

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
45
46
47
48
49
50

PLANNING  **COMMISSION**

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: JANUARY 7, 2014

CALLED TO ORDER: 6:00P.M.

MEETING LOCATION: City Council Chambers
450 East Latham Avenue
Hemet, CA 92543

1. CALL TO ORDER:

PRESENT: Chairman John Gifford, Vice Chairman Greg Vasquez, and Commissioners Rick Crimeni, Vince Overmyer and Michael Perciful
ABSENT: None

Invocation and Flag Salute: Commissioner Michael Perciful

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: (None)

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There were no members of the public who wished to address the Commission regarding items not on the agenda.

Prior to the public hearing item, City Attorney Jex reminded Commissioners of the change in the Brown Act, effective January 1st, 2014, making it necessary to use the voting machine so there will be a public announcement of the vote.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

4. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NO. 14-008 (WOODSIDE HOMES AT McSWEENEY FARMS SPECIFIC PLAN)

Applicant: Woodside Homes

Planner: Trent Heiner

Locations: Lansing Street, Tivoli Court and Suncup Street within the McSweeney Farms Specific Plan

Description: A request for Planning Commission review and approval of a Site Development Review application for the design of the 29 remaining single family

1 residential homes within Tract No. 32717-2 (Chestnut) and consideration of a
2 Notice of Determination that the project is consistent with an Environmental
3 Impact Report (EIR) that was adopted for the underlying project. Specific Plan
4 No. 01-02. The proposed project is located on Lansing Street, Tivoli Court and
5 Suncup Street within Planning Area 11 of the McSweeney Farms Specific Plan
6 (SP No. 01-02)
7

8 (PowerPoint presentation by Assistant Planner Carole Kendrick.)
9

10 Chairman Gifford asked about the paseos and the recommendation that they be
11 completed at the 15th building permit.
12

13 Planner Kendrick explained that originally it was conditioned to be done at the 60
14 percent build-out. However, they did not want to penalize Woodside Homes for trying
15 to complete the project, even though the prior builder, Lennar Homes, was responsible
16 for improving the paseo.
17

18 Chairman Gifford asked if Lennar was willing to deed the property over to Woodside.
19 And he wanted to know how much land is involved.
20

21 Planner Kendrick indicated that the applicant has been diligently trying to communicate
22 with Lennar Homes to get the property deeded over, but has been unsuccessful over
23 the last two weeks. She stated she did not know how much property was involved, but
24 she would get the answer to that question.
25

26 Commissioner Overmyer wondered if there is any leverage that the city can bring to
27 bear on Lennar so the next step can happen.
28

29 CDD Elliano said that if there are any remaining subdivision or improvement bonds that
30 Lennar has, staff can look at those for an improvement obligation. But, because the
31 paseo is for public purposes, if Lennar does not cooperate, the city could ultimately
32 condemn the property, although she did not think that would be necessary.
33

34 Commissioner Overmyer stated he thought building the paseos is a good idea, but the
35 city must find out where the buck stops and make sure there is follow through.
36

37 City Engineer Biagioni stated at this point there is very little the city can do against
38 Lennar. He plans to contact them and ask them to finish their work or the city will call
39 the bond for that purpose.
40

41 Vice Chair Vasquez asked if staff knows what the proposed amendment will say
42 regarding the construction requirements for the equestrian center and the time frame.
43

44 Planner Kendrick said they had four different alternatives they have been working with
45 the owners on. There is a preferred alternative for Planning Area 35. There are two
46 map conditions and a specific plan requirement that differ regarding the construction of
47 the equestrian center. Their specific plan amendment will change the use of Planning
48 Area 35, and it would also clean up the requirement of when the construction of that
49 area will take place. Staff has not yet seen the proposal, but is willing to work with
50 them. The property owners have been very patient, but they have a community center
they're not able to use.

1 Commissioner Cremeni asked if staff had received any responses from their
2 advertisement in the Press Enterprise, and Planner Kendrick responded that there had
3 been no comments, calls or emails received. He was also concerned about the size of
4 the homes in the new construction being smaller than the existing homes.

5
6 Chairman Gifford opened the public hearing for audience comments.

7
8 The applicant, Trent Heiner from Woodside Homes approached the lectern, and
9 Chairman Gifford asked him to address the issue of the size of the lots and the square
10 footage of the homes and how that fits into the rest of the community.

11
12 Mr. Heiner answered that the houses are actually the same units which were approved
13 for the 40 Woodside Homes lots previously. They are utilizing the existing models,
14 although revising the architecture somewhat, working with staff, to make sure that the
15 veneers on the outside fit the Lennar Chestnut community and adding more siding,
16 brick and exact color scheme, rock type and shutter tiles. From the front edge of the
17 house, it looks the same.

18
19 He continued his explanation by saying they dropped their lowest square footage plan
20 and now have the same bedroom count as the existing Lennar homes, but gaining
21 some formal dining/living space. It also allows for a larger backyard than the Chestnut
22 community has right now. He felt that the homes are in keeping with the market and
23 that they are selling well in the community and will be a benefit to the McSweeney
24 Farms communities. The plans were submitted to the HOA board of the present
25 community and were well received.

26
27 CDD Elliano asked if he had an idea of what the current median resale value is for the
28 Lennar homes, in comparison to Woodside's sale price.

29
30 Mr. Heiner replied that he thought these units would increase the property values
31 because they will no longer be looking at a weed patch. It's not going to affect the tax
32 rate of the other homes because it's a fixed tax rate pursuant to each individual lot.

33
34 There was further discussion among the Commissioners regarding real estate values,
35 appraisal values, current resale values, etc.

36
37 Chairman Gifford asked Mr. Heiner about staff's recommendation concerning the
38 paseos and completion of construction by the 15th building permit.

39
40 Mr. Heiner answered that the estimate to finish the paseo is roughly between \$130,000
41 and \$150,000, and he has already budgeted to finish the paseo. He currently does not
42 own the paseo nor is he trying to buy it, but has entered into early negotiations with
43 Lennar to try to get them to deed the property to Woodside Homes.

44
45 After further discussion between the Applicant, Commissioners, CDD Elliano and City
46 Attorney Jex, the following language was suggested and was agreed upon by
47 Mr. Heiner. "Condition 13: All neighborhood paseos located in Planning Areas 10 and
48 11 shall be constructed or an adequate security posted prior to the issuance of the 15th
49 building permit of Site Development Review 13-008."
50

1 CDD Elliano added that staff felt that the single-story option was an advantage as it
2 gives a better street scene and the larger back yards would be appealing to families.
3

4 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Overmyer and **SECONDED** by Vice Chair Vasquez to
5 **ADOPT** Resolution Bill 14-001 **APPROVING** SDR 13-008, with the change and
6 condition of Planning Requirement No. 13 that reads "All neighborhood paseos located
7 in Planning Areas 10 and 11 shall be constructed or an adequate security posted prior
8 to the issuance of the 15th building permit of Site Development Review 13-008,"
9 subject to the findings and conditions of approval and direct staff to file a Notice of
10 Determination with the County Clerk.

11
12 The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote:

13
14 **AYES:** Chairman John Gifford, Vice Chairman Greg Vasquez, and
15 Commissioners Vince Overmyer, Michael Perciful and Rick Crimeni
16 **NOES:** None
17 **ABSENT:** None
18

19 DEPARTMENT REPORTS

20 21 **5. CITY ATTORNEY REPORTS:** *Verbal report from the Assistant City Attorney on* 22 *items of interest to the Planning Commission.* 23

24 City Attorney Jex stated he would be speaking at a seminar next month on the Public
25 Records Act and the Brown Act. He also passed out some brochures concerning the
26 seminar. He suggested that they may wish to attend, or he and other members of his
27 firm could give a version of the presentation at one of the Planning Commission
28 meetings that had a lighter agenda.
29

30 Chairman Gifford thought that a presentation on the Brown Act would be wonderful.
31

32 **6. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORTS:** *Verbal reports* 33 *from Community Development Director Elliano* 34

35 **A. Overview of new planning legislation effective in 2014.** 36

37 CDD Elliano thanked the Commission for working so hard in 2013 and promised 2014
38 would be very busy.
39

40 One bill, Senate Bill 510, in regard to mobile home park conversions, a part of the
41 Subdivision Map Act Law, now allows the occupants of a mobile home park to be
42 surveyed as to their opinions and concerns, and that can now be taken into
43 consideration by the city councils in allowing or not allowing the parks to convert. With
44 49 mobile home parks in the city of Hemet, she was sure this was an issue that would
45 appear in the future.
46

47 Next was CEQA reform legislation sponsored by Senator Steinberg, Senate Bill 743, a
48 very directed legislation to allow an NBA basketball stadium in Sacramento without
49
50

1 CEQA review and limiting legal challenge. CDD Elliano stated her thoughts that if the
2 legislature is doing CEQA reform, it should be for everything, and based on the
3 environment, not a political project.

4
5 Senator Steinberg is also the primary author of Senate Bill 375, as well as AB 32,
6 which is the land use transportation and climate actions program.

7
8 AB 116 grants an automatic extension for 24 months of subdivision maps that had not
9 yet expired. The map had to have been originally approved after the year 2000.

10
11 AB 551 is the Urban Agriculture Zone Act, which allows at least a tenth of an acre to be
12 established as a zone for community gardens or agriculture within the city limits, with
13 tax incentives applicable. It has to be a contract for a minimum of five years.

14
15 AB 1092 is building standards for electrical vehicle charging infrastructure. This bill
16 requires the State Building Commission to adopt, approve, codify, publish and basically
17 create new standards for incorporating electrical vehicle charging stations in multi-
18 family and commercial projects.

19
20 AB 1359 is in regard to the Quimby Act legislation having to do with park dedication
21 and development. In other words, when you do a subdivision based on a formula,
22 population and other factors, developers are required to set aside so much of the land
23 area for park land or pay fees. This bill provides some flexibility so that monies
24 generated within one area could be expended outside that area and allows for some
25 additional flexibility in how the Quimby funds are utilized.

26
27 SB 254 is the Solid Waste Used Mattress Recycling and Recovery Act. It is a state-
28 mandated program, with no funding for local governments to implement. It would
29 create a commission or a new entity that would regulate recycling of mattresses and
30 the bill would require manufacturers, retailers and renovators of mattresses to register
31 with the mattress recycling organization on or before January 1st, 2015.

32
33 The last one is SB 407, Installation of Water Use Efficiency Improvements, California
34 Civil Code Section 1101, which mandates that as of January 1, 2014, any time
35 homeowners or developers are doing renovations or remodels of single-family
36 residences, they have to upgrade all of their fixtures to compliant plumbing fixtures that
37 are water conserving units.

38
39 As of January, 2017, a seller transfer of single-family residential property or commercial
40 property has to disclose to the purchaser that all the plumbing fixtures are compliant.

41
42 As of January, 2019, all non-compliant plumbing fixtures in multi-family residential units
43 need to be upgraded.

44
45 **7. PLANNING COMMISSIONER REPORTS:** *Commissioner reports on meetings*
46 *attended, future agenda items or other matters of Planning interest*

- 47
48
49 **A.** Chairman Gifford (Nothing to report)
50 **B.** Vice Chair Vasquez (Nothing to report)
C. Commissioner Perciful (Nothing to report)
D. Commissioner Overmyer (Nothing to report)

1 E. Commissioner Crimeni (Nothing to report)

2
3 **8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

- 4
5 A. SPA for McSweeny Farms
6 B. CUP for Multi-tenant office building
7 C. WRCOG Presentation regarding Regional Climate Action Plan
8 D. Regent Properties ☐ Ramona Creek SP, TTM and DEIR
9 E. General Plan Consistency Zoning Program: Phase II
10 F. Update on Hemet ROCS

11
12 **9. ADJOURNMENT**

13
14 It was unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 7:00 p.m. to the regular meeting
15 of the City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for January 21, 2014 at 6:00
16 p.m. to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham
17 Avenue, Hemet, CA 92543.
18
19

20
21
22
23 
24 _____
25 John Gifford, Chairman
26 Hemet Planning Commission
27

28 ATTEST:

29
30
31 
32 _____
33 Melissa Couden, Records Secretary
34 Hemet Planning Commission
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50