

1 CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

2
3 TUESDAY, MARCH 18, 2003

4
5 THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION WAS
6 CONVENED BY CHAIRMAN DUISTERMARS ON TUESDAY, MARCH 18, 2003 AT 6:01
7 P.M. AT THE CITY OF HEMET COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 450 EAST LATHAM AVENUE,
8 HEMET, CALIFORNIA.

9
10 Roll Call: Chairman Bob Duistermars and Commissioners Jim Calkins, Nick
11 Jones and Mayzelle Rhoten

12
13 Absent: Vice Chairman B.R. Hicks

14
15 Staff Present: Principal Planner Matthew Bassi, Planning Technician Loretta
16 Domenigoni, Assistant Planner Maureen Losey, Planning
17 Director Richard Masyczek, Minutes Secretary Nancie Shaw, City
18 Engineer Roland Trietsch and Assistant City Attorney Eric Vail

19
20 Invocation and Flag Salute: Chairman Duistermars

21
22
23 I. PUBLIC COMMENTS: Anyone who wishes to address the Commission regarding
24 items not on the agenda may do so at this time. Please line up at the lectern when
25 the Chair asks if there are any communications from the public. **When you are**
26 **recognized, please give your name, spelling of last name, and address for**
27 **accurate recording in the minutes.**

28
29 There were no members of the public who wished to address the Commission.

30
31
32 II. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE: Report given by HUSD
33 Director of Facilities, Sandy Packham.

34
35 There was no update given due to the absence of Sandy Packham.

36
37
38 III. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA

39
40 It was agreed that since Chairman Duistermars needed to leave the meeting for a short
41 period to attend to a prior committment, and since there were only four Commissioners
42 present for this meeting, and since Commissioner Calkins would need to excuse himself

43
44
45

Planning Commission Minutes
March 18, 2003

1
2 for the public hearing of Agenda Item No. VI. B., that this item – Zone Change No. 02-5 –
3 would be postponed until Chairman Duistermars re-joined the meeting.
4

5
6 **IV. CONSENT CALENDAR:**
7

8 There were no items on the consent calendar for approval.
9

10
11 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS:**
12

13 There were no public meeting items to be reviewed by the Commission.
14

15
16 **VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**
17

18 Chairman Duistermars excused himself from the meeting at 6:04 p.m. to attend to a prior
19 commitment, stating that he would return within the hour to finish the meeting. He turned
20 the meeting over to Commissioner Jones.
21

22 **A. VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31146 & ENVIRONMENTAL**
23 **ASSESSMENT NO. 03-5**

24 APPLICANT: Chuck Treatsch, Corman Leigh Properties
25 LOCATION: Northeast corner of Warren Road and Devonshire
26 Avenue (APN: 455-120-013 & 055)
27 PLANNER: Matthew Bassi, Principal Planner
28 DESCRIPTION: A proposal to subdivide 28.79 acres into 105 parcels for
29 the future development of 103 single-family residential
30 dwelling units on property zoned R-1-7.2 (Single-Family
31 Residential).
32

33 Principal Planner Bassi advised the Commission that staff was requesting a continuance
34 of this item in order to deal with some environmental issues.
35

36 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
37 continue the item to a date uncertain.
38

39 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
40

41 AYES: Commissioners Calkins, Jones and Rhoten
42 NOES: None
43

1 ABSTAIN: None
2 ABSENT: Chairman Duistermars and Vice Chairman Hicks

3
4
5 **C. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 03-2**

6 APPLICANT: Michael Culton
7 LOCATION: North side of Acacia Avenue, one parcel east of San
8 Jacinto Street (APN: 445-321-020 & 024)
9 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni, Planning Technician
10 DESCRIPTION: A request for the development of a two-story, 18-unit
11 affordable housing complex for the disabled on property
12 zoned R-3 (Multiple-Family Residential).
13

14 Planning Technician Domenigoni presented the staff report explaining some details of the
15 proposal. She displayed a map indicating the project design, and advised the Commission
16 that Condition No. 72 should be amended to read:

17
18 ***“Prior to final inspection for single-family residential or prior to the***
19 ***issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for all other Development, ‘No***
20 ***Parking - Fire Lane’ signs and red curbing shall be provided to the***
21 ***specifications of the City of Hemet Fire Chief in accordance with the***
22 ***California Fire Code Section 901.4 and 902.1 and Section 22500.1 of the***
23 ***California Vehicle Code.”***

24
25 A discussion ensued regarding block walls and the issue of the project being designated
26 as an “affordable” housing project.

27
28 Commissioner Jones asked if the development would qualify to meet the requirements for
29 the mandated affordable housing that the City must provide.

30
31 Planning Director Masyczek responded that it would.

32
33 Commissioner Jones opened the public hearing at 6:12 p.m.

34
35 Since there were no members of the public who wished to address the Commission,
36 Commissioner Jones closed the public hearing at 6:12 p.m.

37
38 Commissioner Calkins commented on the architecture being a bit extreme for the City of
39 Hemet, and the fact that the location was not ideal for a new housing development.

40
41 A brief discussion followed regarding these issues.
42
43
44

1 Commissioner Jones asked for a motion.

2

3 It was MOVED by Commissioner Calkins and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
4 adopt **Resolution No. 03-12** approving Conditional Use Permit No. 03-2.

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

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

2
3 AYES: Commissioners Calkins, Jones and Rhoten

4 NOES: None

5 ABSTAIN: None

6 ABSENT: Chairman Duistermars and Vice Chairman Hicks

7
8 **D. VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 30560**

9 APPLICANT: Jeff Petrus, Lee Entitlements

10 LOCATION: West side of Sanderson Avenue between Fruitvale and
11 Eaton Avenues (APN: 441-060-009, 020, 021, 022 &
12 024)

13 PLANNER: Maureen Losey, Assistant Planner

14 DESCRIPTION: A request to subdivide 65 acres into 199 lots for the
15 future development of single-family homes on property
16 zoned R-1 (Single-Family Residential) and OS (Open
17 Space).

18
19 Assistant Planner Losey presented the staff report stating that the project had been work
20 studied before the Commission a number of times and that if the Commission did not have
21 any questions, staff would like to recommend that the Airport Land Use Commission's
22 proposed Conditions of Approval be added to the conditions for the project which were
23 indicated in the revised Conditions of Approval that had been distributed to the
24 Commission prior to the meeting.

25
26 Assistant City Attorney Vail inquired regarding the revised Conditions of Approval, asking
27 if the ALUC conditions were included in the revised conditions.

28
29 Assistant Planner Losey responded that they were, indicating that Condition Nos. 120
30 through 123 represented the ALUC's recommended conditions.

31
32 Commissioner Jones opened the public hearing at 6:20 p.m.

33
34 Jeff Petrus of Lee Entitlements, 1550 Amherst Ave. Suite 101, West Los Angeles,
35 approached the lectern and advised the Commission that he concurred with all of the
36 conditions of approval that were required for the project.

37
38 Commissioner Jones closed the public hearing at 6:21 p.m.

39
40 Assistant City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that there was some conflict with
41 ALUC Condition No. 120 and City Standard Condition No. 32. He suggested that
42 Condition No. 120 should be eliminated and Condition No. 32 should be kept as written.

1 The Commission concurred.

2
3 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
4 adopt **Resolution No. 03-11** approving Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 30560.

5
6 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

7
8 AYES: Commissioners Calkins, Jones and Rhoten

9 NOES: None

10 ABSTAIN: None

11 ABSENT: Chairman Duistermars and Vice Chairman Hicks

12
13
14 **VII. WORK STUDY:**

15
16 **A. VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 30969 (RELATED TO ZONE**
17 **CHANGE NO. 02-5) - Matthew Bassi**

18 A subdivision of 10-acres into 38 lots for future single-family residential
19 development located at the northeast corner of Hemet Street and Berkley
20 Avenue.

21
22 This item was presented in concurrence with Zone Change No. 02-5.

23
24 **B. RANCHO DIAMANTE - Richard Masyczek**

25 A PowerPoint presentation to be given by Benchmark Pacific regarding the
26 revised Specific Plan for Rancho Diamante (Page Ranch), which has been
27 coordinated with the Hwy. 79 right-of-way study.

28
29 Doug Avis of Benchmark Pacific, 550 Laguna Drive Suite B, Carlsbad, approached the
30 lectern and advised the Commission that he would need a few minutes to set up his
31 PowerPoint presentation.

32
33 The Commission agreed to take a short break at 6:29 p.m.

34
35 The meeting resumed at 6:34 p.m.

36
37 Mr. Avis began his presentation by displaying a vicinity map of the project known as
38 "Rancho Diamante", followed by maps showing the existing and proposed circulation. He
39 discussed Warren Rd. in relation to the project, and described some of the changes that
40 had been made to the project design. He discussed the proposed realignment of Highway
41 79 and how it could relate to the project. He displayed a proposed Land Use Plan which
42 included Highway 79 with the currently proposed realignment. He explained some of the
43

1 reasons that they had chosen this particular design for the project, stating that they were
2 trying to make the project very pedestrian oriented. He indicated where the parks and
3 paseos were planned to be located within the project, and showed which areas included
4
5 the higher densities and which included the lower densities. He summarized the project,
6 explaining that there would be a total of 3,210 homes, with 2,650 of them being single-
7 family and 560 being multiple-family on 629 acres of land, at 4.4 du/ac density for the
8 single-family section. He displayed an aerial photograph of the property that included
9 major adjacent land features and uses. He indicated where within the project a small
10 commercial center would be located, explaining that it would possibly include a small food
11 market and pharmacy that the neighborhood residents could conveniently utilize. He then
12 went into a discussion of the landscaping and advised the Commission that it would be
13 paid for by a Lighting & Landscaping Maintenance District (L&LMD).

14
15 A discussion ensued regarding traffic and the Highway 79 realignment relative to Rancho
16 Diamante.

17
18 Mr. Avis continued his presentation by explaining his proposed "Patio Home Lotting
19 Concept". He displayed a drawing indicating this concept. He then displayed some
20 photos of his proposed "Multi-Family Product", explaining that the photos represented
21 some of the things that could be done with multiple-family design. He displayed a photo
22 of a "Mixed Use" product and a school site within a project that had been designed by his
23 company, and advised the Commission that they were hoping to provide something similar.
24 He displayed a drawing of the Community Park and Community Center, and gave a
25 detailed explanation of what these areas would include. He advised the Commission that
26 a HOA for the community would maintain these areas, so there would be no expense to
27 the City. He suggested that they would propose, in lieu of fees, to actually build the park
28 and turn it over to the City at a later date, after perhaps a year or so of operation. He
29 displayed a photo of a Community Center that had been designed and built by his
30 company, which was located in Carlsbad, so that the Commission would have an idea of
31 what kind of building design they might expect. He indicated how the outdoor area of the
32 community center included a fireplace and tables for residents to congregate, as well as
33 a community pool. He then displayed a drawing of the MWD Aqueduct Linear Park and
34 gave some details of what they were proposing to include along this area of the project.
35 He showed some photos of linear parks in other projects that his company had developed.
36 He displayed a drawing of the second level of parks, known as the "Neighborhood Parks",
37 explaining that they would also be maintained under L&LMD's. He displayed photos of the
38 "pocket park" concepts in other projects that his company had developed, explaining that
39 the proposed pocket parks were the 3rd level of parks and that they would be maintained
40 by a HOA. He displayed some photos of "Parkway Concepts" as well as of "Primary and
41 Secondary Entry Statements Concepts". He displayed a photo of the "Transit Station
42 Concept" in Carlsbad, suggesting that if the Metrolink is ever brought into Hemet, they
43

1 could develop something similar.

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

1 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the reason for the workshop was
2 because Mr. Avis was getting ready to submit his plan for review within the next 45 days.
3 He stated that it would probably take about 9 months for final approval to be granted.
4

5 The Commission thanked Mr. Avis for his presentation.
6
7

8 **VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONTINUED)**
9

10 **B. ZONE CHANGE NO. 02-5/ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 03-6**

11 APPLICANT: Mr. Sumer Vardhan, Kalpesh Homes, Inc.
12 LOCATION: Northeast corner of Hemet Street and Berkley Avenue
13 (APN: 551-050-007)
14 PLANNER: Matthew Bassi, Principal Planner
15 DESCRIPTION: A proposal to change the zoning on a 10-acre parcel
16 from the existing classification of A-1-C (Light-
17 Agricultural) to R-1 (Single-Family Residential).
18

19 Chairman Duistermars re-joined the meeting at 7:07 p.m. and Commissioner Jones turned
20 the meeting back over to him.
21

22 Commissioner Calkins excused himself from consideration of this project due to a conflict
23 of interest.
24

25 Matthew Bassi presented the staff report, explaining some of the details of the project. He
26 displayed a map indicating the zoning designations of surrounding neighborhoods. He
27 indicated what the development standards were for the current A-1-C zone and the
28 proposed R-1 zone. He advised the Commission that staff had arranged a meeting with
29 the homeowners who resided on Smith Road, stating that 3 of the 4 homeowners had been
30 able to attend. He explained that the number of proposed lots had been changed from 8
31 to 7 as a result of the meeting. He discussed some of the concerns that the homeowners
32 had expressed, and how the applicant was proposing to address those concerns. He
33 advised the Commission that the homeowners had concluded that any development of the
34 site under the R-1 zoning classification would have negative impacts to their property.
35

36 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 7:18 p.m.
37

38 Mike Duffin, 748 Smith Road, Hemet, approached the lectern and addressed the
39 Commission as an adjacent property owner to the proposed project. He stated that he was
40 opposed to the change of zone from A-1-C to R-1. He explained that he had lived at his
41 home for 17 years, and that a precedence for larger homes had been set in the area. He
42 added that several other areas to the south of Berkley St. and east of the project held a
43

1 zoning classification of A-1, which further indicated the precedence for larger homes. He
2
3 stated that he was concerned with the potential increase in traffic and the impact that the
4 subdivision would have on Bautista Creek Elementary School, which was right across the
5 street, adding that he would prefer that the lot sizes be left at 3/4- to 1-acre in size. He
6 encouraged the Commission to give serious consideration to the project before
7 recommending approval of this change of zone. He asked the other members of the
8 audience, who were sympathetic with his views opposing the zone change, to stand up.

9
10 A majority of the audience stood up.

11
12 Dave Noble, 772 Smith Road, Hemet, approached the lectern and addressed the
13 Commission as an adjacent property owner to the project. He advised the Commission
14 that his was the last house within the 10-acre area, and stated that he remains there
15 because of the quality of life that the area provides. He added that he had raised 6
16 children in his home, and has 2 grandchildren there now. He expressed his concern with
17 the idea that he would be looking at a 9-foot block wall in front of his home if this project
18 were to be approved. He explained that he had invested a great deal of time and money
19 into his home and did not want to see this project happen. He reiterated the concern
20 expressed by Mr. Duffin regarding the issues of traffic and the impact on Bautista Creek
21 Elementary School. He concluded with a request that the Commission leave the A-1-C
22 zoning designation in tact.

23
24 Donald Blankenship, 724 Smith Road, Hemet, approached the lectern and addressed the
25 Commission as an adjacent property owner to the project. He stated that he had been in
26 his home for 2 years, and that they bought their home because they like the area and the
27 fact that the lots are 1-acre parcels with a great deal of space. He further stated that he
28 did not want to be closed in by a 9-foot block wall and that he did not want to see Bautista
29 Creek Elementary School become more crowded than it already is. He asked the
30 Commission to keep the zoning designation for the property at A-1-C.

31
32 Chris Minor, 700 Smith Road, Hemet, approached the lectern and addressed the
33 Commission as an adjacent property owner to the project. He stated that he was a 3rd
34 generation farmer in the valley, and that there needs to be areas where space and privacy
35 are maintained, adding that he thinks that the construction of 40 homes on 10-acres of
36 land will add to problems that they already have with water and drainage. He reiterated
37 the testimony of Mr. Blankenship and Mr. Noble that he did not want to see a 9-foot block
38 wall when he looks out of his front window.

39
40 Bob Carol, Brighton Court, Hemet, approached the lectern and expressed his concern with
41 the impacts on both the school and water. He explained that he did not want to see tract
42 houses on small lots, and did not want to see lower-cost homes come into the area.

1 Chairman Duistermars inquired about the issue of Smith Road going through, as proposed
2 with a project that had been discussed in a previous workshop.

3
4 Mr. Noble re-approached the lectern and stated that he would prefer that Smith Road not
5 be opened to through traffic and would like to see it remain as it is.

6
7 Bill Corwin, 24980 Mountain Ave., Hemet, approached the lectern and stated that his
8 family owns acreage contiguous to the proposed project. He explained that Smith Road
9 had been an issue with the project that he was proposing as well, and that he had brought
10 in two different scenarios – one that indicated Smith Road opening into his project, and
11 one that did not. He stated that he would prefer to do whichever scenario made the
12 residents happy.

13
14 Jim Unland of Unland & Associates, 3550 E. Florida Avenue, Suite G, Hemet, approached
15 the lectern as the engineer for the project. He explained to the Commission that they were
16 trying to bring the R-1 zoning into an area where there already seemed to be the
17 occurrence of smaller lot sizes in the surrounding subdivisions. He explained some of the
18 different ideas that they had contemplated while designing the project, and offered some
19 suggestions as to how they could possibly compensate the homeowners for what they felt
20 they might be losing. He stated that he would like to buffer this project as well as buffer
21 the current residents from the new development.

22
23 Charles Bennett, 4595 Berkley Avenue, Hemet, approached the lectern and advised the
24 Commission that he resided to the south of the site, but facing it. He stated that he had
25 moved from Los Angeles to Fontana 19 years ago, and that he moved to his current home
26 when his children grew up and moved away. He explained that they had looked at various
27 cities, and that they chose Hemet because it was the most appealing, and that they chose
28 their neighborhood because of what it had to offer, stating that he would like to see his
29 neighborhood stay the way it is.

30
31 Commissioner Jones asked Mr. Bennett what size his lot was.

32
33 Mr. Bennett responded that it was between 7,200 and 7,500 square-feet.

34
35 Assistant City Attorney Vail stated that he wanted to see some documents that had been
36 submitted earlier in the evening be properly added to the record. He described those
37 documents as: 1) Presentation to Hemet City Planning Commission submitted by R.
38 Michael Duffin; 2) Petition of opposition signed by surrounding property owners; and 3)
39 Letter of support submitted by William W. Corwin, as President of Corwin, Inc.

40
41 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 7:43 p.m.

1 A discussion ensued regarding the lot sizes that were being proposed for the project, and
2 whether larger lot sizes should be required, such as ½-acre or greater.

3
4
5
6 Mr. Unland explained that they would need to come back with the proposed tentative tract
7 map at a later date, and asked the Commission if they could address the issue of lot
8 depths and widths at the time that the map was up for approval.

9
10 Chairman Duistermars stated that he would like to see ½-acre lots mirroring the lots across
11 the street, and that he thought their recommendation to the City Council should reflect this.

12
13 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that the public hearing be continued to the meeting
14 of April 1, 2003, so that the applicant could determine where the ½-acre line would be.

15
16 It was MOVED by Commissioner Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
17 continue Zone Change No. 02-5 to the meeting of April 1, 2003.

18
19 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

20
21 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Jones and Rhoten

22 NOES: None

23 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Calkins

24 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Hicks

25
26
27 **VIII. DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**

28
29 **A. MASTER PLAN OF DRAINAGE (1985 EXISTING MASTER PLAN &**
30 **STATUS OF WEST HEMET MASTER PLAN)**

31
32 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that a copy of the Master Plan of
33 Drainage for the City had been distributed to them, as per their request. He stated that he
34 would be happy to answer any questions.

35
36 Chairman Duistermars stated that he had been reviewing the document, and that it was
37 chewed up into such small pieces that it was hard to get a community wide picture of what
38 was going on. He asked if the City Engineer or Public Works Department had the plan
39 super-imposed on the City where all of the different pieces were plugged together so that
40 they could have a better picture.

41
42 He was advised that there was no such plan.

1 Chairman Duistermars inquired about the City's ability to do create one, with the available
2 technology, stating that he knew the City had GIS capabilities.

3
4
5
6
7 Planning Director Masyczek responded that he would check with the City's GIS Technician
8 to see if she had it plugged into the system. He asked City Engineer Trietsch if all of the
9 maps within the plan were on the same scale.

10
11 City Engineer Trietsch responded that they were.

12
13 Planning Director Masyczek stated that with the maps on the same scale, if worse came
14 to worse they could do a "cut & paste", and compile it together and bring it back for the
15 Commission to review.

16
17 Chairman Duistermars expressed his appreciation of having the maps, as they indicate
18 where the flood plains were located and where the drainage ditches are going to be, and
19 provide an idea of where the flows are going through the valley. He stated that he had
20 noticed that in a couple of areas the City is either behind on building the ditches, or has
21 changed them dramatically. He thanked Planning Director Masyczek for providing these
22 documents and stated that if something could be put together that the Commission could
23 digest as they are reviewing projects it would be very helpful.

24
25 **B. NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT ANALYSIS**

26
27 Planning Director Masyczek explained that staff was becoming more aware of how projects
28 fit in with neighborhoods. He distributed a copy of the Neighborhood Context Review
29 worksheet that staff would be completing for future projects, and advised the Commission
30 that this worksheet would be included with future staff reports for the Commission's
31 information, and utilized as a tool to analyze the project for which it was completed.

32
33 Commissioner Jones stated that they would still need to drive by individually as Planning
34 Commissioners to view the project sites so that they would have a good idea of what they
35 were dealing with.

36
37 Chairman Duistermars stated that he would like to see the worksheet be as detailed as
38 possible, adding that it should also indicate where the projects were located in terms of
39 nearby parks and schools.

40
41 Planning Director Masyczek agreed that these items would be added.

1 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled
2 for April 1, 2003 at 6:00 p.m. to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers
3 located at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet, California 92543.
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

**Planning Commission Minutes
March 18, 2003**

1 Attachments:

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

- 1) Presentation to Hemet City Planning Commission submitted by R. Michael Duffin
- 2) Petition of opposition signed by surrounding property owners
- 3) Letter of support submitted by William W. Corwin as President of Corwin, Inc.

Bob Duistermars, Chairman

ATTEST:

Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary