

1 CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

2  
3 TUESDAY, AUGUST 5, 2003

4  
5 THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION WAS  
6 CONVENED BY CHAIRMAN DUISTERMARS ON TUESDAY, AUGUST 5, 2003 AT 6:02  
7 P.M. 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, B.R. Hicks, and Mayzelle Rhoten

12  
13 **Absent:** None

14  
15 **Staff Present:** Principal Planner Matthew Bassi, Police Lieutenant Rudy  
16 Cabrera, Planning Technician Loretta Domenigoni, Planning  
17 Director Richard Masyczek, Principal Planner David Sawyer,  
18 Minutes Secretary Nancie Shaw, Fire Chief Richard Stacey; City  
19 Engineer Roland Trietsch and Assistant City Attorney Eric Vail

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

22  
23 **I. PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Anyone who wishes to address the Commission regarding  
24 items not on the agenda may do so at this time. Please line up at the lectern when  
25 the Chair asks if there are any communications from the public. ***When you are***  
26 ***recognized, please give your name, spelling of last name, and address for***  
27 ***accurate recording in the minutes.***

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

30  
31  
32 **II. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE:** Update given by HUSD  
33 Director of Facilities, Sandy Packham

34  
35 Sandy Packam, Director of Facilities for the Hemet Unified School District, reported that  
36 the school renovation projects were continuing to move forward with Cawston Elementary  
37 School getting started on their underground utilities and Harmony Elementary School  
38 almost ready for occupancy. She added that the Hemet High School project would be  
39 done in time, but that it would be right down to the wire with the crews working 7 days a  
40 week and 16 hours per day. She stated that the cleaning crews were scheduled to start  
41 this Friday and that everyone would be working very hard towards completion of the

1 project.

2  
3 Ms. Packham reported that the site selection for Jacob Weins Elementary School was  
4 being reviewed by the school board this evening and that the recommendation was to  
5 adopt the stadium at Santa Fe Middle School as the permanent site. She explained that  
6 a new stadium would need to be built at Hemet High School if this site were chosen.

7  
8 Ms. Packham advised the Commission that the rough draft for the HUSD Master Plan had  
9 been reviewed, and that they would be meeting on Wednesday to discuss the plan. She  
10 added that the final draft was to be completed by August 20, 2003, and that they were  
11 hoping to have it distributed for comment within 30 days.

12  
13  
14 **III. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**

15  
16 Chairman Duistermars advised the audience that Item # V.C. would not be heard this  
17 evening, but would be re-advertised for the September 2, 2003 Planning Commission  
18 meeting.

19  
20  
21 **IV. CONSENT CALENDAR:**

22  
23 **A. MINUTES**

- 24  
25 1. March 18, 2003  
26 2. July 15, 2003  
27

28 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Hicks and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Calkins to  
29 approve the consent calendar as presented.

30  
31 The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote:

32  
33 **AYES:** Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,  
34 Hicks and Rhoten  
35 **NOES:** None  
36 **ABSTAIN:** None  
37 **ABSENT:** None  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

1 **V. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

2  
3 **A. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 01-1 (EXTENSION OF TIME)**

4 APPLICANT: The Salvation Army  
5 AGENT: G.V. Salts, STK Architecture, Inc.  
6 LOCATION: Southeast corner of Palm and Acacia Avenues  
7 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni  
8 DESCRIPTION: A request for a one-year time extension and minor site  
9 and architectural modifications for the development of  
10 a 13,572 square-foot one-story building containing a  
11 worship chapel, classrooms, offices and a multi-  
12 purpose room.  
13

14 Planning Technician Domenigoni advised the Commission that the applicant had submitted  
15 a letter requesting that this public hearing be continued to the meeting of September 2,  
16 2003 as he is on vacation and will not be able to attend this meeting. She added that the  
17 request for a continuance had been received in time to grant a temporary extension  
18 pending the Planning Commission's approval.  
19

20 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding architectural changes to the project.  
21

22 Planning Technician Domenigoni responded that the project, with any changes, would be  
23 presented at the September 2, 2003 meeting.  
24

25 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:11 p.m. and asked if there were any  
26 members of the public who wished to speak regarding the project.  
27

28 Since there were none, he asked for a motion to continue the project to the meeting of  
29 September 2, 2003.  
30

31 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Hicks to  
32 continue the public hearing, open, to the meeting of September 2, 2003.  
33

34 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:  
35

36 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,  
37 Hicks and Rhoten

38 NOES: None

39 ABSTAIN: None

40 ABSENT: None  
41  
42  
43

1  
2 **B. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 01-1; SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 01-2**  
3 **(MCSWEENEY SPECIFIC PLAN - PRE-ZONING OF SUBJECT**  
4 **PROPERTY) (AND CONSIDERATION OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL**  
5 **IMPACT REPORT FOR THE PROJECTS**

6 APPLICANT: McSweeney Farms Properties

7 LOCATION: Southeast corner of State Street and Gibbel Road in  
8 the unincorporated area of the County

9 PLANNER: Richard Masyczek

10 DESCRIPTION: A request for pre-zoning of a 673 acre site to Specific  
11 Plan (SP 01-2 which would permit 1,640 residential  
12 units, 100 acres of open space, 12 acres of commercial  
13 space, 3 acres for an equestrian center and two school  
14 sites on the subject property. A concurrent General  
15 Plan Amendment is also proposed to accommodate the  
16 uses specified above. A draft Environmental Impact  
17 Report (DEIR) will also be reviewed.  
18

19 Planning Director Masyczek presented the staff report, providing some details regarding  
20 the proposed project. He described the setting and surroundings and discussed the  
21 proposed plan for drainage. He gave some details regarding the design of the proposed  
22 Specific Plan and noted the changes that had been made. He explained that there would  
23 be an average lot size of 7,200 square-feet and discussed the density of the project. He  
24 indicated the density requirements of the current General Plan land use designation, and  
25 discussed the difference between those and what was being proposed. He explained that  
26 the Planning Commission would need to make a Statement of Overriding Considerations  
27 in order to approve the project by finding that the benefits of the project outweigh any  
28 adverse impacts that the project would cause. He advised the Commission that some of  
29 the other departments had representatives in attendance this evening, adding that Fire  
30 Chief Stacey had some issues that should be easily resolved. He briefly described the  
31 issue, which was with access, and stated that the Chief could elaborate if he needed to.  
32

33 Fire Chief Stacey approached the lectern and explained to the Commission that the Fire  
34 Department had been dealing with the issue of development projects that fail to have good  
35 connectivity with neighboring projects. He added that while the areas adjacent to this  
36 project may be in the unincorporated County area, the City of Hemet Fire Department still  
37 responds to calls within those areas through the mutual aid response mechanism, and  
38 stated that he would like to discuss access issues with the applicant prior to the final  
39 phases of approval for this project.  
40

41 Chairman Duistermars asked if the east border of the project (Girard Street) would be a  
42  
43

1 developed road at some point in the future.

2  
3  
4 Planning Director Masyczek responded that there should be a standard condition requiring  
5 the applicant to do some type of street improvements at least on their half of the roadway.  
6 He explained that the other side of the road would not be improved until development  
7 occurs on the other side.

8  
9 Police Department Lieutenant Cabrera approached the lectern and advised the  
10 Commission that he would like to see an access road coming off of Newport Road between  
11 the south center portion and the southwest corner of the project. He added that it would  
12 be nice to have Girard Street extend into the project. He advised the Commission that in  
13 the future the police department would be looking closely at through traffic and the  
14 avoidance of cul-de-sacs. He suggested that the issue of the Salt Creek Channel bridge  
15 was a concern, but that he believed it would be resolved before this project was well  
16 underway.

17  
18 Commissioner Hicks inquired regarding whether there would be improvements required  
19 for Newport Road.

20  
21 Planning Director Masyczek explained that improvements would be required along the  
22 applicant's portion of the property and that the City would make sure that there were two  
23 lanes of access going through. He added that this would be completed at the time of the  
24 tentative map.

25  
26 Commissioner Hicks asked how it would be possible to continue the roadway eastward in  
27 a manner to accommodate the Fire and Police Department access concerns.

28  
29 Planning Director Masyczek responded that currently Newport Road is paved until it hits  
30 Girard Street where it becomes a dirt road. He stated that when development begins it is  
31 typical for the City to attach the road improvement requirements for roadways adjacent to  
32 the property being developed.

33  
34 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the Statement of Overriding Considerations,  
35 asking if all future Specific Plan developments would be facing the same type of  
36 cumulative impact analysis as this project

37  
38 Planning Director Masyczek responded that this was definitely a possibility. He explained  
39 that in 1992 the City of Hemet had adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations with  
40 the approval of the Environmental Impact Report for the update of the General Plan. He  
41 added that if a project is found generally consistent with the density ranges of the 1992

1 General Plan, a Statement of Overriding Considerations is already in place. He further  
2 explained that whenever there is a project that proposes a density range in excess of what  
3 is listed in the General Plan, because of the fact that the City is in a non-attainment basin  
4 for air quality regulations and the fact that we essentially have a failure of our regional  
5 circulation system, the Commission would probably be looking at very similar types of  
6 findings. He added that this was not to say that the project would be a "fatal flaw", but that  
7 it was simply a fact of life that would need to be evaluated by the Commission as to  
8 whether it would be beneficial to the City to override the implied impacts.

9  
10 Chairman Duistermars asked what the gross density per acre was for the project with the  
11 consideration of 1,640 homes.

12  
13 Planning Director Masyczek responded that it would be 2.44 units per acre.

14  
15 Chairman Duistermars asked for clarification that, with the General Plan allowing 2 to 3  
16 units per acre, the overriding concern was for the southern portion of the project  
17 exclusively.

18  
19 Planning Director Masyczek responded that this was correct.

20  
21 Commissioner Hicks asked if the Commission would be locked into the 1,640 units if they  
22 were to approve the project as presented this evening.

23  
24 Planning Director Masyczek responded that they would be, as the applicant would be  
25 establishing their entitlements as part of the Specific Plan.

26  
27 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:32 p.m.

28  
29 Ric Stephens of AEI-CASC Engineering, 937 South Via Lata, Suite 500, Colton, California  
30 approached the lectern as a representative for the applicant. He gave a PowerPoint  
31 presentation on the proposed project, explaining that numerous changes had been made  
32 since the last review. He indicated that the hilltops would be preserved through Open  
33 Space and Conservation Easements, and that there would be enhanced streetscapes and  
34 entryways. He explained that, project-wide, there would be western heritage themed  
35 architectural and landscape design guidelines. He advised the Commission that the  
36 average small lots had been enlarged, and that there was a 600-foot depth of the large  
37 frontage Equestrian Estates adjacent to Newport Road and Girard Street. He added that  
38 acreage had been reserved for both an elementary school site and a middle-school site,  
39 explaining that the middle school would serve mostly children from Avery Canyon and  
40 Diamond Valley, and that the school district may not end up using this site. He indicated  
41 that there would be a market on the corner of State Street and Domenigoni Parkway, and  
42

1 that they were providing more than twice the park space that was required of them. He  
2 referred to the equestrian park, equestrian center and equestrian staging area, explaining  
3 that all would be connected by over 5 miles of public trails, paseos and walkways to make  
4 a bikeable, rideable and walkable community. He advised the Commission that there  
5 would be a 3-acre community center with an 18,000 square-foot clubhouse that would  
6  
7 include a pool and spa. He added that cultural resource preservation was being handled  
8 in coordination with the Soboba and Pechanga Indian tribes, and that improved flood  
9 protection for southern Hemet and Diamond Valley would be a positive result of the  
10 project.

11  
12 Regarding the project design, Mr. Stephens explained that 1,600 to 1,700 homes would  
13 be provided, with a ceiling of 1,700 units regardless of whether or not the middle school  
14 ended up being built. He added that lot sizes would vary from 5,000 square-feet to more  
15 than 2-acres. He explained that the adjacent residences would be buffered with open  
16 space, parks and one-acre lots, and that the Newport Road and Girard Street residences  
17 would be buffered with equestrian lots to depths of 600-feet.

18  
19 Mr. Stephens continued on regarding the project changes, explaining that the mixed use  
20 and multi-family development had been removed at the request of the both the  
21 Commission and the surrounding residents, that the public park area had been increased  
22 to twice the requirement, and that the rural and equestrian estate areas had been  
23 increased almost 10-fold.

24  
25 Mr. Stephens stated that he was surprised to hear about the new connectivity concerns  
26 after all this time, but assured the Commission that they would be happy to work with Staff  
27 on this issue, and would also like the residents of the surrounding neighborhood to be  
28 involved with the resolution. He added that they would really like to have the Commission  
29 make a decision regarding the project this evening, and believed that they had complied  
30 with all of the changes that had been requested.

31  
32 Sandy Packham approached the lectern and advised the Commission that one of the  
33 reasons that the middle school may not be built is due to the fact that HUSD does not  
34 currently have the funds to build either the middle school or the elementary school. She  
35 added that it was not a matter of whether the site was needed, but whether the acquisition  
36 could be funded.

37  
38 Vice Chairman Jones referred to HUSD as a utility of sorts, and asked if it was correct to  
39 say that if the school district did not have the money to build the needed school site, the  
40 project would be a burden on them.

1 Ms. Packham responded that the district would indeed be burdened, but would not have  
2 the funds to overcome that burden unless something were to happen between now and  
3 then.

4  
5 Chairman Duistermars asked if they should assume that neither site would be developed  
6 if there was no funding available.

7  
8  
9  
10 Ms. Packham responded that it was less expensive to develop an elementary school, so  
11 that site would be developed first. She added that on page V-18 of the proposed Specific  
12 Plan a street is indicated on 3 sides of the school, but the State will only fund 50% on two  
13 sides. She stated that she could not recall a 3<sup>rd</sup> street being part of the agreement, and  
14 explained that this would be an additional burden to the school district.

15  
16 Vice Chairman Jones asked if the issue could be resolved with a Development Agreement.

17  
18 Planning Director Masyczek stated that he did not believe the school district's lack of  
19 funding should be considered a negative impact to the project, and suggested that it  
20 should not affect the Commission's decision.

21  
22 Ms. Packham explained that by the time the Development Fees are paid the homes are  
23 already ready to be built and there is not enough time to build the school before the homes  
24 are completed.

25  
26 Mr. Stephens stated that the project would be a part of a Community Facilities District  
27 (CFD). He explained that while there was no question that the elementary school would  
28 be built, it was questionable as to whether the middle school would be built, but added that  
29 they would work with the school district to resolve any issues.

30  
31 Commissioner Hicks asked if they would be willing to set aside the site until the school  
32 district had attained the funding to meet the need for the middle school.

33  
34 Assistant City Attorney Vail intervened, explaining to the Commission that they have  
35 limited authority under the California Planning and Zoning Law to impose exactions for the  
36 purpose of California school facilities. He added that this was generally limited to the fees  
37 that are set out in the Planning and Zoning law, however, if HUSD had made a finding that  
38 overcrowding exists and had provided that finding to the City, and the City had in turn  
39 adopted an ordinance requiring some additional exactions, then those additional exactions  
40 could take place with regard to a discretionary permit. He added that he was not aware  
41 of the school district having found a state of overcrowding to exist, and explained that if  
42

1 they had not the Commission would be limited in their approval to the fees that are set  
2 forth in the Planning and Zoning Law or to dedications of property or facilities of some kind  
3 of equal value. He further added that this was not to say that some negotiated agreement  
4 between the property owner and the City, if such was sought by the property owner,  
5 couldn't require or ask for fees in addition to those, but explained that this was not the  
6 issue being reviewed by the Commission at this meeting.

7  
8 Commissioner Hicks asked if Mr. Stephens had received a copy of the letter from the  
9 Johannsen's regarding ingress & egress to their property via a road that cuts across the

10  
11  
12 McSweeny property by approximately 200-feet. He provided Mr. Stephens with a copy of  
13 the letter to review.

14  
15 Tom Nieves of AEI-CASC Engineering approached the lectern and advised the  
16 Commission that easements were being completed and deeds being drawn up to provide  
17 the Johannsens with access in perpetuity, which was basically formalizing the legality of  
18 the Johannsens' access. He added that he was not aware of any improvements being  
19 made to this road.

20  
21 Tom Olsen, 2829 South State Street, Hemet, California approached the lectern as the  
22 project applicant and explained to the Commission that they had been preoccupied while  
23 dealing with numerous issues regarding this project. He apologized for not having notified  
24 the Johannsens that proceedings were underway to formalize the transfer of land title for  
25 the roadway.

26  
27 A discussion ensued regarding road improvements to Girard Street.

28  
29 Commissioner Calkins inquired as to where the access to Girard Street was located.

30  
31 Planning Director Masyczek explained that Girard Street is currently accessed from  
32 Newport Road.

33  
34 Commissioner Calkins stated that the current map was rather general and asked if there  
35 would be vehicular access from the community to the commercial property.

36  
37 Mr. Stephens responded that there would probably not.

38  
39 Commissioner Calkins expressed concern for those who would have to go out onto heavily  
40 traveled streets just to access the commercial area.

1 Mr. Stephens suggested that this access issue could be resolved when the project comes  
2 back before the Commission in its final phases.

3  
4 A discussion ensued regarding the widening of State Street.

5  
6 Commissioner Hicks asked what kind of impacts there would be to circulation without  
7 improvements being done to State Street.

8  
9 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the traffic analysis had anticipated  
10 construction of that road, and that obviously the capacity for traffic would not be available  
11 without the widening of State Street. He added that State Street improvements would be  
12 necessary to facilitate emergency response.

13  
14 A discussion ensued regarding the impact of drainage issues from the project in the event  
15 that State Street improvements are not completed.

16  
17 Planning Director Masyczek explained that the project offers no provision for the funding  
18 of off-site improvements.

19  
20 Chairman Duistermars invited members of the audience to speak regarding the project.

21  
22 Brenda Scott, 29290 Girard Street, Hemet, California approached the lectern as an  
23 adjacent property owner to the project. She asked the Commission to continue the project,  
24 explaining that she appreciated all of the changes that had been made, and that she had  
25 a positive feeling about them, but that she had just received the public hearing notice on  
26 July 25, 2003, and had been out of town, so she had not had time to review some of the  
27 changes that had been made to the documents that the Commission had received. She  
28 advised the Commission that she remained concerned with the density of the project, as  
29 well as the location of the school sites. She stated that she had heard a rumor that low-  
30 income housing would have first bid on the site if the school district did not utilize it. She  
31 added that she did not want to see just ½ of her road get paved.

32  
33 Russ Hammill, 40130 Polly Butte Road, Hemet, California approached the lectern as an  
34 adjacent property owner to the project. He expressed concerns regarding Gibbel Road,  
35 explaining that Girard Street could not go all the way through and that there would be only  
36 one access going into Gibbel Road which was all high-density. He stated that he would  
37 like to see access from the project onto State Street. He added that there was not enough  
38 width on Gibbel Road for access, and that any fires in the hills would present a problem  
39 for residents attempting to evacuate.

40  
41 Howard Huseh, 40425 Quiet Hills Road, Hemet, California approached the lectern as an  
42

1 adjacent property owner to the project. He stated that he had watched the project develop  
2 and evolve into the current proposal, which had gone from an original 3,200 dwelling units  
3 to 1,640 dwelling units. He commended the applicant and the city for their hard work,  
4 stating that in his opinion the project is finally “right”, and that he feels the project would  
5 be a great addition to the community and would like to see it approved.

6  
7 Tammy Wilhelm, 27637 Vista Del Mia, Hemet, California approached the lectern and  
8 expressed her support for the McSweeny family and the proposed project. She suggested  
9 that this was an “upper end” project that would give the city an opportunity to start  
10 competing with Temecula and Corona. She added that the project would provide  
11 economic resources to re-build interior portions of the city, and that \$60 million in fees  
12 would go to the school district with the build-out of the project, which should be enough to  
13 build a new middle school.

14  
15  
16 Phil Howard, 41380 Polly Butte Road, Hemet, California approached the lectern as an  
17 adjacent property owner to the project. He expressed his concern with the fact that while  
18 he noted a buffer zone on Newport Road he did not see one for Gibbel Road. He  
19 suggested that some kind of buffer should be added there, particularly since there would  
20 be an access onto Gibbel Road. He added that the density of the project was still a  
21 problem, particularly because the highest density portion of the project was near Gibbel  
22 Road.

23  
24 John Johnston, 39312 State Street, Hemet, California approached the lectern and advised  
25 the Commission that he had been appalled by the project when it was first proposed, but  
26 that as it is presented now the plan is exactly what the City of Hemet needs. He  
27 encouraged the Commission to approve the project, referring to it as a “diamond” in  
28 Diamond Valley, and commended the Diamond Valley residents for their input.

29  
30 Brenda Tomares, 10755-Up Scripps Poway Parkway, Suite #281, San Diego, California  
31 approached the lectern and expressed her appreciation to both the applicant and the City  
32 for their great efforts at working with the tribes. She stated that the mitigation measures  
33 for the project were acceptable to the tribes and encouraged the Planning Commission to  
34 approve the Environmental Impact Report with the revised mitigation measures that had  
35 been drafted.

36  
37 Allison Burke, 39980 Saddle Ridge Road, Hemet, California approached the lectern as an  
38 adjacent property owner to the project. She advised the Commission that she had been  
39 driving the roads in that area for 27 years and that she could not begin to recall how many  
40 times there had been inaccessibility due to flooding. She requested that, with this in mind,  
41 the project be continued until the drainage issues could be resolved.

1 Kelly Ashman, 40911 Gibbel Road, Hemet, California thanked Planning Director  
2 Masyczek, the City, the McSweeney family and their developers for all of their efforts at  
3 making this project more agreeable with the surrounding residents. She stated that she  
4 did, however, still have an issue with the proposed density, and also suggested that the  
5 school site should be reserved for the entire 20-year build-out estimation, if necessary,  
6 rather than the 5 years that it is currently reserved for. She added that the location of the  
7 middle school site in proximity to the canyon was of concern to her.

8  
9 Chairman Duistermars advised her that he believed the site was being moved further to  
10 the south.

11  
12 Ms. Ashman asked that the Commission continue the project to allow the Diamond Valley  
13 Country Coalition time to review the new reports that had come out, adding that she would  
14 like to see the density reduced to 2 units per acre rather than 3.

15  
16  
17  
18 Mr. Stephens addressed some of the issues that had been brought up by the residents.

19  
20 Commissioner Hicks asked if the Riverside County Flood Control was involved in the  
21 resolution process regarding the flooding issue on State Street.

22  
23 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the City reviews the facilities, and the County  
24 is supposed to be maintaining Salt Creek, but never has.

25  
26 Mr. Nieves explained that the new design would have a soft bottom facility that would take  
27 care of some of the flooding problems since some of the existing waters that currently flood  
28 State Street would be channelized to the soft bottom facility.

29  
30 Commissioner Hicks stated that the flood issue was a real concern, and would be even  
31 more of a concern if it was not alleviated with the construction of this project.

32  
33 Mr. Nieves assured the Commission that the flooding would be relieved by this project, and  
34 explained how this would be achieved.

35  
36 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that the two primary canyons were of concern,  
37 adding that the project would help channelize waters that cause flooding from the Cactus  
38 Valley area.

39  
40 Commissioner Hicks stated that he could foresee a problem if the improvements to State  
41 Street were not completed.

1 Mr. Stephens claimed that the current flooding situation would continue to be a problem  
2 until the drainage channels were installed along Gibbel Road. He suggested that without  
3 this project the flooding problem would continue to persist.

4  
5 Planning Director Masyczek stated that there were on-site improvements that would be  
6 provided by this project, including full channelization. He added that a box-culvert under  
7 State Street that flows into the MWD channels would also be provided. He explained that  
8 an unresolved problem is that there would be no off-site requirement for mitigation of Avery  
9 Canyon waters, so once the water leaves the site, the problem would continue to exist.  
10 He suggested that acceleration of a Development Agreement and payment of fees could  
11 help provide a resolution.

12  
13 A discussion ensued regarding water flow from the Avery Canyon area.

14  
15 Commissioner Hicks addressed the fact that there would be a great deal more citizens who  
16 would need emergency services that they may not be able to receive during flooding  
17 conditions.

18  
19 Mr. Stephens assured the Commission that the flooding situation would improve, and that  
20 in no case would it become worse at any point.

21  
22 Commissioner Hicks stated that his concern was not regarding whether or not the flooding  
23 situation would get worse. He explained that the flooding had not been much of an issue  
24 to the City in the past because the residents who were affected did not reside within the  
25 City limits, but that with the approval of this project those affected would be within the City  
26 limits and the number of them would be greater than those who are currently impacted

27  
28 Fire Chief Stacey advised the Commission that the current response time from Fire Station  
29 2 to the project site was 8 minutes, which could increase up to 11 minutes under flooding  
30 conditions. He added that the Airport Station would be the 2<sup>nd</sup> unit to respond.

31  
32 Commissioner Hicks stated that, regarding the circulation plan, he felt uncomfortable with  
33 only one ingress and egress off of State Street.

34  
35 Planning Director Masyczek clarified that there were two on State Street and one on  
36 Gibbel Road.

37  
38 A discussion ensued regarding accessways being added off of Girard Street and Newport  
39 Road.

40  
41 Commissioner Hicks suggested that there should be traffic signals installed for ingress and

1 egress off of State Street.

2

3 Planning Director Masyczek stated that the mitigation plan would require significant  
4 signalization.

5

6 Commissioner Hicks asked how westerly property owners would be affected when State  
7 Street is developed to the south of Gibbel Road.

8

9 Planning Director Masyczek responded that no westerly property owners would be  
10 adversely affected.

11

12 Commissioner Hicks stated that he would definitely like to see the middle school  
13 developed on the site in the future.

14

15 Chairman Duistermars addressed the fact that, in terms of the school, nobody was  
16 comfortable with the site reverting to homes if the school site failed to be developed. He  
17 stated that he would like it to be a requirement that the site be reserved for the school. He  
18 added that he was concerned with the density going back up to 1,700 dwelling units per  
19 acre, and that he would much prefer to see the maximum density at 1,600 units per acre.

20

21 Mr. Stephens explained that the ceiling of 1,700 dwelling units per acre could be changed  
22 to cap at 1,640 dwelling units per acre.

23

24 Vice Chairman Jones asked why it could not cap at 1,600 dwelling units per acre.

25

26 Mr. Stephens explained that engineering required a 2% leeway.

27

28 Chairman Duistermars suggested that it be capped at 1,600 dwelling units per acre with  
29 a 2% leeway, and assurance that the school sites remain school sites.

30

31 Mr. Stephens agreed that they could change the language in the Specific Plan to read  
32 ***“1,600 dwelling units per acre with a 2% leeway.”***

33

34 A discussion ensued regarding this change.

35

36 Vice Chairman Jones inquired as to what point in the process the equestrian center would  
37 be built.

38

39 Mr. Stephens responded that the Home Owner’s Association (HOA) would be established  
40 immediately, and that as soon as the necessary level of dues was collected, construction  
41 of the equestrian center would begin.

42

43

44

1 Assistant City Attorney Vail suggested that the only way to ensure development would be  
2 to have the developer front the cost. He added that it could be conditioned in the phasing  
3 requirements of the Specific Plan.

4  
5 Chairman Duistermars suggested that they could be bonded for the installation. He then  
6 inquired regarding the access roads to the south and east, and the school site sliding to  
7 the south. He suggested that the school district site should be set aside until buildout.

8  
9 Commissioner Hicks asked how maintenance of the site would be satisfied.

10  
11 Mr. Stephens suggested that it could be seeded with something to make it more attractive.

12  
13 Additional discussion ensued regarding the flooding issue on State Street.

14  
15 Commissioner Hicks inquired as to whether it would be reasonable to ask the developer  
16 to mitigate any flood issue that is within ½ mile to one mile down the road.

17  
18 Planning Director Masyczek referred to Page I-38 - Fire Protection Services, explaining  
19 that the project is required to contribute to the improvement of Fire Protection Services.  
20 He

21  
22 suggested that they may be able to impose the same type of language relative to flooding,  
23 and require the developer to help pay for a resolution, but not bear the full cost.

24  
25 Chairman Duistermars stated that there was the question of timing. He inquired regarding  
26 whether the developer would provide funding assistance if the City was unable to fund the  
27 entire State Street project, as was currently questionable,

28  
29 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.

30  
31 Chairman Duistermars addressed the fact that, whether or not this project was built, the  
32 flooding would remain a major issue.

33  
34 The Commission concurred that the same type of language be added, relative to flooding,  
35 as is present for Fire Protection Services on Page I-38.

36  
37 Commissioner Calkins commented that the development was not rural, as one would be  
38 led to believe. He noted that 1,300 of the lots were under the City's current standards, and  
39 suggested that there should be an additional lot size added that would gradually increase  
40 the layers of the project from higher density to rural property. He asked if another 1,300  
41 small lots were really needed within the City, when this would be an opportunity to have

1 more rural estates added to the community. He added that this would also keep the  
2 property in sync with what is already existing in the area, and stated that it was his feeling  
3 that a rural atmosphere should be maintained. He stated that a number of steps had been  
4 taken in the right direction, but he still did not find the current design appropriate for  
5 country living.

6  
7 A discussion ensued regarding these comments.

8  
9 Vice Chairman Jones noted that if ½ acre or greater lots were provided all of the  
10 infrastructure and amenities would not be necessary.

11  
12 Mr. Stephens expressed some frustration, stating that as of the meeting that had been held  
13 in March 2003, he had been under the impression that the current design was what the  
14 Commission was looking for. He noted, regarding timing, that there had been a series of  
15 meetings. He explained that in April the revised Specific Plan had been distributed to the  
16 City, and that it had now been under review for 4 months. He stated that this was by no  
17 means a brand new presentation, and that he was hoping for the Commission's support.

18  
19 Mr. Olsen noted that , in context of the discussion relating specifically to the community  
20 center and the State Street drainage, prior to any agreement they would need to know  
21 what the specific language was. He added that they would work very hard to cooperate  
22 with the City, but could not say that they would agree to additional language without  
23 knowing what the language was. He suggested that he did not want to get stuck with a  
24 vague concept.

25  
26 Chairman Duistermars stated that if the project were to be continued, he would like to  
27 continue the public hearing open.

28  
29 Vice Chairman Jones asked if Staff would be able to pull everything together within 2  
30 weeks for the Commission to make a decision if the project were continued to the next  
31 meeting.

32  
33 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that he would be on vacation until  
34 Tuesday, April 12, 2003, but that he should be able to pull everything together so that a  
35 decision could be made at the next meeting.

36  
37 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.

38  
39 It was MOVED by Commissioner Hicks and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to  
40 continue the public hearing open for General Plan Amendment No. 01-1 / Specific Plan  
41 Amendment No. 01-2.

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

2  
3 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,  
4 Jones and Rhoten

5 NOES: None

6 ABSTAIN: None

7 ABSENT: None

8  
9 **C. ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-5/ ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 03-27**

10 APPLICANT: Jacoby Plantenga 1999 Trust

11 AGENT: Jeff Petrus, Lee Entitlements

12 LOCATION: West side of Cawston Avenue between Fruitvale and  
13 Eaton Avenues

14 PLANNER: Maureen Losey

15 DESCRIPTION: A request for a zone change from A-2-C (Heavy-  
16 Agricultural) to R-1 (Single-Family Residential), and  
17 adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the  
18 project.

19  
20 This item was continued to and will be re-advertised for the Planning Commission meeting  
21 of September 2, 2003.

22  
23  
24 **VI. WORK STUDY:**

25  
26 **A. D-3 ZONE - David Sawyer**

27 A presentation by staff of issues regarding the establishment of a D-3 Zone  
28 as a transitional zone between traditional commercial zones and single-family  
29 residential zoning. Two study areas will be presented with discussion by the  
30 Planning Commission and possible direction to staff.

31  
32 Principal Planner Sawyer began the work study session by distributing a handout  
33 regarding the potential D-3 Zone, which was being established at the request of the City  
34 Council. He described some of the highlights that he would be discussing during his  
35 presentation. He explained that the purpose of the D-3 Zone was to provide a transitional  
36 area between traditional single-family neighborhoods and areas of higher intensive retail  
37 or auto-related commercial activity, allow a mix of single-family residences and low  
38 intensive office or personal service uses, maintain the single-family residential character  
39 of the area and facilitate the conversion of existing residences to non-residential uses. He  
40 indicated the study areas that were being considered for which to apply this zone,  
41 consisting of Area A from Kimball Avenue to Acacia Avenue and Harvard Street to Franklin

1 Street and Area B, beginning 130-feet south of Florida Avenue to Kimball Avenue and  
2 Buena Vista Street to Santa Fe Street. He described the characteristics of each area,  
3 gave a description of the various types of land use that are currently included in each area,  
4 and discussed the conditions of the properties within the areas as well as whether or not  
5 they were in conformance with their zoning and/or land use designations. He explained  
6 that the D-3 zone would serve as a transitional zone between traditional commercial zones  
7 and single-family residential zones, and that Areas A and B were prime areas to consider  
8 for a zone change to a D- (Downtown) 3 zone.

9  
10 It was MOVED by NJ and 2<sup>nd</sup> by MR to extend the time limit of the meeting past the 9:00  
11 p.m. limit.

12  
13 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

14  
15 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,  
16 Hicks and Rhoten

17 NOES: None

18 ABSTAIN: None

19 ABSENT: None

20  
21 Discussion occurred regarding whether the study areas should be enlarged, reduced or  
22 remain as presented.

23  
24  
25  
26 Chairman Duistermars suggested that the planning area appeared to be about the right  
27 size for what the city was trying to accomplish. He asked if some different kinds of uses  
28 could be permitted near Florida Avenue, and then transition into more residential uses to  
29 the south, and if this could be done within one zone.

30  
31 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that it may be difficult to do this within one zone.

32  
33 A discussion of layering within the zone ensued.

34  
35 Planning Director Masyczek explained that many of the legal non-conforming uses that are  
36 present within the current zone are a problem because the property owners cannot get  
37 loans to fund any improvements to their properties due to their non-conforming status.

38  
39 A discussion ensued regarding how property values might be affected by the zone change.

40  
41 Chairman Duistermars stated that he did not think property values would suffer individually

1 with the establishment of the D-3 zone.

2

3 A discussion ensued regarding whether the residential uses should be limited to single-  
4 family residential, or if accessory dwelling units and/or duplexes and triplexes should be  
5 permitted as well.

6

7 The Commission concurred that it would be preferable to limit the residential uses to  
8 single-family.

9

10 Commissioner Hicks inquired about the potential for negative impacts.

11

12 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that the property owners of duplexes, triplexes and  
13 four-plexes would obviously consider the zone change to be a negative impact.

14

15 The Commission concurred that while it would be a good idea to complete a study for the  
16 consideration of the D-3 zone, they did not think that they were ready for the establishment  
17 of an ordinance.

18

19 Principal Planner Sawyer stated that he would prepare a draft ordinance for the  
20 Commission to review.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

1 **B. GPA NO. 03-4 AND ZC NO. 03-10 - Matthew Bassi**

2 A work study session to discuss a recent new project submittal comprising of  
3 a general plan amendment from Industrial (I) to R-1 (Single Family) and a  
4 zone change from CM & M1 to R-1 for a 43 acre project area located on the  
5 west side of Kirby Avenue, approximately 660 feet south of Acacia Avenue.  
6

7 Principal Planner Bassi began the work study session by conveying some details of the  
8 proposal to the Commission. He referred to the conceptual site design that had been  
9 distributed to the Commission with their packets, described the surrounding uses, and  
10 explained that up to 160 lots could be accommodated on this site.  
11

12 Roger Mobley of RGP Planning, 440 Goddard, Irvine, California approached the lectern  
13 as a representative for the applicant. He advised the Commission that there had been  
14 several unsuccessful attempts made in the past to develop the property with industrial  
15 uses, explaining that one possible reason for the lack of success could be due to market  
16 issues with the property being surrounded by residential uses. He suggested that a  
17 residential use for this area may be more appropriate, adding that he would like to get  
18 feedback from the Commission to incorporate into the project as they move forward in the  
19 process.  
20

21 Commissioner Hicks stated that the only concern that he would have is whether or not  
22 there would still be sufficient industrial property available in the City if this General Plan  
23 Amendment and Zone Change were to be approved.  
24

25 Mr. Mobley stated that he had reviewed this issue prior to the meeting, and that there  
26 seemed to be a substantial amount of industrial property available without the inclusion  
27 of this property.  
28

29 Planning Director Masyczek interjected that while there was approximately 1,100 acres  
30 available, excluding the property in question, some of it was located within the airport  
31 influence area.  
32

33 Chairman Duistermars expressed his opinion that there was plenty of land available in the  
34 City for residential use, and that he was not in favor of converting an industrial land use  
35 designation to a residential one at this time.  
36

37 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.  
38

39 It was agreed that staff would come back to the Commission with the amount of usable  
40 industrial space that is available within the City limits.  
41  
42  
43

1  
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

---

**Planning Commission Minutes  
August 5, 2003**

1 **VII. DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**

2  
3 **A. PROJECT APPROVAL SIGN-OFF BY DEPARTMENT**

4 Discussion & update to Commission regarding the implementation of a  
5 requirement for departments to sign off on project approvals.  
6

7 This item was not discussed due to time constraints.  
8  
9

10 **B. PARKS COMMISSION MEETING UPDATE**

11 Discussion and update of the July 28, 2003 Parks Commission meeting and  
12 their discussion of a Parks Master Plan, with possible direction to staff.  
13

14 This item was not discussed due to time constraints.  
15  
16

17 **VIII. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

18  
19 There were no comments made by the Commission.  
20  
21

22 **IX. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

23  
24 No future agenda items were requested.  
25  
26

27 **X. ADJOURNMENT:** It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones, SECONDED by  
28 Commissioner Rhoten and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 9:33  
29 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City of Hemet Planning Commission, scheduled  
30 for August 19, 2003 at 6:00 p.m. to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers  
31 located at 450 East Latham Avenue, Hemet, California 92543.  
32  
33

34  
35 \_\_\_\_\_  
36 Bob Duistermars, Chairman

37 ATTEST:

38  
39  
40 \_\_\_\_\_  
41 Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary  
42  
43

44 \_\_\_\_\_  
**Planning Commission Minutes**  
**August 5, 2003**

1  
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

---

**Planning Commission Minutes  
August 5, 2003**