

1 Regarding the Hemet High School Stadium, Ms. Packham reported that dirt was now
2 moving, and that the importation of additional dirt would begin next week. She noted that
3 construction of the block wall along the northern property line would also be starting soon.
4

5 Ms. Packham reported that the contracts for the West Valley High School pool would be
6 awarded at the School Board meeting this evening, with work to begin at the end of the
7 month. She noted that the anticipated completion of the pool was scheduled for the end
8 of October, and stated that this would be the only CIF approved pool in the Valley.
9

10 Ms. Packham advised the Commission that the HUSD had been given permission to enter
11 the McSweeney property from Sun-Cal, and that consultants were submitting proposals to
12 start the approval process for what was currently known as "New Elementary School #8".
13

14 Ms. Packham addressed the ongoing issue of relocatable classroom and restroom
15 buildings within the school district. She explained that 2 new relocatable classrooms were
16 currently occupied at Ramona Elementary School, one new relocatable classroom was out
17 to bid for Little Lake Elementary School, one new relocatable classroom was out to bid at
18 the HELP School, 2 at Cottonwood Elementary School, 5 at West Valley High School, 8
19 at Cawston Elementary School along with one new relocatable restroom facility, 4
20 relocatable classrooms at Diamond Valley Middle School, and 8 at Jacob Wiens
21 Elementary School along with one relocatable restroom, which came to a grand total of 31
22 new relocatable buildings in the district. She stated that she had never seen such rapid
23 growth in an area, and that the schools were ending up over-enrolled before they were
24 even built.
25

26 Ms. Packham discussed the turf at the Idyllwild School, noting that the contract for this
27 project was to be awarded at the School Board meeting this evening. She stated that work
28 would not start for several weeks, but was expected to be completed by the end of June.
29

30 Ms. Packham concluded her presentation by noting various upcoming projects that the
31 HUSD would be involved with, including the Valle Vista Annex, which was a joint use with
32 Valley Wide Recreation that would include a pre-school program, additional parking and
33 soccer fields; the Cottonwood Library, which was a joint use project with the Riverside
34 County Library that would combine collections and eliminate the mobile library that was
35 currently being used; the Hamilton 2-story classroom addition, which consisted of a new
36 classroom wing that would include the addition of 12 classrooms to the elementary and
37 middle school area; and the West Valley High School turf, which would consist of a
38 synthetic turf on an existing field.
39

40 The Commission thanked Ms. Packham for her report.
41
42
43
44

1 Planning Director Masyczek advised Ms. Packham that she would be added to the
2 distribution list for the Staff Review Committee meeting, which meant that she would get
3 copies of all future project plans and materials at the beginning of the process.
4

5 6 **IV. PUBLIC MEETINGS**

7 8 **A. COMPREHENSIVE PHASING AND MAINTENANCE PLAN FOR** 9 **MCSWEENEY FARMS** - Richard Masyczek

10 A public meeting for Planning Commission review and approval of the
11 Comprehensive Phasing and Maintenance Plan (CPMP) for McSweeny
12 Farms, as required by the McSweeny Farms Specific Plan.
13

14 The staff report was presented by Planning Director Masyczek who provided some details
15 regarding the item, and advised the Commission that the only issue that remained
16 unresolved was the phasing of development. He explained why this was an issue.
17

18 Chairman Duistermars noted that he had not seen anything in the plan regarding the
19 maintenance of paseos. He inquired as to whether he was correctly recalling a greenbelt
20 that was to be maintained by the Riverside County Flood Control District. He noted that
21 he did not think they would be maintaining the basketball courts and other recreational
22 facilities within that green belt.
23

24 Dave Cooper of Sun-Cal Companies approached the lectern as the project applicant. He
25 advised the Commission that he had spoke with Deputy Public Works Director Mike Gow
26 on the previous day, and that the City would be taking over the maintenance that the
27 Riverside County Flood Control District would not be maintaining.
28

