

1                                   **CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

2  
3                                   **TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 2005**

4  
5 **THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION WAS**  
6 **CONVENED BY CHAIRMAN DUISTERMARS ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 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 Jim Calkins, Wigs Mendoza and Mayzelle Rhoten**

12  
13 **Absent:       None**

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

21  
22 **Invocation and Flag Salute:     Commissioner Rhoten**

23  
24  
25 **I.       PUBLIC COMMENTS**

26  
27 There were no members of the public who wished to address the Commission.  
28

29  
30 **II.       AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**

31  
32 There were no amendments or additions to the agenda.  
33

34  
35 **III.       HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE**

36  
37 Assistant Director of Facilities, Tina Koonce, reported to the Commission regarding the  
38 Jacob Wiens Elementary School site progress, noting that the site grading had started in  
39 preparation for all of the concrete flatwork that would soon be installed. She noted that the  
40 carpet was in the process of being installed, and that, overall, the project was 92%  
41 complete.  
42  
43  
44

1 Regarding the Hemet High School stadium, Ms. Koonce advised that the grading had  
2 resumed and that the building, bleacher and field pads were complete. She noted that the  
3 concession, restroom and ticket booth building footings were done, and that the block wall  
4 around the perimeter of the property was in progress.

5  
6 Ms. Koonce reported to the Commission, regarding the West Valley High School pool, that  
7 they were backfilling the pool where they had completed the underground plumbing and  
8 electrical work, and that the footings for the mechanical room had been poured. She noted  
9 that the underground plumbing and electrical for the building was in progress.

10  
11 Ms. Koonce continued her update by reporting that the contracts had been awarded for the  
12 Tahquitz High School, and that work was to begin next week, pending receipt of the final  
13 documents from the contractor. She advised that the official approval to change the  
14 project from just a high school to a 6-12 master plan had been approved, so the HUSD  
15 could now receive the State portion of the funding.

16  
17 On Rancho Diamante, Ms. Koonce reported that the Division of Aeronautics had reviewed  
18 the new sites that had been requested by Benchmark Pacific, and would not give their  
19 approval. She explained that a 10-day letter had been sent out to Benchmark Pacific  
20 requesting a response, and that the HUSD Staff was prepared to move forward on the  
21 original sites that had been agreed upon.

22  
23 Ms. Koonce concluded her report by advising the Commission that the City of Hemet had  
24 denied the HUSD's request to erect signs advising prospective home buyers of the schools  
25 that their children would be attending in the right-of-way on the sites where new homes  
26 were being built. She explained that irate parents continued to come into the Harmony  
27 Elementary School Office and the Facilities counter because they were incorrectly advised  
28 that their children would be attending that school, which was already full to capacity.

29  
30  
31 **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

32  
33 **A. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 04-21**

34 APPLICANT: Vincent R. Graves (AT & T Wireless)

35 AGENT: Christopher Rizza

36 LOCATION: 450 North State Street

37 PLANNER: Tamara Alaniz

38 DESCRIPTION: A request for a conditional use permit to construct a  
39 sixty-five (65) foot tall wireless telecommunications  
40 facility in a flagpole style design on property zoned C-2  
41 (General-Commercial) and located on the east side of  
42 State Street, two parcels south of Oakland Avenue.

1 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Alaniz who provided some details  
2 regarding the project.

3  
4 Commissioner Rhoten inquired regarding the diameter of the flag pole.

5  
6 Assistant Planner Alaniz responded that the diameter of the flag pole was 2-feet, 1-inch.

7  
8 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:15 p.m.

9  
10 Vice Chairman Jones noted that in a meeting approximately three months earlier, it had  
11 been discussed that staff would be asking the City Council for direction on these types of  
12 projects.

13  
14 Planning Director Masyczek noted that the Commission could not limit where such facilities  
15 could go, but could rather only look at the aesthetics of the facilities.

16  
17 Vice Chairman Jones asked if this was an appropriate location with the potential  
18 development across the street.

19  
20 Planning Director Masyczek responded that it was hard to say at this point in time.

21  
22 Commissioner Calkins noted that there was the potential for surrounding residential  
23 development.

24  
25 Planning Director Masyczek noted that the Specific Plan called out for both commercial  
26 and residential development.

27  
28 Vincent Graves of AT&T Wireless approached the lectern as the project applicant and  
29 attempted to address the concerns of the Commission.

30  
31 The Commission continued to note that this location may not be the best one for this type  
32 of facility.

33  
34 Discussion continued regarding the location.

35  
36 Planning Director Masyczek noted that Acting City Attorney Morgan had advised him that  
37 the City could not restrict the location of telecommunications facilities.

38  
39 Vice Chairman Jones stated that it was incompatible with the surrounding area.

40  
41 Mr. Graves advised the Commission that they had been working on this project for quite  
42 some time, and that they had spent a large amount of money already.

1 Planning Director Masyczek explained that the Commission felt that the facility was  
2 incompatible with both the aesthetics and the existing and proposed land uses for the area.

3  
4 Commissioner Rhoten asked why a different design, such as a pine tree, hadnot been  
5 considered.

6  
7 Mr. Graves responded that several options had been considered with staff, and that the  
8 flag pole had been decided upon.

9  
10 Commissioner Calkins expressed his concern with the future development across the  
11 street.

12  
13 Commissioner Mendoza asked if a different location could be found.

14  
15 Mr. Graves inquired about his appeal rights.

16  
17 Planning Director Masyczek advised him that they had 10 calendar days to appeal the  
18 Planning Commission's decision.

19  
20 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:28 p.m. and asked for a motion.

21  
22 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to  
23 deny approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 04-21.

24  
25 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

26  
27 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,  
28 Mendoza and Rhoten

29 NOES: None

30 ABSTAIN: None

31 ABSENT: None

32  
33  
34 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS**

35  
36 **A. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NO. 05-06**

37 APPLICANT: Osborne Development Corporation

38 AGENT: Bob Osborne

39 LOCATION: Southwest corner of Devonshire Avenue and Columbia  
40 Street

41 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni

1 DESCRIPTION: A request for Planning Commission review and  
2 approval of the site development plans for 15 single-  
3 family residential homes within Tract No. 31576.  
4

5 The staff report was presented by Associate Planner Domenigoni who provided some  
6 details regarding the project. She displayed a map indicating the site location and  
7 surrounding zoning designations, and also displayed a site plan for the approved Tentative  
8 Tract Map No. 31576, photos of the surrounding area and elevation plan types for the  
9 project.

10  
11 Commissioner Calkins noted that he did not see 25% of mixed material except for on Plan  
12 1, and that Plan 2 seemed to have a garage forward.

13  
14 Bob Osborne of Osborne Development approached the lectern as the project applicant.  
15 He displayed photos of almost identical homes that were already built so that the  
16 Commission could visualize the final appearance. He explained that the economics of the  
17 development for in-fill sites were difficult and that it was hard to financially justify providing  
18 some design characteristics such as those that would be provided in larger developments.  
19

20 Chairman Duistermars noted that the varied stucco color seemed to achieve the same  
21 intent.

22  
23 Commissioner Calkins expressed his concern that if this was allowed on one tract a  
24 precedent would be set.

25  
26 Planning Director Masyczek explained that the Commission did not have to worry about  
27 a precedent in this case, as this development would be considered an upgrade to the  
28 existing neighborhood.

29  
30 Associate Planner Domenigoni noted that only one plan – Plan 1A – included the different  
31 building materials, which was stone veneer. She suggested that perhaps the applicant  
32 could change that plan to include different colors of stucco as in the other plans.  
33

34 Chairman Duistermars indicated that he would like to see the stone veneer kept in tact on  
35 the Plan 1A.

36  
37 Vice Chairman Jones referred to the large portion of land behind the project site that was  
38 owned by Metropolitan Water District, and suggested that they be contacted to perhaps  
39 coordinate with Valley Wide for the provision of some type of recreational area.  
40

41 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Mendoza to  
42 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-19* approving Site Development Review No.  
43 05-06.  
44

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

2  
3 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,  
4 Mendoza and Searl.

5 NOES: None

6 ABSTAIN: None

7 ABSENT: None

8  
9 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-22.***

10  
11  
12 **VI. WORK STUDY**

13  
14 **A. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 03-05 / ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-11 /**  
15 **VARIANCE NO. 04-01 / VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31466**

16 A work study session with possible direction to staff regarding the: 1) General  
17 Plan Amendment from the current land use designations of Commercial (C),  
18 Rural-Residential (RR-0.5) and Multi-Family Residential (R-II) to R-I (Single-  
19 Family Residential); 2) Zone Change from the current classification of C-2  
20 (General-Commercial), R-A (Residential-Agriculture), R-3 (Multi-Family  
21 Residential) and R-1-14-C (Single-Family Residential - 14,000 square-foot  
22 lots) to R-1-7.2 (Single-Family Residential - 7,200 square-foot lots); Variance  
23 from the City of Hemet ordinance prescribing minimum lot widths (frontage)  
24 on lots having an area in excess of 10,000 square-feet – specifically the  
25 shape, dimensions and topographical features of the property are such that  
26 lots 55, 56, 83, 84 and 85 are much deeper than they would ordinarily be;  
27 and 4) Vesting Tentative Tract Map for 90 single-family residential lots with  
28 a minimum of 7,200 square-feet of lot area on property located at the  
29 northwest corner of Florida Avenue and Lake Street.

30  
31 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the applicant had requested that  
32 this work study item be continued.

33  
34 Chairman Duistermars stated that he would like to see it continued to a date certain.

35  
36 It was agreed to continue the item to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission  
37 meeting of July 5, 2005.

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           Planning Director Masyczek initiated the work study session with an explanation to the  
6           Commission of what exactly it meant to “pencil out” a project. He explained that all projects  
7           could pencil out, noting that developers targeted 3 main groups in their quests to build a  
8           project – very low to low income, average to mid-average income, and upper-end to high  
9           income. He discussed whether or not the City cared about projects penciling out, and what  
10          could be done if the developers’ goals did not match those of the City. He concluded his  
11          presentation by explaining that when a developer says that he “can’t pencil out” a project,  
12          it was not the City’s obligation to help the developer make it pencil out.

13  
14  
15       **VII.    UPDATE OF CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS ON PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS -**  
16       Update given by Planning Director Richard Masyczek

17  
18       **A.     CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF MAY 24, 2005**

19  
20           1.       **ZONE CHANGE NO. 04-5 / TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 31970**  
21                   **/ ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 04-10**

22  
23           Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the City Council had approved  
24           Environmental Assessment No. 04-10 and Zone Change No. 04-5, with the second reading  
25           for the zone change ordinance scheduled for June 14, 2005. He noted, however, that the  
26           map had been continued to the June 14<sup>th</sup> meeting due to the City Council’s concern with  
27           the curvilinear streets and the fact that they did not want a park provided where a retention  
28           basin was. He explained that the Council did not feel that Quimby Act credit should be  
29           provided for retention basins that were developed as parks. He noted that the 2+2  
30           Committee had subsequently asked for clarification regarding rules for parks.

31  
32           Chairman Duistermars noted that the 2+2 Committee was wanting to have a resolution  
33           established regarding the use of open space as active parkland, and noted that the  
34           utilization of retention basins as active parks had been agreed to by not only the 2+2  
35           Committee, but also the Commission and the City of San Jacinto. He added that Park  
36           Credit should only be given when equipment/facilities, besides just land, was provided.

1 **VIII. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**

2  
3 **A. WEST SIDE ISSUES**

4  
5 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the City Council had adopted  
6 an Interim Urgency Ordinance affecting the West Hemet Planning Area. He noted that the  
7 area was currently under a 45 day interim urgency ordinance, and that Staff was working  
8 with property owners on a resolution for the area. He explained that preservation of the  
9 Highway 79 alignment alternatives was a necessity, along with other requirements,  
10 including a modified circulation plan. He advised the Commission that the properties north  
11 of Florida Avenue and South of Devonshire Avenue would be developed under a Specific  
12 Plan. He further advised that development guidelines for this area would be presented to  
13 the City Council at their June 28, 2005 meeting, and that the issue of density would be  
14 addressed at that time.

15  
16 Regarding Benchmark Pacific, Planning Director Masyczek noted that it was possible that  
17 this area would be going "Del-Webb" on a large portion of their project.

18  
19 Commissioner Calking inquired as to whether the extension of California Avenue was the  
20 portion to the north or south of Florida Avenue.

21  
22 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the portion north of Florida Avenue would be  
23 extended.

24  
25  
26 **IX. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

27  
28 Vice Chairman Jones inquired regarding who was currently handling sign issues, such as  
29 the signs that were displayed on windows. He stated that the businesses downtown looked  
30 horrible.

31  
32 Planning Director Masyczek noted that there was not a great deal of restriction on window  
33 signs, but that he would take a look at the downtown area and see if there was anything  
34 that he could have Code Enforcement do.

35  
36 Vice Chairman Jones referred to the City's fixing the curb and gutter at Elk Street and  
37 Florida Avenue, and inquired as to why they did not back it up in order to add a left turn  
38 lane when it was currently a dirt area.

39  
40 Planning Director Masyczek responded that he was not aware of this as it was a public  
41 works effort, and that he would have to check into what was going on.

1 **X. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

2  
3 There were no future agenda items requested.  
4  
5

6 **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

7  
8 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones, SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten and  
9 unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 7:06 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City  
10 of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for June 21, 2005 at 6:00 p.m. to be held in the  
11 City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 East Latham Avenue, Hemet, California  
12 92543.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 \_\_\_\_\_  
20 **Bob Duistermars, Chairman**  
21 **Hemet Planning Commission**

22  
23 **ATTEST:**

24  
25  
26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 **Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary**  
28 **Hemet Planning Commission**  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44