

1 Cawston Elementary School boundary, which was north of Florida Avenue, west of
2 Cawston Street and south of Esplanade Avenue. She noted that the HUSD would like to
3 meet with City Planning staff and any developers who were anticipating construction in the
4 area. She explained that the existing elementary school was currently over-crowded and
5 could not handle any future residential developments.

6
7 Discussion ensued regarding this issue.
8
9

10 **V. WORK STUDY**

11
12 **A. FM LOCKSMITH AND SAFE**

13 A work study session with discussion and possible direction to staff
14 regarding the sale of camper shells at FM Locksmith and Safe located at 268
15 North San Jacinto Street.
16

17 This item was pulled from the agenda because the business owner was not in attendance.
18

19 **B. HEMET HIGHLANDS**

20 _____ A work study session with discussion and possible direction to staff
21 regarding a 26.8-acre attached townhome community consisting of 330
22 homes in both a tri-plex and six-plex configuration located on the south side
23 of Highway 74 west of the City limits and north of the Emerald Acres
24 annexation. This community is being proposed through Annexation No. 05-
25 150, General Plan Amendment No. 05-02 and Conditional Use Permit No.
26 06-01. An Environmental Impact Report will be processed under
27 Environmental Assessment No. 05-08. (APN's: 465-040-008, -009 & -010).
28

29 The work study session was initiated by Assistant Planner Alaniz, who provided various
30 details regarding the proposed project, and explained that the application was currently
31 incomplete and in need of Planning Commission input. She noted that there were some
32 inconsistencies with the multi-family design guidelines, particularly relative to the
33 clustering of the units and the design of the common areas, and that no revisions had yet
34 been submitted, although the applicant was aware of staff's concerns.
35

36 Tony Nissen approached the lectern as a representative for the applicant and discussed
37 how his team was working to rectify the issues at hand.
38

39 Chairman Duistermars advised that some open space areas needed to be added to the
40 plan. He noted that he could see some open space between the buildings, but that they
41 were less than 30-feet in width, with patios protruding into the space. He further noted that
42
43
44

1 there could be up to 800 kids in the community and that he did not see sufficient area for
2 them to play.

3
4 Mr. Nissen assured the Commission that open space would be provided.

5
6 Vice Chairman Jones expressed concern with the small size of the pool that was being
7 provided for the large number of residents that were anticipated within the community. He
8 requested that something additional be done in the green area of the site plan that would
9 allow for more utilization of recreation.

10
11 Chairman Duistermars asked if the open space was buildable that was indicated along the
12 Highway 74 frontage where the sidewalk was present.

13
14 Assistant Planner Alaniz responded that the area to which Chairman Duistermars was
15 referring was the Scenic Highway Setback and could not be included as buildable open
16 space. She noted that staff had asked the applicant to indicate how they had met the open
17 space requirements of the design guidelines.

18
19 Chairman Duistermars noted that as units were brought together more open space areas
20 would be opened up for utilization.

21
22 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that, while the City did not typically allow 3-story
23 buildings, they may want to look at that as an option for a portion of this project as it would
24 allow for more open space.

25
26 Discussion ensued regarding this concept.

27
28 Mike Patterson approached the lectern as a representative for the applicant, and provided
29 some input regarding existing communities that the company had developed that included
30 3-stories. He suggested that the Commission may want to take a look at them to obtain
31 an idea of their design.

32
33 Mr. Nissen noted that they had tried clustering the buildings to open up some area, but that
34 it really wasn't working with this project, and that it would be somewhat timely to go back
35 at this point and try to provide the clustering effect.

36
37 Chairman Duistermars advised Mr. Nissen and his colleagues that they would get the
38 same type of response from the Commission at a public hearing if changes were not made.
39 He noted that they may have to lose some buildings and/or density to provide clustering,
40 meet the requirements of the design guidelines and get their project approved.

41
42 Mr. Nissen asked exactly what the Commission might be looking for in changes.

1 Chairman Duistermars noted that they needed to work on a way to open up the project so
2 that if up to 800 children resided in the community they would have areas to play and
3 utilize for recreation.

4
5 Chris Hezmal approached the lectern as an additional representative of the applicant and
6 discussed some ideas of what they could provide to appease the Commission.

7
8 Chairman Duistermars noted that he would not have a problem with the project going 3-
9 stories high in the center, but that they really needed to cluster the buildings and open up
10 some space for recreation areas. He asked if there were any other Commission comments
11 regarding clustering.

12
13 Commissioner Rhoten noted that the entire project appeared to her to be nothing but
14 rooftops and blacktop.

15
16 The balance of the Commission agreed.

17
18 Assistant Planner Alaniz advised the Commission that another issue with the project was
19 the common open space area, which, she noted, was something that she believed the
20 Commission had already addressed in their discussion. She added that staff would work
21 with the applicant to eradicate the outstanding issues. She then noted that an additional
22 issue was parking along the drive aisle, and explained that a number of the parking spaces
23 that had been provided, per the plan, backed into the main drive aisle. She suggested that
24 with the requested clustering of buildings a parking court could be provided. She added
25 that, if open space was added to provide the portion of the project along the drive aisle
26 with a landscaped area, the driving area along the buildings would be eliminated. She
27 indicated that the parking requirement for the project was currently exceeded, so there may
28 be a way to finagle the project to work by utilizing some of the excessive parking.

29
30 Discussion of the required setbacks ensued.

31
32 Chairman Duistermars suggested that one way to handle the issue would be to move the
33 buildings up and locate the parking behind the buildings and the landscaping behind the
34 parking. He added that it all fell in with the clustering requirement.

35
36 Planning Director Masyczek noted that whenever there is a main circulatory system
37 perpendicular parking would not be allowed, and backing into the drive aisle was not an
38 option. He suggested that the parking be tucked back into the clustering concepts.

39
40 Chairman Duistermars suggested that the applicant may want to add some visitor parking
41 in areas that were adjacent to recreation areas. He noted that he found the architecture
42 very appealing.

1 Assistant Planner Alaniz indicated that staff was also happy with the architectural elements
2 of the project, but would like to see the spanish style portion have some additional
3 architectural detail to define the style more as a "spanish" style. She suggested that it
4 currently had too much commonality with the other styles.

5
6 Vice Chairman Jones asked if there was an overhead display for the pool recreation area.

7
8 Assistant Planner Alaniz presented the requested display.

9
10 Vice Chairman Jones referred to the "brown things" on the plan that were located below
11 the pool to the south and asked what they were supposed to be.

12
13 Assistant Planner Alaniz indicated that they were lounge chairs.

14
15 Vice Chairman Jones noted that if they were, in fact, your typical 7-foot lounge chairs, that
16 the recreational area of the pool was put into perspective, and thus was extremely
17 inadequate and should be opened up. He further noted that, going into the central
18 recreation area, the recreation building was inadequate as well, as it appeared to be not
19 much more than a restroom building. He asked why there was no common building
20 provided for the complex.

21
22 Mr. Hezmal responded that a common recreation area could be added to the plan.

23
24 Mr. Nissen advised the Commission that he would be happy to take them on a tour of their
25 other communities, noting that they had a very nice one in the City of Chino.

26
27 Vice Chairman Jones noted that he would take a look at it, but that he did not necessarily
28 need to be given a tour.

29
30 Chairman Duistermars advised that one of the things that would be discussed in the public
31 hearing for the project was the exterior landscaping, and explained that the Commission
32 would want to see a block wall around the project perimeter with ivy to deter graffiti, as well
33 as stair-step trees.

34
35 Vice Chairman Jones noted that they would also be discussing the view from Florida
36 Avenue to the north, indicating that he would like to see the view of the hills kept in tact.

37
38 Assistant Planner Alaniz assured the Commission that staff would work to preserve the
39 view corridor.

40
41 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that there would be an annexation
42 in the area, and noted that he would be providing an update regarding proposed
43

1 annexations at a future meeting. He suggested that this area was anticipated to be an
2 economic core for the City, and that he felt this development was appropriate for this type
3 of mixed-use area. He added that traffic, schools and etcetera would be addressed as part
4 of the review process.

5
6 A brief discussion ensued regarding the Highway 79 realignment possibilities followed by
7 a discussion of view fencing in lieu of block walls.

8
9 Mr. Hezmal noted that there were hundreds of things that could be done with walls.

10
11 Vice Chairman Jones advised that he would like to see every possible enhancement to the
12 project that could be provided.

13
14 The Commission thanked the group for their presentation.

15
16
17 **VI. CONSENT CALENDAR**

18
19 **A. MINUTES**

20 1. July 18, 2006

21
22 It was MOVED by Commissioner McBride and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
23 approve the consent calendar as presented.

24
25 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

26
27 AYES: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride and Rhoten

28 NOES: None

29 ABSTAIN: Chairman Duistermars

30 ABSENT: Commissioner Mendoza

31
32
33 **VII. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**

34
35 **A. 2+2 COMMITTEE**

36 The re-establishment of the 2+2 Committee with discussion of items to be
37 placed on the agenda and review of the procedures for placing items on the
38 agenda.

39
40 Planning Director Masyczek noted that the 2+2 Committee had been put on hold in the
41 past, but that its intent as a communication device between the Planning Commission and
42 the City Council was invaluable, and that he had spoken with the Mayor and was prepared,
43

1 at this time, to resurrect the Committee. He recommended that any issues that were to
2 come up at future Planning Commission meetings be recommended, via a vote, to be
3 placed on the list of agenda items for the 2+2 Committee. He indicated that he had
4 distributed a list of items that he thought would be appropriate for the agenda.

5
6 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that a meeting be held with John Petty, as a Riverside
7 County Planning Commission member, to discuss County plans for development.

8
9 Commissioner Rhoten asked if a joint meeting was still planned with the City of San
10 Jacinto.

11
12 Planning Director Masyczek indicated that they were allowing the City of San Jacinto's
13 Planning Director some time to deal with his family's tragic loss, and that he would
14 approach him regarding a joint meeting at some point in the future.

15
16 Discussion of the 2+2 Committee list of agenda items ensued, and Chairman Duistermars
17 asked if staff would be taking the list and coming up with an action plan, and if it would be
18 brought back to the Commission for review before it went to the Council as a
19 recommendation.

20
21 Planning Director Masyczek indicated that the Commission would review the list prior to
22 the recommendation being made.

23
24 Chairman Duistermars suggested that a priority list of discussion items be established, and
25 asked the other Commissioners for suggestions.

26
27 Commissioner Rhoten noted that she would like to see traffic and xeriscape landscaping
28 discussed.

29
30 Commissioner McBride noted that he would like to see construction traffic and landscaping
31 discussed.

32
33 Chairman Duistermars suggested that traffic and landscaping be the first priority items,
34 followed by Item Nos. 7, 3 and 11 from the list provided by Planning Director Masyczek.
35 He noted that the balance of the list should be reviewed at the next meeting for a
36 prioritization of the balance of the items.

37
38 The balance of the Commission concurred.

39
40
41 **VIII. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

1 Vice Chairman Jones noted that he had received a telephone call from the Press
2 Enterprise regarding the senior conversion ordinance, which he was not very happy about
3 as he did not like to be contacted by the press.

4
5 Discussion ensued regarding this matter.

6
7 Vice Chairman Jones asked for an update regarding Sam's Club.

8
9 Planning Director Masyczek responded that Sam's Club had come in with some revisions
10 to their architectural design, and that they had pulled the first of their building permits. He
11 noted that they would be in compliance with the Commission's suggestions, and that he
12 had not seen many significant changes. He added that the landscaping was being kept
13 as originally proposed and that they were within 10% of their budget so they should be
14 moving forward with the project after all. He noted that he would be reviewing the project
15 to make sure that it remained in compliance with the Commission's requirements.

16
17
18 **IX. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

19
20 Chairman Duistermars noted that the 2+2 Committee list of items should be added for
21 discussion at the next meeting.

22
23 Vice Chairman Jones asked if everything was comfortable with Code Enforcement at the
24 current time.

25
26 Planning Director Masyczek indicated that Code Enforcement was in a very comfortable
27 position at the moment, with a high number of proactive cases in addition to their usual
28 number of reactive cases.

29
30 Discussion ensued regarding the Code Enforcement team.

31
32 Council Member Christie asked if the Commission had been advised of the upcoming
33 meeting with City business owners.

34
35 Planning Director Masyczek advised and discussed the upcoming meeting with the
36 Downtown business owners regarding signage.

37
38 Discussion ensued.

39
40 Planning Director Masyczek noted that he would be providing an update at a future
41 meeting regarding both property owner and city-initiated annexations.

1 An unnamed member of the audience inquired regarding the filthy sidewalks along Stetson
2 Avenue and the big hole in the ground in Seven Hills that was getting so much attention
3 from the gardeners who seemed to be cutting everything down.

4
5 Planning Director Masyczek noted that the "hole" that was being referred to was called
6 "Lake Maybe" and that the City was in charge of the maintenance of the area and was
7 probably in the process of doing weed abatement.

8
9 The unnamed audience member suggested that he believed they had gone over the top,
10 since all of the wildlife was gone along with the landscaping. He further noted that many
11 of the trees on Stetson Avenue, bordering Seven Hills, were dead, and asked if anything
12 would be done about this.

13
14 Planning Director Masyczek noted that he would discuss the issue at the Senior Executive
15 Team meeting that he would be attending the next morning.

16
17
18 **X. ADJOURNMENT**

19
20 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten, SECONDED by Commissioner McBride and
21 unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 7:03 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City
22 of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **Tuesday, August 15, 2006 at 6:00 p.m.**
23 to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue,
24 Hemet, California 92543.

25
26
27
28
29
30 _____
31 **Bob Duistermars, Chairman**
32 **Hemet Planning Commission**

33
34
35 **ATTEST:**

36
37
38
39 _____
40 **Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary**
41 **Hemet Planning Commission**

42
43
44 _____
City of Hemet Planning Commission Minutes
AUGUST 1, 2006