



1 bid on March 20<sup>th</sup>, and that the Hemet High School renovation was already out to bid. She  
2 suggested that the school district was in for a very busy summer, with four schools under  
3 construction and various renovation projects to be completed. She gave a brief description of  
4 some of the renovation projects that would be completed over the summer, as well as some that  
5 are presently underway.  
6

7 Commissioner Calkins asked if the odd shape of Site No. 2 on the handout that Ms. Packham had  
8 distributed would present a problem.  
9

10 Ms. Packham responded that a portion of the site could possibly be used as a soccer field or  
11 something similar, but agreed that the shape did indeed count as a strike against the site.  
12

13 Ms. Packham concluded her report by advising the Commission that she would not be present at  
14 their meeting of March 4<sup>th</sup>, but would be attending the meeting of March 18<sup>th</sup>.  
15  
16

### 17 **III. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**

18 There were no amendments or additions to the agenda.  
19  
20  
21

### 22 **IV. CONSENT CALENDAR:**

#### 23 **A. MINUTES**

- 24 1. January 21, 2003  
25  
26  
27

28 Chairman Duistermars pulled the Minutes of January 21, 2003 from the Consent Calendar and  
29 asked that Page 6 of the Minutes, be amended to indicate "Questions on what types of  
30 maintenance would be funded by L&LMD's and what type would be funded by HOA's". He asked  
31 for a motion to approve the consent calendar with this amendment.  
32

33 It was **MOVED** by Commission Rhoten and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Calkins to approve the  
34 consent calendar as amended.  
35

36 The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote:  
37

38 **AYES:** Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Jones and Rhoten  
39 **NOES:** None  
40 **ABSTAIN:** None  
41 **ABSENT:** Vice Chairman Hicks  
42  
43

### 44 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS:**

#### 45 **A. MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT 02-20 - CHESHIRE FARMS**

46 **APPLICANT:** Rice Development  
47 **LOCATION:** North side of Lincoln Avenue between Meridian and Hemet  
48 Streets  
49

1 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni  
2 DESCRIPTION: A request for Planning Commission review and approval of  
3 the site development, architectural elevations, landscaping,  
4 and wall plans for Tentative Tract Map 30724.  
5

6 Planning Technician Domenigoni presented the staff report, explaining various details of the project  
7 to the Commission.  
8

9 Chairman Duistermars stated that in the drawing it appeared that there was a combination of brick  
10 and vinyl fencing. He asked if this was against City policy.  
11

12 Planning Technician Domenigoni responded that the map that corresponded with this  
13 Miscellaneous Project had been adopted before the policy that Chairman Duistermars was referring  
14 to had gone into effect. She also explained that the vinyl fencing was being proposed between  
15 homes.  
16

17 A discussion ensued regarding the location of the vinyl fencing.  
18

19 Planning Director Masyczek suggested the addition of a condition, stating that "*Split vinyl rail shall*  
20 *only be installed within the front side-yard....etc.*"  
21

22 Chairman Duistermars stated that he believed this would defeat the purpose of the original intent.  
23 He further stated that it was his understanding that the project was supposed to comply with any  
24 new policies and standards that had been adopted by the City.  
25

26 Planning Technician Domenigoni referred to Condition No. 18, which stated that "*alternative fencing*  
27 *would be reviewed for approval by the Planning Commission.*"  
28

29 A discussion ensued among the Commission.  
30

31 Chairman Duistermars stated that he did not want to end up with a situation that would become an  
32 issue for other developments.  
33

34 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that with the wording of Condition No. 18, the Commission  
35 had the option of individual review regarding the fencing.  
36

37 Chairman Duistermars asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak  
38 regarding the project.  
39

40 Blaine Womer of Blaine Womer Civil Engineering, 41555 E. Florida Ave., Hemet, California,  
41 approached the lectern as a representative for the applicant. He apologized for the absence of the  
42 applicant, Wendy Rice, who was unable to make the meeting due to a schedule conflict. He  
43 explained to the Commission that he knew that Ms. Rice was after a certain look with the split-rail  
44 fencing, and asked the Commission to consider approving this type of fencing. He pointed out  
45 where the front setbacks would be for the entryway monument.  
46

47 Commissioner Calkins indicated that according to the landscape plan it was shown as going all the  
48 way back to the garage, and that at least 10-12 feet of rail fencing was indicated.  
49

1 Mr. Womer stated that they would be happy to go with what the landscape architect had indicated  
2 on his plans.

3  
4 The Commission concurred that this would be acceptable.

