

1 CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

2
3 TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 2003

4
5 THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION WAS
6 CONVENED BY CHAIRMAN DUISTERMARS ON TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 2003 AT 6:03
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 and
11 Mayzelle Rhoten

12
13 Absent: Vice Chairman B.R. Hicks and Commissioner Nick Jones

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:

24
25 Chairman Duistermars announced to the audience that Item Nos. IV.A. and VII.E. would
26 be continued to the Planning Commission meeting of May 6, 2003 due to the lack of a
27 quorum available to vote on the items.

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 Sandy Packham reported that the HUSD was in the process of working on their new
36 Master Plan, and that they were using the City of Hemet General Plan for information on
37 densities. She requested that she be notified of any zone changes or amendments to the
38 General Plan that have occurred or will occur in the near future in order to allow the school
39 district to make adjustments to the master plan so that it is consistent with the City's
40 documents.

1
2 Ms. Packham reported that an analysis had been performed for three (3) possible high
3 school sites, and that the school board would be giving a presentation at their meeting of
4 May 6, 2003. She added that none of the sites were within the City of Hemet limits.

5
6 Ms. Packham advised the Commission that the bid for Cawston Elementary would be
7 opening on May 6, 2003, and that the groundbreaking was scheduled for June 6, 2003.
8 She added that invitations would be mailed out soon.

9
10 Ms. Packham reported that the renovation of student restrooms and kitchens, and the
11 completion of electrical upgrades at various schools would be taking place over the
12 summer. She explained that old wooden ball walls would be replaced with new walls at
13 many schools, and that a new Administrative office was being constructed at Hemet
14 Elementary School. She expressed her appreciation for the approval of Measure "E",
15 which is helping the school district complete many overdue projects.

16
17
18 **III. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**

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

21
22
23 **IV. CONSENT CALENDAR**

24
25 **A. MINUTES**

- 26
27 1. February 18, 2003
28 2. March 4, 2003

29
30 It was MOVED by Commissioner Calkins and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
31 approve the consent calendar as presented.

32
33 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

34
35 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins and Rhoten
36 NOES: None
37 ABSTAIN: None
38 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Hicks and Commissioner Jones

39
40
41 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS**

1 There were no public meeting items on the agenda for review.
2
3

4 **VI. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS (From March 18, 2003)**

5
6 **A. ZONE CHANGE 02-5 & ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 03-6**

7 APPLICANT: Sumer Vardhan / Kalpesh Homes, Inc.
8 LOCATION: Northeast corner of Hemet Street and Berkley Avenue
9 PLANNER: Matthew Bassi
10 DESCRIPTION: A proposal to change the zoning on a 10-acre parcel
11 from the existing classification of A-1-C (Light-Agricultural) to R-1 (Single-
12 Family Residential) and R-1-20,000 (Single-Family Residential, 20,000
13 square-foot minimum lot size).
14

15 This item was pulled from the agenda due to the lack of a quorum with the ability to vote
16 on the project.
17
18

19 **VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

20
21 **A. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 02-3, SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT 02-2**
22 **AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT 02-10**

23 APPLICANT: Nat Harty / Stowe Passco Development
24 LOCATION: East side of Sanderson Avenue approximately 400-feet
25 south of Stetson Avenue
26 PLANNER: Ron Running
27 DESCRIPTION: A proposed General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan
28 Amendment to the Page Ranch Community Master Plan (PCD 79-93) for a
29 103± acre site, changing the General Plan land use designation from R-II (7-
30 17 du/ac), Commercial, Open Space/Park to R-I (7 du/ac), Medium-Density
31 (10 du/ac), Recreation/Commercial, Open Space/Recreation to Low-Medium
32 Density (5 du/ac).
33

34 City Planner Running presented the staff report, explaining various details of the project
35 to the Commission. He advised the Commission that staff was requesting that the public
36 hearing be opened, the project discussed, and then the hearing continued to the Planning
37 Commission meeting of May 6, 2003 due to the project's need to be reviewed by the
38 Airport Land Use Commission, which would not happen until Thursday, April 17, 2003. He
39 discussed the location of the project relative to the surrounding land uses, and displayed
40 several maps and drawings which indicated the proposed project design. He discussed
41 the proposed landscaping, lot sizes and perimeter walls. He advised the Commission that
42 a Mitigated Negative Declaration was being recommended for the project, which would
43

