

1 5.6%.

2
3 Ms. Koonce reported that the summer construction projects were wrapping up, and that the
4 district staff was gearing & planning the maintenance and construction projects for the
5 Christmas and President's Day holiday weeks, as well as the Summer 2007 construction
6 projects.

7
8 Ms. Koonce advised the Commission that Sue Richardson, who was the current Assistant
9 Principal at Hemet High School, had been named as the new Principal for Tahquitz High
10 School.

11
12 Regarding Tahquitz High School, Ms. Koonce noted that the school staff was starting to
13 identify the students that would be the school's first graduating class, and that those
14 students would be able to select mascots and activities, and would be geared to be part
15 of the new school.

16
17 The Commission thanked Ms. Koonce for her report.

18
19
20 **IV. WORK STUDY**

21
22 **A. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 34222 - Bernie Chase**

23 A work study session with discussion and possible direction to staff, to
24 introduce a potential annexation and proposed hillside subdivision for 60 lots
25 with graded pads and one or more large un-numbered lots located
26 immediately east of the McSweeny Farms Specific Plan and south of Gibbel
27 Road outside of the City limits but within the Sphere of Influence, and
28 accessed by way of a proposed connector to Gibbel Road and Polly Butte
29 Road.

30
31 The work study session was initiated by Associate Planner Chase, who provided various
32 details regarding the proposed project.

33
34 Blaine Womer of Womer Engineering, 41555 E. Florida Avenue, Suite G, Hemet,
35 California approached the lectern and provided some additional details regarding the
36 proposed project. He indicated that a positive response had been received from LAFCO
37 regarding the annexation. He noted that a road connection would be added for access to
38 the area, which would allow the City of Hemet's emergency services to reach the site
39 without leaving the City limits. He offered to answer any questions.

40
41 Vice Chairman Jones noted that some of the properties within the project area backed up
42 to larger pieces of property, and that he would like to see some compatibility.

1 Mr. Womer responded that there were both smaller and larger parcels abutting the site.
2 He explained that he was proposing 60 lots within 160 acres, so they had already
3 considered the density issue.

4
5 Discussion ensued regarding the grades and the pathways of the project.

6
7 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding whether there were any development standards
8 relative to hillsides.

9
10 Planning Director Masyczek advised that there was a hillside ordinance that the project
11 would be required to follow. He explained some of the details of that ordinance and the
12 annexation process that the applicant would have to go through, and noted that
13 compatibility would be required.

14
15 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the anticipated prices of the homes.

16
17 Randy Wastal, 4405 Manchester Avenue, Suite 106, Encinitas, California approached
18 lectern as the project applicant. He responded to Chairman Duistermars' question, noting
19 that the anticipated prices of the homes would be in the \$400,000 to \$500,000 range.

20
21
22 Chairman Duistermars asked if the property would be developed as a subdivision or if
23 there would be custom lots developed with custom homes.

24
25 Mr. Wastal indicated that he was planning to develop custom homes.

26
27 Discussion ensued regarding how this type of project would be developed, and how it
28 would be reviewed architecturally, as well as how the developer would be able to prevent
29 manufactured homes from being installed on the lots.

30
31 City Attorney Vail explained that while the City could not restrict the installation of
32 manufactured homes on the site, the developer could do so through CC&R's.

33
34 Shauli Rosen-Rager, 44275 Oak Glen Road, Hemet, California approached the lectern as
35 an interested resident. He noted that while it was hard to tell from the displayed map, it
36 seemed that thousands of homes in the valley had great views of the hills. He urged the
37 Commission to consider the thousands of people who were currently able to enjoy their
38 views of those hills before they allowed the hillside to be torn up and developed.

39
40 Discussion ensued regarding this concept.

41
42 The Commission thanked Mr. Womer and Mr. Wastal for their presentation.

1 **B. SANTA FE PLACE - Loretta Domenigoni**

2 A work study session with discussion and possible direction to staff,
3 regarding a proposed 237-unit condominium project by K-Hovnanian located
4 on Santa Fe Street between Menlo and Fruitvale Avenues.

5
6 The work study session was initiated by Associate Planner Domenigoni who provided
7 various details regarding the proposed project. She displayed a map indicating the
8 project's exact location.

9
10 Chairman Duistermars noted that he saw a great deal of street and not a lot of open space
11 on the site plan. He suggested that they may want to cluster the buildings and add more
12 landscaping and open space to the project.

13
14 Planning Director Masyczek explained that there were some differences in terms of
15 parking requirements. He noted that he had met with applicant earlier in the afternoon for
16 discussion, and that while the bulk of the design guidelines fit the project, there were some
17 aspects that did not. He added that the multiple-family residential design guidelines were
18 in need of being updated, and that staff could work with the applicant during that time to
19 incorporate the Commission's concerns and suggestions into their project.

20
21
22 Commissioner Rhoten inquired regarding how many additional parking spaces were being
23 provided that made the project overparked.

24
25 Associate Planner Domenigoni responded that she believed there were thirteen (13)
26 parking spaces above and beyond the requirement.

27
28 Jamie Teter of K-Hovnanian Homes approached the lectern as a representative for the
29 applicant and provided additional details regarding the proposed project. She introduced
30 her associates as Cindy Hornbaker and Johnathan Jacine of K-Hovnanian Homes and
31 their civil engineer, David Dewderly of Lundstrom & Associates. She noted that they had
32 attended a previous work study session with the Commission and indicated the changes
33 that had been made to the project as a result of that work study session. She offered to
34 answer any questions that the Commission might have.

35
36 Vice Chairman Jones expressed his concern with aesthetics relative to the garages.

37
38 Discussion ensued regarding this issue.

39
40 Planning Director Masyczek noted that earlier in the day he had discussed with the
41 applicant the idea of hiding the garages as much as possible. He added that they had also
42 discussed the orientation of the buildings and the lengthening of some of the streets, as
43

1 well as the provision of additional open space and the elimination of some of the
2 pavement.

3
4 Vice Chairman Jones asked how many bedrooms were being proposed within the project.

5
6 Ms. Teter responded that there would be roughly up to 918 bedrooms within the 237 units
7 that were being proposed.

8
9 Vice Chairman Jones asked if the project would be age-restricted.

10
11 Ms. Teter indicated that it would not.

12
13 Discussion ensued regarding traffic improvements relative to the project.

14
15 Commissioner Rhoten inquired as to whether there was adequate access for the Fire
16 Department.

17
18 Ms. Teter responded that they had been working with the Fire Department, and that the
19 current design of the project met their approval.

20
21 Further discussion ensued regarding the addition of open space, and the Commission
22 offered various suggestions.

23
24 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding what types of recreational areas would be
25 provided for the children and teenagers of the community.

26
27 Ms. Teter responded that there would be a multi-purpose court as well as two (2) tot-lots.
28 She noted that a regular sized pool along with a kiddy-pool would be included, as well as
29 a volleyball court that could also be utilized for other types of sports.

30
31 Ms. Hornbaker added that they had discussed the idea of adding a basketball court, and
32 that modifications could be made to the project design to make that happen, although at
33 this point she could not say where the location of that court would be. She noted that she
34 believed that the quality of life that the proposed community would offer would be positive,
35 and that she would have no problem moving some of the buildings around and adding the
36 amenities that the Commission was recommending.

37
38 Chairman Duistermars advised that he would like to see the traffic circulation improved to
39 at least a "C" level of service (LOS), rather than the anticipated "D" LOS.

40
41 Planning Director Masyczek indicated that a "C" LOS would be ideal, but that it could only
42 happen in a perfect world. He added that the best possible improvements would be made,
43

1 and that they could shoot for a "C" LOS, but that a "D" was a common level of service and
2 would be acceptable.

3
4 Additional discussion ensued regarding traffic, relative to both the project and the General
5 Plan requirements.

6
7 City Attorney Vail advised that the only way that the level of service could be increased
8 was through funding for additional traffic improvements, noting that the improvements
9 provided by one project could not resolve the overall problem, but that continued
10 development would help provide resolution over time.

11
12 Chairman Duistermars noted that he was less than thrilled with the lined up garages.

13
14 Ms. Teter noted that the renderings did not show all of the landscaping. She further noted
15 that changes to the garages had been discussed in the meeting with Planning Director
16 Masyczek earlier in the day.

17
18 Planning Director Masyczek noted that more detailed renderings were needed.

19
20 Ms. Hornbaker indicated that a better model with different viewpoints would be provided
21 in the future.

22
23 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding architectural upgrades and articulation.

24
25 Planning Director Masyczek noted that those concepts had been discussed at the meeting
26 that afternoon as well.

27
28 Chairman Duistermars advised the applicant that all of these issues were things that would
29 be considered at the public hearing level.

30
31 Ms. Hornbaker explained some of the changes that they were already planning to make.

32
33 Chairman Duistermars noted that they would expect to see more detailed renderings
34 provided for the public hearing.

35
36 Commissioner Mendoza asked the applicant if any of their existing communities included
37 the incorporation of wireless technology.

38
39 Ms. Teter responded that she was not aware of any, but that she would be happy to look
40 into it.

1 Vice Chairman Jones asked what would be done to restrict renters, since some buyers
2 were bound to purchase for investment purposes.

3
4 Ms. Teter noted that the units would only be sold as owner-occupied, but that the state
5 would not allow any Home Owner Associations to restrict owners from renting their
6 properties in the future. She added that K-Hovnanian would require an owner-occupied
7 status for a minimum of one (1) year.

8
9 Chairman Duistermars asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak
10 regarding the proposed project.

11
12 Rita Reiman, 112 Chemise Court, Hemet, California approached the lectern as an
13 interested resident of the valley. She expressed concern regarding the buildings of the
14 proposed project blocking the views of the hillsides.

15
16 Shauli Rosen-Rager, 44275 Oak Glen Road, Hemet, California approached the lectern to
17 speak regarding the project. He noted that a friend of his resided in a similar complex, and
18 that he had noticed that the same models were being used in a different orientation. He
19 suggested that some units would end up with larger electric bills because the sun would
20 beat down on them, further suggesting that what was aesthetic in appearance may not
21 always be the best idea. He asked that the Commission consider energy efficiency when
22 reviewing this and future projects.

23
24 Ms. Hornbaker responded to the first public inquiry regarding the view of the hills, and
25 explained how their proposal would not actually block the view of the hills any more than
26 it was already blocked by the trees within the cemetery.

27
28 Mr. Jacine indicated that they were very conscious about energy conservation, and that
29 they actually provided dual pane windows and other things that assisted in such
30 conservation.

31
32 Ms. Reiman reapproached the lectern and advised that the trees tended to thin out during
33 the winter months, which enabled the residents to see through them. She noted that she
34 would much rather see the trees than a 2-story building.

35
36 Additional discussion ensued regarding smart-wiring, view analyses, landscaping and
37 other concerns.

38
39 Chairman Duistermars noted that he would want to see the grading of the site when the
40 project came back for public hearing, and that the pads should not be raised so high that
41 they would be detrimental to other properties.

1 The Commission thanked the K-Hovnanian team for their presentation.
2
3
4

5 **V. CONSENT CALENDAR**
6

7 **A. MINUTES**

8 1. August 1, 2006
9

10 It was MOVED by Commissioner McBride and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
11 approve the consent calendar as presented.
12

13 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
14

15 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride
16 and Rhoten

17 NOES: None

18 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Mendoza

19 ABSENT: None
20
21

22 **VI. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**
23

24 **A. REVIEW OF TRAFFIC CONTROL PLAN AND LANDSCAPING**
25 **CONDITIONS**

26 _____ Review and discussion regarding traffic control plan and landscaping
27 conditions.
28

29 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that he had asked Public Works
30 Director Mike Gow to join the meeting for a discussion regarding the addition of traffic
31 control plans as a standard condition of approval.
32

33 Public Works Director Gow approached the lectern and advised the Commission that the
34 Public Works Department felt very strongly about traffic in general, and more specifically
35 regarding traffic control. He indicated that they had taken some high-dollar steps to
36 ascertain that traffic during construction would travel as smoothly as possible, and noted
37 some examples of those steps, including the Pulte Homes construction of a detour road
38 to support traffic relative to their Del-Webb community, and the City's efforts to keep at
39 least one lane open on State Street in each direction while the widening project was
40 underway. He explained that CalTrans had a requirement that their roadways were not
41 to be worked on during certain daytime hours, and that the City had begun to make some
42 effort in duplicating that requirement, noting that on certain streets, road construction could
43

1 only be completed at night. He added that he was glad to hear that the Public Works
2 Department had the Commission's support regarding this issue, and that with the Council's
3 support they had been able to hire a new Traffic Engineer – Patti Castillo – who was now
4 reviewing all traffic plans that were coming through the City's offices. He noted that he
5 was always open to suggestions from the Commission.

6
7 Vice Chairman Jones asked Public Works Director Gow what impacts he could foresee
8 happening with the November opening of Newport Road.

9
10 Public Works Director Gow responded that he expected that it would end up being a major
11 corridor into the valley and would improve traffic tremendously.

12
13 Discussion ensued regarding the median area of Domenigoni Parkway.

14
15 Public Works Director Gow indicated that the median area was reserved for fifth and sixth
16 lanes to be added, if necessary, in the future.

17
18 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that landscaping of that median be considered until such
19 time that those 5th and 6th lanes were added.

20
21 Discussion ensued regarding how traffic control could be enforced, followed by a
22 discussion of queue limits and other traffic issues.

23
24 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding retention basins, noting that some problems
25 were occurring around town, and that many of the basins had become mosquito infested
26 swamps.

27
28 Public Works Director Gow indicated that above-ground retention basins were definitely
29 not aesthetically pleasing. He noted that approximately one-half of the existing basins
30 were owned by the City while the other half were privately owned. He explained what the
31 City was doing everything possible to try and prevent the basins from becoming nuisances
32 in the future.

33
34 Commissioner Mendoza referred to traffic control planning, and asked if it was correct that
35 developer assistance was required.

36
37 Public Works Director Gow responded that developer assistance was absolutely required,
38 and that with the new traffic engineer on board, the plans were expected to be top notch.

39
40 **B. 2+2 COMMITTEE LIST OF AGENDA ITEMS**

41 _____ Review and discussion with prioritization of the list of proposed agenda
42 items for an upcoming 2+2 Committee meeting.

1 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the 2+2 Committee meeting was
2 in the process of being set up, and that John Petty would be joining the meeting to discuss
3 Riverside County plans. He noted the items that would be agendized for the upcoming
4 meeting.

5
6 Chairman Duistermars asked that the remaining items on the list of agenda items be
7 brought back to the Commission for review following the initial 2+2 Committee meeting.
8

9 **C. CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS**

10 An update regarding recent City Council actions.
11

12 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that at the last City Council meeting
13 there had been a discussion regarding the desire to have pole signs removed within the
14 City and replaced with monument signs. He noted that as a result of that discussion, the
15 Council would be adopting an interim urgency ordinance at their next meeting prohibiting
16 the installation of any new pole signs until such time that the City's municipal code was
17 appropriately updated with acceptable standards and requirements regarding this type of
18 signage.
19

20 City Attorney Vail added that he would be preparing the interim urgency ordinance, noting
21 that there had been some recent revisions to the Business and Professions Code,
22 pertaining to amortization and/or purchase of that particular type of signage, and that the
23 options that were presented to the City Council would have to be framed within those
24 revisions.
25

26 The Planning Commission embarked on a discussion of the sign ordinance.
27
28

29 **VII. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

30
31 Commissioner Mendoza brought up the issue of shopping center maintenance.
32

33 Planning Director Masyczek indicated that the City had plans for the mandated
34 maintenance of shopping centers. He stated that he would be working on this with the 2+2
35 Committee. He discussed the possibility of having annual inspections of shopping centers
36 to ensure that they were in compliance with the maintenance of the landscaping and
37 grounds as a whole.
38

39 Vice Chairman Jones inquired regarding whether Maze Stone Village had come in with a
40 submittal.
41
42
43
44

1 Planning Director Masyczek responded that they had and advised regarding the status of
2 the application.

3
4 Discussion ensued regarding the proposed Maze Stone Village project.
5
6
7

8 **VIII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**
9

10 There were no future agenda items requested.
11
12

13 **IX. ADJOURNMENT**
14

15 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones, SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten and
16 unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 7:36 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City
17 of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for ***Tuesday, September 5, 2006 at 6:00 p.m.***
18 to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue,
19 Hemet, California 92543.
20
21
22

23 _____
24 **Bob Duistermars, Chairman**
25 **Hemet Planning Commission**

26 **ATTEST:**
27
28

29 _____
30 **Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary**
31 **Hemet Planning Commission**
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44