

1 CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

2
3 TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 2003

4
5 THE JOINT MEETING OF THE CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION AND
6 TRAFFIC COMMISSION WAS CONVENED BY PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIRMAN
7 BOB DUISTERMARS AND TRAFFIC COMMISSION VICE CHAIRMAN DAN WALTERS
8 ON TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 2003 AT 6:00 P.M. AT THE CITY OF HEMET COUNCIL
9 CHAMBERS, 450 EAST LATHAM AVENUE, HEMET, CALIFORNIA. THE JOINT
10 MEETING WAS TO BE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWED BY THE REGULAR MEETING OF
11 THE CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION.
12

13 Present: Planning Commission Traffic Commission
14 Chairman Bob Duistermars Vice Chairman Patrick Searl
15 Vice Chairman B.R. Hicks Commissioner Dan Walters
16 Commissioner Jim Calkins Commissioner Don Berry
17 Commissioner Nick Jones
18 Commissioner Mayzelle Rhoten_____

19
20 Absent: Chairman Joseph Ley
21 Commissioner Brenda Garrity
22

23 Staff Present: Public Works Director Mike Gow, Assistant Planner Maureen Losey,
24 Planning Director Richard Masyczek, City Planner Ron Running,
25 Minutes Secretary Nancie Shaw, and Assistant City Attorney Eric Vail
26

27 Invocation and Flag Salute: Commissioner Calkins
28
29

30 I. PUBLIC COMMENTS
31

32 There were no members of the public who wished to address the Commission.
33
34

35 II. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE: Update given by HUSD Director
36 of Facilities Sandy Packham.
37

38 Sandra Packham, Director of Facilities for the Hemet Unified School District, reported to
39 the Commission regarding how busy the district had been. She stated that work on all of
40 the modernization projects had begun on Friday at noon, adding that at Hemet High School
41 the contractors were in the parking lot waiting to begin working even as the students were
42 leaving. By Friday night they had the second floor gutted and all the walls down, and by
43 noon on Saturday the bottom floor was gutted.

1 Ms. Packham reported that the bathrooms at all six of the sites had been gutted and were
2 in the process of being remodeled, and that all of the kitchen equipment was out at Acacia
3 and Santa Fe Middle Schools as well as at Little Lake Elementary in preparation of being
4 remodeled. She further reported that the asbestos abatement was underway at all of the
5 sites and would be completed by Saturday, that grading was in process at Cawston
6 Elementary and that work at Harmony and McSweeny Elementary Schools was also
7 underway.
8

9 Ms. Packham informed the Commission that the district had 72 days to do 15 million
10 dollars worth of work, and that at Hemet High School the crew was working double-shifts
11 and Saturdays in order to meet their deadlines..
12

13 Ms. Packham reported that the district was in the process of scheduling a meeting with
14 Assistant Public Works Director, Mike Gow and Rudy Cabrerra from the Police Department
15 to work out the details regarding where signs and crosswalks would go, the paths of travel
16 and safe routes, etc. She further reported that they had their third meeting with their
17 Master Plan Consultant the previous week, and that they would have the initial draft of the
18 Master Plan in about six weeks.
19

20 Next, Ms. Packham reported on the other items out to bid, including the West Valley High
21 School fencing project and the demolition of the Winchester relocatable buildings. She
22 advised that the district had only received one bid for the Winchester Sewer project, which
23 was too high and thus rejected, therefore causing the project to be postponed until next
24 summer.
25

26 Ms. Packham concluded her report by informing the Commission that the new eligibility
27 documents had gone to Sacramento, and that in addition to the schools that the district
28 was working on now, they were eligible for 5 more elementary schools, another middle
29 school, and a fourth High School.
30

31

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

33

34 Chairman Duistermars moved that the Planning Commission / Traffic Commission
35 Discussion be heard directly after the Planning Commission Public Hearing items.
36

37 **IV. CONSENT CALENDAR**

38

39 **A. PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

40

- 41 1. June 3, 2003
42

43 It was MOVED by Commissioner Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
44 approve the consent calendar as presented.
45

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
2

3 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Commissioner Hicks, Jones, Calkins, and Rhoten.
4 NOES: None
5 ABSTAIN: None
6 ABSENT: None
7
8

