

1 **II. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE:** Update given by HUSD
2 Director of Facilities, Sandy Packham
3

4 Sandy Packham, Director of Facilities for Hemet Unified School District, reported to the
5 Commission that the enrollment projections had already been met for the year, though
6 they are typically not met until October or November. She stated that they were surprised
7 to find out that Bautista Creek Elementary was over projections, and that they would be
8 needing another school in that area, and would soon be looking for a site.
9

10 Ms. Packham reported that the school district was continuing to work with OPSC on
11 eligibility, and that they were hoping to get some letters from the City to complete the
12 packet.
13

14 Ms. Packham advised the Commission that they would be meeting the following week for
15 their kick-off meeting on next summer's modernization projects. She noted that they
16 would be doing Phase 2 at Acacia & Santa Fe Middle Schools and Whittier, Little Lake
17 and Ramona Elementary Schools, and that Idyllwild, Hamilton and Winchester schools
18 would be added to the mix, which would pave the way for a full schedule.
19

20 Ms. Packham reported that some celebrations were approaching, and that the
21 Commission would be getting invitations, but that she wanted to provide them with the
22 dates in advance. She noted that on October 10th would be the "Cawston School
23 Raising", the "Harmony Dedication" would take place on October 24th, and the
24 "McSweeny Dedication" would be held on November 7th. She asked the Commission to
25 keep those dates open so that they could attend these events.
26

27 Commissioner Calkins inquired regarding the approval of the elevator at Hemet High
28 School.
29

30 Ms. Packham responded that it had finally been approved by the Division of State
31 Architects, and they were hoping that it would be completed by the end of October.
32
33

34 **III. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**
35

36 Principal Planner Bassi advised the Commission that staff would like to add Item No. VII.
37 D. to the work study session, which was inadvertently omitted from the agenda.
38

39 The Commission concurred.
40

41 Assistant City Attorney Vail noted that the Commission would need to vote to add the item
42 to the agenda.
43

44 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Rhoten and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Calkins to
45 add Item No. VII. D. to the work study session.
46
47
48

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

2
3 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins and Rhoten
4 NOES: None
5 ABSTAIN: None
6 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioner Hicks
7

8
9 **IV. CONSENT CALENDAR:**

10
11 A. MINUTES

12
13 1. May 6, 2003
14

15 **B. RESOLUTION OF DENIAL FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 02-6**
16 Resolution to be provided at the time of the meeting.
17

18 Chairman Duistermars removed Item No. B from the consent calendar and asked for a
19 Motion to approve the remaining item.
20

21 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
22 approve the Consent Calendar.
23

24 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

25
26 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins and Rhoten
27 NOES: None
28 ABSTAIN: None
29 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioner Hicks
30

31 Commissioner Hicks joined the meeting at 6:04 p.m.
32

33 Chairman Duistermars advised the Commission that he would like to now take a separate
34 vote on Item No. IV. B. - the Resolution of Denial for Conditional Use Permit No. 02-6.
35 He asked for a motion to adopt the resolution.
36

37 It was MOVED by Commissioner Hicks and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
38 adopt **Resolution No. 03-43** denying Conditional Use Permit No. 02-6.
39

40 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

41
42 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Hicks and Rhoten
43 NOES: None
44 ABSTAIN: None
45 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones
46
47
48

1 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS:**

2
3 **A. APPEAL NO. 03-1**

4 APPLICANT: Luanne Stockton, Floral Expressions
5 LOCATION: 210 W. Florida Ave.
6 PLANNER: Ron Running
7 DESCRIPTION: A request for a waiver from the Exterior Color Palette
8 for Floral Expressions.
9

10 City Planner Running presented the staff report, advising the Commission that the facility
11 had recently been re-painted with a color that was indicated on the trim section of the
12 City's color palette, which was limited to 10% of the building exterior. He explained that
13 the business owner had been given a notice of violation and that she was appealing that
14 violation. He displayed some photos of the building and the properties surrounding it.
15 He advised the Commission that some other businesses within the city limits had also
16 painted their buildings with similar colors, including the Hemet Valley mall and the former
17 GoodWill building. He explained that Planning Commission review was required of any
18 appeals of a color palette violation.
19

20 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the fee free permit that the City offers, asking
21 if the color was approved through the permitting process.
22

23 City Planner Running responded that the permit was not submitted until after the building
24 had been painted.
25

26 A discussion ensued regarding the commercial color palette and the process and
27 procedure that should have been followed relative to the subject business, as well as
28 possible remedies and options, including the requirement of re-painting the building,
29 providing a variance to the business owner, or a partial re-painting of the building.
30

31 Assistant City Attorney Vail suggested that if the third option were of consideration to the
32 Commission, he would suggest a continuance in order to allow the business owner to be
33 present for discussion.
34

35 It was MOVED by Commissioner Hicks and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
36 continue Appeal No. 03-1 to the October 7, 2003 Planning Commission meeting.
37

38 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
39

40 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Hicks and Rhoten
41 NOES: None
42 ABSTAIN: None
43 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones
44
45
46
47
48

1 **VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

2
3 **A. VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31179**

4 APPLICANT: Wayne Vaughn, Project Manager
5 OWNER: S.V. Investments, Inc.
6 LOCATION: East side of Soboba Street approximately 300-feet
7 north of Florida Avenue
8 PLANNER: Matthew Bassi
9 DESCRIPTION: A request to subdivide 2.25 acres into eight (8) lots for
10 single-family residential development.
11

12 The staff report was presented by Principal Planner Bassi, who displayed a map
13 indicating the project vicinity and design, and provided some details regarding the project.
14

15 Commissioner Hicks inquired regarding the initial concern that had been mentioned in a
16 previous work study session relative to the offset of the streets.
17

18 Principal Planner Bassi responded that Staff was in agreement that the offsets would not
19 be of concern due to the minimal size of the subdivision.
20

21 A discussion ensued regarding the block wall that was to be provided by the auto repair
22 shop that was adjacent to the subdivision site.
23

24 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:24 p.m.
25

26 Wayne Vaughn of S.V. Investments approached the lectern as the project applicant. He
27 acknowledged the fact that there was a requirement for a block wall to be installed.
28

29 Commissioner Hicks asked if he had spoken with the owners of Phil's Auto Clinic
30 regarding the block wall.
31

32 Mr. Vaughn responded that he had sent letters to them but had received no response
33 thus far.
34

35 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.
36

37 Mark O'Brien of S.V. Investments, 614 Wagonwheel Drive, Hemet, CA advised the
38 Commission that he would be following up with the owner of Phil's Auto Clinic regarding
39 the block wall.
40

41 A discussion ensued regarding a landscaping buffer being required between the
42 commercial and residential project.
43
44
45
46
47
48

1 Principal Planner Sawyer suggested that a final condition be added, requiring that the
2 noise requirements be met, as follows:

3
4 ***“Project shall comply with the minimum noise standards for
5 single-family residential development as stated in the Public
6 Health and Safety Element of the General Plan - Table II-F-
7 4.”***

8
9 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:31 p.m. and asked for a motion.

10
11 It was MOVED by Commissioner Hicks and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
12 adopt **Resolution No. 03-45** approving Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 31179 as
13 amended.

14
15 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

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

21
22 Commissioner Calkins advised the Commission that he would need to excuse himself for
23 the following public hearing item, as he had a conflict of interest.

24
25 **B. VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 30969 & ENVIRONMENTAL
26 ASSESSMENT NO. 03-6**

27 APPLICANT: Kalpesh Homes Inc. (Sumer Vardhan)
28 AGENT: Jim Unland & Associates
29 LOCATION: Northeast corner of Hemet Street and Berkeley
30 Avenue
31 DESCRIPTION: A request to subdivide 10 acres into 32 lots for the
32 future development of 32 single-family residential
33 dwelling units and adoption of a Negative Declaration.

34
35 The staff report was presented by Principal Planner Bassi who provided some details on
36 the proposed project.

37
38 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the misunderstanding with the zone change.

39
40 A brief discussion followed, regarding the issue.

41
42 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:35 p.m.

43
44 Michael Duffin, 748 Smith Road, Hemet, CA approached the lectern as an adjacent
45 resident to the project. He reminded the Commission that at a previous meeting for the
46
47
48

1 related zone change they had submitted a petition with 197 signatures opposing this
2 project. He did a PowerPoint presentation indicating the types of homes and lots that
3 were in the surrounding area of the project, followed by the indication of various housing
4 tracts that had been built by this project applicant within the community. He advised the
5 Commission that he and his neighbors were very concerned about bringing the types of
6 homes that this applicant tended to build into the neighborhood in which they resided.
7

8 Gaye Duffin, 748 Smith Road, Hemet, CA approached the lectern and advised the
9 Commission that there had been a large number of residents at the Planning Commission
10 meeting that had been held to review the related zone change, and that the petition that
11 had been presented had in fact included over 200 signatures of surrounding residents
12 who were opposed to the project at hand. She stated that it would be nice to have the
13 area remain as a larger lot neighborhood.
14

15 Dave Noble, 772 Smith Road, Hemet, CA approached the lectern as an adjacent resident
16 to the proposed project. He stated that he did not object to development, but that he felt
17 that the type of neighborhood that they currently lived in should be preserved, and that
18 the applicant should be required to have a minimum lot size of ½-acre. He asked the
19 Commission to consider requiring the larger, ½ acre lot sizes.
20

21 Jim Unland, Unland & Associates, 3550 E. Florida Ave., Hemet, CA approached the
22 lectern as the engineer for the proposed project. He advised the Commission that he felt
23 their design was a good compromise for the surrounding residents, and that the lots that
24 would be seen by the adjacent property owners were similar to the lots that they resided
25 on.
26

27 Commissioner Hicks asked, regarding the slides that had been shown for the
28 development at Palm & Cottonwood Avenues, what the square-footage of the lots were.
29

30 Mr. Unland responded that he did not know the lot sizes within that development, but that
31 the homes behind the college were built on 6,000 square-foot lots with a minimum 50-foot
32 width.
33

34 Commissioner Hicks inquired regarding the minimum size of the inward lots.
35

36 Mr. Unland responded that there 7,200 square-foot minimum lots, inward.
37

38 Commissioner Rhoten asked if there would be a block wall around the perimeter of the
39 proposed subdivision.
40

41 Mr. Unland responded that there would be, per the Planning Commission's requirement.
42

43 Sandeep Vardhan, 320 Woodruff Drive, Walnut, CA approached the lectern as a
44 representative of Kalpesh Homes. He displayed a map indicating the zoning of the
45 surrounding neighborhood and indicated neighborhoods that had not been displayed in
46
47
48

1 the Duffins' PowerPoint presentation, but were adjacent to the project site. He explained
2 that Mr. Duffin had only indicated the homes immediately surrounding their neighborhood,
3 but that some of the other adjacent neighborhoods were more compatible to what was
4 being proposed with this subdivision.

5
6 Commissioner Rhoten asked if they had met with the 197 people who had signed the
7 petition.

8
9 Mr. Vardhan responded that they had met with the surrounding property owners, which
10 was how they came up with the partial, ½-acre compromise.

11
12 Donald Blankenship, 724 Smith Road, Hemet, CA pointed out that the homes on
13 Berkeley Street that had been indicated by Mr. Vardhan were on 1-acre lots, rather than
14 the 7,200 square-foot lots that were being proposed with this subdivision. He suggested
15 that the four ½-acre lots that were being offered as a token of compromise along Smith
16 Road would not resolve the problems that would occur with the proposed subdivision,
17 such as congestion. He addressed the issue of the zoning conflict, since they had been
18 told that the zoning was A-1-C, and they were now being told that it was R-1. He stated
19 that he and his neighbors would like to see the lot size requirements be 1-acre, and
20 suggested that custom homes should be built, similar to theirs. Regarding the error on the
21 zoning map, he suggested that this was a huge mistake that had been made, particularly
22 when people are planning their lives accordingly.

23
24 Gaye Duffin re-approached the lectern and stated that, on the issue of compromise, she
25 would like to see the whole area subdivided as 1-acre lots, and that ½-acre lots would be
26 a compromise, adding that 4 lots at ½-acre was not much of a compromise at all.

27
28 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 7:01 p.m.

29
30 Principal Planner Sawyer explained how the conflict with the zoning map had occurred,
31 and that the zoning in the area, when annexed from the County, was R-1, and that it was
32 always intended for it to remain R-1.

33
34 Commissioner Hicks asked if and how this project could be denied when it was in
35 compliance with the requirements of the zone.

36
37 Principal Planner Bassi advised the Commission that the site design of the homes would
38 be coming back to the Planning Commission for review and approval. He added that the
39 homes that were indicated in the slides shown by Mr. Duffin did not meet the current
40 single-family design guidelines of the City, and thus the homes that were built with this
41 subdivision would be vastly different in appearance from what had been indicated in the
42 slides.

1 Commissioner Hicks expressed his empathy for the Duffins, but explained that if the
2 project was looked at from a logical standpoint, the developer had come a long way
3 towards compromise, when legally he was not required to. He added that there was also
4 a great amount of other development in the neighborhood that was similar to what was
5 being proposed with this project.

6
7 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.

8
9 It was MOVED by Commissioner Hicks and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
10 adopt **Planning Commission Resolution No. 03-5EA** approving a Negative Declaration
11 for Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 30969.

12
13 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

14
15 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Hicks and Rhoten
16 NOES: None
17 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Calkins
18 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones
19

20 It was MOVED by Commissioner Hicks and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
21 adopt **Planning Commission Resolution No. 03-48** approving Vesting Tentative Tract
22 Map No. 30969.

23
24 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

25
26 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Hicks and Rhoten
27 NOES: None
28 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Calkins
29 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones
30

31 **C. VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 29843**

32 APPLICANT: Lennar Communities
33 AGENT: Kevin Lynch, Project Manager
34 LOCATION: Northwest corner of Cawston and Menlo Avenues
35 PLANNER: Matthew Bassi
36 DESCRIPTION: A request to subdivide 82.52+ acres into 130 lots for
37 the future development of 486 single-family and multi-
38 family senior residential dwelling units.
39

40 Principal Planner Bassi presented the staff report providing some details of the project,
41 and advising the Commission that they had reviewed the project on numerous occasions
42 during work study sessions over the last several months. He distributed a piece of
43 correspondence that had been received earlier this afternoon from Tom Shollin of the
44 Signal Hill Family Limited Partnership relative to consideration of his request to add a
45
46
47
48

1 condition requiring the centerline of Menlo Avenue on the south line of Section 6,
2 Township 5 South, Range 1 West. He stated that the letter was opposing the approval
3 of the project, and explained how staff was proposing to resolve the conflict that Mr.
4 Shollin had referred to.

5
6 A brief discussion of this issue ensued.

7
8 Commissioner Calkins expressed his concern regarding the apartment area of the
9 proposed project relative to how trash trucks or emergency vehicles would be able to turn
10 around in the alleyways.

11
12 Assistant Public Works Director Gow approached the lectern and advised the
13 Commission that he appreciated the opportunity to respond to this issue at this point in
14 the process, as it was a concern of his as well. He stated that an even greater concern
15 was regarding the alleyways that did not go through, meaning that the trash trucks or
16 emergency vehicles would need to back up.

17
18 Commissioner Calkins asked if he would prefer to see these alleyways at a street width
19 rather than an alley width.

20
21 Assistant Public Works Director Gow stated that this would be preferable and that he
22 would also like to see those dead-end alleyways punch through. He indicated on the
23 displayed map which alleys he was referring to.

24
25 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 7:22 p.m.

26
27 Sandy Packham of HUSD approached the lectern and reminded the Commission that
28 there was currently an elementary school under construction to the east of the proposed
29 project, and that they were in negotiations with Jeff Petrus to purchase his property for
30 the construction of a high school and a middle school.

31
32 Tom Shollin, 2901 Orange Avenue, Long Beach, CA approached the lectern as the
33 author of the letter that had been presented to the Commission by Principal Planner Bassi
34 at the beginning of his presentation. He pointed out the area that he was concerned with
35 on the displayed map, explaining that there were 3 ownerships to the south of the
36 boundary that he was concerned with (Menlo Avenue), and that the property to the north
37 of the boundary belonged to Peppertree. He stated that during a prior meeting it had
38 been agreed that the centerline of Menlo Avenue would be adjusted so that half of the
39 street would be on the Peppertree property, and half would be on the southern properties.

40
41 Commissioner Hicks asked Mr. Shollin if he had been present when Principal Planner
42 Bassi had addressed the resolution to this issue with the added condition of approval.
43 He asked Principal Planner Bassi to repeat the added condition.

44
45 Matt read the preliminary wording for the additional condition, stating that they would have
46 the correct language for the wording before the end of the public hearing.

1 Discussion again ensued regarding the location of the centerline of Menlo Avenue.

2
3 It was decided that this would be determined by a surveyor prior to recording of the final
4 map, and that the surrounding property owners would have to sign off on their agreement
5 to the location of the centerline.

6
7 Tom Shollin stated that he was satisfied with this explanation and resolution.

8
9 Kevin Lynch, Lennar Communities, 391 North Main Street, Corona, CA approached the
10 lectern and expressed his confusion regarding the fact that the issues that had been
11 brought up this evening had not been addressed earlier in the process. He explained that
12 in the street section that was of concern, the width was 25-feet, but that there was no
13 parking in this area, so it would be a clear 25-feet. He suggested that the streets that
14 were not indicated to go through, could be pushed through if the Commission so desired,
15 and that the trash bins could be placed in locations so that the trash trucks would not
16 need to go into an area where they would have problems turning around.

17
18 Assistant Public Works Director Gow stated that he would not have an issue with the
19 alleys if the trash trucks did not have to go down them to pick up trash. He suggested
20 that there may be other issues with people leaving their trash out in front of the homes
21 of other residents.

22
23 Mr. Lynch explained that the apartments would not have individual trash cans, but that
24 rather there would be one large bin for the residents to deposit their trash in, and that bin
25 would be located in such a place that the trash trucks would not need to go down the
26 alleys.

27
28 Chairman Duistermars asked if the final language for the Menlo Avenue centerline had
29 been drafted.

30
31 Principal Planner Bassi responded that Condition No. 92 would be added to the
32 Conditions of Approval regarding the final alignment of Menlo Avenue. He noted that
33 they would have the wording for the condition before the end of the public hearing.

34
35 A discussion ensued regarding a condition for the punching through of the streets that
36 had been discussed.

37
38 Mr. Lynch agreed that he would work the Public Works and the Fire Department on a
39 resolution to this issue.

40
41 Jim Unland, 3550 E. Florida Avenue, Suite G, Hemet, CA approached the lectern as the
42 project engineer and stated that there had been a discussion at a Staff Review
43 Committee Meeting some time ago regarding working with staff to resolve the issues of
44 trash pick-up. He questioned Condition No. 49 regarding knuckle streets, and asked that
45 wording be added to condition to state “ **....or as approved by the City Engineer.**”
46
47
48

1 Chairman Duistermars stated that as long as it met the requirements of the City Engineer
2 he did not see a problem with it.

3
4 Commissioner Calkins asked how he would turn around if he were a visitor looking for
5 someone and he were to turn down one of the alleys and discover that he had made a
6 wrong turn.

7
8 Commissioner Hicks suggested that perhaps some signage could be placed, indicating
9 that the alley did not go through, or that it was for residents only.

10
11 Mr. Lynch explained that the roadways were 25-feet in width, and not narrow at all. He
12 suggested that turning around would not be that big of a problem.

13
14 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 7:51 p.m.

15
16 Commissioner Hicks asked that the amendments be re-capped.

17
18 Principal Planner Bassi clarified the amendments to be:

- 19
20 1) The modification of Condition No. 49
21 2) The addition of Condition No. 92
22 3) The addition of Condition No. 93
23

24 Assistant City Attorney Vail suggested a 5-minute break to draft the wording so that exact
25 wording could be read into the record.

26
27 The Commission concurred to take a 5-minute break at 7:55 p.m.

28
29 The meeting resumed at 8:03 p.m.

30
31 Principal Bassi clarified the amendments to the Conditions of Approval as follows:

- 32
33 1) Condition No. 49 shall be modified to read:

34
35 ***“Knuckle streets shall be drawn in accordance with***
36 ***City of Hemet Standard Specifications for Public***
37 ***Works Construction Standard G-806, or as approved***
38 ***by the City Engineer.”***

- 39
40 2) Condition No. 92 shall be added to read:

41
42 ***“The final alignment of Menlo Avenue shall be***
43 ***determined as part of the final map process,***
44 ***including staff review of the street improvement***
45
46
47
48

1 *plans. Provided the street location*
2 *adjustments do not impact the project, the*
3 *changes can be deemed in substantial*
4 *compliance by the City engineer and the*
5 *Planning Director.”*

6
7 3) Condition No. 93:

8
9 *“The 2 private alleys shown on Lot #126, the 1*
10 *private alley shown on Lot #125, the 1 private alley*
11 *shown on Lot #122, and the 3 private alleys shown*
12 *on Lot #121, all of which terminate short of Street*
13 *“A” shall, unless approved by the Planning*
14 *Department, Fire Department, and Public works*
15 *Department, be extended through to Street “A”.”*

16
17 All agreed that this was acceptable.

18
19 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.

20
21 It was MOVED by Commissioner Hicks and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
22 adopt **Planning Commission Resolution No. 03-46** approving Vesting Tentative Tract
23 Map No. 29843 as amended.

24
25 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

26
27 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Hicks and Rhoten
28 NOES: None
29 ABSTAIN: None
30 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones

31
32 **D. ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-5 & ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 03-27**

33 APPLICANT: Jacoby Plantenga 1999 Trust
34 AGENT: Jeff Petrus / Lee Entitlements
35 LOCATION: West side of Cawston Avenue, ±200 feet north of
36 Menlo Avenue
37 PLANNER: Matthew Bassi
38 DESCRIPTION: A request for a zone change from A-2-C (Heavy-
39 Agriculture) to R-1 (Single-Family Residential),
40 including adoption of an Addendum to the General
41 Plan Final Environmental Impact Report for the
42 project.

43
44 The staff report was presented by Principal Planner Bassi, who provided some details of
45 the project. He explained that references made to a “supplemental EIR” should have
46 been an “Addendum to the EIR”, and that staff would make those changes.

1 Jeff Petrus of Lee Entitlements, Inc., 1550 Amherst Avenue, Suite 101, Los Angeles, CA
2 approached the lectern as the project applicant, and provided some additional details
3 regarding the project.
4

5 A discussion ensued
6

7 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 8:09 p.m.
8

9 Sandy Packham of the Hemet Unified School District approached the lectern and advised
10 the Commission that the school district was currently in negotiations with Mr. Petrus and
11 would like to encourage the Commission to approve the zone change this evening.
12

13 David Waite, 1900 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, CA approached the lectern as legal
14 counsel for Lee Entitlements, Inc. He stated that he wanted to point out to the
15 Commission that they had lodged a letter with Mr. Masyczek on September 25th, raising
16 some technical issues regarding the EIR addendum, and the recommendation of staff
17 that the Commission, and ultimately the City Council, would need to adopt a Statement
18 of Overriding Considerations. He noted that they had raised concerns regarding whether
19 or not this was necessary, and that his view was that it was not necessary, but that City
20 Staff continued to feel that it was. He advised the Commission that he had conferred with
21 Mr. Vail earlier that afternoon, and that, notwithstanding their objections, they were
22 prepared to proceed with Staff's recommendation this evening, in order to move ahead.
23 and were looking forward to appearing before the City Council.
24

25 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 8:11 p.m.
26

27 Since there were no comments or questions, Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.
28

29 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Hicks and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Calkins to
30 adopt **Planning Commission Resolution No. 03-27EA** recommending to the City
31 Council approval of an addendum to the General Plan Final EIR for Zone Change No. 03-
32 5 and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 31184.
33

34 The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote:
35

36 **AYES:** Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Hicks and Rhoten

37 **NOES:** None

38 **ABSTAIN:** None

39 **ABSENT:** Vice Chairman Jones
40

41 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Hicks and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Calkins to
42 adopt **Planning Commission Resolution No. 03-35** recommending to the City Council
43 approval of Zone Change No. 03-5.
44
45
46
47
48

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

2
3 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Hicks and Rhoten
4 NOES: None
5 ABSTAIN: None
6 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones
7

8
9 **VII. WORK STUDY:**

10
11 **A. VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31184 - Matthew Bassi**

12 A work Study session to review the subdivision of 120 acres into 279 lots for
13 future single-family residential development located on the west side of
14 Cawston Avenue north of Menlo Avenue.
15

16 Principal Planner Bassi initiated the presentation, explaining that the map corresponded
17 with Zone Change No. 03-5.
18

19 Commissioner Calkins asked if it was necessary to have the work study session when the
20 school district was purchasing the property.
21

22 Assistant City Attorney Vail explained that the school district's purchase could end up
23 falling through, and that it made perfect sense for the applicant to proceed with his efforts
24 to obtain approval of a map which would enable him to proceed with his original plan,
25 should the purchase fail. He added that approval of the map would also increase the
26 overall value of the land.
27

28 Jeff Petrus of Lee Entitlements, Inc. approached the lectern and gave a presentation
29 regarding the proposed map. He explained various changes that had been made to the
30 map since it had last been reviewed at a work study session. He displayed a map
31 indicating the design of the proposed subdivision, noting that the lot sizes ranged in size
32 from 7,400 to 30,000 square-feet. He indicated the meandering walkways, parks,
33 landscaped areas and lake area that he was proposing within the subdivision. He
34 explained that there would be greenbelt areas, tot-lots for children and picnic areas. He
35 added that the lake would be the focal point of the community. He stated that the scenic
36 highway setback would apply along Cawston Avenue, and finally, explained that the
37 differences from the previous map included the elimination of 22 lots and the addition of
38 a larger recreation area.
39

40 The Commission concurred that the design was definitely an improvement over many of
41 the subdivisions that had been recently reviewed.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

1 **B. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31295 - Matthew Bassi**

2 _____ Work study session to review the subdivision of 20 acres into 75 lots for
3 future single-family residential development, located on the north side of
4 Menlo Avenue between Cawston and Sanderson Avenues.
5

6 Principal Planner Bassi initiated the presentation by explaining some details of the
7 proposed project.
8

9 Commissioner Hicks inquired as to who the applicant was, explaining that if Meeker
10 Companies was involved he would have a conflict of interest since he is a consultant for
11 them. He asked Assistant City Attorney Vail if he should excuse himself.
12

13 Assistant City Attorney Vail confirmed that he should.
14

15 Commissioner Hicks excused himself from the work study session and left the dais.
16

17 Principal Planner Bassi displayed a map of the site design.
18

19 A discussion ensued regarding the surrounding properties.
20

21 Chairman Duistermars asked if meandering sidewalks would be included within the
22 subdivision.
23

24 Principal Planner Bassi responded that they would, in compliance with the single-family
25 design guidelines.
26

27 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the average lot sizes.
28

29 Principal Planner Bassi responded that they were 7,200 to 7,400 sf, and that there were
30 no particularly large lot sizes with the exception of the knuckle lots.
31

32 Commissioner Rhoten inquired regarding the density of the project.
33

34 Principal Planner Bassi responded that it was approximately 3.75 dwelling units per acre.
35

36 Chairman Duistermars expressed his concern with the project being one of those smaller,
37 20-acre projects that gets smashed together with other little 20-acre projects, and ends
38 up having no parks in the area or other desirable amenities due to their development as
39 a smaller subdivision.
40

41 The Commission suggested that when the item comes back to the Commission staff
42 should be sure to include information on nearby parks and other amenities.
43
44
45
46
47
48

1 **C. CITY STREET STANDARDS VS. PRIVATE STREETS - Mike Gow**

2 An update on the application of City Street Standards to Private Streets.

3
4 Assistant Public Works Director Gow initiated the work study session by introducing the
5 concept of requiring city street standards to be applied to private streets as a default. He
6 noted that there were some issues regarding this subject, and discussed the recent
7 issues that had come up regarding the lack of sidewalks, street lights, street widths, street
8 name signs, turn-around access and pavement thickness. He explained that the Public
9 Works Department was concerned with this issue, as the City provides various services
10 via private streets. He further explained that the standards are developed with the public
11 benefit in mind, and that a Home Owner's Association may dissolve down the road and
12 ask the City to takeover maintenance. He stated that implementation of this concept
13 would include the default of City Standards being applied to public streets in future
14 subdivisions, and that options to vary from that could be addressed through the Specific
15 Plan process. He then delved into a more detailed discussion regarding the concept,
16 explaining in detail why the Public Works Department wished to apply the City Standards
17 to private streets, and how this would resolve many issues. He suggested that
18 implementation of this requirement would offer protection to the City for future projects.

19
20 Chairman Duistermars suggested that Public Works should sit down and develop private
21 street standards, stating that public street standards would not be the best thing for private
22 streets, which is why many developers wish to have private streets within their
23 subdivisions.

24
25 A discussion of rural standards ensued.

26
27 Assistant Public Works Director Gow explained that there aren't any rural standards, so
28 they could not be applied, and would have to be developed in order to apply them.

29
30 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding traffic calming techniques in current standards.

31
32 Assistant Public Works Director Gow responded that there were no traffic calming
33 techniques within the current standards, and that if traffic calming was necessary, they
34 would need to be added.

35
36 A discussion ensued regarding the positive and negative points of applying city standards
37 to private streets.

38
39 Chairman Duistermars suggested that a discussion should occur between the City
40 Council and the Planning Commission regarding traffic calming, what types they would
41 like to see, and what should be applied to private streets and public streets.

42
43 Assistant Public Works Director Gow suggested that discussion of this issue at a City
44 Council level had been deferred to a future meeting, and stated that when that meeting
45 occurs he would advise the City Council that the Planning Commission had suggested
46 creating other types of standards for private streets and rural areas.

1 Marge Tandy, 1885 Flametree Way, Hemet, CA approached the lectern and advised the
2 Commission that there had been a desire to have the main parts of both public and
3 private streets to be built the same. She explained that this did not necessarily apply to
4 the curbing or streetlights, but that problems had tended to occur over time, with poorly
5 constructed private streets that end up falling apart with the weight of trash trucks. She
6 further explained that the City is not obligated to repair these streets, but that the
7 residents often argue that it is the trash trucks that caused the streets to fall apart, so the
8 City should provide the repairs.

9
10 The Commission agreed that they could see the point in requiring comparable streets to
11 those required by City standards, but also concurred that different types of standards
12 should be created for different types of streets.

13 **D. TOWNHOUSE COMPLEX - DON BENDER**

14
15
16 Principal Planner Bassi initiated the work study session, explaining that the proposed
17 area was part of an existing Specific Plan. He explained that the site was 7.4 acres in
18 size, and displayed a copy of the proposed plan as well as the elevations.

19
20 Don Bender, Tierra West, 4110 E. Florida Avenue, Hemet, CA approached the lectern
21 and advised the Commission that he had met with Planning Director Masyczek regarding
22 the proposed project. He expressed his appreciation for the Commission agreeing to
23 add this item to their agenda this evening. He gave some details regarding the proposed
24 project, first describing its location as being on the corner of Devonshire Avenue and
25 Madrid Street across the street from the Palm Court Villas.

26
27 Chairman Duistermars asked if the townhomes would be owner occupied.

28
29 Mr. Bender responded that they would.

30
31
32 Commissioner Rhoten asked if the project would comply with the Multi-Family Design
33 Guidelines.

34
35 Mr. Bender responded that it would.

36
37 He provided some additional details regarding the project, adding that his architect could
38 address any questions regarding the design, and that Jim Unland would be the Engineer
39 for the project, and was available to answer questions as well.

40
41 A discussion of parking standards ensued.

42
43 Theo Bluhm of TA Bluhm Associates, 4331 North Goldenstate Blvd., Fresno, CA
44 approached the lectern as the architect for the proposed project. He explained some of
45 the architectural details and how they would comply with City standards.

46
47 Commissioner Rhoten asked if it would be a gated community.

1 Mr. Bluhm responded that it would.

2
3 Commissioner Calkins asked what the distance would be from building to building.

4
5 Mr. Bluhm responded that the distance would be 36+ feet from building to building.

6
7 Chairman Duistermars asked if the Fire Department had reviewed the design yet.

8
9 Mr. Bluhm responded that they had, as had the Refuse Division of the Public Works
10 Department.

11
12 The Commission stated that they would look forward to seeing them back in the future
13 once the project had been formally submitted.

14
15
16 **VIII. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

17
18 There were no comments made by any members of the Planning Commission.

19
20
21 **IX. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

22
23 There were no requests for future agenda items.

24
25
26 **X. ADJOURNMENT**

27
28 It was MOVED by Commissioner Calkins, SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten and
29 unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 8:53 p.m. To the regular meeting of the
30 City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **Tuesday, October 7, 2003 at 6:00**
31 **p.m.** to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue,
32 Hemet, California 92543.

33
34
35
36
37
38 _____
39 Bob Duistermars, Chairman

40
41 ATTEST:

42
43
44
45 _____
46 Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary