

1                                   **CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

2  
3                                   **TUESDAY, MAY 3, 2005**

4  
5 **THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION WAS**  
6 **CONVENED BY CHAIRMAN DUISTERMARS ON TUESDAY, MAY 3, 2005 AT 6:00 P.M.**  
7 **AT THE CITY OF HEMET COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 450 EAST LATHAM AVENUE,**  
8 **HEMET, CALIFORNIA.**

9  
10 **Present:       Chairman Bob Duistermars, Vice Chairman Nick Jones and**  
11 **Commissioners Wigs Mendoza and Mayzelle Rhoten**

12  
13 **Absent:         Commissioner Jim Calkins**

14  
15 **Staff Present:   Acting Assistant Planner Tamara Alaniz, Principal Engineer**  
16 **Biagioni, Police Lieutenant Rudy Cabrera, Assistant Planner**  
17 **Maureen Losey, Planning Director Richard Masyczek, Principal**  
18 **Planner David Sawyer, Minutes Secretary Nancie Shaw, City**  
19 **Attorney Eric Vail and Battalion Chief Dave Van Verst**

20  
21 **Invocation and Flag Salute:   Vice Chairman Jones**

22  
23  
24 **I.       PUBLIC COMMENTS**

25  
26 There were no members of the public who wished to address the Commission.

27  
28  
29 **II.       AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**

30  
31 There were no amendments or additions to the agenda.

32  
33  
34 **III.       HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE**

35  
36 Director of Facilities, Sandra Packham, reported to the Commission, regarding the Jacob  
37 Wiens Elementary School site progress, that some of the time had been recovered, and  
38 that the move-in to the new school was scheduled to take place during the week of July 11  
39 - July 15, 2005, with the move-in to the old schools being scheduled for the first week of  
40 August, including the Helen Hunt Jackson Independent Study Program, the Family Tree  
41 Learning Center - Home-Schooling Program and the Special Education Preschool.

1 Regarding the Hemet High School Stadium, Ms. Packham reported that grading was  
2 approximately 50% complete, and that the erection of the block wall on the north property  
3 line had begun, with the scheduled installation of the underground electrical and plumbing  
4 right around the corner.

5  
6 Ms. Packham reported that the West Valley High School Pool project was underway, with  
7 grading almost complete and the digging of the hole for the pool complete. She added that  
8 the underground electrical and plumbing had already begun.

9  
10 Regarding new schools, Ms. Packham reported that testing had begun for new elementary  
11 school #'s 8 and 10, which would be called "McSweeney Farms Elementary School" and  
12 "Winchester Hills Elementary School".

13  
14 Ms. Packham advised the commission that new school sites had been identified within the  
15 Rancho Diamante area, and that a request had been sent to the California Department of  
16 Education for Division of Aeronautics. She explained that the HUSD had been notified that  
17 it would be 2 to 3 months before their requests would be reviewed, which meant a 6-month  
18 delay for the new elementary school. She added that students from the Cottonwood  
19 development and the Willowalk development would have to be bussed to Winchester  
20 Elementary School until the new school was completed.

21  
22 Ms. Packham concluded her update by advising the Commission that the HUSD had some  
23 concerns with Developers giving incorrect school information to new home buyers, even  
24 though they had been notified in writing by HUSD regarding the schools that would be  
25 serving their developments. She explained that HUSD had asked Assistant Public Works  
26 Director Gow if signs could be posted in the right-of-way in front of developments which  
27 would note the schools that would serve each development, and that they were awaiting  
28 a response.

29  
30  
31 **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

32  
33 **A. TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 30204 - EXTENSION OF TIME**

34 \_\_\_\_\_ APPLICANT: Philip Frey Jr., Trustee of the Frey Living Trust  
35 AGENT: Jim Unland - Unland & Associates  
36 LOCATION: South side of Esplanade Avenue between Palm Avenue  
37 and State Street  
38 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni, Acting Associate Planner  
39 DESCRIPTION: A request for a one-year time extension to subdivide  
40 11.3-acres into 14 commercial lots on property zoned  
41 C-M (Commercial-Manufacturing) and M-1 (Light-  
42 Manufacturing).  
43  
44

1 The staff report was presented by Principal Planner Sawyer on behalf of Acting Associate  
2 Planner Loretta Domenigoni, who could not be present at the Meeting. He provided some  
3 details regarding the background of the project.

4  
5 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:10 p.m.

6  
7 Since there were no members of the public who wished to speak regarding the project,  
8 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:10 p.m. and asked for a motion.

9  
10 It was MOVED by Commissioner Mendoza and SECONDED by Vice Chairman Jones to  
11 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 05-21* approving a one-year extension of  
12 time for Tentative Parcel Map No. 30204.

13  
14 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

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

21  
22 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-18.***

23  
24 **B. TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 32516**

25 APPLICANT: K Hovnanian - Four Seasons at Hemet , LLC  
26 AGENT: Tom Carmody - RBF Consulting  
27 LOCATION: McCarron Way (within SP 88-01 Heartland)  
28 PLANNER: Maureen Losey  
29 DESCRIPTION: A request to subdivide 1.25 acres into 2 lots, which will  
30 be 37,026 square-feet (Lot 1) and 17,424 square-feet  
31 (Lot A) in size, lot 2 will contain one single-family  
32 residence and lot A will be an open space lot.

33  
34 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Losey who provided some details  
35 regarding the project.

36  
37 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:12 p.m.

38  
39 Since there were no members of the public who wished to speak regarding the project,  
40 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:12 p.m. and asked for a motion.

1 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to  
2 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 05-20* approving Tentative Parcel Map No.  
3 32516.

4  
5 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

6  
7 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Mendoza  
8 and Rhoten

9 NOES: None

10 ABSTAIN: None

11 ABSENT: Commissioner Calkins

12  
13 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-19.***

14  
15  
16 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS**

17  
18 **A. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NO. 05-03**

19 APPLICANT: Flowerwood Hemet, Inc.

20 AGENT: Dana Dunn, Sales and Marketing Manager

21 LOCATION: 901 Buena Vista Street (Northwest and Southwest  
22 corner of Buena Vista Street and Fruitvale Avenue  
23 within Tract No. 30158)

24 PLANNER: Tamara Alaniz, Acting Assistant Planner

25 DESCRIPTION: A request for Planning Commission review and  
26 approval of the site development plans for Tentative  
27 Tract Map No. 30158.

28  
29 The staff report was presented by Acting Assistant Planner Alaniz, who provided some  
30 details regarding the project.

31  
32 A series of questions and answers followed, and the Commission reviewed the  
33 architectural elevations.

34  
35 A discussion ensued regarding the continuance of the architectural relief around the home  
36 to the back, for visual purposes.

37  
38 Vice Chairman Jones inquired as to why the roofline was continued over the door for one  
39 elevation and not for the other.

40  
41 The applicant explained that this was done to provide some variation.

1 A discussion of "pop-outs" ensued, such as bay windows, which would help to provide  
2 aesthetically pleasing visual relief from the street.

3  
4 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that two conditions be added in order to resolve the  
5 concerns of the Commission, as follows:

6  
7 Add Condition No. 18.a.: ***"The 25% building material shall be provided in a  
8 continuous manner along the front and to all side  
9 returns."***

10  
11 Add Condition No. 18.b.: ***"Where windows are visible on corner lots in front  
12 of the side-yard front fence return, they shall be  
13 enhanced with pop-out features, such as bay  
14 windows or similar treatment as approved by the  
15 Planning Director."***

16  
17 Chairman Duistermars asked if the Commission was ready for a motion.

18  
19 It was MOVED by Commissioner Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to  
20 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 05-13*, approving Site Development Review  
21 No. 05-3.

22  
23 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

24  
25 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Mendoza  
26 and Rhoten

27 NOES: None

28 ABSTAIN: None

29 ABSENT: Commissioner Calkins

30  
31 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-20.***

32  
33  
34 **VI. WORK STUDY**

35  
36 **A. ZC 03-13 & TTM 31064 (KOBY) - PRESENTATION OF PROPOSED**  
37 **PROJECT FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE DIRECTION TO STAFF.**

38  
39 The work study session was initiated by Principal Planner Sawyer, who provided some  
40 background information and details regarding the proposed Zone change and Tentative  
41 Tract Map. He noted that staff was recommending that a minimum lot sizes of 10,000  
42 square-feet be provided for the project in its entirety.

1  
2 Alan Koby, 9641 Manzore Avenue, Garden Grove, California approached the lectern and  
3 advised the Commission that he was the property owner for the subject site. He noted that  
4 there may have been a mis-communication, as he was not aware of the work study session  
5 until this afternoon.

6  
7 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that the work study session be continued for a 2-week  
8 period to allow Mr. Koby to meet with staff regarding the concerns that the surrounding  
9 property owners had conveyed at previous Planning Commission meetings that had been  
10 held with the former applicant.

11  
12 Mr. Koby agreed to the continuance.

13  
14 City Attorney Vail suggested that Meeting Minutes from previous meetings pertaining to this  
15 project should be provided to the property owner and the Commission for the next work  
16 study session.

17  
18 Staff concurred.

19  
20 It was agreed to continue the work study session to the Planning Commission meeting of  
21 May 17, 2005.

22  
23 **B. ANX 05-151, GPA 05-05, ZC 05-05 & TTM 33426 (JAGELS) -**  
24 **PRESENTATION OF PROPOSED PROJECT FOR DISCUSSION AND**  
25 **POSSIBLE DIRECTION TO STAFF.**  
26

27 The work study session was initiated by Principal Planner Sawyer, who provided some  
28 details regarding the proposed projects.

29  
30 Mike Jagels of Jagels Development, 23201 Millcreek Drive, Suite 200, Laguna Hills,  
31 California approached the lectern and introduced himself as the project applicant. He  
32 displayed a rendering of his proposal, and provided some additional details regarding the  
33 projects.

34  
35 Commissioner Mendoza asked Mr. Jagels how the City would benefit with the lot sizes that  
36 he was offering.

37  
38 Mr. Jagels responded that it was his understanding that the City of Hemet was looking to  
39 grow, and that this project was by no means a large project, but it would provide homes for  
40 new residents.

41  
42 Commissioner Rhoten asked for clarification that Mr. Jagels had stated that ½-acre lots  
43 would not work.  
44

1 Mr. Jagels responded that this was correct from a financial standpoint.

2  
3 A discussion ensued regarding how this project would be affected by the Highway 79  
4 realignment, followed by a discussion of how such a high-density project would fit into the  
5 area in which it was being proposed.

6  
7 Planning Director Masyczek referred to the area on the displayed aerial map, noting that  
8 much of it was a transition area.

9  
10 Commissioner Jones advised Mr. Jagels that most of the lot sizes in the area surrounding  
11 the site were at least 5-acres in size. He stated that he did not see how a project that did  
12 not offer comparable lot sizes could be approved.

13  
14 Jeff LeGrande, 11651 Sterling, Suite E, Riverside, California approached the lectern as the  
15 project engineer. He provided some additional details regarding the project, from an  
16 engineering perspective, and tried to explain the proposed transition from larger to smaller  
17 lot sizes.

18  
19 Chairman Duistermars commended the presentation that had been given, and suggested  
20 that the applicant continue to work with the Planning Department Staff on perfecting their  
21 project prior to their final request for approval. He noted that the Commission would also  
22 be discussing the project with the City Council to find out exactly what they were wanting  
23 to see happen with that particular area of the City.

24  
25 Deborah Jagels approached the lectern and advised the Commission that LAFCO had  
26 recommended that they pursue the annexation of their property individually, rather than in  
27 conjunction with any other properties that were considering annexation to the City.

28  
29 Rick Beck, 39185 Diamond Valley Road, Hemet, California approached the lectern as a  
30 co-owner of one of the properties in question, and also a veterinarian who had treated  
31 many horses in the area of the proposed development. He added that he had attended  
32 every Planning Commission and City Council Meeting pertaining to McSweeney Farms, in  
33 opposition to the project, and noted that he did not think that this development would  
34 bother many residents once the McSweeney Farms project was built out. He advised the  
35 Commission that he had spoken with many of the residents of the properties surrounding  
36 the proposed project, and that most of them were not opposed to the project.

37  
38 Chairman Duistermars suggested that the applicant come back for another work study  
39 session in 30 days.

40  
41 City Attorney Vail clarified for the Commission that neither they nor Staff could approach  
42 the City Council to obtain a collective opinion on this or any other project, and that while  
43  
44

1 the applicant could meet with City Council members on an individual basis, this would not  
2 offer a collective "approval" of a project either.

3  
4  
5 **VII. CONSENT CALENDAR**

6  
7 There were no items on the consent calendar for approval.

8  
9  
10 **VIII. UPDATE OF CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS ON PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS -**  
11 Update given by Planning Director Richard Masyczek

12  
13 There was no update of City Council actions on Planning Commission items on this  
14 agenda.

15  
16  
17 **IX. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**

18  
19 **A. STATUS OF PROJECTS**

20  
21 Planning Director Masyczek gave a brief update to the Commission regarding the status  
22 of various projects within the City. He noted that they were expecting to be inundated over  
23 the next few months with project proposals, particularly for the northwest area of the City.  
24 He added that the Commission could be expecting to see an increase in commercial  
25 projects in the future as well.

26  
27 Discussion ensued.

28  
29 City Attorney Vail explained to the Commission that the economic pressures that were  
30 facing a developer should not serve as a basis for the Commission's decision on a project.  
31 He noted that in some of these areas there tended to be a convergence of factors that  
32 were difficult for the City to handle, and explained that these factors should definitely be  
33 considered by the Commission when reviewing a project.

34  
35 **B. GENERAL PLAN UPDATE STATUS**

36  
37 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that P & D Consultants had been  
38 approved by the City Council as the consultant to handle the processing of the General  
39 Plan Update, and that he and Acting Assistant Planner Alaniz would be traveling to  
40 Pasadena on Friday to meet with the team that had been assigned to the project. He  
41 noted that the update would take a minimum of 18 to 24 months to complete.

1           **C.    LETTER TO CITY COUNCIL FROM PLANNING COMMISSION**  
2           **REGARDING        DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR COMMERCIAL**  
3           **CORNERS**

4  
5 Planning Director Masyczek referred to the letter that had been prepared for Chairman  
6 Duistermars' signature and was included in the packet for their review. He noted that City  
7 Manager Temple had suggested that some additional verbiage be provided within the letter  
8 to clarify exactly what the Commission would like to see with the development of  
9 commercial corners.

10  
11 Chairman Duistermars stated that he would work with Planning Director Masyczek on the  
12 modification of the letter.

13  
14 Chairman Jones asked if the issue of corporate colors on the color palette could be added  
15 to the letter.

16  
17 The Commission concurred.

18  
19 Planning Director Masyczek stated that he would make the requested revisions to the  
20 letter.

21  
22  
23 **X.    PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

24  
25           **A.    RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION - Requested by**  
26           **Vice Chairman Jones**

27  
28 Planning Director Masyczek noted that Vice Chairman Jones had requested the addition  
29 of this item to the agenda, and that the subject was more specifically pertaining to the  
30 requirement of bus turnouts. He explained that he had spoken with the Riverside Transit  
31 Agency (RTA), who had advised him that while they could recommend bus turnouts for  
32 major thoroughfares, it was up to the City to require them.

33  
34 Vice Chairman Jones asked if it was correct that RTA could place benches wherever they  
35 chose along major highways.

36  
37 Planning Director Masyczek stated that he believed this was correct.

38  
39 Vice Chairman Jones asked if a meeting could be arranged with RTA to discuss the  
40 possibility of coordinating the locations of these benches.

41  
42 Planning Director Masyczek responded that he would work on arranging that meeting.  
43  
44

1 **XI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

2  
3 Vice Chairman Jones asked if the joint Planning Commission meeting with the City of San  
4 Jacinto was still on for May 31, 2005.

5  
6 Planning Director Masyczek responded that he would follow up with the City of San  
7 Jacinto's Planning Director.

8  
9  
10 **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

11  
12 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten, SECONDED by Vice Chairman Jones and  
13 unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 7:46 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City  
14 of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for May 17, 2005 at 6:00 p.m. to be held in the  
15 City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 East Latham Avenue, Hemet, California  
16 92543.

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 \_\_\_\_\_  
24 **Chairman, Bob Duisternars**  
25 **Hemet Planning Commission**

26  
27 **ATTEST:**

28  
29  
30 \_\_\_\_\_  
31 **Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary**  
32 **Hemet Planning Commission**