

1 **II. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**

2
3 Planning Director Masyczek asked that a Director's Report be added to the agenda
4 following the Update of City Council Actions on Planning Commission Items, to discuss the
5 canceled tour of the Harveston Community in Temecula.

6
7 It was MOVED by Commissioner Calkins and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
8 add the requested item as No. IX. A., and renumber the balance of the agenda
9 accordingly.

10
11 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

12
13 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Rhoten and Searl
14 NOES: None
15 ABSTAIN: None
16 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones

17
18
19 **III. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE**

20
21 Sandra Packham, Director of Facilities for the Hemet Unified School District, reported that
22 Phil Pendley and Steve Temple had recently met to discuss the issue of joint use of the
23 school playgrounds, and that progress was being made on this subject. She explained that
24 the problem was with supervision on the playgrounds while school was not in session, and
25 suggested that perhaps the City or Valley-Wide Recreation could assist with this problem.

26
27
28 Ms. Packham reported that street improvements were being done on Cawston Avenue in
29 preparation for the new Tahquitz High School. She further reported that there was a snag
30 on the relocatable classrooms for various schools, due to a shortage on steel and wood.
31 She noted that the relocatable buildings had been delivered at Bautista Creek Elementary
32 and the Alternative Learning Center, but that several others had been delayed. She added
33 that Cawston Elementary was in the process of finishing their landscaping and carpet
34 installation, and that the principal and secretary were already moved in. She reported that
35 the modernization projects for the summer were proceeding on schedule, in spite of the
36 dry rot that had been discovered, and that escrows were scheduled to close at the end of
37 the month for the Hemet High School stadium property. She concluded her report with a
38 note that the Hemet High School elevator had been approved, and that it was finished and
39 in operation.

1 **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

2
3 **A. VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31280 / ENVIRONMENTAL**
4 **ASSESSMENT NO. 03-32 (Continued from June 15, 2004)**

5 APPLICANT: Orangewood Investment Partners

6 LOCATION: West side of Pine Avenue between Commonwealth and
7 Esplanade Avenue

8 PLANNER: Maureen Losey

9 DESCRIPTION: A request to subdivide 16.18 acres into 13 lots for
10 single-family residential development with adoption of
11 a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project.
12

13 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Losey who provided some details
14 regarding the project, and noted the changes that had been made.
15

16 Commissioner Calkins asked if it should be assumed that Pine Street would never go
17 through.
18

19 Assistant Planner Losey responded that she did not see how it could.
20

21 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:11 p.m.
22

23 Mel Haugen, 1533 Clydesdale Court, Hemet, California approached the lectern and
24 addressed the Commission as an adjacent property owner. He expressed his support of
25 the project and noted that he would strongly recommend that the Planning Commission
26 consider the adoption of some rural standards for the area. He stated that the owners of
27 the project that he was involved with, which was physically connected to this one, were
28 also supportive of the proposed project.
29

30 Loretta Domenigoni, 1260 Garry Lane, Hemet, California approached the lectern and
31 addressed the Commission as an nearby resident of the project. She stated that she was
32 in support of the subdivision and thanked the project engineer, Blaine Womer, for working
33 to make the project "neighborhood friendly".
34

35 Grant Brubaker of Blaine Womer Civil Engineering, 41155 E. Florida Avenue, Hemet,
36 California, approached the lectern and addressed the Commission as a representative for
37 the applicant. He noted that he was present to answer any questions.
38

39 Since there were no questions, Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:14
40 p.m. and asked for a motion.
41

42 Assistant City Attorney Vail noted that two motions would need to be made for the project.
43
44

1 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
2 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 04-7EA* approving a Mitigated Negative
3 Declaration for Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 31280.

4
5 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

6
7 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Rhoten and Searl
8 NOES: None
9 ABSTAIN: None
10 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones

11
12 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-9EA.***

13
14 Planning Director Masyczek pointed out that there should be a condition added to the map
15 which would allow rural standards to be applied to the project if the standards were
16 approved by the City Council at a future date, prior to the project's development.

17
18 It was agreed that ***Condition No. 96*** would be added as follows:

19
20 ***“If, prior to the recordation of the final map, the City***
21 ***adopts rural street improvement standards, the rural***
22 ***standards shall be applied to this map, and revisions shall***
23 ***be incorporated on the final map.”***

24
25 Assistant City Attorney Vail noted that the applicant would need to verbally concur with the
26 addition of the condition.

27
28 Mr. Brubaker stated, on behalf of the applicant, that they were in agreement with the
29 additional condition.

30
31 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
32 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 04-20* approving Vesting Tentative Tract
33 Map No. 31280.

34
35 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

36
37 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Rhoten and Searl
38 NOES: None
39 ABSTAIN: None
40 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones

41
42 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-36.***

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

3
4 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the parking ratio.

5
6 Assistant Planner Domenigoni responded that the project was overparked on every site
7 plan that had been submitted. She displayed the site plan, and noted that Applebee's had
8 been parked as a restaurant, with knowledge that approval of this parcel map would be
9 sought in the future.

10
11 Chairman Duistermars asked if all parties had reciprocal parking agreements.

12
13 Assistant Planner Domenigoni responded that they did. She distributed some photos
14 indicating the architecture for two of the new buildings, which, she noted, would
15 complement the Applebee's restaurant. She noted that all four sites would complement
16 each other where the architecture was concerned.

17
18 Commissioner Rhoten asked if the stone indicated in the photos was to be the same as
19 the stone on the Applebee's Building.

20
21 Assistant Planner Domenigoni responded that it was, and explained that it would also be
22 the same on the other buildings, though she did not have photos of those buildings.

23
24 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:26 p.m.

25
26 Grant Brubaker of Blaine Womer Civil Engineering, 41555 E. Florida Avenue, Hemet,
27 California approached the lectern and addressed the Commission as a representative for
28 the applicant. He expressed a concern regarding the conditions of approval. He referred
29 to the condition for on-site landscaping which was required to be done prior to the issuance
30 of a Certificate of Occupancy. He asked if this was for each parcel or for the site as a
31 whole.

32
33 Planning Director Masyczek responded that it only applied to that portion of the project for
34 which the building permit application was submitted for.

35
36 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:28 p.m. and asked for a motion.

37
38 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Rhoten and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Calkins to
39 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 04-45* approving Tentative Parcel Map No.
40 32484.

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
2

3 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins and Rhoten
4 NOES: None
5 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Searl
6 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones
7

8 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-38.***
9

10
11 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS**

12
13 **A. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NO. 04-7**

14 APPLICANT: Osborne Development, Inc.
15 AGENT: Bob Osborne
16 LOCATION: Southwest corner of Palm and Eaton Avenues
17 PLANNER: Maureen Losey
18 DESCRIPTION: A request for Planning Commission review and
19 approval of the site development plans for Vesting
20 Tentative Tract Map No. 31188 located on the
21 southwest corner of Palm and Eaton Avenues.
22

23 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Losey who provided some details
24 regarding the project. She noted that all of the homes would be single-story, and that there
25 were two plans with three elevations which included columns, pop-outs and enhanced
26 window elevations. She pointed out that there would be tile and shutters, and that 25% of
27 the homes would need to be treated with different texture. She noted that since the
28 varying textures were not indicated on the renderings, a condition had been added for this
29 requirement. She advised the Commission that the applicant was present, and that staff
30 was recommending approval of the project with the applicant's agreement to the added
31 condition of approval.
32

33 Grant Brubaker of Blaine Womer Civil Engineering, 41555 E. Florida Avenue, Hemet,
34 California approached the lectern as a representative for the applicant. He advised the
35 Commission that the applicant had not yet arrived.
36

37 Chairman Duistermars stated that this item could be set aside for a few moments, pending
38 the arrival of the applicant.
39

40 The public meeting resumed following the Pulte Homes work study presentation.
41

42 Bob Osborne of Osborne Development, approached the lectern as the project applicant.
43 He stated that he had no issues with the conditions of approval with one exception. He
44

1 referred to the added condition regarding the 25% varied building textures. He advised the
2 Commission that his project was an upper end project with ½- acre lots that included
3 circular drives along Palm Avenue. He turned the presentation over to the project
4 architect, Wayne Collins.

5
6 Wayne Collins addressed the Commission as the project architect, and discussed the
7 architectural provisions for the project. He noted the recessed windows and garage doors,
8 and pointed out the efforts that had been made to create various roof planes, indicating
9 where some had lower wainscots around the columns. He noted that there was a great
10 deal of color variation, and that the spanish colonial elevation had a base of stucco with
11 wood columns.

12
13 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the setbacks of the houses.

14
15 Mr. Osborne responded that the setbacks were varied, but that some were set back as
16 much as 35 feet.

17
18 Chairman Duistermars asked how much landscaping the company was willing to install.

19
20 Mr. Osborne responded that a typical package was about \$5,000, but that many buyers
21 would want a greater amount installed.

22
23 Chairman Duistermars stated that he did not have any issue with amending the 25% rule
24 in light of the provisions that were being included.

25
26 Commissioner Calkins suggested that it was a shame, on lots that were 100-feet wide, to
27 have houses that were only 11-feet apart.

28
29 Chairman Duistermars responded that he believed that they were placed closer together
30 on one side to provide more space on the opposite side.

31
32 Assistant City Attorney Vail asked if it was the Commission's intent to adjust the conditions
33 to remove the 25% rule.

34
35 Planning Director Masyczek responded that, yes, Condition No. 11 should be deleted.

36
37 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Searl and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Rhoten to
38 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 04-47* approving Site Development Review
39 No. 04-7 as amended.
40
41
42
43
44

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
2

3 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Rhoten and Searl
4 NOES: None
5 ABSTAIN: None
6 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones
7

8 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 04-39.***
9

10
11 **VI. WORK STUDY**
12

13 **A. COTTONWOOD RANCH - Ron Running**

14 A work study session to review the proposed single-family architecture for
15 Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 30558 by Greystone Homes located on the
16 southeast corner of Fisher Street and Mustant Way in Page Ranch.
17

18 City Planner Running asked to have the work study session continued to the August 3rd
19 meeting.
20

21 The Commission concurred.
22

23 **B. PULTE HOMES - Ron Running**

24 A work study session for the architectural review of single-family residences
25 proposed for Tentative Tract Map Nos. 31807 and 31808 located south of
26 the railroad tracks between Warren Road and Fisher Street.
27

28 The work study session was initiated by City Planner Running, who provided some details
29 regarding the proposed project. He displayed a site plan of the proposed tract, and
30 indicated the paseo amenity that was being proposed with the development. He described
31 some other details of the displayed site plan, noting that there was a total of 617 lots with
32 sizes of 4,500 square-feet to 6,000 square-feet. He explained that the east half of the
33 project would be age-restricted and noted that a recreation facility would be included, the
34 40% garage rule was being met, the front and rear planes rule was being complied with
35 and open space amenities were being provided.
36

37 Sandra Packham, Director of Facilities for the Hemet Unified School District, approached
38 the lectern and advised the Commission that they had not yet reached an agreement with
39 the applicant on a middle school site for the area. She explained that if the project were
40 to be built there would be no place to house all of the students.
41

42 Doug Avis, 550 Laguna Drive, Suite B, Carlsbad, California approached the lectern as the
43 project applicant. He stated that it had been recognized, as they got closer to the Tentative
44

1 Map stage of their project, that they needed to find the ultimate builder, and that they had
2 thus indulged in a moderately complex project with Pulte Homes. He explained that the
3 west side of the project would be more traditional, with the east side being geared toward
4 active adults. He further explained that Pulte Homes was in a position to have an option
5 on approximately half of the lots, noting that the other community center that had been
6 previously discussed would be maintained. He advised the Commission that an
7 elementary school site had been identified, and that they were continuing to look at middle
8 school alternatives that they were confident the school district would accept. He noted that
9 65% of the first 3 phases of the project were expected to be active-adult, which would
10 alleviate some of the more urgent need for school facilities, but explained that he knew a
11 middle school site was a requirement, and that it was being worked on.
12

13 Planning Director Masyczek noted that staff had been running into issues of small-lot
14 subdivisions meeting the design guidelines. He recommended that the Commission direct
15 staff to come back with some ideas on rectifying these problems.
16

17 Mike Princelow, 801 Von Karmann, Irvine, California gave a PowerPoint presentation,
18 providing details for the Commission regarding each slide. He discussed the illustrative
19 site plan and the master landscape plan with its open space allotments and passive areas.
20 He pointed out a sample of a "neighborhood wall" and indicated a pedestrian trail with
21 drought tolerant landscaping. He displayed a example of an active pocket park, an entry
22 into a paseo, a paseo crossing, a pedestrian trail leading to a paseo, a pocket park with
23 low-maintenance landscaping, and a pocket park with active landscaping. He indicated
24 the elevations of the different plans for the project areas, including the front, side and rear
25 elevations, and he pointed out the garages and different building materials that were
26 included, such as stucco and shutters. He displayed a photo of a typical street scene
27 within the project.
28

29 Chairman Duistermars asked if the garage doors would have windows.
30

31 Mr. Princelow responded that they would, noting that what had been displayed was already
32 built and only an example. He displayed some more slides of the floor plans, which
33 included an exercise room within the community center. He suggested that they would like
34 to introduce an additional plan type that had not been included in the presentation.
35

36 A discussion ensued regarding the proposed plan.
37

38 Mr. Princelow advised the Commission that all of the homes along Fisher Street would be
39 single-story, with a mixture of one- and two-story homes along New Warren Road.
40

41 Chairman Duistermars asked if there would be zero lot lines on the 4,500 square-foot lots,
42 and how it would be broken up. He explained that a five-bedroom home on a 4,500
43
44

1 square-foot lot would be an issue for the Commission, and noted that they did not want to
2 see all garages, so they would need to meet the 40% rule.

3
4 Mr. Princelow responded that there would be nothing greater than a 4-bedroom house on
5 a 4,500 square-foot lot. He expressed some concern with pushing the garage to the back
6 , since this would put it in the back yard.

7
8 Chairman Duistermars stated that he would like restrictions imposed to have no basketball
9 or soccer nets in the front of the homes, and suggested that he would like to see some
10 plotting, noting that the architecture was very nice, but that plotting was an important issue.

11
12 Mr. Princelow noted that they had held off on plotting until they could determine that they
13 were on the right path.

14
15 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding how much open space and clubhouse area
16 would be built in the early phases of the project.

17
18 Mr. Princelow responded that in the active-adult area the community center would be built
19 right away, but that for the other portion of the project, it would be built in a later phase,
20 although they were not yet sure which one. He explained that for marketing purposes, they
21 would want to install the amenities as soon as possible.

22
23 Chairman Duistermars pointed out that sometimes the market changes, and expressed
24 some concern with the idea that should this happen, the clubhouse might never get built.

25
26 Mr. Avis responded that with the active adult area, an additional 3-acres of amenities had
27 been added to the project, which were expected to be installed early on. He suggested
28 that many of the amenities would evolve with the conditions of approval for the Specific
29 Plan, rather than with these tentative maps.

30
31 A discussion of the proposed school site ensued followed by a discussion of parks.

32
33 Chairman Duistermars noted that if an agreement was not reached regarding a school site,
34 and homes were plotted, there may then become an issue with there being nowhere to put
35 a school. He explained that this was the kind of problem that could erupt with the school
36 site being tied to the final map.

37
38 Mr. Avis noted that they had actually been looking at properties to acquire in other areas
39 for the purpose of working with the school district.

40
41 Ms. Packham noted that if the school sites were not identified until the final map, the
42 builder would start pulling permits and building homes and there would be no place to
43 house the students because a school could not be built that quickly.

1 Chairman Duistermars stated that he wanted both parties to be happy before an
2 agreement was made.

3
4 Regarding the architecture, Commissioner Calkins suggested that the recreation center
5 was too far to one corner of the project in the active-adult section. He further suggested
6 that, regarding plotting, it was important that they review it early in the project in order to
7 avoid the issue that they had currently been seeing in another small-lot project that had
8 become problematic with the size of the homes that the developer was wanting to plot on
9 the smaller lots. He then discussed the issue of where vehicles would be parked.

10
11 Mr. Princelow suggested that the vehicle parking issue could be covered in the CC&R's for
12 the community. He noted that they had discussed the idea of having a storage facility on
13 the site.

14
15 Commissioner Calkins stated that he had hoped this project would have a mixture of 6,000
16 and 7,000 square-foot lots, noting that he did not feel that the smaller lots belonged in this
17 community, but was rather an attempt to bring "Orange County" into this neighborhood.
18 He stated that he was not necessarily resentful of the effort, but that he did not think it was
19 proper. He further noted that the homes that had been displayed included garages as
20 dominant features, which would not be allowed in the City of Hemet.

21
22 Mr. Princelow asked if the Commission would like them to look at a different type of
23 architecture.

24
25 Commissioner Calkins responded that the architecture was fine, but that the garage
26 situation needed to be adjusted so that it did not exceed 40% of the frontage of the
27 building.

28
29 Mr. Princelow suggested that this might be difficult to achieve on a 4,500 square-foot lot.

30
31 Commissioner Calkins responded that he would have to suggest that the garage be
32 located in the back on those lots.

33
34 Regarding the Specific Plan, Chairman Duistermars asked if there would be larger lots that
35 would balance this particular area.

36
37 Mr. Avis responded that there would, noting that in the larger specific plan, as you go out
38 to the west, the lots would get bigger. He explained that this was more of a core area, and
39 that they expected the specific plan to catch up in the year 2005. He discussed the
40 density, noting that the gross density would average out to approximately four units per
41 acre. He pointed out that there were other projects with higher densities and less
42 amenities, and stated that he felt this was a fairly comfortable density for the overall
43 project.

1 A discussion regarding the existing Page Ranch ensued, and what was currently allowed
2 with reference to densities.

3
4 Planning Director Masyczek noted that the Rancho Diamante Specific Plan was proposing
5 about half the density of what would be allowed under the existing Page Ranch PCD. He
6 explained that if they were to go to the smaller sizes of homes, they would be looking at
7 entry-level homes rather than move-up situations, which is what the City had been wanting
8 to see. He noted that a completely different group of people was targeted with the smaller
9 homes. He pointed out that, with this in mind, they obviously would not meet the 40/60 rule
10 on a 4,500 square-foot lot, but suggested that options should be discussed.

11
12 Chairman Duistermars stated that he would like to see some creativity, such as z-lots and
13 moving garages to the back, etc. He suggested that if the Commission could get a copy
14 of the Specific Plan so that they could see how the densities break out, it would be helpful.
15 He asked if any apartments were anticipated within the Specific Plan.

16
17 Mr. Avis responded that there were a couple of areas where there could be apartments,
18 as well as a possible retail area and an area for a future transit station.

19
20 A discussion of the 25% varied building material ensued.

21
22 Mr. Princelow assured the Commission that they would work on incorporating their
23 suggestions into the project design.

24
25 **C. STETSON RANCH - Richard Masyczek**

26 A work study session to review a possible Specific Plan for single-family
27 residential development located south of Stetson Avenue, east and west of
28 Elk Street.

29
30 The work study session was initiated by Planning Director Masyczek who provided some
31 details regarding the proposed project. He discussed some of the design concepts that
32 staff would be in support of, including some of the cul-de-sacs that continue to the main
33 streets and are separated only by pilasters with some wrought iron, which would provide
34 for a more pedestrian friendly design. He discussed the possibility of gating the project,
35 but noted that there were two dedicated public roads that might present a problem with
36 this. He explained that some other design considerations included the inclusion of open
37 space amenities. He noted that the proposed project was at a point where it needed the
38 Commission's input for design considerations, and that a Specific Plan amendment would
39 be needed. He further noted that a neighborhood meeting would be held, and that future
40 work study sessions would be noticed to encourage neighborhood input.

41
42 Ric Stephens of AEI-CASC Engineering, 937 S. Via Lata, Colton, California approached
43 the lectern as a representative for the applicant. He discussed some of the surrounding
44

1 areas, noting that to both the east and west of the site were various 6,000 square-foot lot
2 subdivisions, that the proposal to the south was for a new Master Planned Community
3 called McSweeny Ranch, and that the area around the lake was developing with a different
4 character than what was traditional for Hemet. He pointed out that this project site was an
5 in-fill area, noting that Thornton Avenue and part of Elk Street had already been built out.
6 He explained that each of the proposed villages would have its own Home Owner's
7 Association, that paseos would be included in the project with a great deal of connectivity,
8 and that recreation areas would also be a part of the project. He asked for input from the
9 Commission.

10
11 Chairman Duistermars noted that the guidelines almost had to be thrown out in order to
12 deal with projects that included 4,500 square-foot lots.

13
14 Mr. Stephens stated that they may be able to propose a different set of guidelines for small
15 lots, providing a whole new approach to designing the kinds of homes that the Commission
16 was not used to seeing.

17
18 Chairman Duistermars stated that he would like to keep consistency in check across
19 boundaries. He noted that the adjacent properties had 6,000 and 6,500 square-foot lots,
20 and that the Commission preferred to see lot lines matched for adjacent projects.

21
22 Commissioner Searl pointed out that the area in which the site was located was primarily
23 a single-story area.

24
25 Mr. Stephens stated that they would be very sensitive to privacy for the homes that they
26 proposed to build, so as not to create a privacy conflict. He added that a mix of one- and
27 two-story homes would likely be proposed.

28
29 Commissioner Searl suggested that this may be an issue with the neighbors.

30
31 Mr. Stephens stated that their next step was to hold a community meeting.

32
33 Commissioner Calkins noted that with this project, all of the lots adjacent to Thornton
34 Avenue and Elk Street would be walled. He suggested that this might create somewhat
35 of a raceway.

36
37 Mr. Stephens advised the Commission that all of the villages within the project would be
38 quite distinct. He stated that they might have wanted to do something different with the
39 streets, but that they couldn't because the streets were already existing. He suggested
40 that traffic calming could be proposed, and that they would work with staff to make
41 walkways and landscaping very attractive.

1 Commissioner Calkins noted that “canyon appearances” tended to develop with two-story
2 homes on small lots.

3
4 Planning Director Masyczek suggested the possibility of a clustering concept, and stated
5 that staff could work on this concept with the applicant.

6
7 Mike McGovern, 1392 Morris St., Irvine, California approached the lectern as a
8 representative for Sun Cal Companies, who was the applicant for the proposed project.
9 He stated that they would work with staff on the design, and noted that they were very
10 interested in looking into the cluster housing concept.

11
12 Chairman Duistermars stated that the park was great, and that he liked the paseos,
13 walkways and landscaping concepts.

14
15 Mr. McGovern stated that they would work on incorporating the Commissioners comments
16 into the design of the project.

17
18 **D. BUENA VISTA HOMES - Loretta Domenigoni**

19 A work study session to review a proposed zone change from R-3 to R-1-6
20 and a tentative tract map subdividing approximately 5 acres into 20 single-
21 family residential lots located east of Buena Vista Street and north of Sunjoy
22 Drive.

23
24 The work study session was initiated by Assistant Planner Domenigoni who provided some
25 details regarding the proposal. She noted that a change of zone to single-family residential
26 would be included. She described the surrounding neighborhoods, noting that Searl Park
27 was located on the west side of the street. She described an area of the site plan that
28 could be proposed as open space since it could not be built on, and explained that some
29 of the lots on the plan were indicated to be 6,000 square-feet in size.

30
31 Chairman Duistermars asked how large the lots were in the approved map adjacent to the
32 project.

33
34 Assistant Planner Domenigoni responded that they were 7,200 square-feet with an
35 earthquake fault that required elimination of some of the lots.

36
37 Principal Planner Sawyer pointed out that the General Plan designation was R-1, but the
38 zoning designation was R-3. He noted that the applicant was not attempting to change the
39 General Plan even though he would like to do multiple-family development. Instead, he
40 had chosen to propose lot sizes as small as 6,000 square-feet.

41
42 The Commission concurred that they would like to see some kind of noise study
43 completed.

1 Planning Director Masyczek noted that there had been past instances where the General
2 Plan and zoning designations were conflicting, and that the City had often initiated a
3 General Plan Amendment or Zone Change to bring them into compliance with one another.
4 He suggested that it should be considered as to whether the city should rectify the situation
5 or if the applicant should be required to do so.
6

7 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that in a discussion with the applicant,
8 staff had given the direction that they should go with 7,200 square-foot lots, but that the
9 argument had been that the property was R-3, and that with 7,200 square-foot lots they
10 would lose all of their density. He suggested that R-3 was not a density that was
11 appropriate so close to an earthquake fault line, and that he did not believe 6,000 square-
12 foot lots would be appropriate either.
13

14 Chairman Duistermars noted that on the plan the houses did not appear to be very large.
15

16 Assistant Planner Domenigoni responded that all of the homes were proposed to be two-
17 story and up to 2,000 square-feet in size.
18

19 Chairman Duistermars stated that, in this case, he felt the General Plan was more accurate
20 and consistent with the City's desire, particularly with the fault line being located there. He
21 further suggested that it would provide a nice variety.
22

23 Commissioner Searl noted that there were no issues with the garages since they were all
24 side-entry garages.
25

26 Chairman Duistermars stated that they would need to see how the applicant was treating
27 the fault line and the lot sizes.
28

29 Commissioner Searl asked if anyone had ever looked into a trails system for the fault line
30 areas.
31

32 Planning Director Masyczek stated that the 2+2 Committee had been looking at some
33 ideas that he would probably be bringing before the Commission sometime in August.
34

35 Chairman Duistermars suggested that the property had challenges and that the applicant
36 would need to be creative with it.
37

38 The Commission thanked Assistant Planner Domenigoni for her presentation.
39
40
41
42
43
44

1 **VII. CONSENT CALENDAR**

2
3 **A. MINUTES**

4 _____ 1. July 6, 2004

5
6 Commissioner Searl asked that the July 6, 2004 Minutes be pulled from the Consent
7 Calendar. He noted that in the first paragraph on Page No. 7, the wording should be
8 changed from *“a reciprocal access agreement would be obtained from Home Depot”*, to
9 read that the applicant was *“encouraged to obtain a reciprocal access agreement from*
10 *Home Depot”*, or something to that effect, since the reciprocal access agreement was not
11 necessarily required.

12
13 It was MOVED by Commissioner Searl and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
14 approve the Minutes of July 6, 2004 as amended.

15
16 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

17
18 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Rhoten and Searl
19 NOES: None
20 ABSTAIN: None
21 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones
22
23

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

25
26 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission of the changes that were made to
27 the Municipal Code, relative to Conditional Use Permits, through the adoption of an Interim
28 Urgency Ordinance. He noted that staff had been directed to work with the Planning
29 Commission on a permanent update to the zoning ordinance, and that this process would
30 begin in August. He suggested that it would probably be approximately a 2-month process.
31
32

33 **IX. DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

34 **A. DISCUSSION FOR NEW DATE FOR CANCELED TOUR OF HARVESTON**

35
36
37 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that the Commission could either reschedule the
38 canceled tour, or photos and examples could be brought back to the Commission for
39 review at a future meeting.
40
41
42
43
44

1 **X. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

2
3 There were no comments made.
4

5
6 **XI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

7
8 There were no future agenda items requested.
9

10
11 **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

12
13 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten, SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins and
14 unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 8:34 p.m. to the regular meeting of the
15 City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for Tuesday, August 3, 2003 at 6:00 p.m.
16 at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet,
17 California 92543.
18
19
20
21

22 _____
23 Bob Duistermars, Chairman
24 Hemet Planning Commission

25
26 ATTEST:
27
28
29

30 _____
31 Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary
32 Hemet Planning Commission
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44