29 Chairman Duistermars inquired about the plan that had been orginally presented by AEI-
30 CASC for approval by the Planning Commission. He noted that what was currently being
31 presented seemed a bit different.
32

33 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.
34

35 Tom Nieves of AEI-CASC Engineering approached the lectern as a representative for the
36 project and discussed some of the changes that had been made. He further discussed,
37 at the request of Vice Chairman Jones, some of the Planning Areas that were indicated on
38 the map.
39

40 Further discussion ensued regarding the changes that had been made from the original
41 presentation.
42
43
44

1 Planning Director Masyczek displayed the approved land use plan for the Commission to
2 view. He explained that part of the problem that they'd had was with Planning Area No.
3 39. He noted that MWD had been mandating that they receive clean flows, which had
4 caused things to become somewhat problematic.

5
6 Vice Chairman Jones stated that it had been his understanding that there would be ingress
7 and egress along the trail that was going through the project.

8
9 Planning Director Masyczek noted the location of the Cactus Valley Basin and indicated
10 the trail along that channel.

11
12 A discussion ensued regarding the items that were being eliminated from the original
13 Specific Plan.

14
15 Chairman Duistermars asked who would be maintaining the trails on the sides of the basin.

16
17 Tom Nieves responded that a Home Owner's Association would ultimately be responsible
18 for maintaining those areas.

19
20 Sam Goepp of Valley Wide Recreation and Parks District approached the lectern and
21 advised the Commission that he would be willing to accept parks with a L&LMD set up,
22 noting that the parks would be maintained by Valley Wide.

23
24 Mr. Nieves referred to the large map on display, and indicated that it reflected the tentative
25 tract maps that were before the Commission this evening. He noted that the smaller map
26 showed the overall phasing & maintenance, which included Phases 2 & 3 as well as
27 Cactus Valley, laid out in a more general sense.

28
29 Chairman Duistermars suggested that it would make more sense to have parks and
30 facilities indicated on the map. He noted that on the land use plan there were paseos,
31 which the Commission had been led to believe would be grassed in with landscaping. He
32 stated that in the Comprehensive Phasing and Maintenance Plan (CPMP) he did not see
33 that anyone would be responsible for maintaining those areas.

34
35 City Attorney Vail referred to Table 1-3 on Page No. 5 of the CPMP, and noted that under
36 Parks there was a heading for paseos that indicated maintenance by a Home Owner's
37 Association (HOA).

38
39 Chairman Duistermars noted that the map stated "Overall Comprehensive Maintenance
40 Exhibit", but did not indicate the paseos. He added that he wanted to see everything on
41 one map.

1 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the two tentative tract maps that
2 were affiliated with this project and on the agenda this evening would be continued, and
3 that he was also recommending that approval of the CPMP be continued to the time that
4 the maps will be heard, which would be at the meeting of April 5, 2005.

5
6 Chairman Duistermars asked Mr. Nieves if this would give them enough time to revise the
7 map to be more inclusive.

8
9 Mr. Nieves responded that it would.

10
11 Kirk Duke of LSA Associates, Inc., 1650 Spruce Street, Riverside, California approached
12 the lectern and advised the Commission that his company was doing some archaeological
13 work for Sun-Cal and the Soboba and Pechanga Indian tribes. He explained that he was
14 currently working within the northeastern portion of the site, and that he would be doing
15 some excavation beginning later in the month or the beginning of April.

16
17 City Attorney Vail explained that, regarding archaeological resources, only general
18 information could be provided. He noted that boundaries and detailed discussions
19 regarding these issues were protected by the State and could not be discussed with the
20 public.

21
22 Vice Chairman Jones asked if the larger estate-sized lots would still be provided within the
23 project in light of the archaeological sites that had been discovered.

24
25 Mr. Nieves responded that when the site was finalized to the approval of the tribal
26 representatives, they would be doing some math and coming back to discuss the results
27 with the Planning Department Staff.

28
29 Chairman Duistermars asked for public input regarding the CPMP.

30
31 Since there was none, Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion to continue the review
32 to the meeting of April 5, 2005.

33
34 It was MOVED by Commissioner Calkins and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
35 continue the review of the McSweeney Farms Comprehensive Phasing and Maintenance
36 Plan to the Planning Commission meeting of April 5, 2005.

37
38 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

39
40 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins
41 and Rhoten

42 NOES: None
43
44

1 ABSTAIN: None

2 ABSENT: None

3
4
5 **V. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

6
7 **A. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 04-18 (Continued from February 15,**
8 **2005)**

9 APPLICANT: Cedar City BB, LLC

10 AGENT: Tim Saivar - TW Layman Associates

11 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni

12 LOCATION: Southeast corner of Palm and Florida Avenues

13 DESCRIPTION: A request for approval of a conditional use permit to
14 construct a 2,760 square-foot building that includes a
15 juice bar and a drive-thru coffee house with an outdoor
16 patio.

17
18 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Domenigoni who provided some
19 details regarding the project, and noted the changes that had been made since the public
20 hearing had been opened on February 15th. She discussed the different options that had
21 been considered, and why certain options would not work. She noted the preferred option
22 and what it included. She advised the Commission that the Edison company had only
23 recently advised the applicant that they may require a transformer on-site, and where it
24 would be located. She further brought up a proposed revision to Condition No. 22, which
25 would read:

26
27 ***“All outdoor lighting shall be compatible with the existing***
28 ***shopping center including the light poles and illumination.***
29 ***All lighting shall be adjusted so that it is contained within***
30 ***the boundaries of the site.”***

31
32 She distributed a copy of the revised Conditions of Approval to the Commission and
33 explained the necessity of the changed condition.

34
35 Vice Chairman Jones inquired regarding whether a traffic study had been completed for
36 the project.

37
38 Planning Director Masyczek responded that since it was an existing shopping center a
39 traffic study had not been required.

40
41 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.

42
43 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:52 p.m.

1 Tim Saivar of TW Layman & Associates, approached the lectern as the project applicant.
2 He noted some additional landscaping changes that had been made to the project, and
3 referred to the berming. He displayed some renderings of the project.
4

5 Vice Chairman Jones asked if larger plants could be installed initially, rather than installing
6 smaller plants that would need to grow before they would properly screen the drive-thru.
7

8 Mr. Saivar noted that the wall had been raised up to 42 inches and there was 3-foot
9 berming being provided.
10

11 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that a climbing vine be added to go over the trellis
12 work. He noted changes to Condition Nos. 19 and 21 as follows:
13

14 ***Condition No. 19: Add the following wording - "Climbing vines shall be***
15 ***installed in a manner to climb on the trellis as approved by the Planning***
16 ***Director."***
17

18 ***Condition No. 21: Add section "a" as follows - "The drive-thru wall, as shown***
19 ***on the approved site plan, shall be 42-inches in height."***
20

21 Commissioner Calkins inquired regarding the location of the electrical equipment.
22

23 Mr. Saivar responded that an interior electrical room had been included within the project
24 design.
25

26 Chairman Duistermars commended Mr. Saivar on his re-design of the project.
27

28 Commissioner Rhoten asked if Mr. Saivar could indicate on the plan where the edison box
29 would be located.
30

31 Mr. Saivar pointed out the location of the edison box.
32

33 Since there were no members of the public who wished to speak regarding the project,
34 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 7:00 p.m. and asked for a motion.
35

36 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
37 adopt Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 05-8, approving Conditional Use Permit
38 No. 04-18, as amended.
39
40
41
42
43
44

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

2
3 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins
4 & Rhoten
5 NOES: None
6 ABSTAIN: None
7 ABSENT: None
8

9 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-11.***

10
11 **B. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 32529 (*Continued from February 15, 2005*)**

12 APPLICANT: Thomas Olsen (Rancho San Patricio)
13 LOCATION: East of State Street, north of Newport Road and south
14 of Gibbel Road
15 PLANNER: Richard Masyczek
16 DESCRIPTION: A request for approval of a tentative tract map to
17 subdivide four (4) parcels totaling 146-acres into nine
18 (9) parcels and six (6) lettered lots to create a financing
19 tract map for the McSweeny Farms Specific Plan (SP
20 No. 01-2) Phase I development.
21

22 The staff report was presented by Planning Director Masyczek who advised the
23 Commission that staff was recommending that the public hearing be opened and continued
24 to the Planning Commission meeting of April 5th.

25
26 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 7:01 p.m. and asked if there were any
27 members of the public who wished to speak regarding the project.
28

29 Since there were none, he asked for a motion to continue.
30

31 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
32 continue the public hearing, open, to the Planning Commission meeting of April 5, 2005.
33

34 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

35
36 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins
37 & Rhoten
38 NOES: None
39 ABSTAIN: None
40 ABSENT: None
41
42
43
44

1 **C. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 32717 (Continued from February 15, 2005)**

2 APPLICANT: Thomas Olsen (Rancho San Patricio, LLC)
3 LOCATION: Northeast corner of State Street and Newport Road
4 PLANNER: Richard Masyczek
5 DESCRIPTION: A request for approval of a tentative tract map to
6 subdivide 138-acres into 310 single-family residential
7 lots as part of the McSweeny Farms Specific Plan (SP
8 No. 01-2) Phase I development.
9

10 The staff report was presented by Planning Director Masyczek who advised the
11 Commission that staff was recommending that the public hearing be opened and continued
12 to the Planning Commission meeting of April 5th.

13
14 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 7:02 p.m. and asked if there were any
15 members of the public who wished to speak regarding the project.
16

17 Since there were none, he asked for a motion to continue.
18

19 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Rhoten and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Calkins to
20 continue the public hearing, open, to the Planning Commission meeting of April 5, 2005.
21

22 The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote:
23

24 **AYES:** Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins
25 and Rhoten
26 **NOES:** None
27 **ABSTAIN:** None
28 **ABSENT:** None
29

30 **D. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 01-6A**

31 APPLICANT: Spirit of Joy Church
32 LOCATION: Northeast corner of Sanderson Avenue and Johnston
33 Avenue
34 PLANNER: Maureen Losey
35 DESCRIPTION: A request for an amendment to approved Conditional
36 Use Permit No. 01-6 to operate a child day-care/pre-
37 school facility on property zoned Planned Community
38 Development (PCD 79-91 with commercial standards).
39

40 The staff report was presented by Assistant Planner Losey who provided some details
41 regarding the project.
42
43
44

1 Commissioner Calkins asked if the driveway surrounding the property would need to be
2 installed with the first phase of construction.

3
4 Assistant Planner Losey responded that she believed that when this had initially been
5 reviewed, it had been decided that they were going to install the areas where the church
6 would be, but not the entire driveway area.

7
8 Commissioner Calkins expressed concern with the circulation of parents picking up and
9 dropping children off at a child care facility with only one driveway out onto Johnston
10 Avenue. He suggested that there could potentially be some strange automobile
11 maneuvering on the site unless a circular driveway was installed.

12
13 Assistant Planner Losey stated that she could check the conditions to confirm that what
14 was currently required.

15
16 Commissioner Rhoten asked if she was recalling correctly that a gated egress onto
17 Sanderson Avenue was supposed to be installed.

18
19 Assistant Planner Losey responded that originally they were not going to be allowed to
20 have an egress off of Sanderson Avenue because it was thought that Public Works did not
21 want one, but then the Engineer at that time agreed that it was okay, so that they would
22 have two exits on site.

23
24 Chairman Duistermars asked if the phasing was known.

25
26 Assistant Planner Losey responded that she could look this information up in the file.

27
28 Discussion continued regarding this subject.

29
30 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 7:11 p.m.

31
32 Vicki Rufsvold of 27319 Cloudrest Way, Hemet, California approached the lectern as a
33 representative for the Spirit of Joy church. She spoke to the Commission in support of the
34 church and the proposed school, and pled for their approval of this amendment.

35
36 Christy Hiner, 4324 Anisa Avenue, Hemet, California approached the lectern and
37 addressed the Commission as a mother of 2 children who'd had great difficulty finding
38 quality childcare in the valley. She noted that she had started looking before she was even
39 pregnant, for a loving environment that was stable and would enrich and enhance the
40 growth and development of her children. She stated that children needed a pre-school
41 where they could learn and grow, and that without this they would be in trouble. She
42 explained that she was a kindergarten teacher who saw many children in her classrooms
43 that had been deprived of this, and that it really made a difference. Regarding the picking
44

1 up and dropping off of children, she noted that it was not unusual for them to be picked up
2 and dropped off at different times, as most parents did not tend to have the same work
3 schedules. She suggested that she did not think that this aspect of the school would be
4 as much of a problem as the Commission was anticipating.

5
6 Rick Thomsen, 2587 S. San Jacinto Avenue, San Jacinto, California, approached the
7 lectern as the project Engineer. He responded to the Commission's concern regarding the
8 concept of what was being presented not being what would actually be built. He assured
9 them that it would be.

10
11 Since there were none, Chairman Duistermars asked if there were any other members of
12 the public who would like to speak regarding the project.

13
14 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 7:19 p.m. and asked for a motion.

15
16 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
17 adopt Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 05-12 approving the amendment to
18 Conditional Use Permit No. 01-6.

19
20 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

21
22 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins
23 and Rhoten

24 NOES: None

25 ABSTAIN: None

26 ABSENT: None

27
28 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-12.***

29
30
31 **VI. WORK STUDY**

32
33 **A. CANYON TRAILS - REINHARDT CANYON - Loretta Domenigoni**

34 _____ A work study session with possible direction to staff regarding the proposed
35 annexation and Specific Plan of the Reinhardt Canyon area, to be called
36 Canyon Trails, located west of California Avenue and north of the Heartland
37 Specific Plan.

38
39 Assistant Planner Domenigoni initiated the work study session by indicating the project
40 location and providing a brief description of what was being proposed. She advised the
41 Commission that an application for annexation of the project site would soon be submitted
42 to the City. She turned the balance of the presentation over to the applicant.

1 Mike Naggar, 43034 Agina Street, Temecula, California approached the lectern and
2 addressed the Commission as a representative for the project applicant. He indicated the
3 project area and its surroundings.

4
5 Vice Chairman Jones asked if the Maze Stone would be a part of this project.
6

7 Mr. Naggar responded that it was not a part of the project site, but would be included in the
8 annexation. He continued to describe the surrounding area, and the County's zoning
9 designations for those areas. He advised the Commission that he was proposing the
10 development of 747 units on approximately 364 acres of land. He indicated that this would
11 total an average of 2.1 dwelling units per acre. He noted that what was really important
12 was that they had remained very much consistent with what the current General Plan
13 designation was for the County, and were simply transferring it over to process as a
14 Specific Plan within the City of Hemet.
15

16 Mr. Naggar advised the Commission that the different types of product that they were
17 intending to bring into the Specific Plan were of an interesting note. He referred to the
18 most dense area, which included 10 dwelling units per acre, and stated that they would be
19 calling the homes in this area "Courtyard Homes". He explained that they would be single-
20 family detached homes, which in and of themselves would be self-contained, with their own
21 series of paseos and open space. He noted that they were anticipating that this portion
22 of the project would be gated and would include a clubhouse and pool facilities, and that
23 the streets would be private and maintained by a Home Owner's Association (HOA).
24

25 Vice Chairman Jones asked if families or senior citizens would be the target age group.
26

27 Mr. Naggar responded that they did not have a specific age group targeted for this area.
28 He went on to describe the second type of product for the development, which he called
29 the "Traditional Home Product". He indicated where this product would be located within
30 the Specific Plan, and explained that it would consist of the typical 6,000 square-foot lots,
31 with a density of 5 dwelling units per acre.
32

33 A discussion ensued regarding this portion of the project.
34

35 Mr. Naggar continued his presentation, noting where the "Garden Homes" would be
36 located on 12,000± square-foot lots. He stated that they were anticipating a density of
37 approximately 3 dwelling units per acre, and explained that what was meant by the term
38 "Garden Home" was a home that was slightly larger than average on larger lots.
39

40 Mr. Naggar noted that from there the project would transition to a type of product that they
41 were referring to as the "Ranch Estates", which would include several areas of the site.
42 He indicated which areas this would comprise. He noted that the "Ranch Estates" would
43
44

1 be on 18,000+ square-foot lots, with a density of 2 dwelling units per acre. He explained
2 that the further up the hillside they went, the lower the density would become.

3
4 Mr. Naggar finally referred to the "Hillside Estates", and indicated which areas of the project
5 site would include them. He noted that the "Hillside Estates" would have an anticipated
6 density of 0.7 dwelling units per acre, with a 1-acre minimum lot size. He further noted that
7 they were anticipating the northern portion of the Specific Plan to allow for animal-keeping
8 uses – particularly horse uses – and that they had incorporated a trail and paseo system
9 into this and other portions of the project. He indicated that they would be proposing
10 approximately four different types of architecture that he would expand on further into the
11 processing of the Specific Plan.

12
13 Vice Chairman Jones stated that the fact should be addressed that most of the existing
14 residents in the neighborhood were horse people with livestock and animals. He
15 suggested that there should be a way to mitigate the density for the Specific Plan, as many
16 of the neighboring residents were on 20-40 square-foot lots.

17
18 Mr. Naggar responded that they did want to encourage horse usage along the flood control
19 channel, and intended to build a trail in that regard, all the way into the hillsides. He
20 suggested that they could explore doing some type of multi-purpose or multi-use trail along
21 California Avenue as well, which would provide access all the way up into the hillside. He
22 noted that he was hesitant to pull the "General Plan Card" out, since he was hoping for the
23 support of the community, and wanted to design the project in such a way as to obtain that
24 support.

25
26 A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the proposal.

27
28 The Commission offered some recommendations and thanked Mr. Naggar for his
29 presentation.

30
31
32 **VII. CONSENT CALENDAR**

33
34 **A. MINUTES**

- 35 1. March 1, 2005
36

37 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
38 approve the consent calendar as presented.
39
40
41
42
43
44

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
2

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

5 NOES: None

6 ABSTAIN: None

7 ABSENT: None
8
9

10 **VIII. UPDATE OF CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS ON PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS -**

11 Update given by Planning Director Richard Masyczek
12

13 **A. CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF MARCH 8, 2005**
14

15 **1. Appeal of the Planning Commission's Approval of Conditional**
16 **Use Permit No. 04-12**
17

18 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the ingress & egress and
19 driveway issue that had caused the appeal by In & Out Burgers of Conditional Use Permit
20 No. 04-12 had been resolved. He noted the change that had been approved by the City
21 Council to accommodate this resolution, and explained that once that change had been
22 approved, In & Out Burgers agreed to withdraw their appeal of the project.
23
24

25 **IX. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**
26

27 There were no Planning Director Items scheduled on the agenda.
28
29

30 **X. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**
31

32 There were no Planning Commissioner comments.
33
34

35 **XI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**
36

37 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that the subject of commercial development on
38 corner lots be agendized for discussion and a possible recommendation to the City
39 Council.
40
41
42
43
44

1 **XII. ADJOURNMENT:**
2

3 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten, SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins and
4 unaniously approved to adjourn the meeting at 8:07 p.m. to the regular meeting of the
5 City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for **Tuesday, April 5, 2005 at 6:00 p.m.**
6 to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue,
7 Hemet, California 92543.
8
9
10
11
12

13 _____
14 **Bob Duistermars, Chairman**
15 **Hemet Planning Commission**
16

17
18 **ATTEST:**
19
20

21 _____
22 **Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary**
23 **Hemet Planning Commission**
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44