

1 framing on that building had begun. She advised that the Riverside County Flood Control
2 work was continuing, that the curb and gutter in the parking lot would be poured on Friday,
3 and that the street work was getting ready to start. She noted that the drainage and
4 sprinkler installation for the turf was done, and that the finish grading was in progress in
5 preparation for the installation of the synthetic turf.
6

7 Ms. Packham reported that the block buildings had been completed for the West Valley
8 High School pool project, and that the interior framing was about to start. She advised that
9 the concrete on the floors, walls and gutters of the pool had just been completed earlier in
10 the day, and that the tile in the pool would start later in the week. She added that the lights
11 for the pool had been ordered and would be installed before the pool was completed, and
12 noted that a grant for a shade structure for the swimmers and spectators had been applied
13 for.
14

15 Regarding Tahquitz High School/Rancho Viejo Middle School, Ms. Packham reported that
16 the graders were on site and the dirt was being moved. She noted that the installation of
17 the underground utilities would be ready to start later in the week, and that the
18 groundbreaking ceremony had been held earlier in the afternoon. She further noted that
19 the Rancho Viejo Middle School plans had been submitted to DSA with construction
20 scheduled to begin after the first of the year.
21

22 Ms. Packham updated the Commission regarding the Rancho Diamante school site, noting
23 that the Division of Aeronautics had reviewed the new sites that were requested by
24 Benchmark Pacific and would not grant their approval. She advised that HUSD was
25 proceeding with the testing of the original site at the southwest corner of Mustang Way and
26 Fisher Street, and that the geotechnical, biological and toxic testing was already underway,
27 with the CEQA documentation in the process of being prepared. She added that the
28 HUSD's application had been sent to the Airport Land Use Commission.
29

30 Ms. Packham discussed the issue that the school district was having with obtaining
31 relocatable buildings. She explained that all of the factories were experiencing difficulty
32 in getting materials and qualified workers, and that the HUSD's relocatable deliveries were
33 behind schedule. She noted that the HUSD was working very hard to keep the installations
34 on schedule for the beginning of the new school year.
35

36 Ms. Packham concluded her report with an update regarding some of the new school sites.
37 She reported that in addition to the Rancho Diamante school site, testing was currently
38 underway or getting ready to start at the McSweeny Farms New Elementary School #8,
39 Winchester Hills New Elementary School #10, Valle Vista New Elementary School #12,
40 Winchester's New Middle School #8 and Winchester's New High School #3.
41

42 **IV. WORK STUDY**

43
44

1 **A. ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-13 / TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31064 - D.**

2 Sawyer

3 A work study session with possible direction to staff regarding a request to
4 change the zoning from A-1-C-1 (Heavy-Agricultural) to R-1 (Single-Family
5 Residential) and adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration, including the
6 Mitigation Monitoring Program for the proposed project, with the concurrent
7 processing of tentative tract map to subdivide 39 acres into 150
8 Single-family- Residential lots.

9
10 The work study session was continued to the meeting of August 2, 2005 due to the
11 unavailability of the applicant.

12
13 **B. ACTIVE PROJECTS UPDATE - R. Masyczek**

14 A work study session to update the Commission on currently active projects
15 within the City of Hemet.

16
17 Planning Director Masyczek displayed the Active Projects Map, and explained what the
18 various colors meant. He provided some additional details regarding the projects in the
19 City, including the location of some of the City's vernal pools. Various members of the
20 audience approached the dais to view the map that was laid out on a table in front of the
21 Commission. There were some inquiries regarding exactly what vernal pools were, and
22 Planning Director Masyczek offered a brief explanation. He proceeded to advise regarding
23 some of the various areas that might be annexed to the City in the future.

24
25 A member of the audience asked if horse property would cease to exist with the
26 occurrence of annexations.

27
28 Chairman Duistermars responded that the Commission was hoping that it would not.

29
30 Vice Chairman Jones noted that the Commission was doing everything that they could to
31 make sure that horse trails and large lots were included in new developments, particularly
32 in the larger, master planned communities.

33
34 *(A copy of Resolution Bill No. 05-070 is attached to this document as Exhibit A.)*

1 **V. CONSENT CALENDAR**

2
3 **A. MINUTES**

4 1. January 18, 2005

5
6 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
7 approve the consent calendar as presented.

8
9 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

10
11 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioner Calkins

12 NOES: None

13 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Mendoza

14 ABSENT: Commissioner Rhoten

15
16
17 **VI. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**

18
19 **A. STATUS OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 00-01 - TIBBITTS SENIOR**
20 **APARTMENTS (Continued from July 5, 2005)**

21 A status update of Conditional Use Permit No. 00-01 processed by Tibbitts
22 Investment Company and approved by the Planning Commission on August
23 17, 2000 for the construction of senior apartments on the northwest corner
24 of Devonshire Avenue and Circeli Way, across from the new Social Security
25 Building.

26
27 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that building permits for Conditional
28 Use Permit No. 00-01, which constituted the Tibbitt's Senior Apartment Complex, had been
29 pulled some time ago, and that the project was still under construction. He noted that the
30 last inspection had taken place in June and that the project was moving forward slowly.
31 He advised the Commission that the project had been originally approved in the year 2000,
32 but that as long as there was construction occurring on a regular basis the conditional use
33 permit was locked in. He added that the applicant was consistently coming in with
34 inspection requests on a monthly basis.

35
36 **B. PROPOSED LAND-USE DESIGNATIONS FOR THE UPCOMING**
37 **GENERAL PLAN UPDATE AS DISCUSSED WITH THE CITY COUNCIL**

38
39 Planning Director Masyczek provided the Commission with a copy of City Council
40 Resolution Bill No. 05-070, which approved interim guidelines for the review of zone
41 changes and general plan amendments during the preparation of the comprehensive

42
43 general plan update. He explained that there had been a drastic change in how land uses
44 were classified, and that the City was proposing to go into a more restrictive range in terms

1 of land use densities. He noted that Staff was asking for lot size restriction to a minimum
2 of 7,200 square-feet. He went on to note that in looking at land use categories, the
3 Commission should notice that under commercial, all that was indicated was "Commercial"
4 since Staff was looking into re-defining commercial areas to be more specific regarding
5 their designation.

6
7 Vice Chairman Jones asked what was intended to ensure that the Commission was in
8 concurrence with the City Council regarding keeping quality within the City.

9
10 Planning Director Masyczek explained some of the details of the distributed resolution and
11 discussed the attached bubble map.

12
13 A discussion ensued regarding how the new policy would protect the City from developers
14 who were proposing to develop property in a manner that was not consistent with the
15 policies adopted in the resolution.

16
17 City Attorney Vail offered an explanation regarding how the new policies would protect the
18 City.

19
20 A discussion ensued regarding the various policies that were included within the interim
21 guidelines.

22 23 24 **VII. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

25
26 Commissioner Calkins inquired regarding what was happening at the southwest corner of
27 Florida Avenue and State Street.

28
29 City Attorney Vail responded that the property owner was currently in a legal dispute with
30 the Riverside County Transportation Commission, and that the City was looking at the
31 possibility of purchasing the property. He noted that any other discussion at this time was
32 privileged.

33
34 Chairman Duistermars discussed the meeting that he and Vice Chairman Jones had
35 participated in with two of the Planning Commissioners from the City of San Jacinto. He
36 noted that both communities were concerned with water conservation and would like to
37 engage in some discussions with Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD). He noted that
38 such a discussion should include both cities and EMWD, and he asked that this idea be
39 added to the next Planning Commission agenda. He suggested that if the balance of the
40 Commission concurred, this idea should be forwarded to the City Council.

41
42 Chairman Duistermars noted that the next item of concern that had been discussed with
43 the City of San Jacinto Commissioners was Esplanade Avenue. He explained that City of
44 San Jacinto's issue of low density was different from that of the City of Hemet. He

1 suggested that while going through the process of the General Plan update, perhaps
2 Esplanade Avenue should be coordinated between the two cities. He asked if the 2+2
3 Committee would be interacting with the General Plan consultant.

4
5 Planning Director responded that they would, and that the next meeting was on August 2,
6 2005.

7
8 Chairman Duistermars suggested that perhaps this discussion should be added to the next
9 agenda.

10
11 Chairman Duistermars noted that another object of discussion had been the design
12 guidelines, and that there were questions regarding changes that were being
13 recommended by the development community.

14
15 Planning Director Masyczek explained that the 2+2 Committee on August 2nd would be a
16 meeting with the developers regarding the Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines,
17 followed by a meeting with the General Plan consultants.

18
19 Chairman Duistermars asked what would be the best point of interaction for the
20 Commission.

21
22 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the Single-Family Residential Design
23 Guidelines would be reviewed one additional time by the Committee and then the 2+2
24 Committee, and would then come back to the Commission for their recommendation to the
25 City Council.

26
27 Chairman Duistermars noted that there were not a great deal of traffic calming guidelines
28 within the City of Hemet, which was something that the City of San Jacinto did have in
29 place. He suggested that perhaps the City of Hemet should consider adding these types
30 of guidelines.

31
32 A discussion ensued regarding this idea, followed by a discussion regarding the provision
33 of bus turnouts.

34
35 Chairman Duistermars discussed Planned Unit Developments, which, he noted, were
36 utilized for smaller projects that did not fit the criteria for a Specific Plan, but could still be
37 used for in-fill development to guarantee certain amenities.

38
39 Planning Director Masyczek explained that unless the General Plan required a Specific
40 Plan for an area, Staff did not have the authority to require a PUD, even though there was
41 a provision for one.

42
43 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.
44

1 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that meetings should be scheduled on a regular basis
2 regarding development along Esplanade Avenue, as well as regarding the linking of trails
3 between the two cities.
4

5 Commissioner Mendoza noted that Hemet was fast in changing, and that he had received
6 many comments regarding the pace of these changes. He asked to what extent
7 government was required to give updates regarding development to the general public.
8

9 City Attorney Vail responded that cities were legally required to give notice to property
10 owners within a certain radius of a proposed project, and that they were also legally
11 required to publish agendas and notify various agencies. He added that members of the
12 public could request copies of any notices of public hearings, and stated that he believed
13 the City had increased their radius notification limit from 300-feet to 1,000-feet in an effort
14 to accommodate the public.
15

16 Planning Director Masyczek added that the City was looking at some of the methods that
17 other cities were utilizing, such as the posting of signs on properties that were proposed
18 for development.
19

20 City Attorney Vail further added that many cities held televised meetings which were
21 available on public access channels, or posted notices on their websites.
22

23 Commissioner Mendoza suggested that project updates would be a good idea for the City
24 of Hemet website.
25

26
27 **VIII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**
28

29 Chairman Dusitermars asked that the concept of a discussion with EMWD, regarding water
30 conservation, be added to the next Planning Commission agenda.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

1 **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

2
3 It was MOVED by Commissioner Mendoza, SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins and
4 unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 7:15 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City
5 of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **Tuesday, August 2, 2005 at 6:00 p.m.** to
6 be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet,
7 California 92543.

8
9
10 _____
11 Bob Duistermars, Chairman
12 Hemet Planning Commission

13 ATTEST:

14 _____
15 Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary
16 Hemet Planning Commission