5  
6 Mike Berry, 445 Michelle Lane, Hemet, California approached the lectern and stated that he was  
7 still concerned with the drainage issues that were raised at the public hearing for the map, claiming  
8 that since the project was still being worked on he continued to have no answers.

9  
10 City Engineer Trietsch approached the lectern and advised the Commission that the improvement  
11 and grading plans had not yet been submitted, but stated that the project was conditioned to  
12 require that the drainage problems of Michelle Lane would not be increased.

13  
14 Mr. Berry asked if this meant that water from the development would not be running down their  
15 street.

16  
17 Chairman Duistermars explained to Mr. Berry that it meant that the flow of water down Michelle  
18 Lane would not be any worse than the current flow.

19  
20 Mr. Berry asked if the developer would need to access his property, since the easement that was  
21 previously present had been voided some time ago.

22  
23 Mr. Womer advised the Commission that he had not had a chance to address this issue, but  
24 agreed that it did appear that the easement was no longer present, which would mean that they  
25 would have to work with the property owners for any development that would require access to their  
26 property.

27  
28 Commissioner Jones asked Acting Assistant City Attorney Morgan if, in her opinion, the  
29 Commission had done everything possible to satisfy the concerns of the homeowners.

30  
31 Ms. Morgan responded that if the project had been conditioned to require the drainage issues to  
32 be addressed, and the flow of water to not be increased, that the project would not be able to be  
33 approved if those conditions were not met and satisfied.

34  
35 Mr Berry suggested that since the easement was not accepted by the County of Riverside the City  
36 of Hemet would have to accept it.

37  
38 Planning Director Masyczek advised Mr. Berry that this Miscellaneous Project had been brought  
39 to the Commission strictly to review the architectural design of the project.

40  
41 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.

42  
43 It was MOVED by Commissioner Calkins and SECONDED by Commissioner Jones to adopt  
44 **Resolution No. 03-8** approving Miscellaneous Project 02-20.

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:  
2

3 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Jones and Rhoten  
4 NOES: None  
5 ABSTAIN: None  
6 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Hicks  
7

8  
9 **B. SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DESIGN GUIDELINES**

10 APPLICANT: City of Hemet  
11 LOCATION: City-wide  
12 PLANNER: Richard Masyczek  
13 DESCRIPTION: Proposed single-family residential design guidelines that  
14 would provide guidance on architectural details, landscaping,  
15 and walls and fences for projects in the City of Hemet.  
16

17 Planning Director Masyczek explained to the Commission the changes that had been made to the  
18 Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines. He referred to the attachments that indicated the  
19 changes to the issue of fencing and ground cover, and explained that the City Council had revised  
20 the conditions of approval to permit wood fencing and allow ground cover in addition to sod, and  
21 to promote xeriscape concepts.  
22

23 Chairman Duistermars stated that he had mixed emotions about moving forward with this item  
24 without the funding mechanism for public and private spaces being addressed.  
25

26 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the funding mechanism would be  
27 reviewed by the City Council again on February 25<sup>th</sup>. He further advised that the Council had  
28 directed him to bring the Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines back to them on February  
29 25<sup>th</sup> as well, stating that the Commission, of course, had the option of not recommending approval.  
30

31 Commissioner Calkins suggested that Planning Director Masyczek make sure that the City Council  
32 understands what the Planning Commission's concerns include.  
33

34 Planning Director Masyczek explained that there were some issues regarding the funding that  
35 needed to be researched, and stated that this was why the adoption had been postponed until  
36 February 25<sup>th</sup>. He suggested that it was desirable to get the guidelines in place as soon as  
37 possible.  
38

39 Chairman Duistermars stated that he felt it was important to have a funding mechanism in place.  
40

41 Commissioner Calkins commented that he didn't think the Commission had any choice on  
42 continuance of the guidelines.  
43

44 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that they could have the intent of  
45 recommending approval with the caveat that the Council first take action on the Funding  
46 Mechanism.  
47

48 It was MOVED by Commissioner Jones and SECONDED by Commission Rhoten to recommend  
49 approval, through minute order, of the attached Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines,  
50

