

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  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

**PLANNING**  **COMMISSION**

---

**MEETING MINUTES**

**DATE:** JANUARY 21, 2014 **CALLED TO ORDER: 6:00P.M.**

**MEETING LOCATION:** City Council Chambers  
450 East Latham Avenue  
Hemet, CA 92543

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**PRESENT:** Chairman John Gifford, Vice Chairman Greg Vasquez, and Commissioners Vince Overmyer and Michael Perciful

**ABSENT:** Commissioner Rick Crimeni

**Invocation and Flag Salute:** Commissioner Overmyer

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**A.** Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of December 17, 2013.

It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Michael Perciful and **SECONDED** by Vice Chairman Greg Vasquez to **APPROVE** the Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of December 17, 2013.

The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote:

**AYES:** Chairman John Gifford, Vice Chair Greg Vasquez, Commissioners Vince Overmyer and Michael Perciful

**NOES:** None

**ABSENT:** Commissioner Rick Crimeni

**3. PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

There were no members of the public who wished to address the Commission regarding items not on the agenda.

**PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

1 **4. TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP 36646 (MAP NO. 13-002) TRACTOR SUPPLY CO.**

2  
3 **Applicant:** California Gold Development Corporation  
4 **Agent:** Paul Peck — Paul Peck & Associates  
5 **Planner:** Carole L. Kendrick, Assistant Planner  
6 **Location:** South side of Florida Avenue, west of Sanderson Avenue and  
7 east of Cawston Avenue  
8

9 **Description:** A request for Planning Commission review and approval of the  
10 subdivision of 3.59 net acres into two (2) parcels for future commercial  
11 development in the General Commercial (C-2) zone, located on the south side  
12 of Florida Avenue, west of Sanderson Avenue and east of Cawston Avenue,  
13 with consideration of an Environmental Exemption pursuant to CEQA  
14 Guidelines Section 15315.  
15

16 (PowerPoint presentation by Asst. Planner Carole Kendrick.)  
17

18 Chairman Gifford asked for questions by Commissioners for staff, and hearing none,  
19 opened the public hearing on this item.  
20

21 Mr. Jim Todd, owner and developer of the project, offered to answer any questions of  
22 the Commission, thanked the staff for their assistance in the project, and explained the  
23 orientation of the building, the ingress and egress and easement issues.  
24

25 With no other members of the public wishing to speak, Chairman Gifford closed the  
26 public hearing and asked for Commissioner comments after stating he was happy to  
27 see development coming into that particular area and felt both staff and applicant had  
28 done a good job with the process.  
29

30 Vice Chair Vasquez, Commissioners Perciful and Overmyer agreed with  
31 Commissioner Overmyer, asking about mandated landscape requirements.  
32

33 Assistant Planner Kendrick explained there was a 25-foot setback with special  
34 requirements regarding trees and shrubs, but explained that staff is working with  
35 applicant to make sure all the requirements are met. She also indicated they had  
36 received no negative comments from neighbors, based on the notice.  
37

38 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Vince Overmyer and **SECONDED** by Commissioner  
39 Michael Perciful to recommend **ADOPTION** of Planning Commission Resolution Bill  
40 No. 14-002 **APPROVING** Tentative Parcel Map No. 36646.  
41

42 The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote:  
43

44 **AYES:** Chairman John Gifford, Vice Chairman Greg Vasquez, and  
45 Commissioners Michael Perciful and Vince Overmyer.  
46

47 **NOES:** None

48 **ABSENT:** Commissioner Rick Crimeni  
49  
50

## WORK STUDY REPORTS

### **5. SPECIAL PRESENTATION: UPDATE ON WRCOG SUBREGIONAL CLIMATE ACTION PLAN (CAP):** *Presentation provided by Alexa Washburn, Program Manager and Jennifer Ward, Staff Analyst; representing WRCOG*

CDD Elliano explained the reason for the presentation being to update the public and Commissioners regarding an understanding of what the action plan is, and what the requirements are from the State of California and how it will benefit Hemet. She introduced Alexa Washburn as the program manager for this project.

(PowerPoint presentation by Alexa Washburn.)

Chairman Gifford asked about the emissions projections and whether that means air quality.

Ms. Washburn explained these are greenhouse gas emissions, which are something WRCOG is required to look at as a part of CEQA. As a part of our sub-region, there are 12 jurisdictions that have not completed inventories yet, and WRCOG is filling the gap for the sub region as a whole.

CDD Elliano added that it is air quality in terms of mobile emissions, stationary emissions and energy production. There was an emissions inventory done for Hemet in conjunction with the General Plan EIR to establish a baseline, but additional studies have been done so Hemet could be compared, apples to apples, with other areas.

(The PowerPoint presentation by Ms. Washburn continued.)

Chairman Gifford noted that vehicle emissions are going to be the highest source of greenhouse gas emissions and asked how that could be controlled or reduced without putting all the burden on stationary sources.

Ms. Washburn indicated that 60 percent of emissions are coming from the transportation sector, and their study and measures are focusing on that sector.

Chairman Gifford asked how they were going to measure progress and effectiveness of plans, and how do they intend to use the lessons learned so the measures can be tweaked to be more effective.

Ms. Washburn explained that those questions will be answered in the next grant provided. She envisioned developing a consistent Web based tool that all jurisdictions can use. As projects come in, planners will have to determine consistency with the climate action plan as well as the measures that the city is choosing to implement. There will be an annual report card for cities.

Chairman Gifford asked how this climate action plan, and the tools they are designing, are going to benefit the staff and city in doing the things that have to be done.

1 CDD Elliano explained that many of the measures they are including are areas the city  
2 already identified in the General Plan and transportation plan, etc. The benefit is  
3 creating the region's own plan, as opposed to having the state or CEQA mandate  
4 what must be done.

5  
6 Ms. Washburn continued by stating the focus is on shifting the mode of travel, trying to  
7 get people out of automobiles and looking at biking, parking, mixed-use downtown  
8 housing, and future Metrolink utilization.

9  
10 When Chairman Gifford commented on the fact that Hemet is rating higher than others  
11 in greenhouse gas emission control, CDD Elliano stated that efforts that have already  
12 been put in place, such as plans for an electric vehicle network, have aided the city in  
13 rating within the gold category, with some areas in the platinum category.

14  
15 Commissioner Overmyer asked if manufacturing and new projects would affect this  
16 study. He also wondered if such things as barbeques, fireplaces, and lawn mowers  
17 might be considered in the study.

18  
19 Ms. Washburn stated that big manufacturing does not emit as much greenhouse gas  
20 emissions as transportation and that some of the other things mentioned already do  
21 have some controls and requirements at the state level or AQMD.

22  
23 CDD Elliano said they are working with the public works director also to have street  
24 lights converted to LED lighting, and utilization of solar panels, such as suggested in  
25 the highly successful HERO program.

26  
27 Chairman Gifford asked what programs are being put in place to achieve change into  
28 the 2035 time period.

29  
30 Ms. Washburn explained that along with transportation changes, there would have to  
31 be changes in industry, such as introducing green technology. The urban footprint  
32 modeled provides that analysis, so it is possible to see what changes need to occur  
33 and what type of industries will be emerging.

34  
35 Chairman Gifford expressed his appreciation for the work done by the WRCOG group  
36 as well as CDD Elliano's part in the WRCOG Planning Directors Technical Committee  
37 as vice chair.

38  
39 **6. WORK STUDY #3 REGARDING TEMPORARY SIGNAGE REGULATIONS:**  
40 *Presentation by Emery Papp, Principal Planner*

41  
42 Chairman Gifford invited Andy Anderson of the Chamber of Commerce to speak  
43 before Mr. Papp's presentation was given.

44  
45 Andy Anderson, 615 North San Jacinto Street, Hemet, stated that he believed that  
46 most of the concerns of the business community had been addressed at the various  
47 meetings between the city staff and the Chamber of Commerce, but wished to point  
48 out some concerns that remained: (1) the need for consistency with banner signs, only  
49 one allowed for businesses, but two allowed for theaters and special events; (2) that  
50 fencing and rails not be used for banners; (3) that businesses should be able to

1 professionally install poles and place banners in a landscaped area if all rules for  
2 safety and visibility were followed; (4) that the rules presently in place for flag poles in  
3 property management sites, such as model homes or apartments, not be changed; (5)  
4 that LED board signs should be considered temporary signage; (6) that hand-held  
5 signs be studied carefully, as businesses feel they can be effective, but often residents  
6 object to them.

7  
8 (PowerPoint presentation by Principal Planner Emery Papp.)  
9

10 Chairman Gifford queried how one defines a special event in terms of businesses, and  
11 if the size of the banner is determined by square footage of the business. He also  
12 agreed that banner signs can be effective, but also just sloppy, but hoped that a code  
13 could be constructed in such a way that banner signs could be more professional and  
14 wondered how the landscape banner signs would be constructed and if they would  
15 need to be permitted.

16  
17 CDD Elliano agreed that banner signs are temporary and supposed to come down  
18 after a period of time. She assumed the poles would come out, too, when the signs  
19 came down. She asked Vice Chair Vasquez to explain in his industry how banner  
20 signs are treated.

21  
22 Vice Chair Vasquez explained that it could work two ways: Sometimes the poles  
23 remain stationary and permanently embedded as an anchor, or many can have a  
24 sleeve through which the poles can be removed.

25  
26 CDD Elliano indicated her preference would be the sleeve-embedded poles, with  
27 Chair Gifford agreeing, but asking the staff to do further work on that aspect.  
28

29  
30 Vice Chair Vasquez reiterated his concern about the need for some regulations for  
31 banners not attached to buildings, such as those in landscaped areas, as not all  
32 buildings could accommodate banner signs. At present there is no code which covers  
33 that and he requested that at the next work-study, there be some proposal to cover  
34 that eventuality.

35  
36 CDD Elliano explained that the building is the first preference, but if that is not  
37 possible, it can be in the landscaping. What the staff is opposed to are banners that  
38 are draped between trees, those that are in common areas or landscape setbacks.  
39 However, she said that staff would go back to the drawing board and work on that  
40 area.

41  
42 Planner Papp explained that staff had omitted that issue for three reasons: 1)  
43 Oftentimes landscaped areas might be in a parcel that's separate from the property  
44 that wants to use the sign; 2) Staff is making other suggestions this evening that might  
45 be more useful and would take away the need for banners in the landscape area; 3)  
46 There needs to be a definition of what would constitute "professional installation" to  
47 make sure there's a standard that everyone can follow and understand.

48  
49 Vice Chair Vasquez agreed with the concerns expressed, but felt that there are  
50 circumstances where it should be allowed. He agreed that there needs to be  
consistency about numbers of banners allowed, and he didn't have strong

1 feelings about either one or two banners, but felt it should be consistent for both  
2 businesses and special events.

3  
4 Both Commissioners Overmyer and Perciful felt that consistency was important and  
5 that one or two signs were possible, as long as they did not exceed the square  
6 footage restrictions. Commissioner Perciful also brought up the problem of Florida  
7 Avenue and the difference between City of Hemet restrictions and County of Riverside  
8 restrictions.

9  
10 CDD Elliano explained that they had done a matrix and that county's restrictions are  
11 not that much different; it is just that enforcement in the county is not occurring at the  
12 same level as the city.

13  
14 Vice Chair Vasquez requested that banners on handrails and fences be prohibited,  
15 with Chairman Gifford agreeing, but also adding that CDD Elliano needs to have some  
16 discretion. He suggested tightening the language.

17  
18 Vice Chair Vasquez also questioned the length of time (90 days) that temporary  
19 banners could remain up. He suggested a shorter period of time.