9 **V. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

10
11 **A. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 02-3/SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT**
12 **NO. 02-2/ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 02-10 (CONTINUED**
13 **FROM JUNE 3, 2003)**

14 APPLICANT: Nat Harty, Stowe Passco Development
15 LOCATION: East side of Sanderson Avenue approximately 400-feet
16 south of Stetson Avenue.
17 PLANNER: Ron Running
18 DESCRIPTION: A General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan
19 Amendment to the Page Ranch Planned Community
20 Master Plan (PCD 79-93) for a 103+ acre site, changing
21 the General Plan Land Use Designation from R-11 (7-
22 17 du/ac), Commercial Open Space/Park to R-1
23 (7du/ac) and a Master Plan designation of High-Medium
24 Density (17 du/ac), Medium Density (10 du/ac),
25 Recreational/Commercial, Open Space/Recreation to
26 Low-Medium Density (5 du/ac).
27

28 City Planner Running advised the Commission that this item had been continued from the
29 June 3, 2003 meeting and gave a brief overview of the project description and location.
30 He reported that the setback concerns that had been voiced at the last meeting had been
31 addressed by the applicant as noted in a letter that they would find attached to the Staff
32 Report in which the applicant indicated that he was agreeable to several changes such as
33 including sidewalks on both sides of the street. Mr. Running further reported that the issue
34 regarding garage setbacks has been modified so that only 3 front loading garages would
35 be allowed in a row instead of the previous four. He added that the applicant had
36 committed that all of the units in Villages 1 and 2, which were the two-villages including
37 4,500 square-foot lots, would have glazing in the window panels of the garage doors, and
38 that every fourth unit would have an enhanced setback for the garage at 23 feet.
39

40 A discussion of setbacks relative to garages ensued.

41
42 City Planner Running presented more details of the project to the Commission
43
44
45

1 The applicant, Nat Harty of Stowe Passco Development, approached the lectern and
2 addressed the Commission, stating that he felt they would be pleased with the revisions
3 that had been made.
4

5 Commissioner Jones expressed his appreciation for what had been done and the efforts
6 that had been made to redesign the project to address the concerns that were voiced at
7 the previous meeting.
8

9 Commissioner Rhoten inquired as to how many lots were given up in order to add the
10 recreation area. Mr. Harty answered that they had given up 3 lots.
11

12 Chairman Duistermars asked if there were any members of the public who wished to
13 comment on the project. There were none.
14

15 Commissioner Jones voiced his concern over the area being extremely congested and of
16 a high density, adding that the pool and spa were great, but other open space areas were
17 needed as well.
18

19 Mr. Harty responded that there was more than adequate open space being provided. He
20 then voiced his concern with the source of funding for the required traffic signal on Harrison
21 Avenue.
22

23 Public Works Director Mike Gow stated that the City would be paying for the signal. He
24 explained that the signal had been included in the Development Impact Fee calculations,
25 and that fees were already being collected for it.
26

27 Commissioner Rhoten inquired as to whether Villages 2 and 6 would be age restricted. Mr.
28 Harty replied that he was not planning to restrict the villages to certain ages, however the
29 product that ended up being developed in each village would ultimately dictate whether or
30 not that particular village would restrict the age of its residents.
31

32 Commissioner Calkins stated that, considering that only 10% of the lots would be 4,500
33 square-feet, he would retract his previous statement that he would never agree to these
34 size lots, however he continued to be bothered by the 5-foot side yards that were being
35 proposed when the typical ordinance required 5-feet per story. He explained that the
36 differences between a subdivision that has 20-feet when you get to the second floor or 20-
37 feet all the way versus what we are seeing in Temecula or Murietta are extremely
38 noticeable and the one thing that bothers him substantially.
39

40 Mr. Harty responded that he had been aware of that concern from a previous statement
41 Commissioner Calkins had made and had thus come up with what he thought was a good
42 compromise.
43

44 Commissioner Calkins inquired regarding whether the Commission would have the
45 opportunity to see the formal tract map and the plotting.

1 Planning Director Masyczek confirmed that the Commission would definitely see the tract
2 map as each phase would require site design review by the Planning Commission.
3

4 Mr. Harty mentioned that one of the positives that had resulted from the Community
5 Development Committee, in his opinion, was that rather than trying to create very specific
6 and binding guidelines that wouldn't necessarily be applicable from one project to another,
7 the guidelines that were created allowed for some flexibility.
8

9 Chairman Duistermars asked if there were any other comments or questions. There were
10 none.
11

12 Chairman Duistermars then stated, for verification, that the project would be subject to the
13 guidelines in effect at the time that permits were pulled.. Planning Director Masyczek
14 clarified further, saying that anything that is not clearly articulated within this Specific Plan
15 would be subject to the design guidelines.
16

17 City Planner Running reported that he had neglected to make a suggestion on modifying
18 Condition No. 11, concerning the open space amenity. He suggested that they include a
19 modification to the Specific Plan text to include the site plan of the enhanced recreational
20 amenity. The Commission concurred.
21

22 Mr. Harty asked that the Planning Commission approve this project with 428 minimum lots.
23 Planning Director Masyczek explained that the Commission wanted to see open space.
24

25 Mr. Harty asked if it would be agreeable with the Commission if an additional lot were
26 created without a reduction of open space. The Commission agreed.
27

28 Assistant City Attorney Eric Vail advised that the language needed to clearly state that a
29 4,500 square-foot lot could not be included in a planning area that had been set aside for
30 6,000 minimum square-foot lots, if this were the Commission's intent, and that if this were
31 not the intent it should clearly state so as well.
32

33 Public Works Director Mike Gow added that he wanted to clarify that the signals on
34 Harrison Avenue were to be synchronized.
35

36 Planning Director Masyczek listed the conditions that need to be amended, and Chairman
37 Duistermars asked for a motion.
38

39 It was MOVED by Commissioner Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
40 approve the project as amended.
41
42
43
44
45

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
2

3 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Hicks, Jones, and
4 Rhoten.

5 NOES: None

6 ABSTAIN: None

7 ABSENT: None
8

9 **B. VESTING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 31075 (CONTINUED FROM**
10 **JUNE 3, 2003.**

11 _____ APPLICANT: Karubian Family Trust

12 LOCATION: Northeast corner of State Street and Gibbel Road

13 PLANNER: Maureen Losey

14 DESCRIPTION: A request to subdivide 21.5 acres into eight (8) lots for
15 future commercial development within the Diamond
16 Valley Lake Gateway Specific Plan Area.
17

18 Assistant Planner Losey presented the staff report, advising the Commission of some of
19 the surrounding land use designations relative to the project. She reminded the
20 Commission that this item was continued from the last Planning Commission meeting in
21 order to get more information on the Specific Plan.
22

23 Ms. Losey pointed out that the Specific Plan has certain criteria for the commercial areas.
24 She stated that some of the areas are going to be geared towards the lake, such as RV
25 sales and camping gear, while others will be retail, geared towards the residents of the
26 area. She advised that there would not be a long and linear typical commercial strip, but
27 instead a development of clusters with each cluster area having some type of plan.
28

29 Chairman Duistermars asked if they will be subject to the Commercial Design Guidelines
30 enacted by the City Council.
31

32 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the City Council had not yet approved the
33 Commercial Design Guidelines, but that the approved Specific Plan document referred
34 back to the City Zoning Ordinance.
35

36 Assistant Planner Losey stated that the Specific Plan allowed for some interim commercial
37 use with Planning Commission approval.
38

39 Chairman Duistermars stated that when the Specific Plan had been approved the nature
40 of the area was different, and that now it had become a gateway to the community. He
41 indicated that he had some concern with some of the uses that were permitted under both
42 the tourist commercial and highway commercial sections and inquired as to whether there
43 was any way to restrict some of the uses that were permitted in the plan.
44
45

1 Assistant City Attorney Eric Vail advised that the City could amend the Specific Plan, which
2 would be the only way that any restrictions could be imposed.
3

4 Commissioner Jones explained that although he appreciated what Ms. Losey had sent him,
5 he hadn't had the opportunity to sit down and say exactly what he wanted to say, which
6 was that this area was the entrance to the valley, and if the City were to approve something
7 like this tonight they may not be doing justice for the community that would exist in 20
8 years. He stated that it was his belief that this project should be set aside to allow the
9 specific plan amendment to be completed.
10

11 Assistant City Attorney Vail explained that an additional concern was that they would
12 processing a vesting parcel map which would lock in what was currently in the Specific
13 Plan to that map. He explained that, with this in mind, even if the map were later amended
14 it would be arguable as to whether or not any additional requirements could be imposed.
15

16 Chairman Duistermars listed some of the uses that were currently permitted, which
17 included a recycling facility and dance hall with alcoholic beverage service..He added that
18 there were a number of things that were of concern with the way the Specific Plan was
19 written since the area was a major gateway to the City. He further stated that he would like
20 to open a dialog with the developer about the kinds of things that could be developed there
21 and rework that list. He asked for legal direction.
22

23 Assistant City Attorney Vail suggested that Chairman Duistermars have a discussion with
24 the applicant to see what they might be willing to do,. He added that the Subdivision Map
25 Act was not a very kind tool for making the type of zoning decisions that he wanted to
26 make.
27

28 A Discussion ensued regarding whether a requirement for compatibility could be imposed.
29

30 Assistant City Attorney Vail advised that if the Specific Plan text states that compatibility
31 is necessary, then such a requirement could be imposed.
32

33 Planning Director Masyczek added that the Specific Plan specifically stated that
34 commercial and residential development would comply with the applicable regulations in
35 effect at the time of the site design review. He indicated that there was a "catch-22" in that
36 by adding the word "vesting" to the map the current design considerations would be locked
37 into place, and that if the City were to adopt the commercial design guidelines, they would
38 become the applicable standards in effect at the time of design review.
39

40 Commissioner Hicks stated that if changing the Specific Plan were under consideration,
41 the word "compatibility" should be added to the Specific Plan, which would require
42 development of the individual lots to have compatible land uses.
43

44 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 7:31 p.m.
45

1 Jim Unland of Unland & Associates, 3550 E. Florida Ave., Hemet, California approached
2 the lectern and addressed the Commission as a representative for the applicant. He stated
3 that a number of issues had been mentioned that he would not have thought of. He added
4 that he would hate to see the parcel map denied due to the Commission's desire to amend
5 the Specific Plan, and asked Planning Director Masyczek if the matrix that was within the
6 Specific Plan was derived from the zoning ordinance.

7
8 Planning Director Masyczek responded that it was not.

9
10 Commissioner Hicks asked Mr. Unland if he would have a problem continuing the project
11 to allow time to get together with staff in an effort to address compatibility issues and
12 requirements.

13
14 Chairman Duistermars stated that they would like to have a discussion regarding the uses
15 which would require an amendment the Specific Plan.

16
17 Assistant City Attorney Vail stated that as long as the Vesting map was deemed
18 substantially complete, it would be free from TUMF, so this would not be a problem.

19
20 Bob Duistermars confirmed that everyone was agreeable to a continuance.

21
22 It was MOVED by Commissioner Hicks and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to table
23 the item pending a Specific Plan Amendment to be opened by the City Council.

24
25 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

26
27 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, and Commissioners Jones, Hicks, Calkins and
28 Rhoten.

29 NOES: None

30 ABSTAIN: None

31 ABSENT: None

32
33 Assistant City Attorney Vail requested a letter from the applicant stating that the tabling
34 of the map pending a Specific Plan Amendment was agreeable. He advised Mr. Unland
35 that if his client was concerned about the timing on the map, he should consult with
36 Planning Director Masyczek who could have any appropriate letters issued to make sure
37 that the time limits don't run out and that the application status remained the same.
38
39
40

1 **VI. PLANNING COMMISSION / TRAFFIC COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

2
3 **A. CIRCULATION ELEMENT & CIRCULATION TRAFFIC ISSUES**

4 A discussion of the Circulation Element of the General Plan and Circulation
5 Traffic issues in the City of Hemet.
6

7 Planning Commission Chairman Duistermars advised the Traffic Commission of the
8 reasoning behind the joint meeting, which had come out of a joint meeting with the City
9 Council.
10

11 Planning Director Masyczek listed some of the major issues, which included physical
12 barriers, street layouts, competing needs and conflicts with hierarchy.
13

14 Fire Chief Stacey explained that one issue with the Fire Department was that they were
15 required to meet a 5-minute response time and that there were a number of things that
16 impact this response time. He displayed an aerial photo of an area of the City and
17 described how certain requirements that are imposed to control traffic inhibit the Fire
18 Department's ability to respond within the time constraints that are required of them. He
19 explained how a route that is physically shorter, may take longer for a response. He also
20 discussed how certain streets that were designed to go through but do not, inhibit the Fire
21 Department's ability to respond.
22

23 Chairman Duistermars asked how the Fire Department feels about psychological barriers,
24 with regard to traffic calming.
25

26 Chief Stacey answered that they are opposed to anything that physically impedes their
27 ability to respond, but that psychological barriers would not be a problem for them.
28

29 Commissioner Hicks commented that the psychological barriers may be desirable for the
30 Fire Department, but conflict with the needs of the Public Works Department, who want to
31 know how these psychological barriers, such as trees and landscaping, will be maintained.
32

33 Police Chief Hewitt stated that in regards to crime prevention, a great deal of impact come
34 from lighting, visibility, house set-up and landscaping. He added that anything that blocks
35 visibility encourages crime and that alleys are ideal areas for criminal activity to occur.
36

37 Chief Hewitt stated that the Police Department was not opposed to traffic calming
38 measures, but that maintenance issues needed to be considered when imposing such
39 measures. He informed the Commissions that they needed to have planned traffic
40 circulation and that they could not depend on the General Plan which was last updated in
41 1992 and did not conform to the changed City.
42

43 Chief Hewitt then described some of the issues that the Police Department had been
44 having with various streets within the City. He mentioned that they tended to be getting
45

1 involved in some of the projects too late in the process, at a point when many decisions
2 were already made regarding the design.

3
4 Chief Hewitt agreed with Chief Stacey regarding the fact that issue of the emergency
5 response time was a critical one to consider when planning the traffic circulation system.

6
7 Chairman Duistermars stated that he would like to see a commitment from all of the
8 departments to be involved in the process of producing a new Circulation Element, and that
9 it was important that they all band together in a recommendation to the City Council on a
10 need to update the General Plan.

11
12 Chairman Duistermars suggested that the Planning Commission step back from this
13 process and let the Traffic Commission take the initiative to move forward and prepare a
14 draft document, then bring it back for review at a future joint meeting. He then inquired
15 regarding a time frame to complete the document, as there are new developments coming
16 in and they need to have an updated element in place in order to provide standards.

17
18 Assistant Public Works Director Gow responded that they could come back to the
19 Commission with a list of possible standards by September at the latest.

20
21 Chairman Duistermars suggested the second meeting in September.

22
23 Planning Commissioner Hicks stated that Devonshire and Acacia Avenues should both be
24 major east/west thoroughfares with four lanes.

25
26 Traffic Commissioner Berry added that, when necessary, cities have often had to acquire
27 property in order to expand roadways.

28
29 Planning Director Masyczek stated for the Commissions that one thing which is not being
30 required on major projects, that should be required, is a traffic analysis. He explained that
31 such an analysis is only be required for the more major developments.

32
33 Mr. Gow added that they would also like to see standards for intersections added to the
34 scope of work, and would bring this back for the Commissions to review in September as
35 well.

36
37
38 **VII. DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

39
40 No Items.

1 **VIII. COMMISSION COMMENTS**

2
3 Commissioner Hicks inquired regarding whether something could be done about the signal
4 in front of the new plaza on Sanderson.

5
6 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the Development Agreement had locked the
7 signalization into place.

8
9 Commissioner Hicks then questioned whether the City needed to go through with it even
10 though it is a bad idea, and asked if the developer could be approached about re-thinking
11 the signal. Mr. Masyczek explained that the City had spoken to the developer, but that his
12 tenant would not move in without the signal being installed.

13
14
15 **IX. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

16
17 No items requested.

18
19
20 **X. ADJOURNMENT**

21
22 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Hicks to
23 adjourn the meeting at 8:49 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City of Hemet Planning
24 Commission scheduled for Tuesday, July 1, 2003 at 6:00 p.m.

25
26 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

27
28 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Commissioners Rhoten, Jones, Hicks, and Calkins.
29 NOES: None
30 ABSTAIN: None
31 ABSENT: None
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 _____
Chairman Bob Duistermars

39 **ATTEST**

40
41
42
43 _____
44 Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary