

1 CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

2
3 TUESDAY, MAY 17, 2005

4
5 THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION WAS
6 CONVENED BY CHAIRMAN DUISTERMARS ON TUESDAY, MAY 17, 2005 AT 6:01 P.M.
7 AT THE CITY OF HEMET COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 450 EAST LATHAM AVENUE,
8 HEMET, CALIFORNIA.

9
10 **Present:** Chairman Bob Duistermars, and Commissioners Jim Calkins and
11 Mayzelle Rhoten

12
13 **Absent:** Vice Chairman Nick Jones and Commissioner Wigs Mendoza (excused)

14
15 **Staff Present:** Principal Engineer Jorge Biagioni, Police Lieutenant Rudy
16 Cabrera, Deputy City Attorney Tom Jex, Assistant Planner
17 Maureen Losey, Planning Director Richard Masyczek, Principal
18 Planner David Sawyer and Minutes Secretary Nancie Shaw

19
20 **Invocation and Flag Salute:** Chairman Duistermars

21
22
23 **I. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

24
25 There were no members of the public who wished to address the Commission.

26
27
28 **II. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**

29
30 There were no amendments or additions to the agenda.

31
32
33 **III. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE**

34
35 Director of Facilities, Sandra Packham, reported to the Commission that construction of
36 the Jacob Wiens Elementary School was in the home stretch, with the project being 88%
37 complete. She noted that the lunch shelter was in the process of being erected and that
38 the staff had taken a tour to see their new home. She advised that the furniture and
39 equipment had arrived and was currently being stored in one of the HUSD's warehouses,
40 and that staff at the temporary site had begun packing.

1 Regarding the Hemet High School stadium, Ms. Packham reported that grading had been
2 delayed due to the import soil being rejected because it was too expensive. She noted that
3 the district was working with the contractor to secure suitable soil. She added that grading
4 in critical areas had been completed, so the underground electrical and plumbing was able
5 to continue.

6
7 Regarding the West Valley High School pool, Ms. Packham advised the Commission that
8 the pool was being back-filled where the underground plumbing and electrical had been
9 completed. She added that the footings for the mechanical room had been poured, and
10 that the underground plumbing and electrical for the building was in progress.

11
12 Ms. Packham reported that the contracts for Tahquitz High School were being awarded this
13 evening, and that work was scheduled to start in June. She noted that HUSD had obtained
14 the master plan funding for the grading, off-sites and utility connections for the entire site,
15 including the new middle school.

16
17 Ms. Packham continued her report, advising the Commission that there had still been no
18 word received from the Division of Aeronautics on when they would be able to review the
19 Rancho Diamante property, and that the project was at a stand-still until that was done.
20 She explained that the school district would not be able to serve any new students in the
21 Page Ranch/Rancho Diamante area, and that they would have to be bussed to
22 Winchester. She noted that Winchester would be serving not only Rancho Diamante, but
23 also the Winchester Hills development, and that once Winchester was full, the overflow
24 students would be bussed throughout the valley on a space-available basis.

25
26 Ms. Packham reported that the HUSD continued to have concerns with developers giving
27 incorrect school information to new homebuyers, even though they had been notified in
28 writing regarding the schools that would serve specific developments. She advised that
29 she had sent a formal request to Assistant Public Works Director, Mike Gow, asking that
30 the HUSD be allowed to post signs in the right-of-way in front of new developments
31 notating the schools that would be serving each development, and that they were still
32 awaiting a response.

33
34 Ms. Packham concluded her report by advising the Commission that discussions with staff
35 and an architect were underway to develop a plan for the QZAB grant, which would include
36 staff development facilities. She added that they were continuing to look at developing the
37 back portion of the Nutrition Center.

1 **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

2
3 **A. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 04-01, ZONE CHANGE NO. 04-01,**
4 **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 04-20 AND ENVIRONMENTAL**
5 **ASSESSMENT NO. 04-02**

6 _____ APPLICANT: Western States Mobile Home Parks, General
7 Partnership (Hemet West)
8 AGENT: Ben Miller
9 LOCATION: South side of Florida Avenue, easterly and westerly of
10 Myers Street
11 PLANNER: Maureen Losey
12 DESCRIPTION: A request for approval of a General Plan Amendment
13 from the current land use designation of R-C (Regional-
14 Commercial) to R-I (Single-Family Residential - up to 7
15 du/ac), a Zone Change to change the zone from C-2
16 (General-Commercial) to R-1 (Single-Family
17 Residential) and a Conditional Use Permit to add 73
18 spaces to an existing mobile home park (Hemet West
19 MHP).
20

21 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Losey who provided some details
22 regarding the project, along with the reason why staff was recommending denial.
23

24 Commissioner Calkins noted that, looking at the maps in the packet, the property to the
25 east appeared to have two (2) separate zoning designations – M-2 and R-1-C. He asked
26 which was correct.
27

28 Planning Director Masyczek confirmed that the M-2 zoning was correct.
29

30 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:18 p.m.
31

32 Ted Lindberg, 1482 West Road, La Habra Heights, California 90631 approached the
33 lectern and addressed the Commission as the Managing Partner for Western States
34 Mobile Home Park. He explained that they had not entered into the project blindly, and
35 that their intentions had been discussed with City staff. He stated that they needed to do
36 something with the land, and that in talking with Howard Rosenthal of Rosenthal & Excel
37 Commercial Development, he was advised that the property should not be developed
38 commercially, and that an expansion of the Mobile Home Park would be a good idea. He
39 advised that in order to expand they needed money, noting that they already had an
40 existing loan of \$4 million, which they'd had to pay off with a \$2.2 million pre-payment
41 penalty in order to obtain an additional loan for project-related expenses. He stated that
42 they had received no negativity from the City, and no indication that the project would be
43 recommended for denial until the very end. He added that they had no intentions of
44

1 developing commercially, and that they simply wanted to expand their park which would
2 be a beautiful asset to the City.

3
4 Jim Morrissey of PZL, Inc., 41738 Fulton Avenue, Hemet, California, approached the
5 lectern as a representative for the applicant, and noted that he would like to discuss the
6 larger concept of land use as well as the conditional use permit concept. He provided
7 some background information regarding the existing Mobile Home Park, and suggested
8 that, with respect to the issues that had been raised, the regional-commercial concept was
9 more focused at the corner, and that more land would be needed for significant commercial
10 uses, so the uses that could occur in this area would be limited and would have to fight
11 over access. He stated that from a design perspective, the most compatible use for the
12 two parcels in question was the expansion of the Hemet West Mobile Home Park. He
13 continued his discussion, providing rationale in favor of the expansion of the Mobile Home
14 Park.

15
16 Mr. Lindberg re-approached the lectern and advised the Commission that they did not want
17 to be known as “the Mobile Home Park behind the strip mall” and thanked the Commission
18 for hearing them out.

19
20 Laura Ryan of Skyline Homes approached the lectern as a factory sales representative.
21 She displayed some photos of typical manufactured homes that were going into Mobile
22 Home Parks throughout Southern California as well as this community. She noted that
23 there was a huge demand for manufactured homes, as well as a huge demand for
24 affordable housing. She stated that, as a citizen she had observed that most of the people
25 coming into Hemet were from overcrowded communities who were looking for a nice,
26 affordable place to live. She suggested that the Hemet West Mobile Home Park had
27 raised the bar, and that other Mobile Home Parks were seeming to follow their guide. She
28 added that, as a community person she was not particularly fond of seeing strip malls
29 everywhere, and that she believed that expansion of the Mobile Home Park would be a
30 much better match for the site.

31
32 Commissioner Calkins stated that he was not sure that the proposed lot sizes would be
33 sufficient to accommodate the types of manufactured homes that had been displayed in
34 the photos.

35
36 Ms. Ryan displayed a photo of a triple-wide manufactured home that was not taking up
37 much space, that was currently located within the park.

38
39 Ben Miller approached the lectern as a partnering owner of the Hemet West Mobile Home
40 Park, and advised the Commission that they had put \$40 million into their park, and
41 intended to expand upon amenities that they had been providing to the senior citizens of
42 Hemet. He stated that the lot sizes of the proposed expansion were 60-feet by 80-feet in
43 size, and that the home displayed by Ms. Ryan was a currently existing one in the park.

1 He added that at some point in the future the entire park would include manufactured
2 homes.

3
4 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding age-restriction.

5
6 Mr. Miller responded that the park was restricted to senior citizens.

7
8 Mr. Morrissey stated that he believed the expansion was within the best interest of the
9 community, and that developing the property commercially would have an adverse effect
10 on the existing residents of the Mobile Home Park.

11
12 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:48 p.m.

13
14 Chairman Duistermars explained to the applicant that the Commission's decision would
15 merely be a recommendation to the City council, and that no matter what the Planning
16 Commission's decision was, the City Council would make the final decision regarding
17 whether or not this project could move forward.

18
19 Commissioner Calkins noted that he thought that the City had decided many years ago that
20 there could no longer be any mobile homes backing to the street.

21
22 Planning Director Masyczek explained that the City generally wanted mobile homes to be
23 located within self-contained communities and not along commercial corridors. He noted
24 that the intent with the zoning in the area of the Hemet West Mobile Home Park had
25 always been for commercial. He referred to the displayed zoning map, noting what some
26 of the plans for the future were in the area of the project. He explained that some of the
27 factors that were now under consideration were not known when the project had been
28 submitted.

29
30 Chairman Duistermars stated that he believed the decision regarding this project was one
31 that the City Council should make, and noted that the applicant needed to appear before
32 them anyway. He noted that making a decision was very difficult because the project was
33 nice, but added that he did not know that this was the best area for it.

34
35 Planning Director Masyczek noted that if a recommendation was made for denial of the
36 project, it could be communicated to the City Council that it had been a difficult decision
37 to make.

38
39 Chairman Duistermars advised the applicant that at a different time the project would have
40 been a slam-dunk approval.

41
42 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Rhoten and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Calkins to
43 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 05-28* recommending denial to the City
44

1 Council of General Plan Amendment No. 04-01, Zone Change No. 04-01 and Conditional
2 Use Permit No. 04-20.

3
4 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

5
6 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins and Rhoten

7 NOES: None

8 ABSTAIN: None

9 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioner Mendoza

10
11 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-21.***

12
13
14 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS**

15
16 **A. VESTING TENTATIVE MAP ORDINANCE REVISION - R. Masyczek**

17 A public meeting to allow the Planning Commission to review and provide
18 input to the City Council on the proposed revisions to the vesting tentative
19 map ordinance via Minute order.

20
21 The staff report was presented by Principal Planner Sawyer who went over the details of
22 the proposed revision to the Vesting Tentative Map Ordinance.

23
24 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that the Commission make a recommendation to
25 the City Council that grading permits not be issued for property related to a project that was
26 in process until some sort of approval had been granted. He noted that currently the
27 grading permits were issued without anything having been approved.

28
29 The Commission concurred with the revision to the ordinance as well as adding the
30 recommendation that grading permits not be issued until some type of approval of a
31 proposed project had been granted.

32
33
34 **VI. WORK STUDY**

35
36 **A. “HOW TO MAKE DEFENDABLE DECISIONS” - Deputy City Attorney Jex**

37 A work study session to assist the Commission in how to make decisions
38 that will be defensible.

39
40 The Commission concurred that they would like to continue the work study presentation
41 in an effort to allow all members of the Commission to be present.

1 **B. “PENCILING OUT” - Planning Director Masyczek**

2 A work study session to define the development term “to make a project
3 pencil out”.

4
5 The Commission concurred that they would like to continue the work study presentation
6 in an effort to allow all members of the Commission to be present.

7
8
9 **VII. CONSENT CALENDAR**

10
11 **A. MINUTES**

- 12 1. April 5, 2005
13 2. May 3, 2005

14
15 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
16 approve the consent calendar as presented.

17
18 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

19
20 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins and Rhoten
21 NOES: None
22 ABSTAIN: None
23 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioner Mendoza

24
25
26 **VIII. UPDATE OF CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS ON PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS**

27
28 There were no update items on the agenda.

29
30
31 **IX. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**

32
33 There were no Planning Director Items on the agenda.

34
35
36 **X. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

37
38 Commissioner Calkins noted that the Traffic Commission was requesting review of
39 tentative tract maps. He noted that at this point in time they were only seeing some of
40 them, and that they would like to see all of them.

41
42 Planning Director Masyczek responded that direction had not been given by the Council
43 for the Traffic Commission to review all projects.

1 **XI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

2
3 There were no future agenda items requested.
4

5
6 **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

7
8 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten, SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins and
9 unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 7:11 p.m. to the special joint meeting of the
10 City of Hemet and the City of San Jacinto Planning Commissions scheduled for Tuesday,
11 May 31, 2005 at 6:00 p.m. to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers, 450 East
12 Latham Avenue, Hemet, California, 92543.
13

14
15
16
17

Bob Duistermars, Chairman
18 **Hemet Planning Commission**
19

20
21 **ATTEST:**
22

23
24
25

Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary
26 **Hemet Planning Commission**
27