20  
21 CDD Elliano stated staff was proposing extending the time period from 30 days to 45  
22 days. The only time that would be extended is if it were in place of permanent signs,  
23 such as the sign company had not finished the sign for a business yet.

24  
25 There was a lengthy discussion concerning other restrictions and allowances, such as  
26 banners 10 feet inside buildings with service bays, the definition of special events or  
27 community events to be defined more specifically by the city attorney, and the square  
28 footage of signage available pursuant to a formula.

29  
30 (A short recess was taken.)  
31

32  
33 Further discussion ensued regarding pennant signs, other than those allowed  
34 currently by code for residential model home complexes. The Commission felt that  
35 they could be limited to such things as grand openings or special events, but limiting  
36 them in these events to 15 days.

37  
38 Planner Papp indicated that staff would like to limit maximum amount of coverage on  
39 window space signage, with alcohol sales limited to 25 percent coverage. He asked if  
40 the other recommendations in the staff report were satisfactory, and Commissioners  
41 agreed with the recommendations.

42  
43 There was discussion about cane signs, especially as used in the restaurant industry,  
44 with Mr. Anderson weighing in on the subject, stating that the Chamber of Commerce  
45 is happy to see some movement towards acceptance of these signs.

46  
47 After further deliberation, it was decided to stop discussion and bring back for further  
48 study Staff Report Item 11, electronic signs; Item 2, banner signs; Item 5, cane signs;  
49 and Item 10, stake signs, and item 12, hand held signs.

## DEPARTMENT REPORTS

### 7. CITY ATTORNEY REPORTS: *Verbal report from Assistant City Attorney Erica Vega on items of interest to the Planning Commission.*

Assistant City Attorney Erica Vega informed the Commission that she and Assistant City Attorney Tom Jex will be taking responsibility for alternating weeks through April. Then she will be taking a maternity leave but will be back in the summer.

### 8. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORTS: *Verbal reports from Community Development Director Deanna Elliano.*

#### A. Report on actions from the January 14, 2014 City Council Meeting.

CDD Elliano indicated there were a number of planning related items, such as Airport Land Use Commission meeting where the city was asked to insert some additional Language in the Specific Plan ordinance. The building code revisions will be in effect in 30 days from January 14th, and the General Plan Amendment for the Housing Element went through with no changes and was submitted to the State in a timely fashion, unlike other nearby cities, (therefore evading the four-year cycle). The Council also asked the police chief to put together a task force, which he has done, looking at the transient population. It is an extremely delicate area in terms of not violating civil rights, while trying to preserve the parks for the community. In addition, at the next meeting, the Hemet ROCS program will be introducing 12 new code volunteers.

#### B. Request for cancellation of the February 4, 2014 Planning Commission Meeting

CDD Elliano announced the cancellation of the February 4th Planning Commission meeting, with the 18th of February including another Work Study on the signage regulations.

### 9. PLANNING COMMISSIONER REPORTS: *Commissioner reports on meetings attended, future agenda items or other matters of Planning interest.*

- A. Chairman Gifford (Nothing to report).
- B. Vice Chair Vasquez (Nothing to report).
- C. Commissioner Perciful (Nothing to report).
- D. Commissioner Overmyer (Nothing to report).
- E. Commissioner Crimeni (Absent).

### 10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

- A. SPA for McSweeny Farms
- B. CUP for Multi-tenant office building
- C. Regent Properties Ramona Creek SP, TTM and DEIR
- D. General Plan Consistency Zoning Program - Phase II

1 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

2  
3 It was unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 8:47 p.m. to the regular meeting  
4 of the City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for February 18, 2014 at 6:00  
5 p.m. to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham  
6 Avenue, Hemet, CA 92543.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12   
13 \_\_\_\_\_  
14 John Gifford, Chairman  
15 Hemet Planning Commission  
16

17 ATTEST:

18  
19   
20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 Melissa Couden, Records Secretary  
22 Hemet Planning Commission  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50