1 require mitigation of any possible issues that might effect the environment or the public
2 health, safety or welfare. He discussed the fact that, due to the project's proposed lakes,
3 there would be the potential for wildlife to visit the lakes and there would hence be a need

4
5
6 for a "Wildlife Attraction Study" to be completed by the applicant. Finally, he discussed
7 the fact that this project would be considered a "down-zoning", and that due to the new
8 Dutras Bill that had been enacted by the State of California, certain "up-zoning"
9 requirements would need to be met in other areas of the city.

10
11 Commissioner Calkins addressed the fact that it appeared that the houses on the lots
12 could be as close as 10-feet to the street. He asked if the residential design guidelines
13 that had been adopted were being applied to this project.

14
15 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the purpose of the guidelines were to provide
16 guidance in the approval of projects, but explained that if this Specific Plan were approved
17 it would take precedence over the design guidelines.

18
19 City Planner Running displayed a parking exhibit and advised the Commission that there
20 would be over 600 spaces provided for guest parking.

21
22 Commissioner Rhoten inquired as to why there would be no sidewalks installed on the cul-
23 de-sacs.

24
25 City Planner Running responded that the sidewalks had been eliminated in the cul-de-sacs
26 due to their proximity to the lakes and the fact that the residents would be so close to the
27 walkways surrounding the lakes. He explained that other developments had been
28 developed with this feature also, including certain sections of the Heartland project.

29
30 Nat Harty, President of Stowe Passco Development, 801 N. Parkcenter Drive, Suite 235,
31 Santa Ana, California approached the lectern and addressed the Commission regarding
32 the proposed project. He expressed his disappointment that the project would need to be
33 continued, stating that they were originally supposed to have their public hearing on March
34 18, 2003. He provided some additional details of the project that City Planner Running
35 had not addressed, and suggested that the lake concept was one of the most attractive
36 amenities of the project which he felt would prove to make the community a very appealing
37 one. He proceeded to present a slide show presentation, indicating the paseos,
38 monumentation, parks and lakes, as well as the different villages and their composition.

39
40 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:46 p.m. and asked if there were any
41 members of the public who wished to comment on the proposed project.

1 Bob Rowe, 2610 Maple Drive, Hemet, California approached the lectern and introduced
2 himself as the President of the Seven Hills Home Owner's Association. He stated that the
3 Association had met with Mr. Harty and that the project had been designed to their
4 satisfaction, with the exception of the emergency access issue. He explained that there
5 did not seem to be a critical need for emergency access through the Seven Hills

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 community, which was something that was being proposed with the project. He further
2 explained that while the proposed access gates were desirable by the Fire Department,
3 they were not necessary, and advised the Commission that if there were any way to
4 eliminate those emergency access gates into the Seven Hills community they would like
5 to see this done.

6
7 Since there were no other members of the public who wished to speak regarding the
8 project, Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion to continue the project, as an open
9 public hearing, to the next regular Planning Commission meeting scheduled for May 6,
10 2003.

11
12 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
13 continue General Plan Amendment 02-3, Specific Plan Amendment 02-2 and
14 Environmental Assessment 02-10 to the Planning Commission meeting of May 6, 2003.

15
16 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

17
18 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins and Rhoten
19 NOES: None
20 ABSTAIN: None
21 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Hicks and Commissioner Jones

22
23
24 **B. DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT 03-1**

25 APPLICANT: Jeff Holbrook / Jeffrey MDM Partners VI, LLC
26 LOCATION: South side of Esplanade Avenue, east of Warren Road
27 PLANNER: Ron Running
28 DESCRIPTION: A proposed Ordinance adopting Development
29 Agreement No. 03-1 (Stoney Mountain Ranch) between the City of Hemet
30 and Jeffrey MDM Partners VI, LLC, for the construction of a 405 single-family
31 lot subdivision of 231.5± acres with a ten-acre park in the R-1-7.2 (Single-
32 Family Residential) zone.

