

1 CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

2
3 TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 2003

4
5 THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION WAS
6 RESUMED AT 2:18 P.M. FOLLOWING THE JOINT MEETING OF THE CITY OF HEMET
7 PLANNING COMMISSION AND CITY COUNCIL, AT THE JAMES SIMPSON MEMORIAL
8 CENTER, 305 E. DEVONSHIRE AVENUE, HEMET, CALIFORNIA.

9
10 Roll Call: Chairman Bob Duistermars, Vice Chairman B.R. Hicks and
11 Commissioners Jim Calkins and Nick Jones

12
13 Absent: Commissioner Mayzelle Rhoten

14
15
16 I. PUBLIC COMMENTS: Anyone who wishes to address the Commission regarding
17 items not on the agenda may do so at this time. Please line up at the lectern when
18 the Chair asks if there are any communications from the public. *When you are*
19 *recognized, please give your name, spelling of last name, and address for*
20 *accurate recording in the minutes.*

21
22 There were no members of the public who wished to address the Commission.

23
24
25 II. WORK STUDY:

26
27 A. MCSWEENEY FARMS

28 A work study session to review the latest revisions to the McSweeney Farms
29 Specific Plan.

30
31 Ric Stephens of AEI-CASC Engineering, 937 South Via Lata, Suite 500, Colton, California
32 gave a PowerPoint presentation indicating the latest revisions to the McSweeney Farms
33 Specific Plan. He displayed the design of the new Streetscapes & Entry Treatments and
34 Open Space & Conservation Easements and gave some details of each. He displayed
35 project-wide revisions of the themed Architectural & Landscape Design Guidelines,
36 explaining that there would be a 600-foot buffer with large-frontage equestrian estates
37 adjacent to both Newport Road and Girard Street. He advised the Commission that there
38 would be a 12-acre Elementary school and a 24-acre Middle School, as well as two sports
39 parks, which would include both passive and equestrian uses. He added that there would
40 be a 12-acre rural-themed market place, a 3-acre Community Center with an 18,000
41 square-foot clubhouse which would include a pool and spa, and over 5 miles of public
42 trails, paseos and walkways for a "walkable" community.

1 Mr. Stephens indicated to the Commission that the mixed-use development had been
2 removed, as had the multi-family portion of the development. He explained that the park
3 area within the specific plan had been doubled and that they had increased the number
4 of rural estate homes, while reducing the total number of homes by one-third. He
5 concluded his presentation by distributing a handout which indicated the land use plan
6 itself.

7
8 A discussion followed regarding the hillsides.

9
10 Mr. Stephens explained that there would be a minimal number of 4-acre lots within the
11 600-foot buffer area, and that the open space would be under a conservation easement.
12 He added that the plotting studies would be complete in the near future.

13
14 A discussion ensued regarding the park requirements and the maintenance of the parks
15 as well as that for the flood control facilities. It was noted that there would be 28 acres of
16 parkland within the project.

17
18 Chairman Duistermars asked if the applicant would need to return to the Planning
19 Commission for subsequent review of the design guidelines following approval of the
20 Specific Plan.

21
22 Planning Director Masyczek responded that they could be required to come back for a 2nd
23 stage of review.

24
25 Chairman Duistermars stated that he was hesitant to approve something with this density
26 without having the developer of the Tract Maps come back for design review of their
27 homes, adding that he did not want to see cookie-cutter developments.

28
29 Planning Director Masyczek responded that they would come up with language to have
30 any map developers come back before the Commission for design review.

31
32 Commissioner Calkins stated that he did not think that the proposed elevations were in
33 compliance with the requirements of the City's guidelines.

34
35 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that the Commission could establish a minimum
36 width as a requirement.

37
38 Commissioner Calkins asked if the Commission could request to see a sample of each of
39 the subdivision body types before making a planning decision.

40
41 Planning Director Masyczek responded that he thought it would be wise to do so.
42
43
44

1 Mr. Stephens agreed that he could provide a sample.

2
3 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that Mr. Stephens could establish parameters
4 within the zoning ordinance.

5
6 A discussion ensued regarding the Commission's concern with the proposed lot sizes.

7
8 The Commission expressed concern that the land use plan that had been distributed was
9 misleading with reference to the lot sizes near the hills, since the hills would not belong
10 to the property owners.

11
12 Mr. Stephens explained that the home owners would actually own the hills, and that their
13 portion of the hills would be included as part of their 4-acre lot size, but they would not be
14 able to build on the hilltops.

15
16 Brenda Scott, 29290 Girard St., Hemet, California, addressed the Commission, advising
17 them that she resided on the east side of the project. She expressed her concern with the
18 fact that the Indian sites had not been addressed as far as preservation was concerned.
19 She indicated that according to the land use plan, it appeared that the middle school might
20 be located where the Indian site was present.

21
22 Mr. Stephens explained that the site had been in question, and that it had turned out to be
23 less significant than was originally thought, but that the bands of Indians were aware of
24 what was happening and that appropriate mitigation measures would be implemented and
25 followed.

26
27 Ms. Scott inquired regarding the location of the middle school.

28
29 Mr. Stephens explained that this was the site requested by the school district, who did not
30 want a site adjacent to any attractive nuisances, such as open spaces and parks.

31
32 Kelly Ashman, 40911 Gibbel Road, Hemet, California expressed her concern with the fact
33 that the school was so close to the foothills, and that this could be very dangerous for
34 children, who climb fences and would not hesitate to hike into the hills and canyons. She
35 added that if a fire should break out there was only one way out of the hills, which could
36 put children in extreme danger.

37
38 Kevin Galt, 3789 Vista Rd., Hemet, California addressed the Commission stating that it
39 was his understanding that the original McSweeny Ranch project was taken over by MWD
40 for purposes of constructing the dam. He added that he had heard that land has often
41 been taken over by eminent domain, or traded for other land, and asked if it were a

1 possibility that MWD would be willing to allow the school district to build on the other side
2 of State St.

3
4 Vice Chairman Hicks suggested that the residents take their concerns with the location of
5 the school to the school board, as the city does not have jurisdiction over the sites that are
6 chosen by the school district.

7
8 Ms. Scott mentioned the fact that there were Indian artifacts present on the site, and that
9 there would be excessive amounts of digging and installation of major water and sewer
10 lines. She stated that she knew a study had been completed, but suggested that another
11 one should be performed in order to settle conflicting information.

12
13 Planning Director Masyczek advised that an expert would be present during any grading
14 or excavation processes in order to monitor the finding of any artifacts that may be
15 uncovered.

16
17 A discussion ensued regarding fencing of the project.

18
19 Allison Burke, 39980 Saddle Ridge Rd., asked whether the lots along Newport Road and
20 Girard Street would face the streets, and if she were to send her daughter to get a gallon
21 of milk via horseback, how she would get there.

22
23 Mr. Stephens explained that an equestrian trail had been added to the project design that
24 could be utilized to reach the market area.

25
26 A discussion ensued regarding the phasing of the Specific Plan

27
28 Commissioner Jones inquired as to whether the Specific Plan could be conditioned so that
29 the smaller lots and homes were not developed first.

30
31 Mr. Stephens explained that the homes closest to State Street and Newport Road were
32 planned to be developed first in the phasing process. He suggested that if the standards
33 required the equestrian center to be developed as an initial part of the process, the
34 equestrian estates would likely be developed early in the phasing process as well.

35
36 The Commission assured Mr. Stephens that it was their intention to have the equestrian
37 center developed during the initial part of the process.

38
39 Commissioner Jones left the meeting at 2:40 p.m.

1 Mr. Galt expressed his concern regarding the lighting, and questioned whether there would
2 be a large number of streetlights included within the project that would omit the beautiful
3 view that the current residents have of the stars in the night sky.

4
5 Mr. Stephens explained that there was a section of the Specific Plan that specifically
6 referred to lighting, and assured Mr. Galt that this concern would not be an issue.

7
8 Mr. Galt questioned how a 3-car garage could be included for a home that was set on a
9 5,000 square-foot lot.

10
11 Chairman Duistermars explained that it could be done through tandem parking, where the
12 depth of the garage is greater so that two cars can be parked with one behind the other.

13
14 Mr. Galt suggested that the transition of density should decrease a little more slowly,
15 instead of dropping from ½ acre lots to 5,000 square-foot lots.

16
17 Chairman Duistermars advised that the home buyers would be made aware of the types
18 of adjacent housing at the time of their purchase.

19
20 Mr. Galt inquired regarding the fact that the homes that were proposed to be built next to
21 the equestrian estates would end up being disturbed by the flies and odors that go along
22 with this type of property.

23
24 Chairman Duistermars advised Mr. Galt that the equestrian estate owners would have to
25 include within their CC&R's ways to mitigate these nuisances, and the property owners
26 that purchase homes adjacent to the equestrian estates would have to be informed through
27 disclosure that they were buying homes next to equestrian estates that would house
28 horses and other animals that are associated with flies and odors.

29
30 Mr. Galt asked what amenities would be provided at the equestrian center.

31
32 Mr. Stephens responded that there would be a show ring, wash racks, pastures, turnout
33 areas, a center for lessons, and other similar features.

34
35 June Cook, 40069 E. Newport Road, Hemet, California asked if she could get a copy of
36 the land use plan so that she would have an idea of where the trails would actually be.

37
38 Commissioner Hicks gave Ms. Cook his copy of the land use plan.

39
40 A discussion ensued regarding the Diamond Valley Gateway Specific Plan which had been
41 previously approved, 5 or 6 years ago, for the Karubian family. The Commission agreed
42 that the plan would now be considered obsolete.

1 A discussion of trails within the city then followed.

2
3 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that any members of the Diamond Valley Country
4 Coalition could come into the Planning Department at City Hall to review the City's trail
5 system, which is included as part of the City of Hemet General Plan.

6
7 Ms. Scott inquired regarding the 5,000 square-foot status of some of the lots within
8 Planning Area 5.

9
10 Mr. Stephens advised her that most of the lots would be 6,000 square-feet or greater in
11 size, but that they needed to ask for approval of 5,000 square-foot lots just in case there
12 was a perfect lot that was smaller than the 6,000 square-feet that would be the norm.

13
14 A discussion ensued regarding rural development standards.

15
16 Ms. Ashman noted that some of the properties within Planning Area 5 were indicated as
17 being one-acre and up. She suggested that property owners in the area would like to see
18 a little more transitioning in that planning area.

19
20 Chairman Duistermars explained that the property owners that Ms. Ashman was referring
21 to would not actually be seeing those homes at all with the landscape buffering and wall
22 that would be installed, since the homes in question were internal to the project.

23
24 Chairman Duistermars recapped that Ric Stephens would be providing the Commission
25 with plotting studies prior to approval of the Specific Plan.

26
27
28 **III. PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

29
30 There was no discussion amongst the Commission.

31
32
33 **IV. ADJOURNMENT:** It was MOVED by Commissioner Calkins, SECONDED by Vice
34 Chairman Hicks and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 3:35 p.m. to
35 the regular meeting of the City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for
36 Tuesday, May 6, 2003 at 6:00 p.m. at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located
37 at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet, California 92543.

38
39
40
41
42 _____
43 Bob Duistermars, Chairman

1 ATTEST:

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

Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary