



1 **III. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE** - Update given by Hemet Unified  
2 School District Director of Facilities, Sandra Packham.  
3

4 Sandra Packham, Director of Facilities for the Hemet Unified School District began her  
5 report with an update to the Commission regarding the new Hemet High School Stadium  
6 project. She noted that the project was being re-bid, since the original bids had come in  
7 critically over budget due to the current bid environment. She explained that some items  
8 were being deferred until funds became available, and she further noted that the current  
9 construction industry prices for schools were at an all-time high of approximately \$250 per  
10 square foot.

11  
12 Regarding Tahquitz High School, Ms. Packham reported that the demolition at the site was  
13 complete and that the Phase II bids were being deferred due to delays in approvals from  
14 various agencies. She noted that Phases II and III would be bid at the same time, with the  
15 bid opening scheduled for April 12, 2005, and work scheduled to begin on May 23, 2005  
16 with completion on May 25, 2007.

17  
18 Ms. Packham advised the Commission that a letter had been sent to all of the developers  
19 concerning their participation in CFD's. She noted that a copy had been distributed to the  
20 Commission prior to the start of the meeting. She stated that a public forum was being  
21 scheduled to review the HUSD Facilities Master Plan and to outline the District's inability  
22 to fund all of the schools that were desperately needed. She added that notices would be  
23 mailed out to all developers, notifying them of the meeting time and place.  
24

25  
26 **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

27  
28 **A. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 29129 - EXTENSION OF TIME**

- 29 \_\_\_\_\_ APPLICANT: Jeffrey MDM Partners VI, LLC  
30 AGENT: Jeff Holbrook, Vice President  
31 LOCATION: Stoney Mountain Ranch - South side of Esplanade  
32 Avenue, 800-feet east of Warren Road  
33 PLANNER: Ron Running  
34 DESCRIPTION: A request for a one-year extension of time for approved  
35 Tentative Tract Map No. 29129 to divide 231.5± acres  
36 into 405 single-family lots and open space on property  
37 zoned R-1-7.2 (Single-Family - 7,200 square-foot  
38 minimum lot sizes) and OS (Open Space).  
39

40 The staff report was presented by City Planner Running, who provided some details  
41 regarding the project.  
42  
43  
44

1 Commissioner Calkins inquired regarding the need for an extension of time, when  
2 construction had already begun on the project.

3  
4 City Planner Running suggested that City Attorney Vail might be able to better respond to  
5 this question.

6  
7 City Attorney Vail explained that there was a provision in the subdivision map act, which  
8 stated that if a developer files multiple or "serial" final maps, and there was a condition for  
9 off-site improvements which exceeded \$125,000, each subsequent filing extended the map  
10 for 3 years. He noted that sometimes the developers like a comfort letter from the City to  
11 note that an exception has been made in their case, but stated that he did not like to  
12 provide such letters. He explained that while a project may very well have a 3 year  
13 extension, another way the developer can obtain certainty is to get an extension from the  
14 Planning Commission. He noted that If approval is not issued, the project will still have an  
15 additional 3 years to be completed, but explained that the question tonight was whether the  
16 commission would like to grant a one-year extension to provide the developer with the  
17 additional level of comfort that he was seeking.

18  
19 Vice Chairman Jones stated that the only way that he would agree to an extension was if  
20 the developer would agree that after the one-year extension of time had expired they would  
21 submit to compliance with any change in the City's Design Guidelines.

22  
23 Commissioner Searl inquired about a discrepancy in the staff report regarding the amount  
24 of acreage provided for the park site.

25  
26 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:18 p.m.

27  
28 Jeff Holbrook of Jeffrey MDM Partners VI, LLC approached the lectern as the project  
29 developer. He addressed Commissioner Searl's question regarding the park acreage and  
30 assured the Commission that the required amount of acreage for the park site was being  
31 provided.

32  
33 Chairman Duistermars asked Mr. Holbrook if he would be willing to comply with the City's  
34 current Design Guidelines.

35  
36 Mr. Holbrook declined to do so as his project was close to completion.

37  
38 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:25 p.m.

39  
40 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to  
41 deny the one-year extension of time for Tentative Tract Map No. 29129.

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:  
2

3 AYES: Jones, Rhoten, Calkins  
4 NOES: Searl & Duistermars  
5 ABSTAIN: None  
6 ABSENT: None  
7

8 A discussion ensued regarding the motion for denial and the issues with the design  
9 guidelines.  
10

11 Chairman Duistermars asked if there was a second motion.  
12

13 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and Seconded by Commissioner Calkins to adopt  
14 Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 05-2 approving a one-year extension of time for  
15 Tentative Tract MAP No. 29129.  
16

17 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:  
18

19 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins and Searl  
20 NOES: Vice Chairman Jones & Commissioner Rhoten  
21 ABSTAIN: None  
22 ABSENT: None  
23

24 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-1.***  
25  
26

27 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS**  
28

29 **A. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NO. 04-24**

30 APPLICANT: Lennar / U.S. Homes  
31 AGENT: Joe Deverian, Project Manager  
32 LOCATION: Southwest corner of Cawston Avenue and Cloudywing  
33 Road  
34 PLANNER: Ron Running  
35 DESCRIPTION: A request for Planning Commission review and  
36 approval of the site development plans for Vesting  
37 Tentative Tract Map No. 30558-2 located on the  
38 southwest corner of Cawston Avenue and Cloudywing  
39 Road.  
40

41 The staff report was presented by City Planner Running who provided some details  
42 regarding the project. He noted that he had distributed a copy of two additional conditions  
43  
44

1 of approval that had been inadvertently omitted from the staff report. He displayed  
2 elevations and plotting for the project.

3  
4 A discussion of the exposure of the project to Domenigoni Parkway ensued.

5  
6 Chairman Duistermars noted that there was an error in the staff report regarding the  
7 number of dwelling units.

8  
9 City Planner Running clarified that the correct number of dwelling units for this phase was  
10 115.

11  
12 Commissioner Searl noted that the third paragraph of Resolution Bill No. 05-1 would need  
13 to be revised to reflect the correct number of dwelling units.

14  
15 The Commission and staff concurred that this change would be made.

16  
17 The discussion of the exposure to Domenigoni Parkway continued, with it being noted that  
18 the project had not been conditioned for landscaping at this portion of the project.

19  
20 Chairman Duistermars asked if there was a way that additional landscaping could be  
21 required for this portion of the project.

22  
23 Planning Director Masyczek noted that the Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines  
24 did contain provisions for landscaping along perimeter walls. He explained that in this  
25 particular instance, while it was not a part of the tentative map process, there was nothing  
26 precluding the Commission from requiring additional landscaping at this point in time,  
27 pursuant to the Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines. He advised the Commission  
28 that he had met with Sam Goepp of Valley-Wide Recreation, and that what they were  
29 doing along the Salt Creek Channel was adding Boston Ivy, as it was very effective in  
30 helping to prevent graffiti. He suggested that the Commission do the same with this  
31 perimeter wall.

32  
33 Vice Chairman Jones noted that this solution was more to stop the graffiti along the Salt  
34 Creek Channel. He inquired as to what would break up the monotonous 2-story mess  
35 along the perimeter that would be visible from Domenigoni Parkway. He suggested that  
36 some trees be planted along the perimeter wall.

37  
38 Commissioner Searl suggested that some backyard trees could be required.

39  
40 Planning Director Masyczek noted for the Commission that the Single-Family Residential  
41 Design Guidelines did require, while it was not specific, that there needed to be a breaking  
42 up to avoid monotony along corridors, which this indeed was. He suggested that anything  
43 that the Commission felt was appropriate was in the parameters of what the Commission  
44

1 could do, including trees on the back side, having a better mix of one-story elements along  
2 the perimeter, having more design details along the back residences, Boston Ivy treatment  
3 along the back side of the wall, etc.

4  
5 Commissioner Searl stated that they would hate to repeat the error that had been done  
6 with the Lewis homes and the block wall along their perimeter.

7  
8 Commissioner Calkins noted that the large scale map that had been provided did not agree  
9 with the reduction. He noted that there were four houses plotted on one map and five on  
10 the other.

11  
12 City Planner Running agreed that one of them was out of date.

13  
14 Joe Devarian of Lennar Homes approached the lectern and stated that he understood the  
15 Commission's concerns and was willing to work with the city regarding breaking up the two-  
16 story homes along the portion of the project that would be exposed to Domenigoni  
17 Parkway.

18  
19 Chairman Duistermars stated that the Commission would like to see no more than four (4)  
20 two-story homes in a row.

21  
22 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.

23  
24 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the "architecture forward" concept.

25  
26 Mr. Devarian stated that this would contradict the style of the home and elevate up the  
27 price.

28  
29 Chairman Duistermars stated that something needed to be done to resolve the issue.

30  
31 Mr. Devarian stated that they would be willing to work with the City.

32  
33 Chairman Duistermars noted that the look along the parkway was very important, and the  
34 number of single-story units along this portion of the project might be the appropriate  
35 portion of the project to negotiate the 4% garage issue. He asked if the developer would  
36 be willing to increase the number of single-story units along the parkway and add some  
37 landscaping.

38  
39 Mr. Devarian reiterated that he would be willing to work with the City.

40  
41 Eileen Rykbos, 2050 Bayou Court, Hemet, California approached the lectern as an  
42 adjacent resident to the project. She explained that she wanted to make sure that the new  
43 project manager was aware of the traffic calming requirements.

44

1 Richard Rykbos, 2050 Bayou Court, Hemet, California approached the lectern and  
2 expressed his concern with Lot No. 26, which was next door to one of the existing two-story  
3 homes. He asked if the home on that lot could be built as a single-story home. He  
4 suggested that ivy along the block wall along Domenigoni Parkway might not be such a  
5 good idea, since it could create a problem with field mice, which were already somewhat  
6 prevalent in the area. He echoed Eileen Rykbos' concern with traffic calming devices  
7 being installed.

8  
9 Chairman Duistermars asked who was responsible for making sure that the traffic calming  
10 measures were implemented.

11  
12 City Planner Running stated that this was his job, which he would be following up on during  
13 progression of the project.

14  
15 Mr. Devarian re-approached the lectern to respond to any questions.

16  
17 Commissioner Calkins noted that on Plans 1 and 2, where there were some concerns over  
18 the percentage of the garage front, and it had been suggested that the living rooms or  
19 porches be brought further out, that it was not evident with the way that the garages had  
20 been treated, whether that portion of the building was a storage area, or a bedroom or a  
21 den. He suggested that it had the same appearance as living space, and noted that if was  
22 projected forward on the house, which was not indicated on the plans, it should serve the  
23 same purpose as the architecture forward concept.

24  
25 Chairman Duistermars agreed that he would be comfortable with that along with some  
26 discussion of single-story homes and landscaping.

27  
28 Commissioner Calkins asked Planner Running if he was correct in understanding that the  
29 plans would be adjusted to provide for the 18-inch extension of the storage areas.

30  
31 It was clarified that this was correct.

32  
33 Mr. Devarian agreed to the placement of a single-story home on Lot 26. He further agreed  
34 that every 5<sup>th</sup> home would be single-story along Cloudywing lane, which ran parallel to  
35 Domenigoni Parkway as the southern perimeter street. Within the interior portion of  
36 project, he proposed a 15% mix of single-story and two-story homes.

37  
38 Chairman Duistermars asked what this did with the numbers.

39  
40 A discussion ensued regarding how the numbers would be modified with this modification.

41  
42 Commissioner Calkins noted that one of the problems was that they were only providing  
43 one single-story plan.

44

1 Further discussion of the numbers ensued.

2  
3 Chairman Duistermars expressed his concern with everything that was visible from  
4 Domenigoni Parkway. He asked for clarification that five (5) single-story homes would be  
5 added along Cloudywing Lane.

6  
7 Mr. Devarian responded that the modification would add a total of seven (7) single-story  
8 homes along Cloudywing Lane.

9  
10 Chairman Duistermars stated that he would like to see a 3:1 ratio along Cloudywing Lane,  
11 with the interior restricted to a 15% mix. He noted that he was less concerned, personally,  
12 with the interior portion of the project.

13  
14 Mr. Devarian asked for clarification that the Commission would concur with a 1:5 ratio  
15 throughout the project, but more single-story homes along Cloudywing Lane.

16  
17 A lengthy discussion ensued regarding this issue

18  
19 Chairman Duistermars noted that they needed to come up with an acceptable number of  
20 single-story homes along Cloudywing Lane.

21  
22 Commissioner Searl stated that he would like to see some trees planted along the back  
23 also, to break up the monotony.

24  
25 Chairman Duistermars noted that he believed this had already been concurred to by the  
26 developer.

27  
28 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that on the interior portion of the project, a mid-  
29 block single-story home, to break up the line of two-story homes, might be okay.

30  
31 Mr. Devarian noted that they were currently providing 13 single-story homes, and asked  
32 if he was correct in understanding that the Commission was asking that an additional 13  
33 be provided.

34  
35 Chairman Duistermars clarified that this was correct.

36  
37 Mr. Devarian stated that they would concur with this modification providing the architecture  
38 was not required to be changed.

39  
40 A discussion ensued amongst the Commission as they attempted to come up with a  
41 satisfactory mix of single- and two-story homes.

42  
43 They proposed the written modifications to the developer, who concurred with the changes.  
44

1 It was agreed that trees would be provided along the rear property line, either outside the  
2 wall, if an easement could be obtained, which would be the preferred location, or inside the  
3 back-yards of the homes along Cloudywing Lane, if the easement could not be obtained.  
4

5 The Commission passed the modified map that had been agreed to by the developer along  
6 to the City Attorney.  
7

8 A discussion ensued regarding clarification of the changes to the map.  
9

10 Planning Director noted the following changes to the Conditions of Approval:  
11

12 **Add Condition 13b:** ***Applicant shall revise the plotting of the units to be***  
13 ***in compliance with Exhibit 1.***

14  
15 **Condition No. 13c:** ***Delete***

16  
17 **Add Condition No. 13d:** ***The applicant shall submit revised landscape and***  
18 ***irrigation plans to the Planning Director for review***  
19 ***and approval, which includes the provision for***  
20 ***Boston Ivy and 36-inch box trees on the outside of***  
21 ***the wall adjacent to Salt Creek. Installation of the***  
22 ***ivy and trees shall be in compliance with adopted***  
23 ***standards of the Valley-Wide Park and Recreation***  
24 ***District, for both installation of plants and irrigation***  
25 ***facilities. If an easement cannot be secured from***  
26 ***the appropriate agencies, 36-inch box trees shall be***  
27 ***installed in the back-yard of all houses adjacent to***  
28 ***Salt Creek.***

29  
30 **Add Condition No. 13e:** ***The applicant shall submit rear building elevations***  
31 ***for all homes adjacent to Salt Creek to show***  
32 ***enhanced architectural treatments, as well as***  
33 ***provision of enhanced siding material, color***  
34 ***changes and similar treatments.***  
35

36 The Commission and Mr. Devarian concurred with the changes.  
37

38 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

1 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to  
2 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 05-1* approving Site Development Review  
3 No. 04-24 as amended.

4  
5 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,  
6 Rhoten and Searl

7 NOES: None

8 ABSTAIN: None

9 ABSENT: None

10  
11 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-2***

12  
13  
14 **VI. WORK STUDY**

15  
16 **A. PULTE HOMES - Ron Running**

17 \_\_\_\_\_ A work study session with possible direction to staff for review of the  
18 architecture for Tract No. 31807 & 31808 in the Page Ranch Planned  
19 Community Development.

20  
21 City Planner Running initiated the work study session by advising the Commission that  
22 Pulte Homes would like to present their proposal for Tract Nos. 31807 and 31808, for  
23 which an EIR was currently being processed.

24  
25 Rob Pinslow of Pulte Homes conducted a powerpoint presentation for the Commission  
26 regarding their proposal for Tract Nos. 31807 & 31808. He began by providing an  
27 illustrative plan, followed by a review of the single-story Plan 1, including a display of the  
28 elevations and floor plans as well as photos of the plan that had been built in another area.

29  
30 Plan 3 was displayed next, starting with floor plan and followed by architectural elevations  
31 and photos. Mr. Pinslow noted the optional garage pop-out that would be offered and  
32 pointed out the single-story element that was included.

33  
34 Mr. Pinslow displayed the Plan 4 next, starting with floor plan and following with  
35 architectural elevation and photos.

36  
37 Mr. Pinslow provided a line-of-sight elevation, and pointed out some of the details of the  
38 floor plans for the various Plans. He noted that certain plans were designed to be built on  
39 a 5,000 square-foot lot.

40  
41 Commissioner Calkins asked what kind of back yards would be provided for these large  
42 homes on such small lots.

1 Mr. Pinslow stated that he would have to get back to the Commission regarding the actual  
2 size of the back yards.

3  
4 Mr. Pinslow displayed a photo of what the backyards were proposed to look like from an  
5 aerial view. He then displayed a conceptual park plan.

6  
7 Mr. Pinslow then went on to review the active adult portion of the project. He displayed the  
8 floor plan for the proposed additional Community Center for the Active Adult Community.

9  
10 Vice Chairman Jones asked why the Commission was looking at 5,000 square-foot lots.  
11 He noted that he did not think that any member of the Commission would agree to 5,000  
12 square-foot lots.

13  
14 Mr. Pinslow stated that it was his understanding that the Specific Plan allowed for 5,000  
15 square-foot lots.

16  
17 Chairman Duistermars noted that he believed that when this project had been discussed  
18 it was agreed that there would be a mix of lots.

19  
20 Mr. Pinslow explained that a larger lot portion was to be built in a later phase of the project.

21  
22 A discussion ensued regarding this issue. The Commission expressed their concern with  
23 the small lot sizes.

24  
25 Ms. Packham re-approached the lectern and advised the Commission that the Hemet  
26 Unified School District had met with Benchmark Pacific, who was requesting that the  
27 elementary and middle school sites be moved to the other side of Old Warren Road. She  
28 stated that the Hemet Unified School District did not have a problem with that, however,  
29 she expressed concern with the fact that the projects in the Page Ranch area were  
30 continuing to be approved without schools for the students in the area. She noted that the  
31 students that were generated by any subdivisions in this area, prior to construction of new  
32 schools, would be bussed to various schools throughout the City.

33  
34 A discussion ensued regarding the need for schools.

35  
36 Mr. Pinslow went on with his presentation regarding the Active Adult portion of the project,  
37 and pointed out what each section of the community center would include, such as pools,  
38 exercise centers, etc.

39  
40 Mr. Calkins noted that the map contained housing for both families and active adults, and  
41 suggested that it would be nice if it were differentiated.

42  
43 Chairman Duistermars asked Mr. Pinslow to define "Active Adult".  
44

1 Mr. Pinslow defined this term as being 55+ in an age-restricted community with facilities  
2 for active lifestyles.

3  
4 Chairman Duistermars expressed his concern with the lot sizes. He advised Mr. Pinslow  
5 that he had seen the homes that Pulte built, and that he knew that they were quality homes  
6 so that would not be an issue, but that the small lot sizes would be an issue for this  
7 Commission.

8  
9 Mr. Pinslow displayed the floor plan of Plan 1 for the Active Adult Community.

10  
11 Planner Running noted that this lot would not comply with the design guidelines, and that  
12 Mr. Pinslow was hoping to get the Commission's input on whether it would be considered  
13 "acceptable". He explained the situation.

14  
15 Commissioner Calkins noted that the house was 35-feet wide and inquired as to the lot  
16 width.

17  
18 Mr. Pinslow clarified that the lot width was 50-feet.

19  
20 Chairman Duistermars suggested that the project density should be discussed.

21  
22 Sue Fox, 3800 W. Thornton Ave., Hemet, California approached the lectern and advised  
23 the Commission that she would like to personally thank Mr. Pinslow who had personally  
24 met with she and her neighbors regarding their concerns with this development.

25  
26 The Commission thanked Mr. Pinslow for his presentation.

27  
28  
29 **VII. CONSENT CALENDAR**

30  
31 **A. MINUTES**

32 \_\_\_\_\_  
33 \_\_\_\_\_ 1. November 2, 2004

34  
35 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to  
36 approve the Consent Calendar as presented.

37  
38 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Rhoten and Searl

39 NOES: None

40 ABSTAIN: Vice Chairman Jones

41 ABSENT: None

1  
2 **VIII. UPDATE OF CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS ON PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS -**  
3 Update given by Planning Director Richard Masyczek  
4

5 There were no update items on the agenda.  
6  
7

8 **IX. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**  
9

10 There were no Planning Director items on the agenda.  
11  
12

13 **X. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**  
14

15 Vice Chairman Jones inquired regarding why the Lennar representative did not have a  
16 better understanding of the City's design guidelines before they had made their  
17 presentation.  
18

19 City Planner Running assured the Commission that the Lennar representatives understood  
20 the City's design guidelines very well.  
21

22 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.  
23

24 The Commission then embarked on a discussion regarding what they could do with  
25 projects that had already begun grading by the time that they appeared before the  
26 Commission.  
27  
28

29 **XI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**  
30

31 Vice Chairman Jones asked that a discussion of Groundwater tables and strip mall  
32 standards be placed on a future agenda.  
33

34 A discussion ensued regarding items being diverted from the City Council agendas that  
35 had been requested by the Planning Commission.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

1 **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

2  
3 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl, SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins and  
4 unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 8:13 p.m. to the regularly meeting of the City  
5 of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **January 18, 2005 at 6:00 p.m.** at the City  
6 of Hemet Council Chambers, 450 East Latham Avenue, Hemet, California 92543.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

12 \_\_\_\_\_  
13 Bob Duistermars, Chairman  
14 Hemet Planning Commission  
15

16 ATTEST:

17  
18  
19  
20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 Nancie Shaw, Minutes 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