33
34 City Planner Running presented the staff report, explaining various details of the project,
35 including the fact that the Development Agreement would amend Condition No. 12 of the
36 tentative tract map's conditions of approval, which required masonry walls for perimeter
37 fencing, to allow for alternative fencing materials as approved by the City Council.

38
39 Assistant City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that some changes had been made
40 to the Development Agreement, including the correction of some typographical errors. He
41 advised the Commission what those changes were, and explained that the revised
42 document had only just been received, and a copy was not available at this meeting. He

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

added that the Development Agreement would not require the developer to complete the improvements to the intersection of Warren Road and Esplanade Avenue, as indicated in the staff report, but would rather provide the funding for those improvements to be completed.

A discussion of the project relative to the Highway 79 realignment ensued.

Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the location fo the 10-acres of land that would be donated to the City by the developer, and what would be done with it.

Planning Director Masyczek explained that it was his understanding that the 10-acres of land was that portion that was formerly included in the Tres Cerritos site as a portion of their golf course.

Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 7:01 p.m.

Ric Stephens of AEI-CASC Engineering, 937 South Via Lata, Suite 500, Colton, California approached the lectern and advised the Commission that his firm was working on a project near this one, and suggested that their project could possibly be bisected by the Highway 79 realignment. He spoke briefly regarding this issue.

Jeff Holbrook of Jeffrey MDM Partners VI, LLC, 34179 Golden Lantern, Suite 202, Dana Point, California approached the lectern and addressed some of the issues regarding the Development Agreement.

Since there were no other members of the public who wished to address the Commission regarding the project, Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 7:07 pm.

It was MOVED by Commissioner Calkins and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to adopt **Resolution No. 03-19** recommending approval to the City Council of Development Agreement 03-1 with the revisions indicated by City Attorney Vail.

The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

- AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins and Rhoten
- NOES: None
- ABSTAIN: None
- ABSENT: Vice Chairman Hicks and Commissioner Jones

1
2 Commissioner Calkins asked if the 12-foot high wall would be stable if erected on the east
3 side as indicated.

4
5 Mr. Luciano responded that the block wall on the east side would be the back side of the
6 storage building, similar to the wall on the west side.

7
8 A discussion ensued regarding the "two-story" nature of the project.

9
10 Commissioner Rhoten inquired regarding whether the second-story building would be a
11 metal building.

12
13 Mr. Luciano responded that it would not. He advised the Commission that it would be
14 constructed of stucco material.

15
16 Assistant City Attorney Vail explained that he had raised the issue of the project being a
17 multi-phase project because of an issue that had arisen with a similar project that had been
18 previously approved. He advised the Commission that if the project were approved as
19 submitted, the applicant would need only apply for a building permit to complete the
20 second phase, without any requirement to return to the Planning Commission. He
21 suggested that the Commission could modify the approval to require that the second
22 phase be reviewed by the Commission, or they could simply require a modification to the
23 conditions of approval to address the issue of the closure of the wall that had been
24 mentioned by Commissioner Calkins.

25
26 Mr. Luciano advised the Commission that the only thing that would be added in Phase 2
27 of the project was an additional building, since all of the walls and hydroseeding needed
28 to be completed in the first phase. He explained that they had originally thought that they
29 would be able to leave the Phase 2 area as a dirt area with a chain link fence, but since
30 they were going to be required to build the wall and do the hydroseeding in the first phase,
31 they could simply eliminate the second phase altogether and build the second building at
32 the same time as the first building.

33
34 Commissioner Rhoten asked if the landscaping indicated in the color photo that had been
35 included with the staff report was going to be installed as indicated.

36
37 Mr. Luciano responded that it was.

38
39 Marge Tandy, 1885 Flametree Way, Hemet, California inquired regarding the vehicle
40 stacking ability to enter the storage facility, as Acacia Avenue tends to be a very busy
41 street.

1 Principal Planner Bassi responded that the code requirements for stacking had been met.

2
3
4 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 7:41 p.m. He re-capped that the
5 project was going to be built as a single-phase project, that the colors & materials board
6 indicated the correct color and materials that would be used in the project, and that the
7 landscaping would be installed with a trellis being built as shown in the picture, but not in
8 the landscape plan.

9
10 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Rhoten and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Calkins to
11 adopt **Resolution No. 03-18** approving Conditional Use Permit 03-1 as amended.

12
13 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

14
15 **AYES:** Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins and Rhoten

16 **NOES:** None

17 **ABSTAIN:** None

18 **ABSENT:** Vice Chairman Hicks and Commissioner Jones

19
20 **D. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT 03-2**

21 **APPLICANT:** City of Hemet

22 **LOCATION:** City-wide

23 **PLANNER:** David Sawyer

24 **DESCRIPTION:** A City-initiated request to amend the Hemet Municipal
25 Code, Chapter 90, Article I - In General, Section 90-4 - Definitions; Chapter
26 90, Article X - Single-Family Residential Zones, Sections 90-312 - Permitted
27 Uses and 90-315 - Site development requirements; and Chapter 90, Article
28 XII - Multiple-Family Zones, Sections 90-382 - Permitted Uses and 90-385 -
29 Site development requirements, for the purpose of regulating accessory
30 residential units, including granny flats and second units, in accordance with
31 California Government Code Sections 65852.1 and 65852.2.

32
33 The staff report was presented by Principal Planner Sawyer who explained various details
34 of the proposed zoning ordinance amendment. He addressed the key features of the
35 project, including the fact that “granny flats” and “second units” would be treated the same
36 as “accessory dwelling units” and would therefore be subject to the same development
37 criteria and ministerial approval process. He went on to explain that an accessory dwelling
38 unit would only be allowed on a legal conforming lot that is at least 30% larger in size than
39 the minimum size required for a lot in the zone in which it is located and that an accessory
40 dwelling unit would only be allowed on a lot that has an existing owner-occupied single-
41 family residence and will not result in more than two (2) dwelling units on the lot.

1 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the “owner-occupied” reference, asking if this
2 meant that when a granny-flat or second-unit were built, and the owner decides to move
3 away, the new owner of the property would be permitted to utilize the granny-flat only for
4

5
6 his own “granny” or relative, and that if it was not needed for such a use, it would need to
7 remain vacant or be removed.
8

9 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that the ordinance would require that one of the two
10 residences remain owner-occupied, meaning that a property owner could build a granny-
11 flat, and then eventually move into the granny-flat, and use the principal residence as a
12 rental unit. He added that he had gone back and forth with this issue, and stated that he
13 would come back to it for confirmation as he did not want to give an incorrect answer.
14

15 Principal Planner Sawyer continued his presentation, advising the Commission that the
16 floor area of an accessory dwelling unit would not be permitted to exceed 30% of the floor
17 area of the lot’s principal residence; that the architectural style, construction materials and
18 primary color of an accessory dwelling unit would be required to be compatible with that
19 of the principal residence; that an accessory dwelling unit would be required to meet all
20 of the setback requirements of the lot and would not be permitted to be located closer than
21 the principal residence to the lot’s front property line; that an accessory dwelling unit would
22 not exceed the height of the principal residence; that the floor area of an accessory
23 dwelling unit would be included in the calculation of the cumulative floor area for accessory
24 structures for the purpose of determining compliance with the limitation on total area of
25 accessory structures to be 50% or less than the floor area of the principal residence; that
26 one (1) covered parking space would be required for every bedroom in an accessory
27 dwelling unit; that an accessory dwelling unit may be metered for gas, electricity and water
28 separately from the principal residence, but could not be sold separately; and finally that
29 a covenant that runs with the land and requires continued compliance with the approval
30 criteria would need to be recorded prior to approval of an accessory dwelling unit.
31

32 Principal Planner Sawyer explained that the proposed changes had been drafted to
33 address both the need for compliance with the new state law, and for the continued
34 compatibility between accessory dwelling units, the lot’s primary residence and the
35 adjacent lots, including the structures on those lots in the neighborhood. He added that
36 an analysis of the two findings that were required for a zoning ordinance amendment had
37 been included in the staff report. He then proceeded to search for the section of the
38 ordinance that would provide the correct answer for Chairman Duistermars’ question.
39

40 Assistant City Attorney Vail advised the Commission that the applicable reference was on
41 Page 11 under the addition to Section 90-315 (g), paragraph 2, subparagraph (b), which
42 stated that “*an accessory dwelling unit shall only be located on a lot with an existing owner-*
43

1 *occupied single-family residence.*” He added that he believed that the criteria had been
2 carried over to each of the other sections that had been amended, primarily being Section
3 90-385(g).

