

1 CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

2
3 TUESDAY, MAY 2, 2006

4
5 THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION WAS
6 CONVENED BY VICE CHAIRMAN JONES ON TUESDAY, MAY 2, 2006 AT 5:58 P.M. AT
7 THE CITY OF HEMET COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 450 EAST LATHAM AVENUE, HEMET,
8 CALIFORNIA.

9
10 **Present:** Vice Chairman Nick Jones and Commissioners Eric McBride, Wigs
11 Mendoza and Mayzelle Rhoten; Chairman Bob Duisternars present at
12 5:59 p.m.

13
14 **Absent:** None

15
16 **Staff Present:** Principal Engineer Jorge Biagioni, Planning Consultant Bernard
17 Chase, Planning Director Richard Masyczek, Principal Planner
18 David Sawyer, Minutes Secretary Nancie Shaw, City Attorney Eric
19 Vail, Fire Marshall Dave VanVerst and Police Captain Rob Webb,

20
21 **Invocation and Flag Salute:** Commissioner McBride

22
23
24 **I. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

25
26 There were no members of the public who wished to address the Commission.
27

28
29 **II. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**

30
31 There were no amendments or additions to the agenda.
32

33
34 **III. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE**

35
36 There was no Hemet Unified School District update provided.
37

38
39 **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

40
41 **A. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 05-02**

42 **APPLICANT:** Winston Capital Group, LLC
43

1 AGENT: Don Bender
2 LOCATION: Northwest corner of Sanderson and Devonshire
3 Avenues
4 PLANNER: Bernard Chase
5 DESCRIPTION: A request to construct and operate a 127-unit senior
6 apartment project with three 3-story buildings totaling
7 approximately 119,840 square-feet (52,186, 47,770 and
8 20,004 square-feet respectively) within a combined
9 footprint of 40,734 square-feet on a 3.94-acre parcel
10 (171,594 square-feet), along with a swimming pool,
11 pool restrooms, two gazebos, 140 parking spaces
12 (including 127 carport spaces) and appurtenant
13 landscaping and site improvements.
14

15 The staff report was presented by Planning Consultant Chase, who provided various
16 details regarding the project proposal.
17

18 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding deed restrictions.
19

20 Planning Consultant Chase offered an explanation regarding exactly what the deed
21 restriction was and how it worked to sustain a senior development as such in the future.
22

23 City Attorney Vail elaborated on the explanation.
24

25 Commissioner Mendoza inquired regarding how long it would take for a project to qualify
26 as a senior project, noting that it was his understanding, at this point, that the Commission
27 was reviewing the conditional use permit as a senior project, but that he was having some
28 difficulty with the fact that there could be a possibility that it might be converted to a non-
29 senior status project in the future. He asked for clarification that the Commission was,
30 indeed, currently reviewing the conditional use permit as a senior project, and noted that
31 on the agenda it appeared that it was being reviewed as such, and that he would expect
32 that if there were an attempt to build anything other than a senior project that it would have
33 to come back before the Commission as a revised project. He expressed his concern with
34 the even the possibility that the project might be able to change its senior status, and that
35 he found the issue to be somewhat suspicious.
36

37 City Attorney Vail clarified that it was being reviewed as a senior project and that the
38 CC&R's would need to be recorded as such. He added that if the applicant later attempted
39 to build a project with a non-senior status, he was confident that the conditional use permit
40 could be revoked. He noted that he expected that the Commission would be having the
41 same issue with similar projects in the future, since there was no longer any guarantee that
42
43
44

1 any project would remain one with senior-status, regardless of how it had been originally
2 reviewed, in the future.

3
4 Planning Director Masyczek elaborated on this discussion, noting that staff was confident
5 that the project would be built as, and would remain as, one with a senior status.

6
7 Commissioner McBride inquired regarding what the parking requirements would be if the
8 facility were not exclusive to senior citizens.

9
10 Planning Consultant Chase responded that he believed it would require a minimum of
11 additional 32 spaces.

12
13 Commissioner McBride asked where the additional parking would be located if, at some
14 point in the future, the apartment complex were able to take on a non-senior status.

15
16 Planning Consultant Chase responded that it would be very difficult to provide additional
17 parking for the project, and noted that staff had not looked into where it would be placed
18 if it should ever be required in the future.

19
20 Discussion ensued regarding this subject.

21
22 Commissioner Rhoten asked if the project would be for low-income senior-citizens.

23
24 Planning Consultant Chase responded that there were no income restrictions on the
25 project.

26
27 Commissioner Rhoten asked if there would be handicapped units included within the
28 project.

29
30 Planning Consultant Chase responded that all units would be handicapped adaptable and
31 that elevators would also be included.

32
33 Don Bender, Tierra West Commercial, 4110 E. Florida Avenue, Hemet, California
34 approached the lectern as a representative for the applicant. He offered to answer any
35 questions that the Commission might have.

36
37 Vice Chairman Jones asked if there were any other senior facilities that the applicant had
38 developed in other cities.

39
40 Mr. Bender responded that they had developed various apartment complexes in other
41 cities, but that they were not necessarily designated for seniors exclusively.

1 Vice Chairman Jones expressed some concern regarding this concept, suggesting that
2 there wasn't anything to prevent the developer from converting the project, once it was
3 built, to a family complex.

4
5 Mr. Bender assured the Commission that the project would be developed as a senior
6 facility and was intended to remain so.

7
8 Chairman Duistermars asked for clarification that approval of the conditional use permit
9 would assure that the project would be developed with a senior status.

10
11 City Attorney Vail responded that he was confident that if the applicant were to attempt to
12 develop the project as anything other than a senior project, the conditional use permit
13 could be revoked by the City.

14
15 Further discussion ensued regarding this subject.

16
17 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that the issue be examined further and that it could
18 be reviewed and discussed at a future Planning Commission meeting. Regarding the
19 project at hand, however, he stated that he was comfortable that the requirements and
20 restrictions that had been placed on it, to ensure that it would remain an apartment
21 complex for senior citizens, were adequate.

22
23 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:34 p.m.

24
25 Scott Vincent, 1500 Shaw Avenue, Fresno, California approached the lectern and
26 introduced himself as the project architect. He provided various additional details
27 regarding the project proposal. He discussed the senior status of the proposed facility, but
28 noted that it would be designed primarily for active seniors. He noted that the type of
29 facility that they were planning to build would require higher rents than most low-income
30 senior citizens would be able to afford, and that it was planned to be more of a facility for
31 seniors who were wanting to downsize their living environment. He continued with a
32 discussion regarding some of the other projects that he had developed in other areas.
33 Regarding the handicapped accessibility, he noted that every unit would be "*adaptable*",
34 so that they could be converted easily into handicapped accessible units.

35
36 Vice Chairman Jones inquired as to why many of the units were proposed to be two-
37 bedroom.

38
39 Mr. Vincent responded that the inclusion of additional bedrooms was in response to a
40 market study that had been completed regarding senior housing. He explained that some
41 seniors often wanted to utilize a room to keep some of the items that they did not wish to
42 dispose of when downsizing, but would not have enough room to keep in a one-bedroom
43

1 unit. He further noted that some seniors, who were perhaps single or widowed, often did
2 not wish to live alone and opted to share a unit with another senior friend. At other times,
3 he added, husbands and wives, for various reasons would resort to sleeping in separate
4 bedrooms. He reiterated that the proposal was strictly in response to the market study that
5 had been completed.

6
7 A discussion ensued regarding the retaining wall indicated in the plans.

8
9 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:46 p.m.

10
11 Further discussion ensued regarding the restrictions that were in place to keep the
12 apartment complex as one for seniors exclusively.

13
14 Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.

15
16 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner McBride to
17 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution bill No. 06-13* as presented.

18
19 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

20
21 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioner McBride
22 and Rhoten
23 NOES: None
24 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Mendoza
25 ABSENT: None

26
27 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-18.***

28
29 **B. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT NO. 05-08**

30 APPLICANT: City of Hemet
31 LOCATION: City-wide
32 PLANNER: David Sawyer
33 DESCRIPTION: An amendment of Section 90-892 of the Hemet
34 Municipal Code (HMC) changing specified uses from
35 permitted use to administrative use or conditional use;
36 amendment of HMC Section 90-1537 to require a
37 finding of consistency with adopted City Design
38 Guidelines; amendment of HMC Sections 90-1451, 90-
39 1452, 90-1454, 90-1455 and 90-1456 modifying the
40 City's Site Development Review process; and
41 amendment of HMC Section 90-1455 to require a
42
43
44

1 finding of consistency with adopted City Design
2 Guidelines.
3

4 The staff report was presented by Principal Planner Sawyer, who provided various details
5 regarding the proposed zoning ordinance amendment along with a detailed explanation
6 regarding the modifications that were being proposed for the matrix that was included as
7 "Exhibit A" to the proposed City Council Ordinance. He distributed a modified version of
8 Exhibit 1A, which was the proposed City Council Ordinance, including "Exhibit A" as the
9 matrix. He briefly discussed each matrix item, one by one.
10

11 Vice Chairman Jones inquired regarding the locations of C-1 zones within the City.
12

13 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that the C-1 zones were fairly limited in area, and
14 were typically located outside of the Downtown zones as well as a few other places.
15

16 Planning Director Masyczek noted that an example of a C-1 zone was the area
17 surrounding Weston Park.
18

19 Discussion ensued regarding Matrix Item No. C.21., which referred to gasoline stations,
20 and in which cases an administrative use permit, rather than a conditional use permit,
21 would be required.
22

23 Chairman Duistermars suggested that any commercial gas pumps that were added to a
24 business should qualify the business as a gasoline station and should, therefore, require
25 a conditional use permit.
26

27 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that the wording be modified under Matrix Item
28 C.21.b. to read:
29

30 ***"Gasoline Pumps as an accessory use and where fuel is not offered for sale.***
31

32 Principal Planner Sawyer continued to discuss the items in the matrix, explaining what had
33 been changed and why.
34

35 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that Item No. C.14. – Cemetery – and Item No. C.29. –
36 Mortuary – be combined.
37

38 It was agreed that this would be done.
39

40 Principal Planner Sawyer continued his presentation and explanation of the modifications
41 to the matrix.
42
43
44

1 Under Item No. C.37. – Restaurant (not including bars and nightclubs), Principal Planner
2 Sawyer noted that this item had been discussed in length at a previous work study
3 session. He asked the Commission to review it carefully and let him know if he had
4 accurately applied their suggestions from the work study session.

5
6 Vice Chairman Jones referred to the fact that wineries were not mentioned under Item No.
7 C.37.e., and a discussion ensued regarding this concept.

8
9 It was agreed that Item No. C.37.e. would be modified to read:

10
11 ***“with micro-brewery or winery and limited distribution.”***

12
13 Principal Planner Sawyer continued with his explanations of changes to the matrix.

14
15 A discussion ensued regarding Item No. C.38., with reference to health clubs.

16
17 Planning Director Masyczek referred to 24-hour fitness facilities and suggested that
18 conditional use permits be required for such facilities.

19
20 It was discussed that any 24-hour store, or one that was proposed to be open for business
21 after 9pm or before 7pm (Item Nos. C.38. & C.39. to be evaluated), should be modified to
22 require administrative use permits at the very least.

23
24 It was agreed that Item Nos. C.38. and C.39. would require administrative use permits if
25 the hours of operation were going to be after 9pm or before 7am.

26
27 Principal Planner Sawyer continued his presentation.

28
29 Upon discussion of Item No. C.42. – Smoke, cigarette, cigar, or tobacco store –
30 Commissioner Rhoten inquired as to whether hookah lounges would be included under
31 this category.

32
33 Principal Planner Sawyer confirmed that they would.

34
35 It was agreed that the wording for Item No. C.42., would be modified to read:

36
37 ***“Smoke, cigarette, cigar, tobacco store or hookah lounge”***

38
39 Principal Planner Sawyer again moved on with his presentation.

40
41 Vice Chairman Jones referred to Item No. C.40. – Shelter for the homeless and short-term
42 transitional housing – suggesting that this use be allowed exclusively in the C-M zone.

1 Commissioner Mendoza referred to Item No. C.43. – Tattoo and/or piercing service – and
2 suggested that this use, also, should be allowed in the C-M zone only.

3
4 A discussion ensued regarding the locations of C-M zones within the City.

5
6 It was agreed Item Nos. C.40. and C.43. would be modified to be conditionally permitted
7 uses in the C-M zones only.

8
9 Principal Planner Sawyer moved on with his presentation, embarking on Matrix section D.
10 – Manufacturing and Assembly – on Page No. 6. He discussed the changes that had been
11 made within that section of the matrix. He then moved on to Matrix section F. –
12 Miscellaneous Uses – on Page No. 7, and discussed changes made within that section.

13
14 Finally, Principal Planner Sawyer moved on to Matrix section G. – Accessory Uses – on
15 Page No. 8 and discussed changes made within that section, with focus on Item No. G.4.
16 – Outdoor activities within a clearly defined area accessory to a primary use. He noted
17 that this section included display of merchandise and outdoor seating, and that all zones
18 should require administrative use permits for this type of use.

19
20 Regarding the Residential Uses section of the matrix, Commissioner McBride inquired
21 regarding how many single-family residences were still existing within commercial areas.

22
23 Principal Planner Sawyer indicated that he did not have an exact count, but noted that
24 there were not many.

25
26 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that most were located within the O-P (Office-
27 Professional) zones.

28
29 Some additional discussion ensued regarding the proposed zoning ordinance amendment
30 and the changes that were being made.

31
32 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 7:23 p.m. and asked if there were any
33 members of the public who wished to speak regarding the proposed zoning ordinance
34 amendment.

35
36 Commissioner Mendoza inquired of the City Attorney as to whether a single-family house
37 that was being utilized by more than six people and/or 2 or 3 families could be designated
38 as a commercial use.

39
40 City Attorney Vail indicated that this would depend on whether the house was being leased
41 out to the families, which would make the home no longer a single-family use, but rather
42 a multi-family use or boarding home that would require an additional permit. He indicated
43

1 that if it were not being leased out there was not much that could be done since there was
2 nothing in the law that prohibited multiple families from living together as long as the state
3 housing occupancy limits were not exceeded. He further noted that, under the existing
4 state law there were various restrictions regarding what could be done regarding these
5 types of situations, and that it was not because there was no desire to rectify them, but
6 rather because of the limitations that the state law placed on what could be done.

7
8 Since there were no other comments regarding the proposed zoning ordinance
9 amendment, Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 8:03 p.m.

10
11 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner McBride to
12 adopt *Planning Commission Resolution Bill No. 06-17* recommending approval to the City
13 Council of Zoning Ordinance Amendment No. 05-08 as amended.

14
15 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

16
17 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioner McBride,
18 Mendoza and Rhoten
19 NOES: None
20 ABSTAIN: None
21 ABSENT: None

22
23 ***Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-19.***

24
25
26 **V. WORK STUDY**

27
28 **a. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NOS. 06-02 THRU 06-07 (PEPPERTREE) -**
29 **Bernie Chase**

30 A work study session for discussion with possible direction to staff regarding
31 issues raised during the Development Review Committee Review (DRC)
32 process regarding development of the Peppertree Specific Plan, including
33 compliance with Specific Plan development standards and design
34 guidelines, located at the northwest corner of Cawston and Menlo Avenues.

35
36 The work study session was initiated by Planning Consultant Chase who provided minimal
37 details regarding the proposal before turning it over to the applicant for a PowerPoint
38 presentation.

39
40 Bill Lo of Pacific Century Homes approached the lectern and proceeded to embark on a
41 PowerPoint presentation regarding the proposed Peppertree project, which would be an
42 active-senior adult community. He indicated that it would include several Planning Areas,
43

1 as well as a club house and amenities. He described the Planning Area that would be
2 known as "*Gran Via*" as an area that would include single-family homes that would be both
3 single-story and two-story in size. He displayed an elevation of the "*Gran Via*" elevation.
4 He then discussed and described the Planning Area that would be known as "*Ventana*",
5 which, he noted, would also include single-family homes. He displayed an elevation for
6 "*Ventana*".

7
8 Vice Chairman Jones asked how close the adjacent units would be to one another.

9
10 Mr. Lo indicated that the setback was 8-feet. He explained that this was an issue that they
11 were hoping to discuss with the Commission this evening, and noted that there had been
12 some discussion regarding the idea that there was supposed to be 16 feet – 8-feet per
13 home – rather than 8-feet only, between the 2-story buildings, but noted that such a
14 requirement was not clarified in the wording of the Specific Plan. He stated that if it was
15 the Commission's preference to have 16-feet between the homes, he would be willing to
16 accommodate them.

17
18 Mr. Lo went on to display the elevation for the "*La Ronda*" elevation which, he explained,
19 was proposed to be townhomes, followed by the "*Entrada*" elevation, which was also
20 proposed to be townhomes. He offered some details regarding each, and noted that he
21 was not aware of staff having had any issues with either of these elevations.

22
23 Vice Chairman Jones made some suggestions regarding the rather large wall on the side
24 of the "*Entrada*" elevation, and Mr. Lo agreed that they could try to accommodate the
25 suggestions.

26
27 Mr. Lo went on to display elevations of the "*Monte Verde*" elevation and provided an
28 explanation regarding their design.

29
30 Mr. Lo displayed a rendering of the elevator that was intended to be provided in every 2-
31 story home of each community, followed by some elevations and floorplans of the
32 clubhouse with its amenities. He then displayed a rendering of the recreation area and
33 outdoor amenities, including a putting green as well as a swimming pool and spa.

34
35 Chairman Duistermars noted that he had observed various significant changes regarding
36 the design and location of various buildings.

37
38 Principal Planner Sawyer noted that staff was somewhat concerned with the "*Ventana*"
39 Planning area, relative to the square-footage of the product. He explained that the former
40 name of that area, within the Specific Plan, had been "*The Bungalows*", and noted that the
41 setback requirement for that planning area was 5-feet per story, per the development
42 standards, but that the applicant was not providing that in the proposed plan. He indicated
43

1 that the Development Code took precedence over the Design Guidelines of the Specific
2 Plan.

3
4 Chairman Duistermars indicated that he would like to see the project follow the
5 requirements of the code.

6
7 Principal Planner Sawyer further noted that some of the architectural and design styles
8 had been adjusted and that staff was rather concerned with the reorientation of some of
9 the buildings. He referred to the "*La Ronda*" elevation, which had formerly been called
10 "*The Quartz*", and noted his concern with the orientation. He discussed access and
11 garage frontages, explaining that the new design included a row of exposed garages. He
12 noted that there was also another portion of the project, across from the aforementioned
13 area, that had a similar design, but that had actually been approved as such in the original
14 design. He stated that staff would like to get some direction from the Commission
15 regarding this issue.

16
17 Chairman Duistermars responded that the issue clearly needed to be mitigated, and that
18 the buildings should be reoriented so that the garages were not exposed to the street.

19
20 Principal Planner sawyer referred to the "*Entrada*" elevation, noting that while the garages
21 were on the rear elevation they were being accessed by the drive aisle. He pointed out
22 where in the plan the garages were aligning the street, and expressed some concern with
23 the design, even though it had been approved in the original plan.

24
25 Planning Director Masyczek advised that much of what had been originally presented was
26 the "cozy feel", explaining that the look and feel of the project now appeared to be
27 different. He suggested that some of these issues could be addressed through add-ons,
28 including treatment around the windows, flower-boxes, shutters, and etc., which staff could
29 work on with the applicant. He noted that setbacks were not an issue since the applicant
30 had conceded to expand them, but that the issue of the garages remained an outstanding
31 issue without a resolution.

32
33 Chairman Duistermars reiterated his concern to the applicant regarding the row of exposed
34 garages.

35
36 Mr. Lo indicated that the only thing that could be done to mitigate the issue was to add
37 landscaping and change the color of the garage doors to make them less offensive. He
38 explained that the former engineering firm who had been dealing with the project – AEI
39 CASC Engineering – had used a completely different product, and that his engineers were
40 having to adjust things to fit their product. He noted that he could change the setback, as
41 discussed earlier in the meeting, to provide 16-feet between homes, but that to change the
42 footprint would be very difficult.

1 Regarding the “Entrada” elevation, Vice Chairman Jones indicated that in the brochure that
2 had been distributed, the same elevation that was displayed in the PowerPoint
3 presentation appeared as if it were a barracks when viewed at the slightly different angle
4 within the brochure.

5
6 A discussion ensued regarding this concept as well as some additional discussion
7 regarding the exposed garages.

8
9 Chairman Duistermars asked Mr. Lo to have his team take a look at the garage issue and
10 see if they could come up with some way to mitigate the exposed garages through a
11 modified design.

12
13 Mr. Lo indicated that they would see what they could do, though his architect noted that
14 achieving such a change would be problematic.

15
16 Chairman Duistermars asked for any other comments regarding the proposal.

17
18 Since there were none, Chairman Duistermars thanked Mr. Lo and his associates for their
19 presentation, as well as their cooperation in working with staff on making the requested
20 changes.

21
22 **B. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 06-02 (DYNASTYTOWN / HEMET**
23 **ELEGANTE - Bernie Chase**

24 A work study session for discussion with possible direction to staff regarding
25 a request for a conditional use permit to construct and operate a 1,608
26 square-foot restaurant, a 738 square-foot mini-mart with a gas station and
27 a carwash located at the southeast corner of Cawston and Stetson Avenues.

28
29 The work study session was initiated by Planning Consultant Chase, who provided minimal
30 details regarding the proposed conditional use permit before turning the presentation over
31 to the project applicant.

32
33 Nick Panchev, 1235 E. Francis St. Unit “1”, Ontario, California approached the lectern with
34 his associates to discuss the proposal and answer any questions.

35
36 It was suggested that the design be modified to be more suitable and compatible with the
37 area.

38
39 Mr. Panchev indicated that they were in complete agreement with staff’s recommendations,
40 but noted that he did not want to infringe upon the Wal-Mart design that was right down
41 the road.

1 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that the applicant take a look at compatibility with
2 the surrounding neighborhood.

3
4 One of Mr. Panchev's associates indicated that they were hoping to place the carwash
5 behind the mini-mart.

6
7 Principal Planner Sawyer indicated that the proposal had not been reviewed in much detail
8 with the applicant as of yet, and that this work study session was extremely preliminary for
9 staff as well as the Commission.

10
11 Chairman Duistermars suggested that the applicant proceed with some additional review
12 of the project with staff in order to get the uses and the design sorted out, and then bring
13 the proposal back to the Commission for further review.

14
15 Mr. Panchev agreed that they would work with staff to resolve the issues that had been
16 mentioned.

17
18
19 **VI. CONSENT CALENDAR**

20
21 **A. MINUTES**

- 22 1. April 4, 2006
23 2. April 18, 2006
24

25 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner McBride to
26 approve the April 4, 2006 Minutes as presented.

27
28 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

29
30 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride
31 and Rhoten
32 NOES: None
33 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Mendoza
34 ABSENT: None
35

36 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner McBride to
37 approve the April 18, 2006 Minutes as presented.

38
39 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

40
41 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners McBride
42 and Mendoza
43

1 NOES: None
2 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Rhoten
3 ABSENT: None
4
5

6 **VII. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS**
7

8 **A. MAJOR PROJECTS UPDATE**

9 To be provided at the first meeting of each month.
10

11 Planning Director Masyczek provided a brief verbal update regarding some of the major
12 projects that were underway in the City.
13
14
15

16 **VIII. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**
17

18 There were no Planning Commission comments made.
19
20

21 **IX. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**
22

23 There were no future agenda items requested.
24
25

26 **X. ADJOURNMENT**
27

28 It was MOVED by Commissioner Mendoza, SECONDED by Commissioner McBride and
29 unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 8:29 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City
30 of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for ***Tuesday, May 16, 2006 at 6:00 p.m.*** to be
31 held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet,
32 California 92543.
33
34
35

36 _____
37 **Bob Duistermars, Chairman**
38 **Hemet Planning Commission**
39
40

41 **ATTEST:**
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

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