from June 1, 2004)**

13 APPLICANT: Victoria Homes, Inc.  
14 AGENT: Mel Haugen  
15 LOCATION: West side of Palm Avenue between Eaton Street and  
16 Esplanade Avenue (approximately 967-feet south of  
17 Esplanade Avenue)  
18 PLANNER: Maureen Losey  
19 DESCRIPTION: A request for a tentative tract map to subdivide 19.43  
20 acres into 19-lots for future single-family residential  
21 development.  
22

23 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Losey who provided some details  
24 regarding the project.

25  
26 Discussion ensued regarding the addition of rural standards for the project.

27  
28 Planning Director Masyczek explained to the Commission that a work study session  
29 regarding rural standards was going to be held at the City Council meeting on June 22,  
30 2004. He referred to the condition that could be added to the proposed map, that would  
31 allow rural standards, and explained that the condition would apply if the City Council  
32 were to choose to adopt rural standards.

33  
34 Assistant City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that they could not impose  
35 standards on a subdivision that were not in place at the time the project was approved.  
36 He noted that the applicant for this project was in favor of rural standards, and that such  
37 standards may possibly be adopted by the City Council in the future. He explained that,  
38 per the subdivision map act, if an applicant requests changes such as this, any  
39 ordinances, policies, standards, etc. that are adopted in the future as a result of that initial  
40 request, may be applied to the applicant's project. He stated that, with this in mind, he  
41 did not mind drafting a condition to add to the conditions of approval for the map. He  
42 noted that the condition would only apply if the City Council were to adopt rural standards  
43 prior to the development of the project.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

1 Mel Haugen, 1333 Clydesdale Court, Hemet, California, approached the lectern as a  
2 representative for the applicant, and advised the Commission that he had discussed the  
3 condition with staff and was prepared to accept it, as written, along with all of the other  
4 conditions of approval.

5  
6 Vice Chairman Jones closed the public hearing at 6:12 p.m.

7  
8 Planning Director Masyczek read the language for the additional condition regarding rural  
9 standards, as follows:

10  
11 **Condition No. 41a:**

12  
13 ***“If, prior to the recordation of the final map, the City adopts  
14 rural street improvement standards, the rural standards shall be  
15 applied to this map, and revisions shall be incorporated on the  
16 final map.”***

17  
18 Vice Chairman Jones asked for a motion.

19  
20 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Searl to  
21 adopt *Resolution Bill No. 04-30*, with the addition of Condition of Approval No. 41a.

22  
23 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

24  
25 AYES: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins, Rhoten and Searl  
26 NOES: None  
27 ABSTAIN: None  
28 ABSENT: Chairman Duistermars

29  
30 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-29.***

31  
32 **C. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT NO. 04-2 AND DETERMINATION  
33 OF A STATUTORY EXEMPTION**

34 APPLICANT: City of Hemet  
35 LOCATION: City-wide  
36 PLANNER: Richard Masyczek  
37 DESCRIPTION: An amendment to Section 90-1261 of the Hemet  
38 Municipal Code regulating moving signs within the City  
39 of Hemet.

40  
41 Planning Director Masyczsek presented the staff report, explaining some details of the  
42 proposal to the Commission.

43  
44 Vice Chairman Jones inquired regarding how the new code would be enforced.

1 Planning Director Masyczek responded that there were now full-time code officers  
2 working on both Saturdays and Sundays, and that enforcement of the code would be in  
3 the hands of the Code Enforcement Division.

4  
5 Commissioner Rhoten asked if there were any way that an exception could be made for  
6 the school kids who were employed by developers to turn directional signs that indicate  
7 the new home locations.

8  
9 Planning Director Masyczek responded that, unfortunately, there was no way to make  
10 that exception.

11  
12 Vice Chairman Jones opened the public hearing at 6:15 p.m.

13  
14 Brian Christie, 320 Juel Lane, Hemet, California approached the lectern and asked who  
15 the intended enforcement team would be for the new code.

16  
17 Vice Chairman Jones responded that the City had authorized the Code Enforcement  
18 division to provide enforcement.

19  
20 Mr. Christie inquired regarding the ramifications of a violation, asking if the offender would  
21 be jailed or fined.

22  
23 Planning Director Masyczek responded that initially the signs would be confiscated, and  
24 the sign owners would be notified that their signs were in possession of the City and  
25 where they could be retrieved.

26  
27 Mr. Christie asked if kids would still be able to display their sandwich board "Carwash"  
28 signs.

29  
30 Planning Director Masyczek advised Mr. Christie that those types of "A" frame signs were  
31 already prohibited.

32  
33 Eric Gosch, 40415 Twin Springs Rd., Hemet, California approached the lectern and  
34 advised the Commission that this issue had originally been discussed by the Association  
35 of Auto Dealers in the City. He explained that the out-of-town used car dealers that come  
36 into town to hold a sale load up every intersection with people holding signs to advertise  
37 their sales. He suggested that this was very distracting and had gotten out of hand. He  
38 noted that when the issue had been discussed, it had focused on the auto sales and not  
39 the directional signs that are generally held by kids. He explained that the Association's  
40 intention had not been to take jobs away from kids, and stated that it was unfortunate that  
41 the ordinance could not distinguish between the reasonable and unreasonable sign  
42 displays, but advised the Commission that the Association was in support of the  
43 ordinance and would like to see the Commission recommend it for approval to the City  
44 Council.

45  
46 A discussion ensued regarding different aspects of the proposed ordinance.  
47  
48

1 Assistant City Attorney Vail noted that **any** signs in the right-of-way would be prohibited,  
2 whether they were displayed by themselves, or held by a person.

3  
4 Vice Chairman Jones asked for a motion.

5  
6 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to  
7 adopt *Resolution Bill No. 04-44* recommending approval to the City Council of Zoning  
8 Ordinance Amendment No. 04-2 and Determination of a Statutory Exemption.

9  
10 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

11  
12 AYES: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins and Rhoten

13 NOES: Commissioner Searl

14 ABSTAIN: None

15 ABSENT: Chairman Duistermars

16  
17 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-30.***

18  
19  
20 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS**

21  
22 **A. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NO. 03-28**

23 APPLICANT: KB Home Coastal, Inc.

24 LOCATION: East side of Cawston Avenue between Fruitvale and  
25 Eaton Avenues

26 PLANNER: Maureen Losey

27 DESCRIPTION: A request for Planning Commission review and  
28 recommendation to the City Council of the final design  
29 of the proposed park site for Vesting Tentative Tract  
30 Map No. 30560.

31  
32 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Losey who provided some details  
33 regarding the project. She described what the proposed park would include, and  
34 displayed a site plan indicating the proposal. She noted that the park site had been  
35 reviewed by the Staff Review Committee four (4) times, and that the Parks Commission  
36 had also reviewed the project and wanted to see some shade structures added along with  
37 another table on the northern end of the park. She explained that it had been necessary  
38 for the applicant to go back to Metropolitan Water District (MWD) to request approval of  
39 the Parks Commission's recommended additions, and distributed a letter to the applicant  
40 from MWD, indicating that the proposed locations of the structures was not acceptable.

41  
42 Commissioner Rhoten referred to the lack of lighting within the park area, and asked if  
43 the Police Department had reviewed the proposal.

1 Police Lieutenant Cabrera approached the lectern and responded that the Police  
2 Department had been present during each of the Staff Review Committee meetings. He  
3 noted that they were not too concerned with the lighting since there were streetlights  
4 around the perimeter of the park. He advised the Commission that the primary concern  
5 of the Police Department was its proximity to the school, which was right across the  
6 street, and the probability that the park would be frequented by the school children  
7 throughout the day. He suggested that, as far as night time usage of the park went, most  
8 of the parks in the City did not have interior lighting, which had not presented much of a  
9 problem thus far.

10  
11 A discussion ensued.

12  
13 Vice Chairman Jones inquired regarding what kind of mitigation the applicant would need  
14 to comply with, as far as offsetting for the provision of real parks. He suggested that,  
15 since this park area was unusable anyway, it should not be considered a full provision of  
16 an amenity.

17  
18 Planning Director Masyczek stated that the Commission would need to decide if this area  
19 would be acceptable as a City Park, since it would be dedicated as such. He added that  
20 he would recommend that at least two (2) half-court basketball areas be provided, rather  
21 than the one (1) that was proposed with this design. He further suggested that bollards  
22 be added to light the sidewalks within the park.

23  
24 Assistant City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that approval of the original tentative  
25 tract map had included this particular site as the park area, so the question of the location  
26 of the park was not one that was before the Commission this evening. He explained that  
27 by dedicating the park the applicant would get credit against Development Impact Fees  
28 or Quimby Act Fees, and noted that the park fee would be approximately \$300,000, but  
29 that the actual construction of the park would likely exceed that amount. He stated that  
30 he did not believe the issue of granting or withholding credit was even a question before  
31 the Commission, but that the issue was with the design of the park. He explained that the  
32 Commission did not have to accept the park as designed, noting that they could  
33 recommend changes to the design as long as the changes did not go outside of the  
34 limitations imposed by MWD. He explained that under the Quimby Act, and the City's  
35 implementation of the Quimby Act, the land that is dedicated by a developer is not  
36 required to be land that could have been reasonably put to another use, and that just  
37 because homes could not have been built on this parcel does not mean the developer is  
38 disqualified from receiving credit for dedication.

39  
40 Commissioner Searl suggested that he would love to see some soccer fields included  
41 within the park area, since they would be highly utilized, but that he did not want the  
42 proposal to have to go back before the Parks Commission.

43  
44 Commissioner Rhoten asked if the applicant would consider adding another half-court  
45 basketball area.

1 Andrea Deleon, Director of Local Government Affairs for KB Home Coastal, Inc., 26201  
2 Ynez Road, Suite 104, Temecula, California approached the lectern and stated that the  
3 proposed project would allow Hemet families to use the area as a park facility. She noted  
4 that they would not have a problem adding an additional half-court basketball area within  
5 the MWD restrictions, and displayed a map indicating where the facility could be placed.  
6

7 Chairman Duistermars joined the meeting at 6:39 p.m.  
8

9 A discussion ensued regarding the provisions of the park.  
10

11 Tim Lokkesmoe of KB Home Coastal Inc., 26201 Ynez Road, Suite 104, Temecula,  
12 California approached the lectern as the project manager. He indicated on the displayed  
13 map where certain facilities could be provided.  
14

15 Planning Director Masyczek indicated on the map where he would recommend that the  
16 additional half-court basketball area be provided, as well as where a soccer field could  
17 be added by removing berms.  
18

19 Kim Takaki of SKA Landscape Architecture approached the lectern and advised the  
20 Commission that MWD had restricted certain areas to be 18-inches in height, and that  
21 the display that the Commission was looking at was a result of the effort to compromise  
22 with MWD.  
23

24 Commissioner Rhoten inquired about the notation in the Parks Commission Minutes that  
25 indicated that the benches would be made out of recycled milk jugs.  
26

27 Ms. Takaki confirmed that this was correct, adding that such benches were very durable  
28 and lasted much longer than the traditional wood benches. She further noted that they  
29 hold up very well to vandalism, including graffiti and fire.  
30

31 A discussion ensued regarding the materials that the different facilities would be made  
32 of.  
33

34 Chairman Duistermars expressed his frustration with the limited uses, and stated he  
35 would like to add as many usable facilities as possible to this park in order to  
36 accommodate the users.  
37

38 Police Lieutenant Cabrera expressed some concern regarding some of the shrubs that  
39 were proposed.  
40

41 Discussion of the shrubbery and lighting ensued.  
42

43 Assistant City Attorney Vail explained that the Commission had a couple of different  
44 options, including the option to **NOT** approve the design and send it back to the Parks  
45 Commission for more work, or to work directly with the developer on the design. He  
46  
47  
48

1 clarified that the SDR status of this project did not give the Commission the ability to re-  
2 open the approval of the tentative tract map to relocate the park.  
3

4 Chairman Duistermars suggested that the Commission needed to get together with MWD  
5 to find out where they were coming from regarding their limitations, but noted that the  
6 need to do this should not hold up approval of this park design. He again stated that they  
7 merely needed to get as many usable amenities included in this park design as possible  
8 without going outside of MWD's restrictions. He added that if the park design had been  
9 proposed at the time the map was approved he would not have been in favor of it.  
10

11 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that the parking lot be removed to add more open  
12 space area, that pedestrian lighting be added in the form of bollards, and that an  
13 additional half-court basketball area be included in the design. He mentioned the idea  
14 of contacting MWD to discuss other options that they might consider allowing.  
15

16 The Commission concurred.  
17

18 Ms. Deleon stated that she would like to humbly request that this project be  
19 recommended for approval to the City Council, with the notation that they would provide  
20 any additional facilities that the City would like to have added if they were permitted by  
21 MWD.  
22

23 Chairman Duistermars stated that all the Commission needed from the applicant was the  
24 commitment to install as many usable facilities as possible.  
25

26 Ms. Deleon assured him that the Commission had that commitment.  
27

28 Chairman Duistermars advised Ms. Deleon that City Planner Running and Planning  
29 Director Masyczek would address MWD regarding the permission of additional provisions.  
30

31 Mr. Lokkesmoe asked for clarification regarding what the Commission had asked to have  
32 added to the park this evening, noting that his list included a low fence around the  
33 perimeter of the park, a pick-up field, an additional play structure, an additional half-court  
34 basketball area and elimination of the parking lot.  
35

36 The Commission concurred that this was correct.  
37

38 Commissioner Calkins inquired regarding who would be responsible for maintenance of  
39 the park.  
40

41 Planning Director Masyczek responded that an L&LMD would be implemented to pay for  
42 the maintenance.  
43

44 Chairman Duistermars asked for clarification regarding the motion that needed to be  
45 made.  
46  
47  
48

1 Planning Director Masyczek stated that the motion should be to adopt staff's  
2 recommendation with the changes that had been discussed during the meeting, along  
3 with any other modifications that MWD would allow.

4  
5 Ms. Takaki noted that the lowering of the shrubs in the center could be a problem with  
6 MWD as they specifically wanted 18-inch shrubs.

7  
8 Chairman Duistermars stated that the shrubs around the tot lots and the shade centers  
9 should be lowered, but that he was not necessarily concerned with the ones in the center.

10  
11 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to  
12 adopt *Resolution Bill No. 04-43* recommending approval to the City Council of Site  
13 Development Review No. 03-28, as amended, and with any other modifications that  
14 would be permitted by MWD.

15  
16 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

17  
18 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins  
19 and Searl

20 NOES: Commissioner Rhoten

21 ABSTAIN: None

22 ABSENT: None

23  
24 Chairman Duistermars asked that a meeting be scheduled with MWD for discussion,  
25 since their easement runs right through the valley.

26  
27 Vice Chairman Jones left the meeting at 7:02 p.m.

## 28 29 30 **VI. WORK STUDY**

### 31 32 **A. SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DESIGN GUIDELINES - UPDATE -** 33 Richard Masyczek

34 A work study session including a review and update of the existing single-  
35 family residential design guidelines with discussion and possible direction  
36 to staff.

37  
38 The work study session was initiated by Planning Director Masyczek who began by  
39 discussing the 40/60 guideline relative to garages. He explained how different lot sizes  
40 might require different variations of the rule, and displayed some photos indicating types  
41 of designs that would be acceptable and types that would not.

42  
43 Planning Director Masyczek discussed the staff recommended option that the 40/60  
44 guideline be met through side-on garages or by placing garages in the rear of the home,  
45  
46  
47  
48

1 or along an alleyway, which, he noted, could be designed very beautifully. He displayed  
2 photos indicating attractive alleyways. He suggested that if the Commission were to  
3 choose the inclusion of this option the guidelines would need to be written very carefully  
4 to avoid the mess that alleys can often become.  
5

6 Planning Director Masyczek presented the pros and cons of various options, as follows:  
7

- 8 1. Require any design that shows more than 40% garage to either provide garage in  
9 rear or to provide side-on garages (staff recommended options).

10 Pro - Minimized impact of garages

11 Con- Decreases side-yard usability for rear garages. Minimizes livable  
12 areas in front for side-yard garages.  
13  
14

- 15 2. Require any design that shows more than 40% garage to provide garages in rear  
16 serviced by alleys.

17 Pro - Same as above plus implements policies of General Plan

18 Con- Alleys can be an eyesore and if not designed properly, a police  
19 problem.  
20  
21

- 22 3. Not permit any violation of the 40/60 rule.

23 Pro - Somewhat helpful in minimizing impacts; permits creativity in dealing  
24 with the issue.

25 Con- Not feasible for lots with a width of less than 72 feet; would  
26 effectively negate small lot zoning.  
27  
28

- 29 4. Permit amenities, such as windows, to offset garages exceeding 40%.

30 Pro - Somewhat helpful in minimizing impacts; permits creativity in dealing  
31 with issue.

32 Con- Exceptions are vague and unclear; amenities may be insufficient to  
33 offset visual impacts.  
34  
35

- 36 5. Remove 40/60 rule.

37 Pro - Removes problem with rule!

38 Con- Would result in garages dominating street scene.  
39  
40

41 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that photos could be provided to developers  
42 indicating what is and is not acceptable relative to the provision of garages.  
43

44 Commissioner Rhoten inquired regarding side-on garages.  
45  
46  
47  
48

1 Commissioner Calkins referred to the fact that side-on garages often require the entire  
2 frontage of the home for garage access.

3  
4 Planning Director Masyczek noted that this issue often comes up, and that it needs to be  
5 decided whether the guidelines should be amended, and how it can be indicated to the  
6 developers exactly what the City is willing to accept.

7  
8 Commissioner Searl suggested that there should be some flexibility of the 40/60 rule, as  
9 it will not always be able to be complied with when the smaller lot sizes and widths are  
10 taken into consideration.

11  
12 Discussion ensued regarding the 40/60 rule.

13  
14 The Commission discussed recommending that the City Council change the design  
15 guidelines so that the architectural problem goes away.

16  
17 Planning Director Masyczek noted that it was not critical that the recommendation be  
18 made right away, explaining that the Commission had some time to perfect their  
19 recommendation.

20  
21 Chairman Duistermars suggested that a field trip be scheduled to look at how other  
22 communities handle the issue. He added that perhaps a couple of City Council members  
23 should be included.

24  
25 Planning Director Masyczek moved on to the next issue regarding single-story homes.  
26 He explained that the Commission should consider whether or not single-story homes  
27 were to be required exclusively along perimeter streets of subdivisions. He suggested  
28 that the one-story rule should stay in place unless the applicant were to provide specific  
29 criteria, including the following:

- 30  
31 1. Two-story homes provide an additional 10-feet of setback on rear property  
32 lines.  
33 2. A viewshed analysis be provided that shows how two-story homes will not  
34 impact views of mountains.  
35 3. That two-story homes provide detailed rear- and side-story architectural  
36 treatment.

37  
38 Planning Director Masyczek displayed some examples of elevations that provide these  
39 types of criteria. He noted the pros and cons of single-story homes as follows:

40  
41 Pros - Protects viewsheds; provides visual relief along streets.

42 Cons- Single-story homes are generally cheaper than two-story homes, and may  
43 be contrary to the Commission's desire for more expensive homes; can be  
44 monotonous; R.V. parking is more noticeable next to one-story homes.

1 Chairman Duistermars mentioned that when the one-story issue had first been  
2 addressed, it was along access points to the valley, and that he was not sure how they  
3 ended up requiring one-story homes along every perimeter street. He stated that he  
4 would like to discuss the issue in terms of the size of streets and which streets should  
5 require single-story homes. He stated that he would also like to discuss material  
6 variations and building planes, noting that the Commission had recently reviewed a  
7 number of projects that provide the addition of a 2' x 4' as a building plane.

8  
9 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that a list of criteria for where single-story homes  
10 would be required could be established, or even a list of specific streets.

11  
12 Commissioner Searl suggested that the list could be established according to traffic  
13 count.

14  
15 Planning Director Masyczek responded that traffic counts tended to change too often.

16  
17 A discussion ensued regarding the single-story requirement being limited to certain  
18 streets, such as those with an 88-foot right-of-way.

19  
20 Chairman Duistermars noted that clarity regarding building planes was still needed, as  
21 well as which amenities, such as porches, should be required amenities, and which are  
22 only provided if chosen as an option by the home buyer.

23  
24 Planning Director Masyczek stated that staff would draft up a revision to the design  
25 guidelines, schedule a tour for the Commission to visualize where the provisions that had  
26 been discussed were and were not being met, and then have a subsequent work study  
27 session regarding this issue.

28  
29 The Commission concurred.

30  
31 A discussion ensued regarding walls and fencing.

32  
33 Planning Director suggested that this issue could also be reviewed during the tour to  
34 come up with some possible resolutions.

35  
36  
37 **VII. CONSENT CALENDAR**

38  
39 **A. MINUTES**

40 1. June 1, 2004

41  
42 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Rhoten and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Calkins to  
43 approve the consent calendar as presented.

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

2  
3 AYES: Commissioners Calkins, Rhoten and Searl  
4 NOES: None  
5 ABSTAIN: Chairman Duistermars  
6 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones  
7

8  
9 **VIII. UPDATE OF CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS ON PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS -**  
10 Update given by Planning Director Richard Masyczek  
11

12 No update.  
13

14  
15 **IX. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**

16  
17 **A. REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY**  
18

19 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that a Specific Plan had been  
20 submitted to the City, entitled the "Maze Stone Specific Plan", which would include a new  
21 hospital on the west side of town. He further advised that a company called "Sun Cal"  
22 had been looking at options to buy the McSweeny Farms property and had submitted  
23 tentative tract map applications for the property, which was something that had not been  
24 expected to happen for awhile.  
25

26 Chairman Duistermars asked where the City Council had finally ended up on the Fire  
27 Station issue for the McSweeny Farms area.  
28

29 Planning Director Masyczek responded that McSweeny would be contributing to a fire  
30 station for the area.  
31

32 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding whether the response time continued to be an  
33 issue for the area.  
34

35 Planning Director Masyczek responded that there had been an issue as part of the  
36 McSweeny Farms project, noting that they were conditioned as part of their  
37 Environmental Impact Report as well as their Development Agreement to provide  
38 emergency services, via either funds or on-site contribution. He added that Metropolitan  
39 Water District (MWD) had also been conditioned to install a fire station, explaining that  
40 the City's desire was to have the station located on the MWD side, with McSweeny  
41 contributing to a portion of it.  
42

43 Chairman Duistermars inquired whether the Development Agreement required the  
44 response time issue to be dealt with prior to the issuance of any building permits for the  
45 area, in the event that any projects were submitted.  
46  
47  
48

1 Assistant City Attorney Vail responded that it was his recollection that in the Development  
2 Agreement the response time was not specifically addressed, but that there was an  
3 expressed provision that in the event that the City, based on a fiscal review of the  
4 project's impacts to City Services, determined that the project would result in a net  
5 shortfall, the City could then create a Communities Facilities District (CFD) to be imposed  
6 on the area at \$300 per unit, which would be applied towards police and fire services.  
7

8 Sandy Packham, Director of Facilities for the Hemet Unified School District, re-  
9 approached the lectern and stated that it had been the school district's understanding  
10 that, in lieu of the middle school site, they would be deeded the elementary school site,  
11 but that they had not yet seen any paperwork regarding the deed. She asked that this  
12 issue be followed up on, and that the school district be advised as to when they would be  
13 receiving the deed.  
14

15 Planning Director Masyczek advised Ms. Packham that Sun Cal was in the process of  
16 having a lot line adjustment completed to allow a deed to be recorded.  
17

18 Planning Director Masyczek further advised the Commission that a subsequent  
19 archaeological study was being completed for the McSweeny site, as some human  
20 remains had been discovered there. He went on to say that Page Ranch was moving  
21 forward, and that tract maps had been submitted and should soon be before the  
22 Commission for review. He noted that a request for an annexation on the southwest  
23 side of the City had been submitted as well.  
24

25 Regarding the General Plan Update, Planning Director Masyczek reported that the City  
26 Council had allocated \$850,000 for the update. He advised the Commission that  
27 development activity was currently fairly high, with consistent increases annually over the  
28 past five years.  
29

30 Chairman Duistermars stated that he had heard rumors that there were some retailers  
31 looking at the current Wal-Mart site. He asked if the City had any idea who those retailers  
32 might be.  
33

34 Planning Director Masyczek responded that it was too soon to tell who would take over  
35 the site, but noted that a Chilis Restaurant would be replacing the former Penfolds  
36 Restaurant across the street, that Applebees Restaurant was under construction on the  
37 southwest corner of Kirby and Florida Avenues and that a second Starbucks and Panda  
38 Express Restaurant were going in on the northwest corner of State Street and Stetson  
39 Avenue.  
40

41 Commissioner Searl asked if made any sense to be building a Sam's Club in San Jacinto  
42 when they already owned a building in Hemet that was going to be vacant.  
43

44 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.  
45  
46  
47  
48

1 Finally, Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that TUMF fees would be  
2 going into effect on July 1<sup>st</sup>, and that many of the vacant buildings would likely have an  
3 increased value to retailers as they would not be subject to TUMF.  
4

5 **B. HIGHWAY 79 UPDATE**  
6

7 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that a tentative concurrence had  
8 finally been reached with the agencies on the Highway 79 realignment, and that the next  
9 step would be to get them to buy off on the criteria. He explained that once that  
10 happened, a long convoluted process would follow, noting that the Environmental Impact  
11 Report, which should be complete in approximately two years, could possibly be having  
12 scoping meetings in the City as soon as September. He advised the Commission that  
13 the Wildlife agencies were pushing for the alignment to go in the western area that is  
14 actually outside of the City. He indicated this location on the displayed map of the City.  
15 He added that the highway would be up to a 230-foot right-of-way, and that it was the  
16 most critical need for the valley according to recent traffic studies.  
17

18 Ms. Packham stated that if the realignment were to go up Cawston Avenue, the new high  
19 school, the new middle school and the new elementary school would all have to be  
20 relocated as they could not be located on a major highway. She asked that the City keep  
21 this in mind as the negotiations progress.  
22

23 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the MSHCP was supposed to  
24 have been signed, but that the Spirit of the Sage Council had essentially won a court suit  
25 that was preventing the US Fish & Wildlife Service from issuing 10A Permits, which  
26 included the MSHCP. He added that he did not know how long this would effect the  
27 MSHCP.  
28

29 Chairman Duistermars asked if the developers who require that permit would be stalled  
30 in their projects.  
31

32 Planning Director Masyczek explained that the projects would be processed under CEQA  
33 guidelines, but noted that if the MSHCP were adopted prior to the final approval of a  
34 developer's CEQA, that developer would have to comply with the MSHCP at that point  
35 in time. He suggested that it was proving to be a real problem for several projects within  
36 the City.  
37

38 Planning Director Masyczek concluded his report by advising the Commission that the  
39 initiative for the re-zoning of the property at Kirby and Acacia Avenues to Residential had  
40 passed and would be going to the City Council the following week.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

1 **X. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

2  
3 Commissioner Calkins suggested that the next time any of the Commissioners were to  
4 drive down Winchester Road they should take a look at the new shopping center at  
5 Murrieta Hot Springs Road where the new Albertson's Grocery Store was located. He  
6 noted that apparently no signage control had been included with the development, and  
7 that there was the biggest "mish-mash" of red, green and yellow signs all over the fronts  
8 of the buildings. He suggested that the Commission should look at this as a bad example  
9 and make sure that a sign program be included with the development of any future  
10 shopping centers in the City of Hemet that include five or more stores.  
11

12  
13 **XI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

14  
15 Chairman Duistermars noted that the rural standards were going to the City Council on  
16 June 22, 2004.  
17

18 Planning Director Masyczek added that the City Council should be referring them back  
19 to the Planning Commission.  
20

21 Chairman Duistermars asked that, if that happened, the rural standards be placed on the  
22 next agenda.  
23

24  
25 **XI. ADJOURNMENT**

26  
27 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten and  
28 unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 7:57 p.m. to the regular meeting of the  
29 City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **Tuesday, July 6, 2004 at 6:00 p.m.**  
30 at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet,  
31 California 92543.  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 \_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman, Bob Duistermars

37 ATTEST:

38  
39  
40  
41  
42 \_\_\_\_\_  
43 Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48