4
5 Principal Planner Sawyer explained to the Commission that one of the issues had been
6 whether or not to allow some flexibility, and whether the owner-occupied restriction should
7
8 be on the house only, or applied to either structure. He stated that he had gone back on
9 forth on the issue while drafting the ordinance amendment, and that it was finally decided
10 that the principal residence should remain owner-occupied.

11
12 Chairman Duistermars asked for clarification that if a homeowner were to move out of their
13 home and their “granny” that had been occupying their accessory dwelling unit moved with
14 them, and they decided to rent their house out rather than sell it, the tenant that they were
15 renting to would not be able to have their “granny” reside in the accessory dwelling unit.

16
17 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that this was correct. He added that if they sold the
18 home, the new homeowners would be able to use the accessory dwelling unit for their
19 “granny”.

20
21 Chairman Duistermars added that he felt the “owner-occupied” status was critical, as the
22 purpose of the ordinance was not to develop rentals. He asked if it could also be required
23 to have kitchens and bathrooms in the units.

24
25 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that this requirement was already there. He explained
26 that the ordinance had been crafted to take advantage of the definition system in the
27 existing ordinance. He stated that definitions were being added for both the accessory
28 dwelling unit and the principal dwelling unit, which both keyed on the existing definition of
29 “dwelling unit”, therefore meaning that as the ordinance was crafted that requirement was
30 already in place. He added that if the Commission wanted more assurance of this
31 requirement additional language could be added to the text.

32
33 Chairman Duistermars stated that additional language was not necessary.

34
35 A discussion ensued regarding the addition of separate utility meters for the accessory
36 dwelling unit.

37
38 Chairman Duistermars stated that he would prefer to see the accessory dwelling unit be
39 metered through the principal residence so that the owner of the principal residence would
40 be required to pay the bills for the accessory dwelling unit, He added that this would
41 discourage the use of the accessory dwelling unit as a rental.

1 It was agreed that the ordinance would be amended to require that the utilities for the
2 accessory dwelling ***not*** be metered separately from the principal residence.

3
4 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 7:55 p.m.

5
6 Since there were no members of the public who wished to speak regarding the issue,
7 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 7:55 p.m.

8
9
10 Assistant City Attorney Vail interjected that after hearing the Commission's concern
11 regarding the criteria for an "owner-occupied" use, and the desire to discourage the use
12 of the accessory dwelling unit as rental upon the termination of the owner-occupied status
13 of the principal residence, he recommended that an additional sentence or an additional
14 clarification on the provision that was recited be added. He explained that Section 90-
15 315(g) Subparagraph 2(b) and Section 90-385(g) Subparagraph 2(b), currently read that
16 "*An accessory dwelling unit shall only be located on a lot with an existing owner-occupied*
17 *single-family residence.*" He proposed that this clause be amended in both sections to
18 read:

19
20 ***"An accessory dwelling unit shall only be located and maintained on***
21 ***a lot with an existing owner-occupied single-family residence. At such***
22 ***time as the primary dwelling unit is no longer owner-occupied, the***
23 ***accessory unit use shall cease.***

24
25 Assistant City Attorney Vail noted that the lettering within Section 90-385(g)(2) was off,
26 reverting to start back over with the letter "i" following the letter "k", and suggested that this
27 should also be corrected.

28
29 The Commission concurred with the changes.

30
31 Commissioner Calkins stated that he did not know how the City would be able to control
32 compliance with such a requirement, but that at least they would have a right to make the
33 attempt to control it.

34
35 A discussion ensued regarding the parking requirements and the location of the covered
36 parking for the accessory dwelling unit.

37
38 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.

39
40 It was MOVED by Commissioner Calkins and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
41 adopt **Resolution No. 03-21** recommending approval to the City Council of Zoning
42 Ordinance Amendment No. 03-2.

