

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
2

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

5 NOES: None

6 ABSTAIN: None

7 ABSENT: Commissioner Mendoza
8
9

10 **IV. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE** 11

12 Since the Hemet Unified School District Director of Facilities, Dan Lovingier, was unable
13 to attend the meeting, the update was provided by Facilities Planner, Tina Koonce.
14

15 Ms. Koonce advised the Commission, regarding the Hemet High School stadium, that the
16 track and traffic signals for the project had been completed. She noted that the street
17 improvements, including the median and wrought iron, were pending final approval.
18

19 Ms. Koonce reported that the Tahquitz High School and Rancho Viejo Middle School
20 projects were moving along with the buildings being prepared for stucco and the street
21 improvements in progress. She added that she and the Director of Facilities, Dan
22 Lovingier, had met with the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) earlier in the day
23 to finalize the HUSD's funding application.
24

25 Regarding the Hamilton 2-story classroom project, Ms. Koonce reported that 32 modular
26 classroom units had been installed and that they were preparing for lightweight concrete
27 and the hooking up of utilities.
28

29 Ms. Koonce advised the Commission that the HUSD's tract map guru, Roxanne Estavillo,
30 had left the Facilities Department for another position in the District, and that they would
31 be conducting interviews for her position on Friday. She noted that she would probably
32 be asking members of the City's Planning Department to meet with members of the
33 Facilities Department so that they could begin to create procedures and protocol for
34 working with both agencies.
35

36 Ms. Koonce further advised that HUSD staff was presenting the School Facilities Needs
37 Analysis at this evening's Governing Board Meeting. She explained that the report would
38 authorize the District to levy developer fees on new construction. She noted that while in
39 Sacramento the OPSC had indicated that there were no more state funds for
40 modernization projects.
41
42
43
44

1 Ms. Koonce concluded her report with an update regarding two proposed school bonds –
2 one by the Governor and another by the Speaker. She noted that the Speaker’s bill was
3 to be placed before the voters on November 7, 2006, and that the Governor’s was
4 suggesting \$38 billion over ten years with differing amounts in each bond cycle – the first
5 two cycles in 2006 and 2008. She advised that, per the Governor, this would meet the
6 needs of K-12 schools through the year 2017.

7
8 The Commission thanked Ms. Koonce for her report.

9
10
11 **V. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

12
13 **A. ZONE CHANGE NO. 04-14 AND TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 32878**
14 ***(Continued from 12-06-05)***

15 APPLICANT: Mark O’Brien - S.V. Investments
16 AGENT: Oscar Montez - Cozad and Fox
17 LOCATION: Northeast corner of Devonshire Avenue and Girard
18 Street
19 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni
20 DESCRIPTION: A request for approval of: 1) a zone change to change
21 the zoning from R-1-8 (Single-Family Residential -
22 8,000 square-foot minimum lot size) and SLR (Small-
23 Lot Residential) to R-1-7.2 (Single-Family Residential -
24 7,200 square-foot minimum lot size); and 2) a tentative
25 tract map to subdivide 10.0 acres into 23 lots and one
26 (1) remainder lot for the future development of single-
27 family homes.
28

29 The staff report was presented by Associate Planner Domenigoni, who advised the
30 Commission that staff was requesting a continuance of the item to the Planning
31 Commission meeting of March 7, 2006.

32
33 Chairman Duistermars noted that the public hearing for this item had been opened at the
34 last meeting. He asked for a motion to continue it open to the requested date.

35
36 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
37 continue Zone Change No. 04-14 and Tentative Tract Map No. 32878 to the Planning
38 Commission meeting of March 7, 2006.

39
40 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
41
42
43

1 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride
2 and Rhoten
3 NOES: None
4
5 ABSTAIN: None
6 ABSENT: Commissioner Mendoza
7

8 **B. VESTING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 30602 (Continued from 12-06-**
9 **05)**

10 APPLICANT: Lock Piatt - Frey and Associate
11 AGENT: Jim Unland - James Unland & Associates
12 LOCATION: North side of Wentworth Drive approximately 480-feet
13 east of Cawston Avenue with a portion of the property
14 located on the east side of Cawston Avenue
15 approximately 375-feet north of Wentworth Drive.
16 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni
17 DESCRIPTION: A request to subdivide 19.10 acres into eight (8) lots for
18 future industrial development.
19

20 The staff report was presented by Associate Planner Domenigoni, who provided the
21 Commission with various details regarding the project. She referred to the staff report
22 addendum that had been distributed to each of the Commissioners prior to the start of the
23 meeting and explained the nature of the addendum, including the modified and additional
24 conditions. She noted that a revised set of the Conditions of Approval was attached to the
25 staff report addendum, and that the applicant was in acceptance of all of the revised
26 conditions as written.
27

28 Vice Chairman Jones inquired as to why the applicant was not being required to improve
29 Cawston Avenue.
30

31 Planning Director Masyczek offered a brief explanation for this.
32

33 City Attorney Vail elaborated on the explanation.
34

35 A discussion ensued regarding the proximity of the airport expansion to the proposed
36 project.
37

38 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:26 p.m.
39

40 Don Bender of Tierra West Commercial, 4110 E. Florida Ave., Hemet, California
41 approached the lectern as a representative for the applicant. He noted the many
42 extensions of the public hearing that had been granted in order to allow the right-of-way
43

1 issues relative to Cawston Avenue to be resolved. He expressed some confusion with the
2 Commission's concern regarding the improvements.

3
4 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.

5
6 Mr. Bender inquired as to whether he would be permitted to appeal any added conditions
7 that the Commission might impose to the City Council if they were to approve the project
8 with additional conditions that were unacceptable to the applicant.

9
10 Chairman Duistermars advised Mr. Bender that any part of the Planning Commission's
11 decision was appealable to the City Council.

12
13 A discussion of safety access to the property ensued, and it was noted that a traffic study
14 had not been prepared for the project.

15
16 City Manager Steve Temple approached the lectern and added some clarification as to the
17 reasoning for the discussions with the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) regarding the
18 right-of-way issues relative to Cawston Avenue. He further noted that if the applicant were
19 required to do the improvements to Cawston Avenue, they would receive a credit on their
20 fees, but since they were not providing the improvements they would be required to pay
21 the full fees, with no credit opportunity.

22
23 Mr. Bender inquired regarding the gate for the Fire Department, wanting to know if it would
24 be a temporary gate, or if it would be permanent and if the property owners would be able
25 have access through the gate.

26
27 Planning Director Masyczek noted that a Knox-box was being proposed for the gate, which
28 would allow the property owners to have access through the gate, and that ultimately the
29 gate would end up being removed.

30
31 Chairman Duistermars suggested that the project be continued to the next Planning
32 Commission meeting to allow the applicant to get together with Staff and resolve the
33 questions and concerns that were still apparent.

34
35 City Attorney Vail noted that with the road locations and extensions currently in question,
36 it would be difficult to require improvements.

37
38 Chairman Duistermars stated that he did not think it would be appropriate for the City to
39 end up bearing the burden of cost for putting the road in.

40
41 A discussion ensued regarding whether or not the project should be continued.
42
43

1 It was noted that, before approval, a combination of issues should be discussed and
2 resolved, including the road situation, and that the Development Impact Fees should be
3 reviewed and understood.

4
5 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Vice Chairman Jones to
6 continue Vesting Tentative Parcel Map No. 30602 as an open public hearing to the
7 February 7, 2006 Planning Commission meeting.

8
9 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

10
11 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride
12 and Rhoten
13 NOES: None
14 ABSTAIN: None
15 ABSENT: Commissioner Mendoza

16
17 **C. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 05-09 & ENVIRONMENTAL**
18 **ASSESSMENT NO. 05-09 (SAM'S CLUB)**

19 _____ APPLICANT: Wal-Mart Realty
20 AGENT: Mike Birkland - Nasland Engineering
21 LOCATION: Southwest corner of Florida Avenue and Gilmore Street
22 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni
23 DESCRIPTION: A request to demolish a 130,226 square-foot
24 unoccupied building and construct a 135,300 square-
25 foot food & general retail store with a 12-pump gasoline
26 station on 13.45 acres with adoption of a Mitigated
27 Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring
28 Program for the project.

29
30 The staff report was presented by Associate Planner Domenigoni who provided various
31 details regarding the project and displayed several renderings. She brought up the issues
32 of height exceptions, parking adequacy, additional landscaping, the sign program and
33 comments received in response to the Mitigated Negative Declaration. She noted that
34 Staff was recommending an additional Condition of Approval, which she read aloud for the
35 Commission as follows:

36
37 **Condition No. 135:** ***“Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy***
38 ***or finalization of any building permit, all***
39 ***outstanding invoices regarding the preparation of***
40 ***any environmental document and associated work***
41 ***performed by an environmental consultant shall be***
42 ***paid in full.”***

1 Commissioner Rhoten inquired as to what street the delivery trucks would be accessing
2 the property from.

3
4 Associate Planner Domenigoni pointed out the access route for the delivery trucks on the
5 displayed map.

6
7 Commissioner Rhoten asked if there would be enough room for the trucks to turn around.

8
9 Associate Planner Domenigoni responded that there would be.

10
11 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the level of noise that would come from the
12 delivery trucks and whether it would be disturbing to the nearby residences.

13
14 Associate Planner Domenigoni noted that a condition could be added restricting the hours
15 of delivery.

16
17 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 7:01 p.m.

18
19 Tom Dodson of Tom Dodson & Associates approached the lectern as the environmental
20 consultant for the project and advised the Commission that the noise issue had been
21 addressed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. He assured the Commission that the
22 noise levels would be sufficiently mitigated as per the Mitigation Monitoring Program
23 required with the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

24
25 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the proposed landscaping.

26
27 Pete Richie of Nasland Engineering approached the lectern as the engineering consultant
28 for the project and offered to answer any additional questions.

29
30 Chairman Duistermars reiterated a concern that had been expressed by Vice Chairman
31 Jones early in the hearing regarding the aesthetic provisions of the project along Florida
32 Avenue.

33
34 Mr. Richie noted that it was his understanding that there was currently a row of shrubs that
35 would be removed and replaced with different shrubbery. He displayed a rendering of the
36 proposed landscaping. He advised the commission that they would be improving the
37 landscaping and adding landscaping to the medians within the parking area which was
38 currently quite bland.

39
40 A discussion of the landscaping plan ensued, and it was noted that the Crepe Myrtle trees
41 would be replaced with Honey Locusts, but that the landscape architect had not had time
42 to make the change on the renderings that were currently displayed.

1 Associate Planner Domenigoni noted that Condition No. 18 required the applicant to have
2 the landscaping plan approved prior to their obtaining any building permits.

3
4 Planning Director Masyczek noted that the landscaping condition could be modified to add
5 some additional requirements, and stated that he would work on the wording for that
6 condition.

7
8 A discussion of the signage then followed.

9
10 Howard Hardin of WPTDC approached the lectern as the building design architect for the
11 project. He noted that the existing pylon sign on the shopping center was for more than just
12 the Wal-Mart center, and was, in fact, not owned by Wal-Mart at all. He explained that
13 they simply had a right to a panel on the top panel spot. He also spoke briefly regarding
14 the proposed landscaping.

15
16 A discussion ensued regarding storage, and more specifically outside storage containers,
17 such as had been utilized at the old Wal-Mart at this location.

18
19 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that a condition of approval could be added stating
20 that outside storage containers were prohibited. He added that a specified number of units
21 could be permitted during the holiday season, based upon approval of the Planning
22 Director at that point in time.

23
24 A discussion ensued regarding this concept.

25
26 Mr. Hardin noted that there was a difference between the operations of Sam's Club and
27 those of Wal-Mart. He explained that Wal-Mart offered a lay-away plan, which created a
28 need for the storage containers, but Sam's Club did not offer lay-away, so there was very
29 little need during any part of the year for outside storage containers. He stated that he
30 would not have an objection to a restriction being added regarding outside storage
31 containers.

32
33 Planning Director Masyczek stated that a condition of approval could simply be added as
34 follows:

35
36 ***“Outside storage shall be prohibited.”***

37
38 The Commission and the applicant concurred with the added condition.

39
40 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 7:20 p.m.

1 Associate Planner Domenigoni advised the Commission that there were two conditions –
2 Condition Nos. 55 and 133 – that should have been deleted, but were inadvertently left in
3 place. She explained what the conditions were.

4
5 The Commission concurred with the deletion of these conditions, as did the applicant.

6
7 City Attorney Vail noted that the site plan should also be revised to reflect the deletion of
8 Condition No. 55. He then asked that clarification regarding the changes to the Conditions
9 of approval be read into the record.

10
11 Planning Director Masyczek noted changes to the conditions as follows:

- 12
13 1. Condition No. 18: after the wording “*proposed in the plans*” the following
14 phrase shall be added: “***....as well as a continuous shade tree wall along***
15 ***Florida Avenue and Gilmore Street (Honey Locusts). The plan shall***
16 ***also include, at minimum, two specimen trees at the project entrance.***”
- 17
18 2. Under **Operational Characteristics**, a condition should be added stating
19 that: “***Outside storage shall be prohibited.***”

20
21 Planning Director Masyczek asked if the Commission had any specific direction to staff
22 regarding signage.

23
24 The Commission noted that the signage requirements could remain as is.

25
26 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding Condition No. 18 and the fact that the plan was
27 not required to come back to staff for approval.

28
29 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the condition already required the landscape
30 plan to be brought back to staff for approval, and that he had simply added on to the
31 existing wording.

32
33 City Attorney Vail asked if he had heard correctly, earlier in the meeting, that part of the
34 store’s palette area was outside the building. He suggested that if this were the case, the
35 condition regarding outdoor storage should be modified so that the conditions were not
36 prohibiting something that they were not intending to prohibit.

37
38 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that under **Operational Characteristics** the
39 previously discussed condition should be omitted and the following condition should be
40 added in its place:

1 **Condition No. 27.a.: “Outside storage shall be prohibited and/or**
2 **screened from public view by a masonry wall, as**
3 **approved by the Planning Department.”**
4

5 Both the Commission and the applicant concurred with the modification.
6

7 Associate Planner Domenigoni noted that the condition regarding payment of invoices,
8 which she had read into the record early in the public hearing, should also be added.
9

10 City Attorney Vail clarified that the changes to the conditions were as follows:
11

- 12 1. Deletion of Condition No. 55 with the site plan modified accordingly.
 - 13 2. Modification of Condition No. 18.
 - 14 3. Addition of Condition No. 27a.
 - 15 4. Deletion of Condition No. 133.
 - 16 5. Addition of Condition No. 135 as previously read into the record.
- 17

18 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.
19

20 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
21 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 06-01EA* approving a Mitigated Negative
22 Declaration for Conditional Use Permit No. 05-09.
23

24 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
25

26 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride
27 and Rhoten
28 NOES: None
29 ABSTAIN: None
30 ABSENT: Commissioner Mendoza
31

32 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-02EA.***
33

34 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
35 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 06-01* approving Conditional Use Permit
36 No. 05-09 as amended.
37

38 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
39

40 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride
41 and Rhoten
42 NOES: None
43

1 ABSTAIN: None
2 ABSENT: Commissioner Mendoza

3
4 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-05***

5
6 **D. TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 33915**

7 APPLICANT: Steve and Anna L. Nersasian
8 AGENT: Frank Gorman - GW Engineering
9 LOCATION: Northeast corner of Lyon and Commonwealth Avenues
10 PLANNER: Kristina Cline
11 DESCRIPTION: A request to subdivide 4.68 acres into four (4) one-acre
12 lots for the future development of single-family homes.

13
14 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Cline who provided various details
15 regarding the proposed project.

16
17 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 7:28 p.m.

18
19 Frank Gorman of GW Engineering, 800 E. Florida Ave., Hemet, California approached the
20 lectern as a representative for the applicant. He noted that the project should include the
21 City's Estate Street Standards, which had a 30-foot setback, but indicated that he had only
22 included a 20-foot setback on the plans, which would need to be changed. He discussed
23 the proposed drainage for the project and offered to answer any questions.

24
25 Mel Haugen of 1333 Clydesdale Court, Hemet, California approached the lectern as an
26 adjacent resident to the project and offered his support of the proposed project. He noted
27 that all of the neighbors that he had spoken with were also in support of the project.

28
29 Planning Director Masyczek noted that the map should be modified to comply with the
30 City's Estate Street Standards, as indicated in the Conditions of Approval, and that, if the
31 applicant agreed, it would be incorporated at the time of the final map.

32
33 Chairman Duistermars asked Mr. Gorman if the applicant would agree to this.

34
35 Mr. Gorman responded that he would. He asked for clarification that no sidewalks would
36 be required on Commonwealth Avenue, that a light would be required at Lyon and
37 Commonwealth Avenues with on-site lights required for each home.

38
39 Planning Director Masyczek clarified that this was correct. He noted that when they came
40 in with the actual housing plans, they would like to see the houses setback approximately
41 30-feet in order to keep the rural feeling.

1 Mr. Gorman concurred with the changes, and stated that the 30-foot setback could be
2 added to the conditions of approval as well, if staff would like to add that requirement.

3
4 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 7:37 p.m. and asked for a motion.

5
6 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Jones to
7 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 06-02* as amended.

8
9
10
11
12 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

13
14 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride
15 and Rhoten

16 NOES: None

17 ABSTAIN: None

18 ABSENT: Commissioner Mendoza

19
20 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-06.***

21
22
23 **VI. WORK STUDY**

24
25 **A. FLOOD CONTROL FACILITY STANDARDS WITHIN THE CITY OF HEMET**

26 - Mike Gow

27
28 The work study session was initiated by Assistant Public Works Director Gow who
29 provided the Commission with various details regarding the City's drainage standards. He
30 noted that Stetson Avenue now included a major storm drain facility, which was an
31 example of a multi-million dollar project. He noted that drainage was fairly simple in a few
32 different ways, and that the concept behind drainage was that water would flow downhill.
33 He explained that drainage criteria was pretty defined, industry-wide, and that a developer
34 could go from one district to another with a single drainage concept since all districts and
35 developers were familiar with the 100-year storm. He went on to say that what he liked
36 about drainage was that it was easy to see when it was working as well as when it wasn't.

37 He then advised that drainage was also complicated in some ways, and referred to
38 various different standards that had not been in place for very long. He explained that
39 many areas did not have improved drainage, nor improved streets, and that complications
40 tended to result regarding how this should be handled.

1 Assistant Public Works Director Gow went on to discuss the drainage difficulties that were
2 present on the west end of the City due to jurisdictional water ways that tended to
3 complicate things. He noted that the City had a design manual for drainage systems, and
4 explained, with regards to the 100-year storm, that water must be contained within the
5 street right-of-ways, while water from the 10-year storm must be contained from curbside
6 to curbside. He advised that there had been recent changes made to drainage standards,
7 including the increase of the minimum street slope, which had improved drainage although
8 many developers were not happy about it. He further noted that underground drainage
9 systems were now required within many developments, and that retention basins included
10 standards requiring dual uses as both a drainage area and a passive activity area that
11 needed to be maintained. He explained that sometimes there was a missing link when an
12 older home remained between two tracts and the developers of those tracts did not want
13 to improve the street in front of that home. He referred to a new strategy that had been
14 designed to require improvements in such situations. He then referred to dry wells, which,
15 he noted, had recently been discussed by the Commission and which the Public Works
16 Department had no objection to. He noted that they tended to work to a certain extent, at
17 least for a period of time, and did not worsen a situation by any means. He noted that new
18 landscaping within developments was often over-watered and that slime often grew where
19 there was a continuous flow of water. He reiterated that the Public Works Department had
20 no objection to dry wells on private property, but that he did not know how well they would
21 work on a long term basis. He suggested that it could not hurt to utilize them to assist
22 other drainage requirements, adding that there was always room for improvements with
23 drainage and that the Public Works Department was open to new ideas.
24

25 Vice Chairman Jones referred to the fact that the City of San Jacinto was working together
26 with Easter Municipal Water District (EMWD) on the capture of water runoff. He asked if
27 the City of Hemet was working with EMWD to capture deficiencies near Salt Creek.
28

29 Assistant Public Works Director Gow responded that the City of Hemet was working with
30 EMWD on Salt Creek near Lyon Avenue, but that they still needed to secure some
31 funding.
32

33 Commissioner Rhoten asked if there were any areas within the valley where the soil would
34 not be compatible with dry wells.
35

36 Assistant Public Works Director Gow responded that the west end area included vernal
37 pools that would probably not be compatible without extensive excavation. He noted that
38 developers were often eager to find other sources of fill dirt, and would thus probably not
39 be opposed to over-excavating.
40

41 Chairman Duistermars referred to the fact that when projects were tilted up, the speed of
42 drainage was increased. He asked if there were a way to decrease the speed of the
43

1 drainage in order to prevent pooling, noting that water in certain areas often traveled so
2 fast that it crossed intersections and went to the other side of the street rather than taking
3 the path it was meant to take.

4
5 Assistant Public Works Director Gow suggested that some areas required special
6 attention, and that the Public Works Department was continuing to try and work on ideas
7 for those areas. He referred to some of the areas where the existence of such problems
8 had been noted.

9
10 Chairman Duistermars noted that as retention basins were made into parks, the City
11 should be sure that they were not creating marshlands that would make them unusable.
12 He inquired as to whether there had been any discussions of underground pipelines for
13 draining these basins.

14
15 Assistant Public Works Director Gow advised the Commission that the Public Works
16 Department had been discussing ideas for rectifying water build-up in retention basins,
17 and suggested that Mary Henley Park was a perfect example. He noted that piping had
18 been installed that now allowed the park to drain quickly. He added that the City was
19 working on a set of standards with various developers, and that he would be happy to
20 bring them back to the Commission for review when they were complete.

21
22 The Commission thanked Assistant Public Works Director Gow for his presentation.

23
24 Vice Chairman Jones left the meeting at 7:55 p.m.

25
26 **B. COMPREHENSIVE SIGN ORDINANCE UPDATE - R. Masyczek**

27 An initial discussion with possible direction to staff regarding a
28 comprehensive update to the City of Hemet Sign Ordinance.

29
30 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the City Council had directed
31 staff to initiate a zoning ordinance amendment for a comprehensive sign ordinance update
32 in order to rectify problems that staff had been running into with signs. He stated that he
33 would like to come back to the Commission with a list for review at the next meeting. He
34 noted that staff was also compiling a matrix that included a list of what other cities currently
35 allow. He added that staff would first work with the Planning Commission and then with
36 the community to try and complete the update relatively quickly. He noted that he was
37 expecting it to be a very capricious project as signs tended to be a very sensitive issue to
38 business owners.

39
40
41 **VII. CONSENT CALENDAR**

1 He stated that while it would be done on a very informal basis, it would include reports
2 from the General Plan consultant, the downtown consultant and the traffic consultant. He
3 suggested that this would be the best way to get a broad amount of insight into what was
4 going on with the General Plan.

5
6 Chairman Duistermars suggested that the other Commissioners add this to their calendars,
7 but noted that he would not be able to attend.
8

9
10 **X. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

11
12 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion to appoint Commissioner McBride as the new
13 Traffic Commission liasion for the Planning Commission, since the current appointee,
14 Commissioner Mendoza had been unable to attend any of the meetings due to schedule
15 conflicts.
16

17 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Chairman Duistermars to
18 appoint Commissioner McBride as the Planning Commission liasion for the Traffic
19 Commission.
20

21 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

22
23 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners McBride and Rhoten
24 NOES: None
25 ABSTAIN: None
26 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioner Mendoza
27
28

29 **XI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

30
31 There were no future agenda items requested.
32
33

34 **X. ADJOURNMENT**

35
36 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten, SECONDED by Chairman Duistermars and
37 unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 8:07 p.m. to the special meeting of the City
38 of Hemet City Council and Planning Commission scheduled for **Monday, January 30,**
39 **2006 at 7:00 p.m.** to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E.
40 Latham Avenue, Hemet, California 92543.
41
42
43
44

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

**Bob Duistermars, Chairman
Hemet Planning Commission**

ATTEST:

**Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary
Hemet Planning Commission**