

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

**CITY OF HEMET  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**DATE:** December 16, 2008 **CALLED TO ORDER:** 6:00 p.m.

**PLACE:** City Council Chambers, 450 East Latham Avenue, Hemet CA 92543

**Present:** Chairman Bob Duistermars, Vice Chairman Nick Jones, Commissioners Rick Crimeni, Wigsbert Mendoza and Mayzelle Rhoten

**Absent:** None

**Invocation and Flag Salute:** Commissioner Mendoza

**I. PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

None.

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

None.

**III. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**A. Project: SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NO. 07-006 (SEVEN HILLS)**

Applicant: Seven Hills Resort Corp.

Agent: Patricia Herron and James Unland

Location: West side of South Lyon Avenue at Chambers Street

Planner: Bernie Chase, Associate Planner

Description: A request for Planning Commission review and approval of the design for a multiple-family senior residential project consisting of five residential buildings with 40 dwelling units totaling approximately 30,640 square feet, along with appurtenant street widening and site improvements including a potential drainage basin, landscaping, covered and garage parking, and improvements to an existing parking lot, on an approved, undeveloped 1.95-acre parcel adjacent to a golf course, a golf course club house and maintenance building, in conjunction with a Mitigated Negative Declaration approved under Environmental Assessment No. 07-005.

Commissioner Rhoten recused herself from the presentation due to a conflict of interest.

1 The Staff report was presented by Associate Planner Bernard Chase, who provided  
2 various details and exhibits regarding the proposed project.

3  
4 Commissioner Jones questioned issues and Chairman Duistermars asked if there was  
5 a condition that required that the incremental drainage be kept on-site.  
6

7 Associate Planner Chase answered in the affirmative.  
8

9 Chairman Duistermars also stated that the project was conditioned that they participate  
10 in some kind of a drainage channel upon completion of the housing to the south.  
11

12 Associate Planner Chase indicated that a project to the south between this site and Salt  
13 Creek had come before the Commission and City Council a number of times with  
14 drainage issues associated with this project. He explained that, between discussions  
15 with staff, the applicant and City Council, the project was proposed and approved to  
16 implement improvements to have drainage flow on the east side of Lyon Avenue.  
17

18 Vice Chairman Jones stated that Chambers Street was completely blocked today and  
19 that the City had to put up barricades.  
20

21 Associate Planner Chase noted that drainage had been an issue on Chambers Street  
22 for some time and that if the other project did not solve the drainage problem or was not  
23 approved to solve it, a contingency had been included requiring that if the drainage  
24 channel needed to be completed on the west side of Lyon Avenue, that the project  
25 would include it. The four buildings would be reduced to three, but some additional two-  
26 story units would be added to the west side of the proposed building to make up for the  
27 loss of the fourth single-story building.  
28

29 Vice Chairman Jones noted that a vote of approval at this time may not be the same as  
30 it would in the future, if engineering could not fix the water problem.  
31

32 Associate Planner Chase stated that there would be a contingency to allow for this.  
33

34 Vice Chairman Jones stated that the Commission could not vote at this time.  
35

36 Associate Planner Chase indicated that staff believed that when the other project was  
37 approved by City Council, it would solve the problem. He noted that if this project was  
38 not built any time soon and the other project were to fall out, there was a contingency to  
39 fall back on. He explained that the number of units would not be changed — simply,  
40 one building would be removed and the size of the two-story building would be  
41 increased to account for the units lost in that building.  
42

43 Commissioner Mendoza indicated that this would not solve the problem.  
44

45 Associate Planner Chase stated that Engineering was available to discuss the issue.  
46

47 Chairman Duistermars asked Principal Engineer Jorge Biagioni to fill the Commission in  
48 on this contingency and asked if it was part of the original approval of Plan A and B.  
49 City Planner Ron Running indicated that it had been detailed in the SDR.  
50

1 Principal Engineer Biagioni responded that the proposal had been on the original  
2 submittal that was reviewed and approved by the Commission. He explained that  
3 Alternative A showed the development to the south as completed, so the improvements  
4 would be connected to the south. Alternative B, he noted, was to mitigate some of the  
5 effects now and proceed later on to connect future increments if they were to  
6 materialize.

7  
8 Commissioner Crimeni asked if the City would be stuck, should this project be approved  
9 at this time, if the future increments did not materialize.

10  
11 Vice Chairman Jones gave an example of the area around Tahquitz High School and  
12 the elementary school on Cawston Avenue, to describe the problems with the City  
13 approving a project without resolving the flooding issues first. He suggested that this  
14 project would present the same problem.

15  
16 Principal Engineer Biagioni responded negatively, explaining that the problem on  
17 Chambers Street and Lyon Avenue had been present for a long time.

18  
19 Vice Chairman Jones stated that the City was inviting problems by allowing this  
20 development to move forward with knowledge of a major flood problem at that  
21 intersection.

22  
23 Principal Engineer Biagioni noted that Alternative B would be implemented before they  
24 could build the development to the south.

25  
26 Vice Chairman Jones questioned whether the Commission had been presented with  
27 Alternative B and the concept of more two-story units.

28  
29 Principal Engineer Biagioni responded affirmatively.

30  
31 Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioner Crimeni indicated that they did not recall that  
32 presentation.

33  
34 Commissioner Crimeni asked if the City would be stuck with a flood problem if this  
35 project were built, but McSweeny was not built to resolve the problem.

36  
37 Principal Engineer Biagioni indicated the problem would not be completely solved. He  
38 explained that the solution they were proposing would allow this development to be  
39 safe. He noted that Conditions of Approval should include going through FEMA, etc., to  
40 clear the area from a flood zone.

41  
42 Chairman Duistermars asked if the proposed project would build Alternative B if they  
43 were to build before any projects to the south.

44  
45 Principal Engineer Biagioni noted this was his understanding.

46  
47 Commissioner Crimeni inquired regarding the number of two-story units that would be  
48 added with Alternative B.

1 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing.

2  
3 The Commission questioned prior discussion that had occurred regarding Alternative B.

4  
5 Principal Engineer Biagioni indicated that he had come to the podium and participated  
6 in a brief discussion with the Commission regarding the Alternative.

7  
8 Associate Planner Running noted that there had been a discussion of the drainage  
9 issues with the Environmental Impact Report and that the discussion regarding the  
10 Alternatives had occurred at that time, including the discussion of on-site units going to  
11 the southern building.

12  
13 Chairman Duistermars requested that the applicant, or the engineer representing the  
14 applicant approach the lectern.

15  
16 Associate Planner Chase informed the Commission that Alternative B was referred to  
17 as Exhibit B-1.

18  
19 Russell Rumansoff - Herron & Rumansoff Architects – approached the lectern and  
20 advised the Commission that it was his understanding that they would never have to  
21 use Alternative B. He stated that Alternative B had been submitted at the request of the  
22 Planning Department back in the beginning stages of the project. He noted that they  
23 were proposing to build Alternative A, with all of the proposed units, and improve the  
24 intersection.

25  
26 Chairman Duistermars noted that the Commission was discussing Alternative B  
27 because they had been told that if the houses were not built, and the apartments were  
28 completed first, Alternative B would be utilized.

29  
30 Mr. Rumansoff reiterated that Alternative A is what they were intending to build.

31  
32 Commissioner Crimeni expressed concern regarding the consequences that would face  
33 the City if the McSweeny property to the east did not get built.

34  
35 Mr. Rumansoff noted that they were ready to begin construction as soon as possible.

36  
37 Commissioner Crimeni explained that the McSweeny project was proposed to correct  
38 the drainage problem and that if they did not end up building, a drainage problem would  
39 continue to exist.

40  
41 Mr. Rumansoff responded negatively, indicating that with this project they would be  
42 building all of the units included with Alternative A, including all of the required  
43 improvements, which would extend a significant distance south of Chambers Street.

44  
45 Jim Unland – Unland & Associates – 3550 E. Florida Avenue, Hemet, Engineer –  
46 approached the lectern and advised the Commission that Alternative B had been  
47 inserted into the proposed project before the project to the south was approved by City  
48 Council. He explained that Alternative B had been included in the event that the  
49 Council did not approve that project, and that drainage was determined to be rightfully

1 on the east side of Lyon Avenue. Since the project to the south had since been  
2 approved, the City had determined that the water should be taken care of on the east  
3 side of the street. He noted that there was no longer any intention of including  
4 Alternative B in the project, and that If the project were to start construction tomorrow,  
5 they would be meeting with the City Engineer to make sure that everybody understood  
6 that they would be proceeding with the design on Lyon Avenue, the improvements and  
7 the grading on the project itself, and that a channel would not be built, providing a right-  
8 of-way for a future channel on the Seven Hills side of the street. He reiterated that it  
9 was not the intention of the developer to implement Alternative B, noting that the only  
10 way that the drainage situation would be resolved was if some type of improvement  
11 went in. He explained that the water was coming down Chambers Street and Lyon  
12 Avenue, but had nowhere to go when it reached the intersection.

13  
14 Vice Chairman Jones expressed concern that it was overflowing the catch basin.

15  
16 Discussion ensued regarding the flooding at the intersection, and what could be done to  
17 alleviate it.

18  
19 Chairman Duistermars inquired as to what was going to be done to move that water off  
20 the intersection.

21  
22 Mr. Unland noted that at the Kirby turn on the southwest corner, the curb stopped and  
23 there was just dirt and weeds, with no place for the water to go. He pointed out that the  
24 only existing improvement was on the east half of Lyon Avenue, south of Pepper Tree  
25 and down to Chambers, and then it was only improved on the north half of Chambers  
26 Street, with the south half being on private property. He suggested that a great solution  
27 would be if Metropolitan Water District came in and did some improvements there. In  
28 the interim, he noted that the curb and gutter would be extended from Pepper Tree  
29 down about 450 feet to the south edge of the project, with full improvements to the west  
30 half of the street. He explained that it would go downhill that way so the water would  
31 have a chance to get away from Pepper Tree and Lyon and proceed south. Once it got  
32 down there, it would be graded to drain towards Salt Creek to try to get the water out of  
33 that area. He noted that this problem would continue until the MWD side was fully  
34 improved, but that it would channel the problem further downstream and would not be  
35 as bad at that intersection.

36  
37 Mr. Unland further noted that Alternative B may have been an option if the project to the  
38 south had not been approved and if there was a channeling going on the east side of  
39 the street. He suggested that if the Commission wished to strike the conditions referring  
40 to Alternative B, it would be acceptable.

41  
42 Extensive additional discussion of the drainage issue ensued.

43  
44 Mr. Rumansoff reapproached the lectern and advised the Commission that one of the  
45 basic requirements of this project was to finish this end of the Seven Hills Development  
46 project. He noted that the residential complex would tie into the golf course and  
47 clubhouse and would take access off of the parking lot. Since it would all be part of the  
48 golf course, it would need to be maintained, and would need to be aesthetically pleasing  
49 as part of the Seven Hills development.

1 Mr. Rumansoff further noted that most of the traffic would be contained within the  
2 existing parking lot, and that there would be an entrance that would line up with  
3 Chambers Street which would feed the front row of the single-story units. Traffic  
4 impacts, he advised, would be minimized by not having individual driveways or anything  
5 on the street. The single-story units, he noted, would be 14 feet high to the ridge in  
6 terms of transition between the surrounding areas. He added that they would be low-  
7 rise units no higher than the modular units on Pepper Tree.

8  
9 Mr. Rumansoff went on to advise the Commission that the two-story units would be no  
10 higher than the clubhouse and some of the two-story areas located to the north of the  
11 retention basin. He explained that the two-story units would be sited as far away from  
12 Pepper Tree as possible to make sure that no views were blocked, and to ensure that  
13 the angle of vision would go right over the two-story units, which was a concern that had  
14 been expressed by the residents of the modular units.

15  
16 Discussion ensued regarding maintenance of the view for the residents of the modular  
17 units.

18  
19 Vice Chairman Jones requested that the condition of mutual use of the clubhouse be  
20 addressed because no amenities except for parking lots at the two-story unit would be  
21 included. He inquired regarding the agreement with Seven Hills in utilizing the  
22 clubhouse.

23  
24 Mr. Rumansoff indicated that the clubhouse was a public facility and available for use.

25  
26 Vice Chairman Jones inquired regarding the legality of utilizing the clubhouse as a  
27 recreational facility.

28  
29 Calvin Nishikawa – Seven Hills Development – stated that Condition of Approval No. 48  
30 provided acceptable language to address this issue. He read the condition into the  
31 record.

32  
33 Chairman Duistermars asked if there was a fee to use the clubhouse.

34  
35 Mr. Nishikawa indicated that he believed there was, noting that project representative  
36 Frank Bruno, who would typically answer such questions, was ill and not in attendance  
37 for the meeting. He advised that there was usually a charge for rental of the banquet  
38 facilities.

39  
40 Discussion continued regarding clubhouse benefits for the residents.

41  
42 City Planner Running advised the Commission that the PCD did not have a requirement  
43 for providing such benefits.

44  
45 Chairman Duistermars indicated that he believed that any 55 plus development in the  
46 State of California had to include a provision for certain amenities.

47  
48 City Planner Running indicated that he was not aware of such a requirement.  
49  
50

1 City Attorney Jex explained to the Commission that the City had a special zoning that  
2 would require such provisions, but that the zoning for this property was the PCD  
3 Ordinance — the Specific Plan — which governed the types of amenities that were to  
4 be provided.

5  
6 Mr. Rumansoff indicated that all conditions of approval had been discussed with staff  
7 and agreed to by the applicant.

8  
9 Additional discussion ensued regarding flooding issues.

10  
11 Vice Chairman Jones asked if the flooding problem would be resolved if a condition  
12 were imposed on the project that required Seven Hills to grade it to Salt Creek.

13  
14 Mr. Unland indicated that there would be some resolution in the short term, but that  
15 once the weeds began to grow, the problem would resume. He suggested that it could  
16 be graded south from the end of the road improvements.

17  
18 Vice Chairman Jones asked if it would be the City's responsibility to provide  
19 maintenance after grading to Salt Creek.

20  
21 Mr. Unland responded in the affirmative, noting that it would be just like a street  
22 improvement.

23  
24 City Attorney Jex asked if the City had the right-of-way.

25  
26 Mr. Unland responded that they did, all the way down on the west side.

27  
28 City Attorney Jex questioned whether it was private.

29  
30 Mr. Unland indicated that it was not.

31  
32 Chairman Duistermars asked if the condition could be added since the project was a  
33 design review.

34  
35 City Planner Running stated that it could.

36  
37 Chairman Duistermars asked the Commissioners if everyone was in agreement that a  
38 condition be added.

39  
40 All Commissioners present agreed.

41  
42 Chairman Duistermars indicated that the Commission would like to add a condition  
43 requiring grading to continue down south to Salt Creek.

44  
45 Vice Chairman Jones requested to hear the condition read back into the record.

46  
47 Chairman Duistermars agreed to have that condition read back when the Commission  
48 was ready to vote.

1 Commissioner Mendoza inquired regarding what would be exceeding or meeting the  
2 conditions of Title 24 as part of the green building efficiencies.

3  
4 Mr. Rumansoff noted that dual glazing would be provided, and insulation in both walls  
5 and ceilings would be increased to the optimum, using materials to transmit heat or cool  
6 air. He noted that wood was not good in this climate, so they would be utilizing some  
7 kind of composite material that would be well insulated, but easily maintained.

8  
9 Commissioner Mendoza inquired about the color of the roof.

10  
11 Mr. Rumansoff responded that the color of the rooftops would be a light reddish or  
12 tannish/reddish shade.

13  
14 Commissioner Mendoza wanted to know if that was because of the design guidelines or  
15 if a light color roof could be utilized.

16  
17 Mr. Rumansoff noted that he felt that the proposed color was lighter, rather than darker  
18 in terms of reflecting the heat. He indicated that the increase in landscaping and  
19 creating areas that would not absorb and regenerate heat would help considerably.

20  
21 Further discussion ensued regarding green-building provisions.

22  
23 Commissioner Crimeni requested that the landscaping be more substantial and  
24 attractive on the corner coming into the project — maybe a fountain.

25  
26 Mr. Rumansoff indicated that there would be an entry fountain and that he believed  
27 there would be a monument at the corner that could be upgraded.

28  
29 Commissioner Mendoza asked if the landscaping would be water efficient and whether  
30 grass would be used.

31  
32 Mr. Rumansoff responded positively to the water efficiency and indicated that there  
33 would be no grass because the area would not be big enough.

34  
35 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing.

36  
37 Alice Albright – 2156 Pecan Tree Street in Seven Hills – expressed concern with the  
38 two-story units but indicated she was pleased with a senior development.

39  
40 Hank Singleton – 1770 Almond Tree in Seven Hills – expressed concern regarding  
41 flooding.

42  
43 Diana Taverner – 1425 Seven Hills Drive in Seven Hills – expressed concerns  
44 regarding the timeframe of the remodeling of the clubhouse, the landscaping being  
45 completed by the lowest bidder, and the appearance of the entryway.

46  
47 Chairman Duistermars inquired about the remodeling of the clubhouse, noting that it  
48 was not before the Commission at this meeting.

1 Commissioner Mendoza asked if the landscaping plans had been submitted.

2  
3 City Planner Running indicated that staff did not yet have the detailed landscape plan.

4  
5 Commissioner Mendoza asked if there was a landscaping ordinance and if the  
6 developer would have to follow it.

7  
8 City Planner Running responded affirmatively.

9  
10 Commissioner Mendoza asked if drought-resistant plants were being recommended,  
11 and encouraged the citizens of the community to be vigilant about what the developers  
12 were bringing in and inform the Commission if something was not in conformance with  
13 what had been agreed to at the meeting. He added that the Commission would love to  
14 receive input from the citizens.

15  
16 Additional discussion ensued regarding the clubhouse being used as a recreational  
17 facility for the development.

18  
19 City Attorney Jex indicated that there seemed to be some confusion about there being a  
20 City ordinance which required such an amenity, but clarified that there was not. He  
21 explained that the development standards governing the property being discussed was  
22 the PCD. He noted that if the project were to be a senior community and the developer  
23 wanted to provide an amenity, then the City could add it as a requirement for the  
24 project, but that this was not the case, and that the amenity could only be included as a  
25 requirement if the developer volunteered to provide it.

26  
27 Vice Chairman Jones stated that it was a give and take situation with the two-story units  
28 and that now there was nothing.

29  
30 Mr. Unland noted that it was his understanding that the project was okay with Condition  
31 No. 48, and that he believed that the issue of the rate of pay the renter would have to  
32 provide had already been resolved. He added that, if it was something the Commission  
33 wanted done, a discount to apartment owners or renters could be offered for golf or  
34 rental of the facility. He noted that this was not the intention, but that if the Commission  
35 requested something along those lines, he could refer that request to Mr. Bruno.

36  
37 Commissioner Crimeni indicated that he thought that would be very wise.

38  
39 Chairman Duistermars noted that an amenity was something that was provided as a  
40 part of residency, and that he would prefer that it not be about a 5% discount, but rather  
41 something that rose to the level of an amenity — a benefit for being there.

42  
43 City Planner Running indicated that staff could establish a condition requiring that a rate  
44 discount be provided for future residents.

45  
46 Discussion ensued regarding the height of the two-story building, and it was noted that  
47 the project was conditioned to build according to the PCD, and that the building height  
48 was in compliance with the PCD standards.

1 Commissioner Crimeni asked if the air-conditioning units would be on the side.

2  
3 Mr. Rumansoff responded that they would not.

4  
5 Linda Manley – 1932 Pecan Street in Seven Hills – asked if there was any guarantee  
6 that the apartments would remain 55-plus throughout their existence.

7  
8 Chairman Duistermars responded that he did not believe there was any way to impose  
9 such a requirement within the State of California, but noted that the fees that would be  
10 paid would be significantly reduced as a senior project and the difference would need to  
11 be recaptured if that were ever changed.

12  
13 Ms. Manley stated that the Seven Hills Development was a beautiful community, and  
14 that to jeopardize that in any way would be a travesty of the City and the Commission.

15  
16 Nancy Singleton – 1770 Almond Street in Seven Hills – noted that she resided on the  
17 18<sup>th</sup> fairway and expressed concern with the two-story units obstructing her view and  
18 the multi-family nature of the development.

19  
20 Additional discussion ensued relative to the two-story units and how they would affect  
21 the views of existing residences.

22  
23 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing and asked that the additional  
24 Conditions of Approval be read into the record.

25  
26 City Planner Running noted the modifications to the Conditions of Approval as follows:

- 27  
28
  - **Delete Condition of Approval No. 101.**
  - **Add Condition of Approval No. 127 as follows:**

29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
*“The applicant shall provide adequate grading for stormwater drainage within the existing public right-of-way on Lyon Avenue to the south to Salt Creek, as approved by the Engineering Department.”*

- **Add Condition of Approval No. 128 as follows:**

*“The applicant shall provide an increased landscape amenity and entry monument feature at the southwest corner of Lyon and Pepper Tree Avenues, subject to the review and approval of the Planning Director.”*

- **Add Condition of Approval No. 129 as follows:**

*“The applicant shall provide a discount program to project residents for the use of the golf course and clubhouse facilities, subject to review and approval of the Planning Director.”*

1 Commissioner Crimeni asked if a condition could be added that would require the  
2 developer to take care of any flooding problems that were to occur, so that the City  
3 would not bear the cost burden of such an occurrence.

4  
5 City Attorney Jex advised the Commission that the grading plans would need to be  
6 reviewed and approved by the City Engineer, and that if they did not meet the required  
7 specifications, the City would have the ability to require the developer to solve such a  
8 flooding problem.

9  
10 City Planner Running noted that the construction of the drainage course would be  
11 installed by the applicant, but that the ongoing maintenance would be a City expense  
12 because it was in the public right-of-way.

13  
14 Vice Chairman Jones inquired about Alternative B.

15  
16 Commissioner Crimeni noted and City Planner Running confirmed that Alternative B  
17 would not be implemented.

18  
19 City Attorney Jex asked if it was the Commission's desire to delete references to  
20 Alternative B.

21  
22 The Commission concurred that it was.

23  
24 Associate Planner Chase referred to Condition of Approval No. 45, which discussed  
25 Alternative B, and suggested that it be stricken.

26  
27 Chairman Duistermars noted and City Planner Running confirmed that Condition of  
28 Approval No. 45 was being replaced by the new Condition of Approval No. 127 for  
29 grading, and so could be stricken.

30  
31 City Attorney Jex suggested that the Commission get the applicant's concurrence on  
32 the record with the revisions to the Conditions of Approval.

33  
34 Chairman Duistermars asked the applicant to come to the lectern.

35  
36 Mr. Nishikawa returned to the lectern and inquired regarding what the Commission  
37 wanted them to approve.

38  
39 Chairman Duistermars asked for concurrence with the Conditions of Approval that had  
40 been read into the record.

41  
42 Mr. Nishikawa expressed concurrence with the added Conditions.

43  
44 Vice Chairman Jones asked Mr. Nishikawa to state his name for the record.

45  
46 Mr. Nishikawa indicated that he was "*Calvin Nishikawa on behalf of the Seven Hills Golf*  
47 *Course*".

48  
49 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.

1 It was MOVED by Commissioner Crimeni and SECONDED by Commissioner Mendoza  
2 to adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 08-077* approving Site Development  
3 Review No. 07-006 as amended.

4  
5 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

6  
7 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Crimeni  
8 and Mendoza  
9 NOES: None  
10 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Rhoten  
11 ABSENT: None

12  
13 **(APPROVED – PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 08-052)**

14  
15 Chairman Duistermars called a brief recess.

16  
17  
18 **B. Project: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 08-014, GENERAL**  
19 **PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 07-001, SPECIFIC PLAN**  
20 **AMENDMENT NO. 06-004, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO.**  
21 **35392 (MAP07-004), TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO 35393**  
22 **(MAP07-005), & TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO 35394**  
23 **(MAP07-006) (RANCHO DIAMANTE)**

24 Applicant: Page/Strata/BP, LLC  
25 Agent: Rick Robotta of Benchmark Pacific  
26 Location: East and west sides of Warren Road, south of BNSF  
27 Railroad Tracks  
28 Planner: Bernie Chase, Associate Planner  
29 Description: A request for Planning Commission review and  
30 recommendations to the City Council regarding a General  
31 Plan Amendment to amend the General Plan Land Use  
32 designation from Industrial and RR-2.5 to R I (Low Density)  
33 and an amendment to the Page Ranch Planned Community  
34 Master Plan to allow residential uses by changing a  
35 designation from Industrial and Low Density Residential to  
36 Low-Medium Density Residential for portions of the project  
37 site, and three phased subdivisions of a 244-acre site  
38 proposed for 993 single-family residential lots, along with an  
39 overrule of an Airport Land Use Commission finding of  
40 inconsistency for a portion of the site and a Subsequent  
41 Environmental Impact Report for the proposed changes.

42  
43 The staff report was presented by Associate Planner Bernard Chase, who provided  
44 various details and exhibits related to the project.

45  
46 Vice Chairman Jones inquired regarding what the age group of the residents for  
47 Tentative Tract Map No. 35393 would be and what the proposed lot sizes were.  
48  
49  
50

1 Associate Planner Chase responded that there were no age restrictions for that  
2 subdivision, and that the lot sizes were proposed to be 5,000 square-feet.

3  
4 Chairman Duistermars referred to an ordinance or overlay zone that the City had  
5 passed requiring 7,000 square-foot minimum lot sizes.

6  
7 Commissioner Rhoten clarified that they were to be 7,200 square-foot minimum lots.

8  
9 Chairman Duistermars asked if this proposal was part of an old Page Ranch standard  
10 that allowed the lots to be that small.

11  
12 City Planner Running responded affirmatively.

13  
14 Chairman Duistermars asked if there had been approval for lots to be built at the  
15 proposed size.

16  
17 City Planner Running advised the Commission that there had been an earlier  
18 amendment to Page Ranch that allowed development of 5,000 square-foot lots, and  
19 that it had also been added to the Single-Family Design Guidelines that lot sizes could  
20 be developed at 5,000 square-feet.

21  
22 Vice Chairman Jones asked when those approvals had been granted.

23  
24 City Planner Running indicated that it had been with a prior amendment put forth by  
25 Benchmark Pacific when Pulte Homes developed the Del Webb community.

26  
27 Vice Chairman Jones asked if that approval had been given for homes of all ages, or for  
28 seniors exclusively at that point, and if the standard had been made clear to the  
29 Commission.

30  
31 City Planner Running responded that he could not recall.

32  
33 Vice Chairman Jones expressed concern with small lot sizes.

34  
35 Associate Planner Chase continued with his presentation of the staff report, moving on  
36 to discuss Tentative Tract Map No. 35394.

37  
38 Vice Chairman Jones asked if this would be a senior-oriented subdivision.

39  
40 Associate Planner Chase responded affirmatively and continued on with his  
41 presentation.

42  
43 Chairman Duistermars asked if the City was utilizing the 1992 or 2002 Airport Land Use  
44 Plan in the evaluation of the proposed project.

45  
46 Associate Planner Chase indicated that the 1992 plan was in effect for this project, but  
47 noted that the City's General Plan would allow the City to use the 2002 California  
48 Handbook for Airports, which came up with different results.

1 City Planner Running explained that the County of Riverside was compelled to go by  
2 the old plan since they did not have the changes incorporated into their plan yet. He  
3 noted that when the Lowe's project had been approved, the City's General Plan was  
4 amended to allow the City to do an override and rely on the 2002 manual.

5  
6 Chairman Duistermars asked what this would do to the project.

7  
8 Associate Planner Chase indicated that with the 2002 California Handbook different  
9 types of zones were used that were not the same as those in the 1992 Plan.

10  
11 Chairman Duistermars asked if the project was consistent with the 2002 California  
12 Handbook.

13  
14 Associate Planner Chase responded that it was.

15  
16 Chairman Duistermars asked for questions of staff.

17  
18 Commissioner Rhoten inquired regarding the type of lot sizes that were consistent with  
19 the General Plan.

20  
21 Vice Chairman Jones asked if Plan B was being considered.

22  
23 Associate Planner Chase responded that it was.

24  
25 Vice Chairman Jones inquired regarding the current designation for the site.

26  
27 City Planner Running advised the Commission that the current General Plan for the  
28 west side of Warren Road was Rural Residential because of the old Airport Land Use  
29 Plan, and that the request was to change the General Plan designation to R-1 with up to  
30 seven dwelling units per acre.

31  
32 Chairman Duistermars asked if this was for the single-family units.

33  
34 City Planner Running responded affirmatively.

35  
36 Chairman Duistermars pointed out that the family units were an issue.

37  
38 Discussion ensued regarding the proposed 5,000 square-foot lots and the possibility of  
39 a school being built.

40  
41 City Planner Running advised the Commission that the school district had sent the  
42 plans for the school to Sacramento for review and that a final EIR had been approved,  
43 but that he did not know the status of the plans.

44  
45 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing.

46  
47 Al Buche – 1669 Via Simpatico in the Del Webb Community: stated that when the  
48 project was built and sold, it had been sold as an 1,100 unit project — 500 units  
49 between Warren Rd., Mustang Way and Fisher St. He inquired regarding where Del  
50

1 Webb would be adding the second portion of the project, if they were still the property  
2 owners, and whether the remaining part of the project was still in the works.  
3

4 Chairman Duistermars noted that the gray area on the displayed map indicated the  
5 current Del Webb project, and that the new project was indicated on the left and would  
6 need to be purchased by Del Webb.  
7

8 Rick Robotta of Benchmark Pacific — 550 Laguna Drive, Carlsbad, CA approached the  
9 lectern as a representative for the applicant and clarified that the gray area indicated on  
10 the map had been sold to Del Webb in 2004, and currently contained a 26,000 square-  
11 foot recreation facility and 135 homes, with 120 of them having been sold. He noted  
12 that there was currently a small standing inventory of 21 homes under construction. He  
13 indicated that he hoped that Del Webb would purchase the triangular parcel and the  
14 parcel west of Warren Road for continuation of their existing project and to support the  
15 amenities that had already been constructed. He added that he could not ascertain Del  
16 Webb's continuation of the project, but that they were currently supporting the  
17 homeowner's fees and subsidizing so that the Home Owner's Association fees on the  
18 current Phase 1 of the project did not get too high.  
19

20 Mr. Robotta provided clarification regarding the lot sizes, explaining that all three tracts  
21 had a minimum allowable lot size of 5,000 square-feet, but that in Tentative Tract Map  
22 35393 the actual proposed density was 4.3 dwelling units per acre. He noted that only  
23 about 40% of the lots were proposed to be under 6,000 square-feet, and that the  
24 remaining 60% were greater than 6,000 and up to 8,000 square-feet.  
25

26 Vice Chairman Jones stated that the Commission did not want 5,000 square-foot lots.  
27

28 Mr. Robotta responded that there was a mixture of lot sizes, which was what the  
29 community wanted. He added that the philosophy of the design of the all-age  
30 subdivision was the same as Phase 1, with continuation of the paseo system. He  
31 explained that the difference was the two-story homes and that the actual footprint  
32 provided more yard. He noted that Del Webb had just recorded another map because  
33 they were running out of 5,000 square-foot lots, which was what the senior buyers were  
34 looking for.  
35

36 Chairman Duistermars suggested a continuance of the project to the next Planning  
37 Commission meeting to allow discussion with staff regarding lot sizes.  
38

39 Mr. Robotta stated that he would work with staff to try and come up with something the  
40 Commission could support.  
41

42 Chairman Duistermars noted that the continuance would be to the meeting of January  
43 6, 2009.  
44

45 Discussion ensued regarding lot sizes, amenities, alternatives for Area B and the  
46 possibility of a future school being added to the mix.  
47

48 Vice Chairman Jones referred to the need for industrial property in the future and asked  
49 for an explanation as to why it was important to give it up. He noted that John Husing  
50

1 had advised the City that there was a scarcity of industrial land in the area and to treat  
2 what was left like gold. He noted that it was his understanding that John Husing was  
3 considered to be one of Southern California's premier authorities on land use in the  
4 area.

5  
6 City Planner Running concurred, noting that the City needed a diverse economic base.

7  
8 Discussion ensued regarding maintaining the City's existing industrial property.

9  
10 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion to continue.

11  
12 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Crimeni to  
13 continue Environmental Assessment No. 08-014, General Plan Amendment No. 07-001,  
14 Specific Plan Amendment No. 06-004, Tentative Tract Map No. 35392 (Map 07-004),  
15 Tentative Tract Map No. 35393 (Map No. 07-005), and Tentative Tract Map No. 35392  
16 (Map No. 07-006) (Rancho Diamante) as an open public hearing to the Planning  
17 Commission meeting of January 6, 2009.

18  
19 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

20  
21 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners  
22 Crimeni, Mendoza and Rhoten

23 NOES: None

24 ABSTAIN: None

25 ABSENT: None  
26  
27

#### 28 **IV. PLANNING COMMISSISON COMMENTS:**

29  
30 Vice Chairman Jones inquired regarding the proposed change of the start time for the  
31 meeting to 5:00 p.m. and asked whether staff had reviewed it.

32  
33 City Planner Running stated that he had no knowledge of this request.

34  
35 Chairman Duistermars indicated that it was supposed to be reviewed to see whether or  
36 not it was an ordinance.

37  
38 City Attorney Jex advised the Commission that it was not an ordinance, and that the  
39 City staff would need to review the by-laws to find out where the meeting time of the  
40 Planning Commission was noted and whether the document needed to be amended to  
41 change that time.

42  
43 Vice Chairman Jones noted that the Riverside County General Plan was going to be  
44 addressed by staff and the Council on Thursday.

45  
46 Discussion ensued regarding the County's General Plan.  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 **V. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

2  
3 None requested.

4  
5  
6 **VI. ADJOURNMENT:**

7  
8 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten, SECONDED by Commissioner Crimeni and  
9 unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 8:17 p.m. to the regular meeting of the  
10 City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **Tuesday, January 6, 2009 at 6:00**  
11 **p.m.** to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham  
12 Avenue, Hemet, CA 92543.

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 Bob Duistermars, Chairman  
20 Hemet Planning Commission

21  
22  
23  
24 ATTEST:

25  
26  
27  
28 \_\_\_\_\_  
29 Nancie Shaw, Secretary  
30 Hemet Planning Commission