1 following approval of the funding mechanism for private and public space.  
2

3 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:  
4

5 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Jones and Rhoten  
6 NOES: None  
7 ABSTAIN: None  
8 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Hicks  
9

10  
11 **VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**  
12

13 **A. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 02-9**

14 APPLICANT: Keystone Education and Youth Services  
15 LOCATION: 145 N. Tahquitz Street  
16 PLANNER: Maureen Losey  
17 DESCRIPTION: A conditional use permit to expand an existing school facility  
18 for the developmentally disabled to increase the student  
19 capacity from 48 to 168 by adding three (3) 24' x 60' modular  
20 units on property zoned S-1 (Church) and C-2 (Commercial).  
21

22 Assistant Planner Losey presented the staff report, advising the Commission of various details of  
23 the project. She referred to the issues that the Commission had brought up at the work study  
24 session on February 4<sup>th</sup>, and explained how the applicant was resolving some of those issues. She  
25 noted that the number of students from the City of Hemet that currently attend the school is 14, per  
26 the HUSD.  
27

28 A discussion ensued regarding the attendance of children from the Hemet Unified School District  
29 at the Keystone School.  
30

31 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:58 p.m.  
32

33 David Leonard, 1223 University Ave., Suite 240, Riverside, California, approached the lectern as  
34 a representative for the applicant. He expressed his appreciation of the staff's willingness to work  
35 with them, and advised the Commission that they had been very busy redesigning the project in  
36 an effort to address the concerns that were expressed previously. He introduced Dina Driskill as  
37 a representative for the school. He addressed the conditions of approval for the project, stating  
38 that the applicant was in agreement with all of the conditions. He referred to the elevations, and  
39 stated that the applicant was committed to providing a stucco finish to the new buildings, which was  
40 not indicated in the elevations. Regarding the students in attendance at the school, he explained  
41 that a majority of them come from the City of San Jacinto, at a figure of 22, while the figure from  
42 the City of Hemet has increased by two students since the preparation of the staff report, bringing  
43 the figure to 16. He went on to explain the various ways that they were attempting to address and  
44 satisfy the Commission's concerns.  
45

46 Commissioner Jones brought up the fact that a representative from the Hemet Unified School  
47 District had stated that the students from their district would be phased out in the future.  
48

49 Mr. Leonard responded that even if this were to happen, the need for the school would continue

1 to exist for other school districts.  
2  
3

4 Commissioner Calkins referred to a letter that had been distributed to the Commission, stating that  
5 the letter indicated that sprinklers would be added, but that it did not indicate whether they were  
6 lawn sprinklers or fire sprinklers.  
7

8 Mr. Leonard confirmed that both would be added.  
9

10 Commissioner Rhoten inquired about the area of permanent residence for the school's employees.  
11

12 Ms. Driskill responded that the school staff members resided in various areas, but explained that  
13 a majority of them were from the Hemet-San Jacinto Valley.  
14

15 Jill Hussar, 25462 Browca St., Hemet, California, approached the lectern and addressed the  
16 Commission, stating that she has a daughter who attends Keystone School. She explained to the  
17 Commission that her daughter is unable to attend public school and that she did not know what she  
18 would do if the school were not available locally.  
19

20 Commissioner Jones explained to Ms. Hussar that he while he does agree that the school meets  
21 a need of the valley at the present time, his concern is with the expansion of the facility to bring in  
22 students from other areas.  
23

24 Ms. Hussar gave some additional reasons why she felt the project should be approved.  
25

26 Dr. Wanda Driskill approached the lectern and advised the Commission that she had been with  
27 Keystone Schools for 9 years as the Vice President of Development. She provided the  
28 Commission with information on some of the things that would be done with the new modular  
29 buildings. She explained that each classroom would have a restroom adjacent to it, and that  
30 laundry facilities and shower facilities would be installed to provide any necessary laundering of  
31 clothing that might get soiled by children who are not toilet-trained, as well as the bathing of those  
32 children. She advised the Commission that she had spoken with Gary Goldamer of the Hemet  
33 Unified School District, and had explained to him that these types of facilities were going to be  
34 provided. She stated that Mr. Goldamer had responded to her that with these types of facilities  
35 being available at the school, he would very likely be sending them more students that had a need  
36 for such facilities. She further stated that they would also be providing jobs to various people from  
37 the valley.  
38

