

1 wrestling room, and the Adult Education office building. She noted that they would be
2 scrambling to house kids in the upcoming school year.

3
4 Regarding the Jacob Wiens Elementary School site, Ms. Packham reported that the
5 caissons had begun. She noted that on the first day five caissons were drilled, with two
6 of them collapsing, and that on the second day twelve were drilled with only one collapsing.
7 She added that they were making progress since they were currently half way there, with
8 60 having been drilled and 127 needed. She explained that there were some very strict
9 safety rules to follow, and that since the holes go down 70-feet into the ground nobody
10 could get near them without being harnessed off.

11
12 Ms. Packham reported, regarding the summer modernization projects, that the sod was in
13 at Santa Fe Middle School and that they were continuing to work on the street, although
14 water drainage was an issue. She added that the sod was to go in at Winchester
15 Elementary School on the following day, and that the long overdue office expansions and
16 improvements at Little Lake and Ramona Elementary schools were on target.

17
18 A discussion ensued regarding Santa Fe Middle School, and Ms. Packham advised the
19 Commission that there was a design competition amongst three architects, with the
20 designs due for submittal by August 16th, to be reviewed by the Governing Board Facilities
21 Committee on August 17th.

22
23 Ms. Packham reported that the escrow had closed for the Hemet High School Stadium site
24 and that the school district was working with the Riverside County Flood Control Agency
25 on a joint project with the storm drains.

26
27 Regarding the Hamilton turf, Ms. Packham reported that they were moving along on
28 schedule, although water availability had become an issue. She noted that the process
29 was of interest to the school district since they would be installing six more fields.

30
31 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that City staff had met with Phil
32 Pendley of HUSD regarding the Santa Fe Middle School site and how the area might be
33 master planned.

34
35 Ms. Packham stated that they were looking at an urban design for the downtown area
36 since there was not a "luxury of land" available.

37
38 The Commission thanked Ms. Packham for her report.

39
40
41 **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

42
43 No items.

1 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS**

2
3 No items.

4
5
6 **VI. WORK STUDY**

7
8 **B. COTTONWOOD RANCH - Ron Running**

9 A review of the proposed single-family architecture for Vesting Tentative
10 Tract Map No. 30558 (Greystone Homes) located on the southeast corner
11 of Fisher Street and Mustang Way in Page Ranch.

12
13 The work study session was initiated by City Planner Running who advised the
14 Commission that Tract Map No. 30558 had been approved with 372 lots. He displayed a
15 site plan indicating the map area.

16
17 Bob Walton of Greystone Homes, 40980 County Center Drive, Temecula, California gave
18 an overview of the site, noting that in addition to 3 park sites there were also several
19 parkways that would run parallel to the streets in both Phase 1 and Phase 2, all of which
20 would lead to the main park. He noted that at the time of their first meeting the setbacks
21 that had been given to them were the first setbacks for the original Page Ranch Specific
22 Plan, which tended to differ from some of the other area setbacks. He explained that they
23 had set the plans up so that there was a good 20-feet between each home site, with an
24 extra 20-feet for the homes that were adjacent to parkways. He pointed out that the Plan
25 1 design was roughly 2,000 square-feet in the Bridlewood community, noting that it was
26 a 40-foot wide product that would just meet the 40% guideline relative to garages. He
27 explained that since they wanted to get away from having the garage pushed right up next
28 to the house, they had opted to go with a new plan that included a front porch that
29 extended farther over. He noted the four planes on the front elevation, and the stone on
30 the "C" elevation, with stucco trim accents and color schemes. He displayed a rendering
31 of 2 planes that were 40-feet across, indicating that the 40% guideline was met, as well as
32 the sideyard setbacks. He then displayed a rendering of the front elevation and rear
33 elevation, followed by a floor plan indicating a 4-bedroom home with a side-on garage. He
34 displayed photos of the A, B and C elevations and provided a description of each,
35 indicating the architectural pop-outs. He explained that he was now going into the
36 Cottonwood product, which was comprised of larger homes that would be set on 6,000
37 square-foot lots, with 5-foot setbacks on each side for the single-story homes, and 10-foot
38 setbacks for the two-story homes. He displayed the floor plans for those homes, noting
39 that the single-story homes included an upstairs loft with an option for an extra bedroom
40 and bathroom. He noted that the Plan 2 in this community would include side-on garages,
41 and would be approximately 3,000 square-feet in size, with a huge loft area upstairs and
42 four bedrooms.

1 Vice Chairman Jones asked what percentage of the front of the home was comprised of
2 the garage.

3
4 Mr. Walton responded that the garage was not visible at all since it was a side-on garage,
5 and that the only part of the garage that faced the street at all was a small 8-foot section.
6 He indicated that section in the displayed rendering.

7
8 Mr. Jones asked if one could look through the window and see into the garage.

9
10 Mr. Walton responded that one could.

11
12 Mr. Walton discussed the Plan 3, which was proposed to be 3,300 to 3,400 square-feet in
13 size, with a huge area upstairs and a large family room and nook area downstairs.

14
15 Commissioner Calkins asked if there were any houses in the 1,600 to 2,000 square-foot
16 range, noting that there seemed to be a gap in the available sizes of homes.

17
18 Mr. Walton explained that marketing studies had indicated that people want larger homes.

19
20 Commissioner Calkins asked if they wanted bigger "houses" or simply bigger "rooms".

21
22 Mr. Walton responded that they found that people were looking for more bedrooms so that
23 children could have their own separate rooms rather than having to share rooms. He noted
24 that there was also a demand for an office area, and that media rooms and lofts were very
25 popular as well, but that more rooms had been far more desirable than fewer larger rooms.

26
27 A discussion of the R.V. Parking ensued, followed by discussion of the garages and the
28 percentages of single-story homes versus two-story homes.

29
30 Mark Gross of Gross & Associates, 1551 N. Tustin Avenue, Ste. 640, Santa Ana, California
31 approached the lectern as an additional representative for the applicant. He asked if the
32 Commission would like to see the garages relocated and the project redesigned.

33
34 Planning Director Masyczek referred to the Design Guidelines.

35
36 Chairman Duistermars explained that when there is a major thoroughfare the City prefers
37 to keep the houses along the street as single-story homes. He stated that he did not know
38 what this requirement may have done to their mix of homes, but suggested that they take
39 a look at the issue and move some things around. He noted that since this was a work
40 study session they would have some time to consider this option.

41
42 A discussion ensued regarding which streets were considered major thoroughfares.

43
44

City of Hemet Planning Commission Minutes
August 3, 2004

1 Mr. Gross explained that they had drawn a street scene so that the Commission would
2 have it available to look at. He noted that a nice thing about one-story homes was that
3 they were gablelands, which created positive spaces between the homes. He added that
4 they could dip some, gable some and shed some to create variety.

5
6 Chairman Duistermars explained why the single-story homes were more desirable along
7 major thoroughfares.

8
9 Mr. Walton asked if the Commission was stating that they would need to meet that
10 guideline.

11
12 Chairman Duistermars responded that he would suggest that they take a look at their
13 design and see if it was something that could be incorporated into it. He noted that they
14 had been requiring it of most developers, but stated that they needed to decide whether
15 or not it would work for them and whether they were wanting to fight the battle. He added
16 that one developer had completed a "line of sight" study.

17
18 Sue Fox, 3800 W. Thornton Avenue, Hemet, California approached the lectern and
19 advised the Commission that she was very concerned about the traffic that would be
20 generated by these and other homes that were about to be built in the area. She stated
21 that much of the traffic would end up going down her street to reach the Page Plaza.

22
23 Mr. Jones asked Ms. Fox if she had a solution in mind.

24
25 Ms. Fox stated that the only solution she could think of was to either eliminate the driveway
26 into the Plaza off of Thornton Avenue or to block off the street entirely so that Mustang
27 Way would have to be utilized to reach the Plaza.

28
29 Mr. Masyczek advised Ms. Fox that traffic issues are typically reviewed during the Tract
30 Map process, and that for this project they were beyond the ability to review any traffic
31 concerns.

32
33 A discussion ensued regarding the potential traffic issues for that area.

34
35 Sandy Packham of the Hemet Unified School District approached the lectern and reminded
36 the Commission that the school district had only a verbal agreement regarding an
37 elementary school site for the area, and no agreement regarding a middle school site,
38 which meant that there was currently no place to house any new students that would be
39 residing in the new housing communities.

1 **C. RURAL/ESTATE STANDARDS - Richard Masyczek**

2 A discussion of potential rural/estate standards with possible direction to
3 staff.

4
5 The work study session was initiated by Planning Director Masyczek who gave an overview
6 regarding several other surrounding cities and whether or not they had some type of rural
7 or estate standards.

8
9 Planning Director Masyczek discussed the “typical rural standard, which included a street
10 width of 24- to 28-foot curb-to-curb, either no curb or an asphalt curb or berm, no parkway,
11 no sidewalk and no lighting. He displayed some photos of rural areas in the Hemet Valley,
12 including Crest Drive in the southeast portion of Hemet. He explained that the standards
13 that are applied to the development of an area influence how the neighborhood is
14 perceived. He noted that even though there was no street lighting, many residents in rural
15 neighborhoods install residential lighting.

16
17 Planning Director Masyczek went on to discuss a “typical” estate standard, which tended
18 to include a street width of 32- to 36-foot curb-to-curb, concrete curbs, no parkway and no
19 sidewalks. He displayed photos of homes that fell under the estate standard category,
20 along with photos of various street scenes. He advised the Commission that it needed to
21 be decided what was trying to be achieved as a City. He distributed a handout that
22 included the rural standards for the City of Murrieta and reviewed the handout briefly with
23 the Commission. He stated that he was hoping to get some direction from the Commission
24 regarding the possibility of establishing rural standards for the City of Hemet.

25
26 Assistant Public Works Director Gow approached the lectern and stated that he wanted
27 the Commission to understand the daily lives of the Public Works employees, noting that
28 many requests for sidewalks and street lighting were received on a regular basis from
29 those communities that did not already have them. He explained that it would be very
30 costly to install sidewalks and streetlights and all of the other items that would bring a
31 neighborhood up to “city” standards, after a community was developed, since the City
32 would bear that burden of cost. He suggested that he would love for the Public Works
33 Department to have less facilities to maintain, but noted that in 5 to 20 years they were
34 liable to get requests from the residents of those “rural” communities for sidewalks and
35 streetlights. He concluded by stating that he was not in favor of rural standards.

36
37 Planning Director Masyczek stated that he would not want such standards to be
38 considered an “exception to the rule”, but rather legitimate standards that would be
39 applicable to certain areas of the city.

40
41 Commissioner Searl asked if there were any suggestions for neighborhoods that might
42 want to remain as equestrian areas, such as an equestrian trail in lieu of a sidewalk.

1 Assistant Public Works Director Gow responded that the Public Works Department utilized
2 concrete because of its durability, which kept them from having to go in and do the grading
3 that is frequently needed in those areas that do not have sidewalks.

4
5 Chairman Duistermars pointed out that while there were some cities on the provided list
6 who'd had their rural standards in place for some time, there were also others who had
7 established them only recently. He suggested that perhaps the public works departments
8 in those cities should be contacted to see what kinds of issues they had run into.

9
10 Planning Director Masyczek stated that it was important to match the type of standards that
11 were applied to a neighborhood to the lifestyle, which, he explained, was what was trying
12 to be done with the creation of rural/estate standards in the City of Hemet. He explained
13 that they did not want to apply them to urban areas, and that there would need to be a
14 determination made regarding under what circumstances the rural/estate standards would
15 occur.

16
17 Commissioner Searl asked if a rural standard overlay would be established.

18
19 Planning Director Masyczek responded that rural standards could not be established
20 outside of certain areas, and reiterated that a determination would need to be made
21 regarding which areas of the city would be able to develop under them. He stated that the
22 public works standards would need to be amended to incorporate the rural/estate
23 standards, and that he needed direction from the Commission regarding their interest in
24 the establishment of such standards.

25
26 Mel Haugen, 1333 Clydesdale Court, Hemet, California approached the lectern and
27 advised the Commission that he resided in a neighborhood that would like to keep their
28 rural atmosphere. He noted that he had a 19-lot subdivision that he was developing, which
29 he characterized as horse property, and stated that all of his potential buyers were pleased
30 with the effort and possibility that rural standards for the subdivision might be established.
31 He stated that he had received over 200 phone calls from people who wanted to live in a
32 rural area, adding that he would like to maintain the same continuity on Eaton Avenue. He
33 stated that he knew that Commonwealth Avenue was likely to pick up more traffic, and
34 intended to have concrete curb and gutter installed on that portion of his development, but
35 that he would like to eliminate sidewalks and streetlights. He explained that he was
36 expecting his subdivision to be more of an upscale area with ranch-style homes that would
37 be up to 3,700 square-feet in size with various setbacks and lighting in the front of each
38 home, such as walkway lights or lights that border driveways. He suggested that there
39 were many areas within the city that were being developed very quickly with larger lots, and
40 that the demand for rural standards was high.

41
42 Commissioner Calkins asked Mr. Haugen if he currently had curbing on Clydesdale Court.

43
44

City of Hemet Planning Commission Minutes
August 3, 2004

1 Mr. Haugen responded that they had rolled asphalt, noting that there were many areas
2 where it was damaged, and that it did tend to damage easily. He stated that he was not
3 opposed to curb and gutter, and explained that there was currently some curb and gutter
4 as well, but no sidewalks or streetlights.

5
6 Bobbi Christie, 320 Juel Lane, Hemet, California approached the lectern and stated that
7 she thought it would be a good idea to have some restrictions to specific areas. She
8 explained that she lived in a rural area and would like to keep it that way, but that the
9 proposed development which was adjacent to her property may not be developed as a
10 rural neighborhood.

11
12 A discussion ensued regarding the proposed subdivision that was adjacent to Ms.
13 Christie's neighborhood.

14
15 Vice Chairman Jones stated that he was in favor of developing rural standards.

16
17 Commissioner Calkins noted that he felt curbing was important.

18
19 Chairman Duistermars suggested that he did not see rural standards as not having curbs,
20 but rather as having some variety on the outside of the curbs, whether it be a riding trail or
21 a walking trail. He stated that he also felt there needed to be some rural/estate standards.

22
23 Commissioner Searl asked if the lack of sidewalks would give the extra 8-feet to the
24 property owner to maintain, or if it would be maintained by the city.

25
26 Planning Director Masyczek responded that it would be an easement that would be
27 maintained by the property owner.

28
29 Vice Chairman Jones clarified that the Commission was giving staff direction to come back
30 with a draft of rural/estate standards.

31
32 City Manager Temple and Assistant City Attorney Vail joined the meeting.

33
34 **A. SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 03-2 / VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT**
35 **MAP NO. 31513** - Ron Running

36 An amendment of the Hemet Valley Country Club Estates Specific Plan
37 (Tres Cerritos / Corman Leigh) with a subdivision of 178 single-family lots
38 located on the northeast corner of Rose Road and Old Warren Road.

39
40 The work study session was initiated by City Planner Running who gave a brief overview
41 of the proposal to bring the Commission up to date.

1 David Leonard of Corman Leigh Communities, 1223 University Avenue, Suite 240,
2 Riverside, California approached the lectern as the project applicant. He explained that
3 the project had changed substantially, and noted that there was an expansion of the open
4 space within the city area. He explained that some of the drainage issues had been
5 resolved, as well as some of the species issues and circulation issues. He advised the
6 Commission that a Development Agreement had been created that would serve as a
7 bridge document. He displayed an aerial photo and described the areas surrounding the
8 project site. He then displayed the proposed site plan for the specific plan amendment
9 followed by the west planning area and east planning area, which he noted were
10 designated by different ownerships. He displayed a color coded plan that indicated the
11 different lot sizes that would be included within the specific plan, and described what those
12 areas would include. He advised the Commission that they had been mindful of the
13 Single-Family Design Guidelines and displayed some renderings of the architectural styles,
14 including the variation of planes and attention that had been given to the garages. He
15 referred to the 5,000 square-foot lot series, noting that the lots would be 50' x 100' in width
16 and depth, and then the 6,000 square-foot lot series that would be 60' x 100' in width and
17 depth, followed by the 7,200 square-foot lot series which would be 72' x 100'. Finally he
18 noted the 10,000 square-foot lot size that would be 100' x 100' in width and depth. He
19 explained that they would have to surround the conservation area with block wall, as it was
20 not to have any public access at all. He displayed some drawings of park/open space
21 areas, and briefly described what would be included. He then displayed photos of what the
22 paseo system was proposed to look like, followed by a display of the proposed circulation
23 map, along with a map indicating the sewer lines that would be incorporated into the
24 project. He concluded his presentation with a map of the drainage system.

