

1
2 **III. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE**
3

4 The Hemet Unified School District (HUSD) update was presented by Facilities Planner,
5 Tina Koonce.
6

7 Ms. Koonce advised the Commission that there were several future school sites under
8 consideration within the HUSD. She noted that both Fruitvale and Cawston Elementary
9 Schools, located within the northwest corridor of the City, were either at or above their
10 capacities, and that the HUSD was in desperate need of a new school site that would
11 immediately house the continued growth in this area of the City. She added that there
12 were two sites under consideration. She explained that the first site was actually in the
13 City of San Jacinto, north of Esplanade Avenue and east of Warren Road, but that the
14 infrastructure, roads and drainage would need to be installed before the HUSD could begin
15 construction. She added that a site within the Garrett Ranch Specific Plan, at Devonshire
16 Avenue and Old Warren Road, had recently been agreed upon, and that the HUSD was
17 very appreciative of the Garrett Group stepping up and allocating a school site. She
18 noted, however, that neither of the school sites would be ready for occupancy until 2009
19 at the earliest, and that the HUSD would be bussing students to interim schools until they
20 were able to begin construction of a new Elementary School in the area.
21

22 Ms. Koonce noted that the HUSD had recently been looking at a parcel (APN 441-070-
23 006) on the corner of Commonwealth Avenue between Kirby and Lyon Streets as a
24 potential school site. She explained that they had examined the site several years
25 previously and had done minimal testing, but did not pursue the property; however,
26 because of the current unprecedented growth, the site was once again being considered
27 as a school site. She added that another option the HUSD was contemplating was a
28 possible "instant" school at Cawston Street and Fruitvale Avenue, directly north of
29 Cawston Elementary school, on a HUSD owned property.
30

31 Ms. Koonce continued her update, advising the Commission that the HUSD was also trying
32 to move forward on the Page Ranch/Freedom Middle School project at Mustang Way and
33 Fisher Street, and noted that a meeting was scheduled for the following day with city
34 engineers and staff to discuss several issues, including street improvements, offsite water,
35 sewer, drainage infrastructure and the participation of required parties. She explained that
36 this was another school that needed to be under construction as soon as possible, as
37 students from the Willow Walk and Lennar housing developments were currently being
38 bussed to Winchester Elementary school. She noted that as more houses were built, the
39 need to place neighborhood schools was becoming a critical issue, and that the HUSD
40 was working hard to make sure that their focus continued to be on the students first.
41
42
43
44

1 Ms. Koonce concluded her report with an update that the construction of Gibbel
2 Elementary school, within the McSweeney Farms Specific Plan, would begin in May of 2007
3 with anticipated occupancy in August of 2008. She added that this particular project was
4 a textbook example of a developer understanding the need for neighborhood schools, and
5 working with the HUSD to make that need a reality.

6
7 The Commission thanked Ms. Koonce for her presentation.
8
9

10 **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

11 **A. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 34116 (Continued from 09-05-06)**

12
13 _____ APPLICANT: Alex Lisnevsky
14 AGENT: Matt Hussions – Aquila Development
15 LOCATION: 204 North Mayflower Street (East side of Mayflower
16 Street between Florida and Devonshire Avenues)
17 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni
18 DESCRIPTION: A request for Planning Commission review and
19 approval of the conversion of an existing 20 unit
20 apartment complex into 20 condominium units and to
21 vary from the minimum required side and rear setbacks
22 for required parking.
23

24 The staff report was presented by Associate Planner Domenigoni who displayed a copy
25 of the vicinity map and site plan, and provided information regarding the reasons that the
26 public hearing had been continued. She explained that one of the previous issues had
27 been clarified, which was Condition No. 11. She noted that the applicant had originally
28 disputed this condition, and that the condition would remain, but would not be an issue,
29 because the project was within the 5-minute response time. She displayed an exhibit of
30 the existing parking along with photos, and explained the code requirements, noting that
31 due to those code requirements the project was currently under-parked, but that
32 exceptions could be made with the appropriate findings. She distributed a copy of a
33 supplemental staff report.
34

35 Vice Chairman Jones inquired regarding how binding the findings were, noting that the
36 project was still under-parked.
37

38 Discussion ensued regarding the parking issue.
39

40 Associate Planner Domenigoni explained that a Lot Line Adjustment would have to occur
41 to allow for additional parking spaces.
42
43
44

1 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that there were basically three (3)
2 options: 1) The existing garage did not have to be converted into an additional unit, as
3 desired by the applicant, which would provide extra parking; 2) A condition could be added
4 requiring that the adjacent property be acquired for Lot Line Adjustment purposes prior
5 to finalization of the map; or 3) An agreement could be signed, prior to the final map, that
6 the adjacent property would be condemned as long as the applicant had made a good faith
7 effort to acquire the property. If acquisition of the property was unsuccessful the City could
8 then decide whether they would want to declare eminent domain.

9
10 Discussion ensued regarding the proposed project and the existing setbacks.

11
12 Associate Planner Domenigoni explained that the project was conditioned to provide
13 landscaping.

14
15 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:18 p.m.

16
17 Alex Lisnevsky approached the lectern as the property owner and project applicant. He
18 advised the Commission that throughout the course of the project he had hit many road
19 blocks and was a year behind schedule. Regarding acquisition of the adjacent property,
20 he noted that the property owner was asking an unreasonable price for property that he
21 would merely be using for the addition of parking spaces. He added that, regarding the
22 existing 2-car garage, it was neither practical or necessary to have it there, as condo-
23 owners would likely end up fighting over which of them the garage belonged to. He noted
24 that it was more practical to merge the unsaleable studio unit with the garage space to
25 create an additional one-bedroom unit that would be more likely to sell.

26
27 Discussion of street parking ensued, along with parking options and possible resolutions
28 to the existing issues.

29
30 Chairman Duistermars indicated that he would like to see the eight additional required
31 spaces added to the project and that he was open to options regarding how to make that
32 happen. He added that while he would like to take a look at options regarding how to add
33 those spaces into the project design, he was not sure that they would be able to
34 accomplish this task at the current meeting.

35
36 Commissioner Mendoza suggested a continuance and the balance of the Commission
37 concurred.

38
39 It was MOVED by Commissioner Mendoza and SECONDED by Commissioner McBride
40 to continue Tentative Tract Map No. 34116 to the Planning Commission meeting of
41 December 5, 2006.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

**City of Hemet Planning Commission Minutes
OCTOBER 17, 2006**

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
2

3 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride,
4 Mendoza and Rhoten

5 NOES: None

6 ABSTAIN: None

7 ABSENT: None
8
9

10 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS**
11

12 **A. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NO. 05-19 (Continued from 09-05-06)**

13 APPLICANT: Sagefield Homes

14 AGENT: Eugene Wilson

15 LOCATION: Northeast corner of Kit Avenue and Carson Street
16 (APN: 443-080-035)

17 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni

18 DESCRIPTION: A request for review and approval of the site
19 development review application related to Zone
20 Change No. 05-10 and Tentative Tract Map No. 33916
21 for seven (7) single-family lots with homes on 1.86
22 acres.
23

24 Associate Planner Domenigoni advised the Commission of the applicant's request to table
25 the proposed project.
26

27 Planning Director Masyczek noted that since the project was not a public hearing, it would
28 simply need to be re-agendized when the applicant was ready to proceed.
29

30 The Commission concurred to table the item indefinitely.
31

32 **B. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NO. 06-016 (Continued from 09-05-06)**

33 APPLICANT: Centex Homes

34 AGENT: Heather Allen

35 LOCATION: North side of Fruitvale Avenue between Palm Avenue
36 and State Street

37 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni

38 DESCRIPTION: A request for Planning Commission review and
39 approval to construct 193 single-family residential units
40 on 27.4 acres within Tract Map Nos. 31796 and 24147.
41
42
43
44

1 The staff report was presented by Associate Planner Domenigoni, who reminded the
2 Commission of what the original issues of concern had been at the previous meeting, and
3 explained how those issues had been addressed and resolved. She noted that Condition
4 Nos. 17 and 18 had been added, which allowed staff to review additional landscaping.

5
6 Chairman Duistermars referred to the east-west streets and noted that he wanted to make
7 sure that the view was not blocked. He suggested that some of the 2-story units along
8 these streets be moved to the interior of the project and replaced with single-story units.

9
10 Mr. Greg Mendoza responded to Chairman Duistermars' concern regarding the relocation
11 of some of the 2-story units.

12
13 Chairman Duistermars indicated exactly what he would like to see modified on the
14 rendering that was on display.

15
16 Mr. Mendoza agreed that he could plug single-story units into the design intermittently.

17
18 Vice Chairman Jones inquired regarding storage areas that could be converted into
19 parking. He referred to specific lots and noted that he would like to have some assurance
20 that there would be adequate parking for the homes that had a larger number of bedrooms.

21
22 Mr. Mendoza noted that there were a very minimal number of 5-bedroom homes within the
23 project, and explained that those homes had previously included 3-car garages, but that
24 they'd had to turn the 3rd bay into a storage area with a non-garage architectural element
25 in order to meet the 40/60 rule of the Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines.

26
27 Vice Chairman Jones commented that it was his preference to see 5-bedroom homes on
28 10-acre parcels rather than on 7,200 square-foot lots.

29
30 Mr. Mendoza indicated that the reason that they had included the 5-bedroom plan, is
31 because one of the bedrooms was downstairs, which was often useful when a mother-in-
32 law, or other older relative resided with a family and could not climb up and down the
33 stairs.

34
35 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding how many of the homes were proposed to
36 include 5-bedrooms.

37
38 Mr. Mendoza noted that 49 homes, or 25% of the total number of homes, were proposed
39 to include 5-bedrooms, but that if the Commission felt that it was necessary to reduce that
40 amount, they could drop the number down to somewhere between 20 and 25%. He added
41 that some could be replaced with single-story units.

1 Chairman Duistermars brought up the issue of the retention basin, and the fact that it
2 looked fairly steep and not very usable. He noted that the City Council had authorized the
3 use of covered basins, and that he believed this project would provide the perfect
4 opportunity to utilize that authorization.

5
6 Mr. Mendoza noted that the basin was designed to be open, but that they could try to add
7 additional uses to it.

8
9 Chairman Duistermars explained that most above-ground basins were typically required
10 to be utilized as parks when they were not holding water. He noted that if it could not be
11 used as a park the Commission might like to see it covered.

12
13 Planning Director Masyczek noted that the applicant had been advised that the basin
14 should be designed as a usable area. He added that it would be a more usable site with
15 the pipes underneath.

16
17 Chairman Duistermars suggested that the applicant work with staff on this issue and
18 explore the viability of utilizing the retention basin as a park or other usable area.

19
20 Planning Director Masyczek noted that the project could be approved with a condition
21 requiring that the applicant come back before the Commission with a park design, prior to
22 the issuance of any certificate of occupancy.

23
24 Commissioner Mendoza suggested that the project should include a park, whether the
25 retention basin was feasible as one or not. He asked what other options there were for
26 park area.

27
28 Mr. Mendoza noted that they would have to eliminate lots to make room for a park if the
29 retention basin could not be utilized as one.

30
31 Dave Kent of KGGY Architects approached the lectern to help respond to questions.

32
33 Commissioner Rhoten inquired regarding the lack of garage windows on the single-story
34 units.

35
36 Mr. Kent responded that in some of the elevations the garage details had not come out
37 very clearly. He displayed some renderings and indicated that while the windows were not
38 visible, they were indeed present. He further noted that his renderer had also erroneously
39 omitted carriage lights that should be present on some of the renderings. He suggested
40 that Commission look at the black & white renderings to better see the details.

1 Planning Director Masyczek noted that one of the problems that staff was consistently
2 noticing, was with the spanish modern architecture, which was a style with a fairly heavy
3 massing. He suggested that the spanish modern style in the single-story homes be
4 eliminated.

5
6 Mr. Mendoza advised the Commission that each of the four (4) elevations included three
7 (3) separate color schemes, and that he could drop the noted elevation if that was the
8 Commission's direction.

9
10 Discussion ensued regarding the elevations and color schemes.

11
12 The Commission concurred that they would like the spanish modern elevation to be
13 eliminated for the single-story units.

14
15 Discussion ensued regarding the architecture and differentiation on colors, as well as the
16 addition of stuccoed foam board that could be given an offset color to provide additional
17 detail.

18
19 Planning Director Masyczek read additional conditions into the record as follows:

20
21 **Condition No. 40:** *“Prior to issuance of building permits the applicant shall*
22 *submit a revised plot plan to the Planning Director for*
23 *review and approval, which maximizes single-story homes*
24 *on the easterly terminus of east/west streets and which*
25 *maximizes five (5) bedroom homes on lots with wide side*
26 *yards.*

27
28 **Condition No. 41:** *“Prior to issuance of building permits the applicant shall*
29 *submit revised park plans to the Planning Commission for*
30 *review and approval and which maximizes useable area*
31 *through application of techniques such as underground*
32 *basins.*

33
34 **Condition No. 42:** *“Prior to issuance of building permits the applicant shall*
35 *submit revised building elevations to the Planning*
36 *Director for review and approval, deleting Plan ‘A’, and*
37 *which provides for offsetting color schemes on rear pop-*
38 *outs and provision of off-color banding on rear and side*
39 *elevations and other architectural details as approved by*
40 *the Planning Director.*

1 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Mendoza to
2 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 06-31* approving Site Development Review
3 No. 06-16 as amended.
4
5
6
7

8 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
9

10 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride,
11 Mendoza and Rhoten

12 NOES: None

13 ABSTAIN: None

14 ABSENT: None
15

16 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-39.***
17

18 **C. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NO. 06-022**

19 APPLICANT: Jesse and Julia Saenz

20 LOCATION: North side of Eaton Avenue between Lyon Avenue and
21 Kirby Street (1910 Eaton Avenue)

22 PLANNER: Bernard Chase

23 DESCRIPTION: A request for Planning Commission review and
24 approval of a site development review application to
25 construct a 2,400 square-foot accessory structure
26 (shed) for residential uses.
27

28 The staff report was presented by Associate Planner Chase who provided various details
29 regarding the proposed project.
30

31 Discussion ensued regarding the proposal.
32

33 Julia and Jesse Saenz of 1910 Eaton Avenue, Hemet, California approached the lectern
34 as the project applicants. Ms. Saenz explained that their property included large parcels
35 of land, and that their goal was to move their excess cars and R.V out of visibility and
36 ultimately clean up their lot.
37

38 Mr. Saenz noted that they currently had several sheds on their property, which they would
39 like to remove and replace with the proposed accessory structure.
40

41 Chairman Duistermars indicated where on the plan he would like to see additional
42 landscaping, such as oleanders.
43
44

1 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that the Commission may want to look at Acacia
2 longifolia, since there had been a fungus popping up with various oleanders throughout
3 the City.

4
5 Ms. Saenz advised the Commission that they were proposing the color of the accessory
6 structure to be beige with a white trim.

7
8 Chairman Duistermars noted that he would like to see standards for accessory structures
9 discussed on a future agenda.

10
11 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the drainage for the project, noting that the
12 arrows on the rendering indicated that the water would be traveling in five or six different
13 directions, and all to the front of the property. He asked if the City had approved the
14 drainage.

15
16 Principal Engineer Biagioni indicated that the proposed drainage was acceptable, and that
17 when the building was erected the inspector would make sure that the drainage was the
18 way it was supposed to be.

19
20 Planning Director Masyczek noted that it was a standard provision that no incremental
21 water could flow off-site, but added that this provision could also be noted in the record.

22
23 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion regarding the project.

24
25 It was MOVED by Commissioner McBride and SECONDED by Commissioner Mendoza
26 to approve *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 06-38* approving Site Development
27 Review No. 06-022 with the additional landscaping as discussed.

28
29 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride,
30 Mendoza and Rhoten

31 NOES: None

32 ABSTAIN: None

33 ABSENT: None

34
35 ***Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 06-40.***

36
37
38 **VI. WORK STUDY**

39
40 **A. SHELLEY – SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT - Ron Running**

41 A work study session with discussion and possible direction to staff
42 regarding a Specific Plan Amendment proposed by Jason & Angela Shelley
43

1 for a recreational vehicle and boat storage facility on a 3.3 acre site located
2 on the south side of Stetson Avenue north of the Santa Fe Railroad tracks
3 in the M-1 district of the Page Ranch Planned Community Development
4 (PCD 79-83).

5
6 The work study session was initiated by City Planner Running, who provided various
7 details and displayed renderings regarding the proposal.

8
9 Vice Chairman Jones inquired regarding who would have information regarding the
10 realignment of Stetson Avenue. He asked if this project would affect or be affected by that
11 realignment, and noted that it would be hard to review the project without knowledge
12 regarding that realignment.

13
14 Planning Director Masyczek explained that the existing portion of Stetson Avenue would
15 actually remain in tact. He described what the realignment would entail.

16
17 City Planner Running displayed renderings of the proposed architectural elements. He
18 noted that the issue that he could foresee was the streetscape, since high R.V.'s would be
19 visible from the street. He added that the office building was a little problematic, as
20 designed, but noted that the Specific Plan did allow for the storage of R.V.'s.

21
22
23 Chairman Duistermars stated that it was his opinion that this type of storage was needed
24 in the area. He suggested that the architecture needed a lot of work, that the screening
25 along Stetson Avenue would need to be explored and that the setbacks & landscaping
26 should be reviewed.

27
28 Commissioner Mendoza indicated that he would like to see another design, noting that it
29 seemed that the structure would be somewhat out of place, coming from the direction of
30 Page Plaza.

31
32 Chairman Duistermars noted that there would someday be a metrolink in the affected area,
33 and that the back side of the wall would be a prime target for taggers. He suggested that
34 landscaping be added along the wall to discourage graffiti.

35
36 Vice Chairman Jones stated that he was in agreement that a storage facility was needed
37 in the area, but questioned that the proposed location was the right one.

38
39 Planning Director Masyczek noted that it was a transitional use and that conditions could
40 be added that would make it attractive. He added that the airport expansion may have an
41 effect on the area as well.

1 Chairman Duistermars suggested that there should be some discussion on whether the
2 proposed location was appropriate for the project, noting that he had also heard that it
3 could very well work at this location. He added that the architecture needed to be worked
4 on and that the restraints of the airport would need to be considered. He asked if there
5 were any other comments regarding the proposal.

6
7 Rita Riemann of 1102 Chemis Court, Hemet, California approached the lectern as a
8 concerned citizen. She referred to the blue triangle on the displayed map, to the north of
9 the green area, and asked what it signified.

10
11 City Planner Running noted that it signified an industrial zone.

12
13 Planning Director Masyczek added that it was part of the airport expansion area.

14
15 Ms. Riemann expressed her belief that the City was in need of expanding the airport, and
16 that she was all in favor of the expansion.

17
18 Commissioner Mendoza suggested that planning was something that was done as a big
19 picture, and noted that the question was whether this was the type of structure that the City
20 would want at this location. He further suggested that if more exploration were done, he
21
22 believed that another use could be found for this parcel that would be more beneficial to
23 the community.

24
25 The Commission thanked City Planner for his presentation.

26
27 **B. LAVASANI / HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT - *Bernard Chase / Ron Running***
28 A pre-application work study session with discussion and possible direction
29 to staff regarding a proposed hillside development that includes the
30 subdivision of 29-acres into approximately 60 single-family residential lots
31 with a 10,000 square-foot average lot size located on the east side of State
32 Street south of Chambers Street.

33
34 The work study session was initiated by Associate Planner Chase, who provided various
35 details regarding the proposed project. He indicated that the site was currently a golf
36 driving range that went partially into a hillside area.

37
38 Clark Van Deventer of 40637 Via Lata, Murrieta, California approached the lectern as the
39 project applicant. He advised the Commission that he and his associates were looking for
40 input regarding their proposed development, and that they were hoping to address most
41 of the issues up front so that they could resolve them and move forward quickly. He
42 displayed a rendering of the proposal and discussed some of his ideas. He then displayed
43 a color-materials board and a 3-dimensional rendering of the proposal. He noted that they

1 were trying to keep the view of the hillside and background in tact, and that they were
2 retaining a local builder with a good reputation. He explained that there would be a great
3 variety of architectural design, and that the homes would include front porches as well as
4 exterior courtyards on some models. He added that all elevations would continue with
5 building treatment around the front of the property, and then asked if the Commission had
6 any suggestions or input.

7
8 Vice Chairman Jones asked who the builder would be.

9
10 Mr. Van Deventer responded that they were retaining Covenant Development Inc. as their
11 builder.

12
13 Chairman Duistermars noted that there was a pretty solid wall along State Street that was
14 of concern to him.

15
16 Mr. Van Deventer replied that they had also seen this as a problem, and that they intended
17 to have it bermed with a winding cut rather than a straight cut.

18
19 Discussion ensued regarding various aspects of the project.

20
21 Vice Chairman Jones inquired regarding how many 5-bedroom homes were proposed to
22 be included within the project.

23
24 Mr. Van Deventer indicated that such a determination had not yet been made.

25
26 Vice Chairman Jones asked what the average lot size was proposed to be.

27
28 Mr. Van Deventer responded that they were proposing lot sizes between 8,000 and 10,000
29 square-feet.

30
31 Chairman Duistermars explained that the Commission's concern with 5-bedroom homes
32 was that multiple families would move in or that if a family was large enough to need 5-
33 bedrooms and they stayed in their home on a long-term basis, eventually there would be
34 more than just 2 or 3 cars, and that there should be consideration for adequate parking
35 relative to that possibility. He further explained what some of the requirements were and
36 what the Commission would like to see.

37
38 Mr. Van Deventer suggested that the project would include a rather intrusive grading
39 operation, but that it would be handled so as not to be disruptive to the adjacent residents.

40
41 Commissioner Mendoza noted that the project would add approximately an additional 60
42 homes with a possibility of 2 cars and up to 3 children each. He questioned whether the
43

1 City really needed another 60 homes, knowing that the market had slowed down and that
2 the existing homes were not selling like they once were.

3
4 Mr. Van Deventer responded that the real estate market had always been and would
5 always be up and down, and that the demand for this type of home would come back. He
6 added that he was providing larger lot sizes in order to keep the density on the lower side.

7
8 Rita Riemann of 1102 Chemise Court, Hemet, California re-approached the lectern and
9 asked if the City of Hemet would remain "Hemet" or if they were going to merge with
10 Temecula or Moreno Valley. She added that she did not know whether what she was
11 saying was pertinent or not, but that the excessive development was of concern to her, and
12 that she seemed to be seeing prison corridors, as there were nothing but walls everywhere
13
14 you went, and none of the homes faced the road anymore. She suggested that the City
15 was starting to look more and more like downtown Los Angeles or New York City.

16
17 The Commission thanked Mr. Van Deventer for his presentation.
18
19

20 **VII. CONSENT CALENDAR**

21
22 **A. MINUTES**

- 23 _____ 1. September 5, 2006
24 2. September 19, 2006
25

26 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Mendoza to
27 approve the consent calendar as presented.
28

29 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
30

31 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride,
32 Mendoza and Rhoten

33 NOES: None

34 ABSTAIN: None

35 ABSENT: None
36
37

38 **VIII. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**

39
40 **A. MAJOR PROJECTS UPDATE**

41 An update of major projects within the City of Hemet (to be provided at the
42 meeting).
43
44

1 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that since the November 7th Planning
2 Commission agenda was fairly heavy he would like to omit the Major Projects Update from
3 that agenda, and carry it over to the December 5th meeting, at which time he would display
4 a map indicating the various locations of all of the current major projects within the City.

5
6 The Commission concurred with this change.

7
8 **B. UPDATE REGARDING LIST OF STREETS WITH TRAFFIC LEVEL OF**
9 **SERVICE "F" AS REQUESTED BY VICE CHAIRMAN JONES** *(Continued*
10 *from 09-19-06)*
11

12 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that there were currently
13 approximately four (4) intersections within the City that were operating at a "F" Level of
14 Service (LOS), and that they would continue to operate at that level regardless of any
15 future changes. He indicated which intersections those were, and noted that staff was
16 working on a traffic run for buildout analysis as part of the General Plan update.

17
18 Discussion ensued regarding the traffic levels of service throughout the City, relative to
19 Measure C, which was passed in 1992.

20
21 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that in order to bring down the LOS,
22 the City would need to look at 10-lane intersections.

23
24 Commissioner Mendoza inquired regarding when that might happen.

25
26 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the issue had not come before the Planning
27 Commission in the past, because the traffic studies were still being worked on. He added
28 that drastic measures would be required to fix the LOS "F" intersections.

29
30 Further discussion ensued regarding possible resolutions to traffic problems throughout
31 the City.

32
33 **C. CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS**

- 34 _____ 1. **Meeting of September 26, 2006:** Update regarding the extension of
35 the Interim Urgency Ordinance for Pole Signs
36

37 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the interim urgency ordinance
38 prohibiting pole signs had been extended by the City Council for a period of 22 months
39 and 15 days.

- 40
41 2. **Meeting of October 10, 2006:** Update regarding the Interim Urgency
42 Ordinance for Conversion of Senior Housing to Family Housing
43

1 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that an interim urgency ordinance
2 had been approved by the City Council regarding the imposition of certain requirements
3 relative to the conversion of senior housing to non-senior housing.
4

5 Council member Lori Van Arsdale, 228 Jelly Way, Hemet, California approached the
6 lectern and advised the Commission that a lot of passion had been expressed over this
7 ordinance at the City Council meeting. She noted that many citizens thought that the City
8 was trying to promote the conversion to non-senior housing, when they were actually
9 attempting to regulate it. She added that it was her belief that those who had attended the
10 City Council meeting had been adequately updated. She advised that a meeting would
11 be held to update the public on Thursday, November 9, 2006 at 3:00 p.m. at the Simpson
12 Center. She added that the meeting would be recorded and extensive notes would be
13 taken.
14

15 16 **IX. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

17 18 **A. DISCUSSION OF HOLIDAY SCHEDULE**

19
20 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the November 7, 2006 Planning
21 Commission meeting was somewhat booked up, and that, due to the Thanksgiving
22 Holiday, elimination of the November 21, 2006 meeting was anticipated, which would not
23 affect any projects. He noted that there were several items for the December 5, 2006
24 meeting, but that nothing major was scheduled for the December 19, 2006 meeting at this
25 time. He further noted that the 1st meeting of 2007 was scheduled for January 2nd, and
26 asked if the Commission would prefer to eliminate this meeting as well and have their first
27 meeting of 2007 be held on January 16th.
28

29 Chairman Duistermars agreed that the December 19th meeting should be scratched, but
30 that the November 21st meeting could be kept open for back-up purposes, if needed. He
31 also agreed that the January 2nd meeting should be scratched.
32

33 The balance of the Commission concurred.
34

35 Chairman Duistermars embarked on a discussion of traffic problems in the Mayberry
36 neighborhood, as expressed by a mother whose child was almost hit by a car. He noted
37 that he had suggested that the mother write a letter to the City.
38

39 Discussion of traffic in the West Valley High School area – adjacent to the Mayberry
40 community – ensued.
41

42 43 **X. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

1 Planning Director Masyczek noted that a workstudy regarding design guidelines for
2 agricultural zones, as well as a map of major projects would be on the December 5th
3 agenda.

4
5 Chairman Duistermars asked if there was some confusion amongst the developers
6 regarding covered retention basins.

7
8 Principal Planner Sawyer noted that staff was now beginning to recommend that
9 developers go to underground systems.

10
11 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that staff work with the Engineering Division on
12 educating the developers regarding what would be required in the future.

13
14 Discussion ensued regarding drainage and retention basins.

15
16 Planning Director Masyczek asked if it would be helpful to have Public Works Director /
17 City Engineer Mike Gow provide an update regarding drainage and retention basins.

18
19 Chairman Duistermars suggested that he would also like to have an update regarding the
20 striping of streets and the queuing of cars.

21
22 Planning Director Masyczek noted that he would see if Mr. Gow would be available to hold
23 a work study session at the December 5th meeting.

24
25
26 **XI. ADJOURNMENT**

27
28 It was MOVED by Commissioner McBride, SECONDED by Commissioner Mendoza and
29 unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 8:27 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City
30 of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **Tuesday, November 7, 2006 at 6:00 p.m.**
31 to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue,
32 Hemet, California 92543.

33
34
35
36 _____
37 **Bob Duistermars, Chairman**
Hemet Planning Commission

38 **ATTEST:**

39
40
41 _____
42 **Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary**
43 **Hemet Planning Commission**

44

City of Hemet Planning Commission Minutes
OCTOBER 17, 2006

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

**City of Hemet Planning Commission Minutes
OCTOBER 17, 2006**