

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: MAY 6, 2014

CALLED TO ORDER: 6:00 P.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 Rick Crimeni, Vince Overmyer and Michael Perciful

ABSENT: None

Invocation and Flag Salute: Commissioner Rick Crimeni

2. NOMINATION AND ELECTION OF PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR FOR 2014-15 — Community Development Director Elliano

It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Vice-Chairman Greg Vasquez and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Vince Overmyer to **NOMINATE** Chairman John Gifford as Planning Commission Chair for 2014-15.

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

AYES: Vice-Chairman Greg Vasquez, Commissioners Michael Perciful, Rick Crimeni and Vince Overmyer

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Chairman John Gifford

3. NOMINATION AND ELECTION OF PLANNING COMMISSION VICE-CHAIR FOR 2014-15 — Community Development Director Elliano

It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Michael Perciful and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Vince Overmyer to **NOMINATE** Vice-Chair Greg Vasquez as Planning Commission Vice-Chair for 2014-15.

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

1 Density Residential (2.1-5.0 d.u./ac.) to Low Medium Density Residential
2 (5.1-8.1 d.u./ac.). The Planning Commission will also consider the Draft
3 Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that has been prepared to assess the
4 environmental effects of the project.
5

6 **C. RAMONA CREEK SPECIFIC PLAN (SP-12-001)** - A request for Planning
7 Commission review and recommendation to the City Council regarding the
8 proposed Ramona Creek Specific Plan establishing 954 residential units
9 and 649,044 square feet of commercial space; consideration of an
10 associated General Plan Amendment to the Land Use Element to modify
11 the mix of residential units and commercial acreage in Mixed Use Area No.
12 1 and to change the land use designation on 44.9 acres from Low Density
13 Residential (2.1-5.0 d.u./ac.) to Low Medium Density Residential (5.1-8.0
14 d.u./ac.). The Planning Commission will also consider the Draft
15 Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that has been prepared to assess the
16 environmental effects of the project.
17

18 **D. RAMONA CREEK MASTER SUBDIVISION MAP (TTM 36510)** - A request
19 for Planning Commission review and recommendation to the City Council
20 regarding the proposed Ramona Creek master tentative tract map to
21 subdivide the site into 37 large numbered lots and 49 lettered lots.
22

23 (Planner Running gave a detailed report to the Commission and invited comments.)
24

25 Chairman Gifford wanted to know the reason for the increase in proposed residential
26 and decrease in commercial as part of the proposed General Plan Amendment.
27

28 Chairman Gifford also questioned if the recent changes in the conditions of approval
29 have been approved by the applicant, and Planner Running said they had discussed it
30 by telephone with the applicant and provided it to them at the meeting.
31

32 Commissioners Overmyer and Crimeni wanted more information about the increase in
33 residential and change in commercial and its impact on traffic for the Mixed Use Area
34 #1 of the General Plan.
35

36 CDD Elliano responded that when you look at the General Plan and potential
37 amendments, in terms of Mixed Use Area #1, the area is larger than just this project
38 site. At the time the City was preparing the general plan update, we studied a
39 maximum build-out condition as a "worst case analysis" in terms of the EIR and the
40 relative impacts to traffic, etc. It was anticipated that the acreages of the actual land
41 uses proposed in the area would change or modify over time. A traffic analysis and
42 environmental analysis was prepared to make sure that reducing the overall
43 commercial square footage and adding residential wasn't going to change the
44 environmental impact assumed originally in the General Plan, and it is, in fact, less of
45 an impact.
46

47 Even in the General Plan fiscal analysis done in 2012, the City's fiscal
48 consultant stated that the area was too high for the amount of commercial, based on
49 the foreseeable market. So when the Ramona Creek proposal came forward, it was a
50

1 more appropriate mix of land uses for the site, and was further substantiated by the
2 market and fiscal studies prepared for the Ramona Creek project.

3
4 Chairman Gifford asked if there was a plan to have Riverside County Flood Control
5 take over management of the flood control features of the project.

6
7 City Engineer Biagioni stated that RC Flood Control usually does not take isolated
8 pieces, that building to their specifications does not ensure their management. The
9 advantage is the saving for maintenance.

10
11 Chairman Gifford opened the public hearing and invited Daniel Gryczman to the
12 lectern.

13
14 Daniel Gryczman, Regent Properties (11990 San Vicente Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA
15 90049) stated that this was their fourth appearance before the Planning Commission
16 and it had always been a pleasure to work with the City of Hemet. He noted that he
17 had been developing properties all over California for 15 years, and he had never
18 seen such a well put-together package from a city staff, and he appreciated having a
19 partner that takes development as seriously as Regent does.

20
21 He clarified that the decrease in commercial and increase in residential had to do with
22 the General Plan, not this specific property, as this had always been their proposal.
23 Retail vs. residential is always a chicken and egg conversation, but their plan really is
24 set up to respond to that market demand.

25
26 Mr. Gryczman also explained that the project is being designed to Flood Control
27 District standards, with the hope that eventually the district would take it over.

28
29 There were a number of conditions that were proposed to be changed, relative to
30 signals. Putting the Florida Avenue signal aside, (because that signal must be in
31 place before the first building goes up for retail), all the other signals should be
32 installed when they are warranted, from the developer's perspective. That way, when
33 the number of building permits pulled warrant a traffic signal, it's then the developer
34 should be expected to expend a significant amount of money to put the traffic signal
35 in, rather than with the first building permit.

36
37 CDD Elliano explained that it was not clear from the Specific Plan what the timing was
38 for the signals and street improvements. The Florida Avenue signal is indeed
39 warranted, in conjunction with the commercial portion of the plan, but the others are
40 going to be when they are warranted based on traffic demand.

41
42 Planner Running further noted that street improvement is needed prior to the first
43 building permit, when development occurs, so people can get there. He felt that the
44 two concepts (signals and street improvements) probably should have been separated
45 in the phasing plan chapter of the Specific Plan.

46
47 Chairman Gifford remarked that there is no disagreement these three signals need to
48 be put in. It's just a matter of what triggers them.

1 Mr. Gryczman agreed, and explained further that the phasing plan for the project is
2 somewhat atypical - in a good way - because it's set up to be responsive to the
3 market. The phasing plan is not chronological, therefore, building Phase 3 first
4 doesn't mean a particular traffic signal may or may not be warranted.

5
6 After extensive further discussion the suggestion was made to solidify the language of
7 the conditions of approval: General Condition 13(c)2, suggest changing the "and" to
8 "or"; 13(d)1, adding "or when signal warrants are met," and likewise, with (e) and (f),
9 page 3 of 3 on the General Conditions.

10
11 Mr. Gryczman noted that he agreed that the streets need to be in place.

12
13 Chairman Gifford stated that the consensus was that the matter be deferred to staff for
14 actual language clarification in the modified conditions of approval.

15
16 To Commissioner Crimeni's question about anchor stores to attract other retailers, Mr.
17 Gryczman declined to give out names, as these negotiations have not, as yet, been
18 finalized, but stated that they are attending the Shopping Center Conference in Las
19 Vegas and have meetings set up with big boxes, junior boxes, restaurant chains and
20 convenience store representatives.

21
22 They have been working hard, as has Hemet's Economic Development Staff, to entice
23 the right anchor. A match has not been found, however he is optimistic that it will.
24 Their leakage study showed that the greatest need in Hemet and surrounding areas is
25 apparel, home goods, entertainment, and that is where they are focused.

26
27 Seeing no other members of the public wishing to speak, Chairman Gifford closed the
28 public hearing.

29
30 **A.** It was **MOVED** by Vice Chair Vasquez and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Michael
31 Perciful to direct staff and the City's environmental consultant to prepare the Final EIR
32 for the project including the Response to Comments, The Mitigation Monitoring and
33 Reporting Plan (MMRP), and the Findings and Statement of Overriding
34 Considerations, for City Council review and certification.

35
36 **AYES:** Chairman John Gifford, Vice-Chairman Greg Vasquez, Commissioners
37 Michael Perciful, Rick Crimeni and Vince Overmyer

38 **NOES:** None

39 **ABSTAIN:** None

40 **ABSENT:** None

41
42 **B.** It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Rick Crimeni and **SECONDED** by Commissioner
43 Michael Perciful to **ADOPT** Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 14-012
44 recommending to the City Council **APPROVAL** of GPA 12-005.

45
46 **AYES:** Chairman John Gifford, Vice-Chairman Greg Vasquez, Commissioners
47 Michael Perciful, Rick Crimeni and Vince Overmyer

48 **NOES:** None

49 **ABSTAIN:** None

50 **ABSENT:** None

1 **C.** It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Vince Overmyer and **SECONDED** by
2 Commissioner Rick Crimeni to **ADOPT** Planning Resolution Bill No. 14-009,
3 recommending approval of the Specific Plan (SP 12-001) to the City Council, subject
4 to the amended conditions of approval presented at the Planning Commission meeting
5 and as further modified by staff.
6

7 **AYES:** Chairman John Gifford, Vice-Chairman Greg Vasquez, Commissioners
8 Michael Perciful, Rick Crimeni and Vince Overmyer

9 **NOES:** None

10 **ABSTAIN:** None

11 **ABSENT:** None
12

13 **D.** It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Rick Crimeni and **SECONDED** by Commissioner
14 Michael Perciful to **ADOPT** the attached Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 14-
15 010 recommending the City Council approve Tentative Tract Map No. 36510, subject
16 to conditions of approval and the findings contained in Resolution Bill No. 14-010, as
17 modified at the Planning Commission meeting.
18

19 **AYES:** Chairman John Gifford, Vice-Chairman Greg Vasquez, Commissioners
20 Michael Perciful, Rick Crimeni and Vince Overmyer

21 **NOES:** None

22 **ABSTAIN:** None

23 **ABSENT:** None
24

(Brief Recess)
25

26 DEPARTMENT REPORTS

27 7. CITY ATTORNEY REPORTS:

28
29 Assistant City Attorney reported that the Supreme Court had overruled a lower court on
30 the issue of prayer in local government meetings. It ruled that the town of Greece,
31 New York, did not violate the First Amendment by opening its city council meetings or
32 town council meetings with prayer. Had the lower court ruling been upheld by the
33 Supreme Court, it would have been precedent setting.
34
35
36

37 8. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORTS:

38 A. Report on actions from the April 22, 2014 City Council Meeting.

39
40 CDD Elliano reported that there were no Planning Commission related items on the
41 council's agenda, but a presentation of interest:
42
43

44 A workstudy where Police Chief Brown and the San Bernardino Research Institute
45 presented the quality of life results to the council, including what people valued about
46 the city of Hemet, such as location, scenic setting, sense of community and community
47 pride, with such necessities as a public participation in public safety, crime-free
48 housing program, and the need for community outreach to supplement police
49 oversight.
50

1 **B. Riverside County Transportation Commission SR-74 Curve Widening Project**

2
3 CDD Elliano reported that this curve-widening project began in March and is starting
4 with the California Avenue and Florida Avenue traffic signal. From there, it is moving to
5 Calvert, with work during the daytime hours. There will be a speed reduction corridor
6 through that area, with the project completion date sometime in September.
7

8 **C. Inland Empire Economic Quarterly Report (April 2014)**

9
10 CDD Elliano referred to a report she had included in the Commissioners' packets from
11 Dr. John Husing regarding Inland Empire economic trends, which included increases in
12 jobs in logistics, healthcare and manufacturing. Construction is picking up, but many
13 laborers have left the area, but overall, the job market is improving.
14

15 **D. Local Housing Trends for 1st Quarter, 2014**

16
17 Commissioner Michael Perciful commented on a merger between Hemet/San Jacinto
18 Board of Realtors and Southwest. The cities included in this area are Temecula,
19 Murrieta, Menifee, Lake Elsinore, Wildomar, Canyon Lake, Hemet and San Jacinto.
20 CDD Elliano reported that first quarter single-family unit sales volume in Hemet is very
21 high. Where the divide starts is in the price points. Median home price in Temecula is
22 \$427,000 versus \$182,000 in Hemet, in part because of the numbers of mobile homes
23 and manufactured homes in the Hemet area. The short sales and foreclosures have
24 dramatically decreased, but lending institutions are restraining the market. There is
25 supply now, but in terms of the resale market, more than with new sales.
26

27 CDD Elliano reported that there are some new tracts coming up in the next couple of
28 months for Planning Commission review and consideration.
29

30 **9. PLANNING COMMISSIONER REPORTS:**

- 31
32 **A. Chairman Gifford (Nothing to report)**
33 **B. Vice Chair Vasquez (Nothing to report)**
34 **C. Commissioner Perciful (Nothing to report)**
35 **D. Commissioner Overmyer (Nothing to report)**
36 **E. Commissioner Crimeni reported that the Ramona Play season was a great**
37 **season.**
38

39 **10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

- 40
41 **A. Preliminary review for Paseo Santa Fe Project**
42 **B. General Plan Consistency Zoning Program - Phase II**
43 **C. Other reports requested by the Planning Commission**
44

45 **11. ADJOURNMENT**

46
47 It was unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 7:32 p.m. to the regular meeting
48 of the City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for June 3, 2014 at 6:00 p.m. to
49
50

1 be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue,
2 Hemet, CA 92543.
3
4
5
6
7
8
9



John Gifford, Chairman
Hemet Planning Commission

10
11
12
13 ATTEST:



Melissa Couder, Records Secretary
Hemet Planning Commission
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