25
26 Commissioner Calkins inquired about the lot sizes.

27
28 Planning Director Masyczek noted that the current Tres Cerritos specific plan was still in
29 effect, and that in order to address concerns a Development Agreement had been
30 submitted. He explained that a lot more work needed to be done on the east side than was
31 necessary for the west side, and suggested that the east side would require a separate
32 amendment, as this amendment was primarily for the west planning area..

33
34 Vice Chairman Jones expressed his concern with the idea that they would have to accept
35 the project with 5,000 square-foot lots.

36
37 Planning Director Masyczek pointed out that since they were considering a Specific Plan
38 Amendment they would not have to accept the 5,000 square-foot lots for the west side.

39
40 Assistant City Attorney Vail suggested that, although the Development Agreement has to
41 refer back to the underlying zoning document, the lot sizes had not been specified. He
42 stated that it was his understanding that the project had included approximately 180
43
44

1 dwelling units before, and would continue to include 180 units, although he was not sure
2 of the densities.

3
4 Chairman Duistermars asked if the EIR had been updated in light of all of the radical
5 changes that had been made. He wondered how the project was being put together
6 mechanically with such a dramatic change.

7
8 Assistant City Attorney Vail stated that an EIR had never been completed for the site,
9 which was originally called "Tres Cerritos" before being renamed as the "Hemet Valley
10 Country Club Estates". He noted that there were many problems with this project, and
11 referred to the many issues that had been dealt with, explaining that they were ending up
12 with an east planning area that would be tremendously complex to develop. He noted that
13 the golf course idea didn't work because there were enough golf courses in the community
14 already, and it hadn't been sited correctly to begin with. He explained the efforts that had
15 been made to work with the developer to address some of the important issues outside of
16 the underlying specific plan, and noted that there was a certain disassociation between the
17 west side and the east side. He further explained that with the golf course being removed,
18 some of the remaining planning issues had gone away. He advised the Commission that
19 there were many environmental issues that would have to be addressed, and noted that
20 he was not sure how they could be addressed outside of an EIR. He explained that
21 amendments could be made to the Specific Plan to address certain issues of the project,
22 and that the Development Agreement would secure the financing mechanism regarding
23 the drainage facility for the west side, which would be set up as a CFD, with the developer
24 being required to dedicate land for the facility. He stated that case law had changed
25 significantly since the original Specific Plan had been adopted, and that in this case the
26 Development Agreement would allow the option of providing a sense of security for the
27 developer and a financing mechanism for the city. He noted that the Master Plan of
28 Drainage had not ripened yet, which was important for the facility, and explained that it was
29 also important that the project move forward to help move the property owner out of
30 bankruptcy.

31
32 A discussion followed regarding what the original intent of the Specific Plan was.

33
34 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that it was their job to take a look at
35 what was being presented before them, noting that Assistant City Attorney Vail had done
36 a good job of explaining the reason behind the Development Agreement.

37
38 Chairman Duistermars stated that he did not disagree with splitting the area into an "East"
39 and a "West" side, but that he did not want to link the amenity packages for both sides.
40 He suggested that both the east and west side would require separate discussion and
41 amenity packages, and that part of the discussion should be regarding the 5,000 square-
42 foot lots.

1 Commissioner Calkins noted that even though it was split, it remained the same Specific
2 Plan. He asked if the old Specific Plan could be wiped out and a new one started over
3 from scratch.

4
5 Assistant City Attorney Vail responded that this could be done, but suggested that such an
6 option should be discussed with the property owner. He noted, however, that the Specific
7 Plan status adds value and entitlements to the land, which the property owner would not
8 likely want to give up.

9
10 Chairman Duistermars stated that he was nervous about what they would be locking into
11 on the east side by amending only the west side.

12
13 Assistant City Attorney Vail pointed out that the Specific Plan did not vest a legal right,
14 noting that it allowed for the land uses to change. He explained that what would be vested
15 was the proposed vesting map, including the lot sizes and etc. that go along with the west
16 side. He noted that this was the Commission's chance to take a look at all of it.

17
18 Chairman Duistermars inquired about the single park that was included within the Specific
19 Plan.

20
21 A discussion ensued, and City Planner Running noted that because there would be private
22 parks the applicant would not be given credit for the public park obligations.

23
24 A discussion of the project density ensued, and what impacts those densities would have.

25
26 Planning Director Masyczek noted that there would be a 30-day review period for
27 recirculation of the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and that a public hearing could not be
28 held during that time frame.

29
30 City Planner Running clarified the densities of the project per the Specific Plan document.

31
32 It was agreed that the Specific Plan that was approved previously was not something that
33 would be approved now, and that various aspects of it had changed drastically, which
34 would tend to instigate a review of the larger aspects of the Specific Plan.

35
36 Dave Jeffers, 19 Spectrum Point Drive, Suite 609, Lake Forest, California approached the
37 lectern as a representative for the applicant, and pointed out that the overall density of the
38 project in the tract map was 2.9. He noted that 75 lots were designated for the 5,000
39 square-foot lot type, and that the average lot size was 5,767 square-feet. He added that
40 65 lots were to be 6,000 square-feet in size and 38 were to be 10,000 square-feet, which
41 added up to a density of 2.3. He noted that the average was almost 6,000 square-feet,
42 suggesting that 5,700 square-feet was quite large. He further noted that the overall
43 average on the west side was just over 9,000 square-feet.

1 Commissioner Rhoten asked where the 4,500 square-foot lots were located.

2
3 City Planner Running explained that those were on the old plan and throughout the entire
4 project, but that they were not proposed with this plan.

5
6 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that perhaps City Manager Temple would like to speak
7 regarding the economics of the project.

8
9 City Manager Temple approached the lectern and discussed the current drainage of the
10 area. He explained that the city had been trying to establish a flood control solution for the
11 area since 1983, but that every developer had failed, which was a frustrating problem for
12 the City. He went on to explain that all of the drainage for that end of the City relied on this
13 area, and that any development of this project would need to include a drainage solution,
14 noting that the Development Agreement assured the City that this issue would be resolved.
15 He advised the Commission that it had taken a considerable amount of time and energy
16 to put the Development Agreement together, and noted the commitment that the CFD's
17 would contribute monies into the pot so that the City would get the flood control that they
18 needed. He discussed the fact that the City had a desperate need for Devonshire Avenue,
19 explaining that it needed to be connected with the fire station site on Cawston Avenue,
20 which would improve the response times on the west end of the City – the Development
21 Agreement would insure the completion of Devonshire Avenue. He explained to the
22 Commission that the City stood a lot to gain by the approval of the Development
23 Agreement, and that they had done their best to contract as many commitments as
24 possible out of the document. He suggested that he had seen the opportunity to bring the
25 Development Agreement forward at the time of the Specific Plan and Vesting Tentative
26 Tract Map, and noted that in return the developer wanted 180 lots. He stated that the
27 Planning Commission needed to determine if that was the best thing, and noted that no
28 commitment had been made to the developer that guaranteed them the 180 lots.

29
30 Commissioner Calkins noted that the cost of the drainage program was apparently a
31 burden of both the City and the developer. He asked if Riverside County Flood Control
32 would enter the picture at all.

33
34 Planning Director Masyczek stated that RCFC would accept the design of the City.

35
36 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the replotting of some of the lots, and a
37 discussion ensued regarding this issue.

38
39 Rick Scott, Corman Leigh Communities, 32823 Highway 79 South, Temecula, California
40 approached the lectern and stated that their goals regarding the project included drainage,
41 and they wanted to be able to absorb the cost of what they were providing.

1 Chairman Duistermars explained that during the process of establishing the design
2 guidelines he had learned that higher densities were sometimes a good thing, and noted
3 that with the requirement for 7,200 square-foot minimum lot sizes, a developer could “buy”
4 down to smaller lots. He pointed out that since the establishment of the design guidelines
5 the City had been inundated with developers wanting 4,500 - 6,000 square-foot lots. He
6 suggested that Corman Leigh take a look at their system and see if they could provide
7 larger lots.

8
9 Vice Chairman Jones reiterated Chairman Duistermars frustration, stating that the City
10 could not keep absorbing 4,500 square-foot lots and be good stewards to the community
11 at the same time.

12
13 Commissioner Calkins commended the paseo system, but agreed that the smaller lots
14 were not desirable.

15
16 Chairman Duistermars advised the applicant that he believed the Commission as a whole
17 felt the same way regarding the smaller lots.

18
19 The Commission thanked the speakers for their presentation.

20
21 Chairman Duistermars suggested that the following work study sessions be continued to
22 the next meeting.

23
24 The Commission concurred.

- 25
26 **D. SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DESIGN GUIDELINES - Richard Masyczek**
27 A review and discussion of current single-family residential design guidelines
28 with possible direction to staff.

29
30 This item continued.

- 31
32 **E. CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS - Richard Masyczek**
33 Discussion of the Interim Urgency Ordinance adopted by the City Council
34 changing permitted uses to conditionally permitted uses. Initiate discussion
35 of uses and conditionally permitted uses per City Council direction, as well
36 as the development review process.

37
38 This item continued.

1 **VII. CONSENT CALENDAR**

2
3 **A. MINUTES**

4 _____ 1. July 20, 2004

5
6 It was MOVED by Commissioner Calkins and SECONED by Commissioner Rhoten to
7 approve the consent calendar as presented.

8
9 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

10
11 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Rhoten and Searl

12 NOES: None

13 ABSTAIN: Vice Chairman Jones

14 ABSENT: None

15
16
17 **VIII. UPDATE OF CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS ON PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS -**

18 Update given by Planning Director Masyczek

19
20 **A. INTERIM URGENCY ORDINANCE ON CONDITIONAL USE PERMTIS**
21 **ADOPTED BY CITY COUNCIL**

22
23 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the City Council had adopted
24 an Interim Urgency Ordinance which established various commercial projects as
25 conditional uses. He entertained a brief discussion regarding the issue, noting that this
26 item was one of the work study sessions that had been continued. He suggested that it
27 might be a good idea to have a special meeting to hold the continued work study sessions,
28 since the agenda for the August 17th meeting was full. He stated that a time and date
29 could be discussed at the next meeting.

30
31 The Commission concurred.

32
33 **B. SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING REGARDING KIRBY STREET**
34 **INITIATIVE**

35
36 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the Kirby Street Initiative would
37 be on the November ballot.

1 **IX. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**

2
3 No items.
4

5
6 **X. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

7
8 Vice Chairman Jones stated that he had not seen much of a change in the signage issues
9 around the City and asked if more code enforcement had been hired.

10
11 A discussion ensued regarding code enforcement.
12

13 Commissioner Searl asked if any interest had been expressed in the soon-to-be-empty
14 Wal-Mart building.
15

16 Planning Director Masyczek responded that quite a bit of interest had been expressed.
17

18 A discussion ensued regarding major builders that were coming into town, and Planning
19 Director Masyczek advised the Commission that a Conditional Use Permit had been
20 submitted for the vacant area west of the Bell Tower Plaza. He noted that Marshall's,
21 PetSmart and Office Depot had expressed interest in developing there.
22

23 Commissioner Searl inquired about what would happen to the truck parking on Elk Street
24 when the vacant area was developed.
25

26 Planning Director Masyczek responded that it would have to be reviewed by the City
27 Council.
28

29 A discussion of options ensued.
30

31 Chairman Duistermars stated that the City should provide an area for truckers to park.
32

33 Commissioner Calkins stated that he would not be at the August 17th Planning Commission
34 meeting since it was his birthday.
35

36
37 **XI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

38
39 No items requested.
40
41
42
43
44

1 **XII. ADJOURNMENT**
2

3 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl, SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten, and
4 unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 8:49 p.m. to the regular meeting of the
5 City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **Tuesday, August 17, 2004 at 6:00**
6 **p.m.** at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 East Latham Avenue, Hemet,
7 California, 92543.
8
9
10
11

12 _____
13 **Nick Jones, Vice Chairman**
14 **Hemet Planning Commission**
15

16 **ATTEST:**
17
18
19
20

21 _____
22 **Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary**
23 **Hemet Planning Commission**
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44