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
2

3 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins and Rhoten

4 NOES: None

5 ABSTAIN: None

6 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Hicks and Commissioner Jones
7
8
9

10
11 **E. VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 30869 & ENVIRONMENTAL**
12 **ASSESSMENT 03-9**
13

14 This item was pulled from the agenda due to the lack of a quorum with the ability to vote
15 on the project.
16
17

18 **VIII. WORK STUDY:**
19

20 Chairman Duistermars reorganized the work study items to hear those items that included
21 members of the public before hearing city-initiated projects that generally include only staff
22 members. He requested that all future agendas be ordered in this manner.
23

24 **C. VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 31184 - Maureen Losey**

25 A work study session to review the proposed subdivision of 120 acres into
26 307 lots for the future development of single-family homes, located on the
27 west side of Cawston Street, 177.01± feet north of Fruitvale Avenue.
28

29 Assistant Planner Losey gave a brief summary regarding some of the details of the
30 proposed project and then turned the presentation over to the applicant.
31

32 Jeff Petrus of Lee Entitlements, 1550 Amherst Ave., Suite 101, West Los Angeles,
33 California, approached the lectern and gave some details regarding the proposed project.
34 He displayed some foam boards indicating the site plan and the project design, and
35 explained the effect that he was trying to achieve with the project. He indicated the
36 provision of some curvilinear streets that he had added to accommodate the Commission's
37 desire to have these types of roadways included within new residential developments. He
38 further advised the Commission that he would be processing a zone change concurrently
39 with this map, in an attempt to change the zoning designation from Agriculture to
40 Residential. He discussed the idea that this project would be an ideal one to include a
41 Home Owner's Association, with a Lighting & Landscaping Maintenance District (L&LMD)
42 as a possible backup device.
43
44

1 Chairman Duistermars asked if the larger lots would be developed as estate lots with
2 larger homes.

3
4 Mr. Petrus responded that he would like to develop them as what he calls "ranchettes".
5 He added that he was not envisioning them as two-story homes.

6
7 Commissioner Rhoten inquired regarding the turnarounds being adequate in the indicated
8 cul-de-sacs.

9
10
11
12 Mr. Petrus responded that they may need to work on the turnarounds with the Fire
13 Department and Public Works Department as the project goes through the Staff Review
14 process.

15
16 Chairman Duistermars commended Mr. Petrus on the way that he had alternated the lot
17 sizes, as well as on other aspects of the proposed project.

18
19 Mr. Petrus asked if there were any comments or suggestions that the Commission would
20 like to offer.

21
22 The Commission had no comments or suggestions.

23
24 Chairman Duistermars suggested that, if the Fire Department bought off on the traffic
25 calming renditions, Mr. Petrus should provide an expanded version of his proposal so that
26 the Commission could get a better idea of what would be provided.

27
28 A discussion ensued regarding maintenance of the project.

29
30 The Commission thanked Mr. Petrus for his presentation.

31
32 **D. SPECIFIC PLAN 01-3 / VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 29843 -**
33 **"PEPPERTREE" - Matthew Bassi**

34
35 Principal Planner Bassi addressed the Commission, advising them that the project had
36 changed since originally submitted, including the fact that Lennar Communities was now
37 the developer rather than Pacific Century Homes. He added that the land use plan
38 remained the same as originally proposed. He discussed some of the changes that were
39 being proposed for the project, including the fact that the conservation easement would
40 be preserved as an easement. He discussed the possible time line of the project, stating
41 that the City Council would need to approve the Specific Plan before the Commission
42 could approve the map.

1 Kevin Lynch of Lennar Communities, 10627 Bowe St., Temple City, California approached
2 the lectern and introduced himself, stating that a PowerPoint presentation would be given
3 by Ric Stephens of AEI-CASC Engineering.

4
5 Ric Stephens of AEI-CASC Engineering, 937 South Via Lata, Suite 300, Colton, California
6 approached the lectern and began the presentation with a display of the vicinity map for
7 the project. He indicated some of the areas surrounding the project. He explained that the
8 overall goal was to provide a residential community for senior citizens that would include
9 various desirable amenities. He discussed the lawsuit that had been pending with the
10 Soboba and Pechanga Indian tribes, explaining that as a result of that lawsuit, one-third

11
12
13 of the project was now a part of the conservation easement that Principal Planner Bassi
14 had mentioned. He displayed some of the proposed architectural styles for the project,
15 including the "Resorts", "Courts", "Manors", "Gardens" and "Bungalows". He explained
16 the recreation provision for the project, which would include a total of 5.39 acres. He
17 displayed some conceptual illustrations and explained that they were hoping to provide a
18 variety of senior housing opportunities in a master planned community environment, which
19 would include a secure and attractive environmental setting with quality architecture and
20 landscaping design, along with a high level of amenities and services for outside
21 recreation as well as indoor activities.

22
23 Chairman Duistermars asked how it could be insured that the project would be developed
24 as a senior community.

25
26 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the designation as a senior community would
27 be provided through the CC&R's for the project.

28
29 Mr. Stephens advised the Commission of the proposed phases that the project could be
30 developed in, explaining that those phases may change as the market changes over the
31 next couple of years.

32
33 Chairman Duistermars stated that he liked the project design as indicated, and would look
34 forward to seeing additional details and specificity.

35
36 The Commission thanked Mr. Stephens for his presentation.

37
38 **A. TELECOMMUNICATIONS ORDINANCE** - David Sawyer

39 A work study session to review the basic telecommunications issues and
40 discussion regarding the drafting of a telecommunications ordinance.

41
42 Principal Planner Sawyer gave a brief PowerPoint presentation, reviewing the basic issues

1 relative to telecommunications. He explained that the intent was to give an overview of the
2 industry and provide them with information on how other cities are looking at
3 telecommunications issues. He discussed some of the requirements that local agencies
4 must meet relative to telecommunications towers. He advised the Commission that 75%
5 of all cell towers are of basic construction, while the other 25% are constructed under
6 camouflage, such as palm trees or pine trees, or even within church towers or in buildings
7 by themselves. He provided the Commission with a variety of information regarding the
8 necessity of telecommunications towers. He described some of the alternatives that the
9 city has in dealing with telecommunications, including: leaving things as they are, drafting
10 a new telecommunications ordinance or drafting a new telecommunications ordinance that
11 requires a conditional use permit for major facilities and allows minor facilities to be
12 approved at the staff level. He suggested that while working through the process the
13 Commission could help decide what is a minor and what is a major telecommunications
14
15 facility. He gave a brief idea of what the time line might be, suggesting that it should reach
16 its final stages around September.

17
18 A discussion ensued regarding major and minor facilities.

19
20 Chairman Duistermars asked if multiple organizations could be on the same pole.

21
22 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that they could, and that this was called "co-location".

23
24 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the mandation of providers to co-locate on the
25 same pole in an effort to limit the number of poles that are erected.

26
27 Assistant City Attorney Vail responded that it is normally up to the service provider whether
28 or not they want to co-locate on a pole with another provider. He stated that while he
29 thinks co-location is a good idea, not every provider finds this desirable.

30
31 Chairman Duistermars stated that he was not so concerned with the issue of minor versus
32 major facilities, but would like to encourage co-location.

33
34 **B. ACCESSORY STRUCTURES - David Sawyer**

35 A work study session to review the recent amendment to the City's
36 regulations regarding residential accessory structures and direction
37 regarding potential additional amendments.

38
39 Due to time constraints, the Commission unanimously agreed to move this item to the May
40 6, 2003 Planning Commission agenda.

1 **IX. DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**

2
3 There were no items on the agenda for the Director's Report.
4

5
6 **X. PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

7
8 Chairman Duistermars mentioned the fact that there was an attendance issue regarding
9 the Planning Commission that would probably be discussed at the joint meeting of the
10 Planning Commission and City Council.
11

12
13 **XI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

14
15 No future agenda items were requested.
16

17
18 **XII. ADJOURNMENT:** It was MOVED by Commissioner Calkins, SECONDED by
19 Commissioner Rhoten and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 9:14
20 p.m. to the joint meeting of the City Council and the Planning Commission
21 scheduled for April 29, 2003 at 11:00 a.m. at the James Memorial Simpson Center
22 located at 305 E. Devonshire Avenue, Hemet, California 92543.
23

24
25
26
27
28 _____
29 Bob Duistermars, Chairman
30

31 ATTEST:

32
33
34
35 _____
36 Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary
37