39 Commissioner Rhoten inquired about the life expectancy of the modular buildings.  
40

41 Ms. Driskill stated that she was not certain of the life expectancy, but assured the Commission that  
42 they would keep the modular buildings in the best of repair.  
43

44 Mr. Leonard expressed his appreciation for the Commission's concern with the issues that had  
45 been mentioned, assuring them that they were willing to comply and cooperate with the  
46 Commission in any way that they could, and hoped the Commission would consider approval.  
47

48 Acting Assistant City Attorney Morgan advised the Commission that it was not a legal, rational  
49 basis to deny the project based solely on the fact that children were coming from areas outside the

1 City. She explained that they would have to include some sort of safety issue as a basis for denial,  
2 and that she wanted the Commission to understand the law and refrain from making their decision  
3 based on anything other than what was lawful.  
4

5  
6 Commissioner Jones expressed his adamant opposition to the project, and expressed his concern  
7 with the fact that there was a county facility nearby for the mentally disturbed, as well as an  
8 alternative education school.  
9

10 Chairman Duistermars asked Mr. Leonard if he knew where the County facility was.  
11

12 Leonard stated that he was not sure of the location.  
13

14 Commissioner Jones stated that there were two schools of concern  
15

16 Ms. Driskill conveyed her appreciation for the concern of the students, but explained that they are  
17 and will continue to be supervised at all times and that the campus is completely fenced to make  
18 sure that they are kept safe, with the vans transporting the children from curb to curb.  
19

20 Chairman Duistermars asked if the buildings that were proposed for installation had been checked  
21 for safety.  
22

23 Ms. Driskill responded that the buildings were brand new, state certified, and would be approved  
24 before they are brought onto the campus.  
25

26 Chairman Duistermars asked if any of the buildings would be utilized to relieve some of the  
27 overcrowding that had been previously mentioned.  
28

29 Ms. Driskill respnded that the buildings would be utilized for various purposes. She stated that one  
30 of the reasons included the allowance of toilet needs to be better provided for. She explained that  
31 a sensory room would be included for autistic children, but that the new buildings were primarily  
32 geared towards the more severely handicapped students.  
33

34 Chairman Duistermars asked if any security efforts were being provided for to keep outsiders from  
35 coming and mingling with the students on campus.  
36

37 Ms. Driskill responded that the school staff is on high alert at all times and that no children are ever  
38 left unsupervised. She explained that the only gate that is left open is the gate that goes to the  
39 office, and that all visitors are required to sign in.  
40

41 Commissioner Rhoten inquired regarding how many other communities have similar schools  
42

43 Ms. Driskill provided the Commission with a verbal list of the various communities that house similar  
44 schools.  
45

46 Miranda Whitman, 25462 Browca St. approached the lectern as a student of Keystone School and  
47 stated that she was in support of the expansion because there are many kids who need this type  
48 of school. She added that at public schools there are a lot of kids that don't understand the type  
49 of children that attend Keystone.

1 Ms. Driskill addressed the Commission, stating that there will always be a need for the type of  
2 school that Keystone provides, and that public schools are simply unable to accommodate the  
3 severely handicapped children that Keystone is equipped to care for. She added that both a  
4 therapist and a nurse are included in their staff.  
5

6 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 7:34 p.m. He stated that he did not share  
7 Commissioner Jones' concern regarding students coming from other areas, but that he did have  
8 a concern with the portable buildings, since there is an ongoing desire to improve the downtown  
9 area. He asked if a time limit on the portable buildings could be mandated.  
10

11 Acting Assistant City Attorney Morgan responded that it could.  
12

13 Commissioner Rhoten said that it was her understanding that the portable buildings would be  
14 permanent.  
15

16 A discussion ensued regarding the life span of the portable buildings.  
17

18 Sandy Packham advised the Commission that the buildings that had been uninstalled at the Hemet  
19 Elementary school site were originally placed there in 1983, and were in fairly bad shape. She  
20 added that this could have been from lack of maintenance. She suggested that the quality of the  
21 buildings that are being manufactured now are different from the older buildings. She advised the  
22 Commission, however, that her ability to advise on the quality of the building would depend on what  
23 type of building they were installing.  
24

25 Chairman Duistermars asked if it would not be a better idea to consider installing permanent  
26 buildings.  
27

28 Mr. Leonard responded that one of the problems with this concept is that the expansion was  
29 needed immediately, as well as the fact that the school did not have the funds that would be  
30 needed for permanent structures. He added that if a time limit on the modular buildings must be  
31 established, the school would be happy to work with the Commission on this issue.  
32

33 Commissioner Rhoten asked if the school would proceed with a 10-year time limit on the modular  
34 buildings.  
35

36 Mr. Leonard responded that it would.  
37

38 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that the following conditions be added to the conditions of  
39 approval:  
40

- 41 1) ***“This conditional use permit is valid for 10 years from the effective date of***  
42 ***approval, and shall then become null and void unless a subsequent***  
43 ***conditional use permit is approved by the Planning Commission.”***
- 44 2) ***“The applicant shall reimburse the City of Hemet on a cost recovery basis for***  
45 ***the annual inspection of said facility, beginning one year from the effective***  
46 ***date of approval.***  
47  
48

49 The Commission concurred with the added conditions.

1 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.

2  
3 It was MOVED by Commissioner Calkins and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to adopt  
4 **Resolution No. 03-10** approving Conditional Use Permit 02-9 as amended.

5  
6 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

7  
8 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Jones and Rhoten  
9 NOES: None  
10 ABSTAIN: None  
11 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Hicks  
12

13 **B. ZONE CHANGE 02-4 & ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 03-1**

14 APPLICANT: Lee Entitlements  
15 AGENT: Jeff Petrus  
16 LOCATION: Sanderson and Cawston Avenues, between Fruitvale and  
17 Eaton Avenues  
18 PLANNER: Maureen Losey  
19 DESCRIPTION: A request for a zone change from A-1-C (Light-Agricultural)  
20 and A-2-C (Heavy-Agricultural) to R-1 (Single-Family  
21 Residential) and OS (Open Space) on 65 acres of vacant  
22 land.  
23

24 Assistant Planner Losey presented the staff report explaining various details of the project to the  
25 Commission. She advised the Commission that some communications had been received  
26 regarding the environmental assessment of the project, which had been included in the staff report,  
27 and for which responses had been distributed to the Commission this evening.  
28

29 Commissioner Calkins asked what the zone was for the notch on the map that was not included  
30 in the proposed zone change.  
31

32 Ms. Losey responded that it had an Agricultural zoning designation.  
33

34 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 7:48 p.m.  
35

36 Jeff Petrus of Lee Entitlements, 1550 Amherst Ave., West Los Angeles, California approached the  
37 lectern and referred to some of the similar projects that had been approved in the surrounding  
38 areas. He explained that he was proposing 3.34 dwelling units per acre. He then advised the  
39 Commission that the owner of the 9.55 acre notch that was not included in the zone change had  
40 a concern with the type of fencing that would be separating his property from the proposed  
41 subdivision.  
42

43 A discussion of the fencing ensued.  
44

45 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 7:52 p.m., and since there were no questions,  
46 asked for a motion.  
47

48 It was MOVED by Commissioner Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to adopt  
49 **Resolution No. 03-3EA** recommending to the City Council approval of Environmental Assessment

1 No. 03-1.  
2

3 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:  
4

5 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Jones and Rhoten  
6 NOES: None  
7 ABSTAIN: None  
8 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Hicks  
9

10 It was MOVED by Commissioner Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to adopt  
11 **Resolution No. 03-9** recommending to the City Council approval of Zone Change 02-4.  
12

13 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:  
14

15 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Jones and Rhoten  
16 NOES: None  
17 ABSTAIN: None  
18 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Hicks  
19  
20

21 **VII. WORK STUDY:**  
22

23 **A. VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 30560 - Maureen Losey**

24 A Tentative Tract Map to subdivide 65 acres into 199 lots on property proposed to  
25 be zoned R-1 (Single Family) located on the west side of Sanderson between  
26 Eaton and Fruitvale.  
27

28 Assistant Planner Losey opened the work study session by advising the Commission that the  
29 applicant had moved the paseo area within the project. She turned over the session to the agent.  
30

31 Jeff Petrus of Lee Entitlements, 1550 Amherst Ave. West Los Angeles, California approached the  
32 lectern as the agent for the project. He explained that he had been working with the Commission  
33 for the past 14 months on the residential design guidelines through participation in the Community  
34 Development Committee (CDC), and commended the City on the outcome. He described the  
35 changes that he had made to the design of the proposed map since the last work study session  
36 that was held. He stated that he believed that most of the issues between himself and the Planning  
37 Commission had been resolved. He discussed the issues of maintenance and what portion of it  
38 would be funded by an L&LMD versus a HOA. He explained why his paseo had been modified,  
39 and discussed the issue of public space vs. private space relative to maintenance. He described  
40 the entryway features, and addressed the privacy concern of the property owner of the notch of  
41 land that lies in the middle of the property which is excluded from his project. He stated that he had  
42 discussed the issue with the property owner, and that he would be providing a six-foot block wall  
43 to separate that property from the subdivision, which was agreeable with the property owner. He  
44 inquired regarding whether the Commission planned to deem the Open Space areas as public or  
45 private spaces.  
46

47 Chairman Duistermars responded that this issue would probably be resolved once the funding  
48 mechanism was put in place by the City Council. He added that it was his belief that the Planning  
49 Commission should be the designated body to make the finding for which areas are public space

1 and which are private space.  
2

3 A discussion ensued regarding what would be deemed as public and private space relative to the  
4 issue of public access off of the scenic highway.  
5  
6  
7

8 Mr. Petrus stated that if the open space areas are deemed to be private space, he felt that the  
9 access off of the scenic highway should be closed, adding that if it were opened, it should be  
10 deemed public space and maintenance should be funded under a L&LMD.  
11

12 Commissioner Calkins asked if there were any possibility on adding more length to the park near  
13 Lot A.  
14

15 Mr. Petrus responded that he would like to make the 7,200 square-foot lot bigger and reduce the  
16 8,800 square-foot lot, which would allow him to increase the walkway for the park.  
17

18 Commissioner Calkins expressed his concern with the length of Street "A" becoming a raceway.  
19

20 Mr. Petrus responded that he had proposed a narrowing of the street, and that the Traffic  
21 Commission did not see this as a problem.  
22

23 A discussion ensued regarding the modification of lot sizes.  
24

25 Planning Director Masyczek explained that with the larger lot situation the amenity is provided  
26 through the lot itself. He added that while every developer wants to maximize lot yield, not much  
27 can then be done to avoid monotony. He suggested that this could be avoided through the correct  
28 design of the buildings, stating that the question would be how to deal with this issue within a linear  
29 project.  
30

31 Mr. Petrus stated that he had not tried to maximize lot yield. He explained that he had tried to  
32 make the lots as large and as wide as possible, and that he could have maximized by another 25  
33 to 30 lots if he had chosen to do so, but that it was his understanding that the Planning Commission  
34 did not want to see 7,200 square-foot lots exclusively, but in fact would prefer even larger lot sizes,  
35 which he has provided in this project. He added that this particular site was not suited for the more  
36 "curva-linear" project that the Planning Commission is partial to.  
37

38 The Commission thanked Mr. Petrus for his presentation.  
39

40 **B. VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 30558 (LENNAR HOMES, INC.) -**

41 Matthew Bassi

42 A work study for the review of a proposed 387-lot single-family residential  
43 subdivision (previously owned by Pacific Century Homes) located at the southeast  
44 corner of Fisher and Harrison Avenues within the Page Ranch Specific Plan.  
45

46 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the project at hand was the former  
47 Cottonwood Ranch that had been work studied before the Commission by Pacific Century Homes  
48 some time ago. He explained that Pacific Century Homes had merged with Lennar Homes, who  
49 was now moving forward with the project. He described some of the details of the proposed

1 subdivision, including the various parks, and paseo and walkway systems. He stated that his  
2 concern was with the length of some of the streets and the straightness of those streets, which he  
3 had discussed with the project engineer.  
4

5 Jim Unland of Unland & Associates, 3550 E. Florida Ave., Hemet, California approached the lectern  
6 as the project engineer. He explained the changes that had been made from when the project had  
7 been previously work studied. He addressed the concern with the streets going through existing  
8 subdivisions, which had been an issue during a past tract map submittal for the same lot, stating  
9 that in order to avoid any conflict with the residents of those existing subdivisions, those streets  
10 would be turned into cul-de-sacs. He addressed the issue of the long streets, advising the  
11 Commission that there had been discussion of installing some traffic calming mechanisms to  
12 alleviate potential problems with these streets.  
13

14 Commissioner Calkins asked if the cul-de-sacs for the existing subdivisions would be constructed  
15 by Lennar Homes.  
16

17 Mr. Unland responded that they would.  
18

19 Commissioner Calkins added that this was very gracious of them.  
20

21 A discussion of pocket parks ensued.  
22

23 Commissioner Jones inquired regarding how the bottom portion of the triangular section of the  
24 subdivision could be cut off.  
25

26 Mr. Unland explained that traffic calming mechanisms were being contemplated.  
27

28 Planning Director Masyczek suggested the installation of islands.  
29

30 Mr. Unland stated that this could be a possibility, but that they were also considering narrowing the  
31 streets and enhancing the rights-of-way.  
32

33 Chairman Duistermars asked if the project would be subject to the Single-Family Residential  
34 Design Guidelines.  
35

36 Planning Director Masyczek responded that implementation of the guidelines for this and other  
37 projects was a primary reason that staff was so anxious to get the Single-Family Design Guidelines  
38 approved by the City Council. He advised the Commission that this particular project application  
39 had not yet been accepted as complete, so there was a good chance that it would be subject to the  
40 guidelines.  
41

42 Discussion of the lot sizes, open space areas and vehicular access ensued.  
43

44 Mr. Unland stated that they were still manipulating the design a bit.  
45

46 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the provision of vehicle parking in the park area.  
47

48 Mr. Unland responded that there was no provision for parking.  
49

1 Chairman Duistermars suggested that they may want to consider adding some.  
2

3 Planning Director Masyczek explained that if lots under 7,200 square-feet were being proposed a  
4 certain amount of privately maintained open space would need to be provided, and that this project,  
5 as submitted, would fall under a Home Owner's Association (HOA).  
6

7 A discussion of public and private space relative to small-lot development ensued.  
8

9 Mr. Unland stated that they were hoping to avoid implementing an HOA.  
10

11 The Commission suggested that the applicant work with the Planning Department staff to resolve  
12 any issues that would require them to do this, and to work on hooking the parks together. They  
13 thanked Mr. Unland for his presentation.  
14

15 It was MOVED by Commissioner Jones, SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten and unanimously  
16 approved to extend the Planning Commission meeting beyond the 9:00 p.m. limit.  
17

- 18 **C. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 03-2 (ABILITY FIRST) - Loretta Domenigoni**  
19 A work study for the review of an 18-unit disabled housing project located on the  
20 north side of Acacia Avenue approximately 130-feet east of San Jacinto Avenue.  
21

22 Planning Director Masyczek approached the lectern and explained some of the details of the  
23 proposed work study, including the fact that the City Council was continuing to support the project.  
24 He stated that one of the issues was with the provision of emergency access, and that Battalion  
25 Chief Dave Van Verst was present at the meeting to address this issue. He further advised that  
26 the applicant had been asked to provide some parking analysis. He stated that another issue had  
27 arisen regarding the need for this type of facility within the City of Hemet, explaining that the 2000  
28 census had established that there were in excess of 15,000 developmentally disabled persons  
29 residing within the City, which supported the fact that there was indeed a need for this type of  
30 housing. He discussed the neighborhoods surrounding the proposed project, and how they would  
31 blend together. He advised the Commission that both the applicant and architect were present to  
32 answer any questions that the Commission might have.  
33

34 Noelle Sweitzer, 3460 South Broadway, Los Angeles, California approached the lectern and  
35 introduced herself as the project applicant, and John Matlow as the architect for the project.  
36

37 John Matlow, 2536 Vermont Ave., Los Angeles, California approached the lectern and described  
38 some of the various details of the project relative to parking, facility location, elevations,  
39 architecture, landscaping, setbacks, provision of amenities and more. He explained that the large  
40 setbacks on the east and the north would be used as extensive patios and garden areas.  
41

42 The Commission thanked Mr. Matlow for his presentation.  
43

44 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding emergency access.  
45

46 Fire Department Battalion Chief Van Verst approached the lectern and advised the Commission  
47 that there had originally been some concerns regarding this issue, but that some mitigation  
48 measures had been developed that would resolve the problem with traffic gridlock after the  
49 dismissal of Acacia Middle School in the afternoon.

1 Chairman Duistermars asked if there were any possibility of purchasing one of the adjacent homes  
2 to allow for access off of Acacia Avenue.

3  
4 Ms. Sweitzer advised the Commission that HUD would not allow for the addition of any more  
5 property to the project.

6  
7 Chairman Duistermars asked Battalion Chief Van Verst if they could red-line the curbs on both  
8 sides of the driveway to keep the space open for emergency access.

9  
10  
11 A discussion of the turnaround area indicated in the project plans ensued, and Chairman  
12 Duistermars asked if it were designed for emergency access.

13  
14 Battalion Chief Van Verst responded that it was and that he had worked with Mr. Matlow to come  
15 up with that turnaround area.

16  
17 Chairman Duistermars inquired as to whether the units would be owned or rented.

18  
19 Ms. Sweitzer responded that they would be rented and that there would be a covenant use for 40  
20 years for this specific disabled housing.

21  
22 Planning Director Masyczek added that even after 40 years the facility would not be able to revert  
23 to a regular apartment use, as it would be specifically designed as housing for the physically  
24 disabled.

25  
26 Chairman Duistermars asked if there would be on-site management.

27  
28 Ms. Sweitzer responded that there would.

29  
30 Discussion of where the on-site manager would be located ensued, and Mr. Matlow explained that  
31 the manager would reside in one of the central units so that they would be easily accessible to all  
32 residents.

33  
34 Chairman Duistermars inquired about the perimeter fencing.

35  
36 Mr. Matlow responded that wrought iron fencing was being proposed.

37  
38 Chairman Duistermars asked if there were guidelines in place for this type of project.

39  
40 Planning Director Masyczek stated that there were, and that the fencing would have to be either  
41 block wall or wrought iron.

42  
43 The Commission thanked Ms. Sweitzer and Mr. Matlow for their presentation.

44  
45  
46 **VIII. DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**

47  
48 **A. TW2'S - "THE WEEK THAT WAS"**

49

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6

1. February 7, 2003

Planning Director Masyczek asked if there were any questions.

The Commission responded that there were none.

1                   **B.     RECENT CITY COUNCIL ACTION**  
2

3                   1.       Wood Fences vs. Block Walls  
4

5     Planning Director Masyczek explained to the Commission that he had advised the Council of the  
6     Commission's concerns with wood fencing and its deterioration. He stated that he believed the  
7     Council was concerned with the various costs of TUMF and other items that were being imposed  
8     on the development community, and that they did not want to impose further costs through the  
9     requirement of block walls. He assured the Commission that the Council had mandated that any  
10    wood fencing needed to be of a high quality.  
11

12    A discussion ensued regarding the issue of wood fencing.  
13

14                  2.       Funding for Maintenance of Public and Private Areas  
15

16    Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the Funding for Maintenance of Public  
17    and Private Areas had been continued from the February 11, 2003 City Council meeting to the  
18    meeting of February 25, 2003.  
19

20  
21                  **IX.     PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION**  
22

23    The Commission discussed the possibility of future annexations and their locations.  
24

25    Commissioner Jones requested that staff let the City Council know that the Commission would like  
26    to sit down with them to discuss just how far the city was going relative to development.  
27

28    A discussion ensued regarding the evolvment of the community and the elements that have  
29    invaded it which are detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of the residents.  
30

31    Chairman Duistermars suggested that the Commission should be given some idea of what findings  
32    should be made to deny a project, as they have no legal background to assist them in making  
33    these findings.  
34

35    Acting Assistant City Attorney Morgan responded that staff should be making those findings, and  
36    that the Commission should continue any items that require these findings in order to allow staff  
37    to come back with a report that would include them.  
38

39  
40                  **X.     FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**  
41

42    Commissioner Calkins requested that a future agenda include a discussion on Paseos vs.  
43    Backyards vs. Public Streets.  
44  
45  
46

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

**XI. ADJOURNMENT:** It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten, SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins, and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 9:28 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for Tuesday, March 4, 2003 at 6:00 p.m. to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet, California 92543.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Duistermars, Chairman

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary