

1 CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

2  
3 TUESDAY, JULY 1, 2003

4  
5 THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION WAS  
6 CONVENED BY CHAIRMAN DUISTERMARS ON TUESDAY, JULY 1, 2003 AT 6:05  
7 P.M. AT THE CITY OF HEMET COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 450 EAST LATHAM AVENUE,  
8 HEMET, CA.

9  
10 Present: Chairman Bob Duistermars, Vice Chairman Nick Jones and  
11 Commissioners Jim Calkins, B.R. Hicks and Mayzelle Rhoten

12  
13 Absent: None

14  
15 Staff Present: Principal Planner Matthew Bassi, Planning Technician Loretta  
16 Domenigoni, Assistant Planner Maureen Losey, Planning  
17 Director Richard Masyczek, Acting Assistant City Attorney  
18 Robert Messinger, City Planner Ron Running, Minutes Secretary  
19 Nancie Shaw,

20  
21 Invocation and Flag Salute: Commissioner Rhoten

22  
23  
24 I. PUBLIC COMMENTS: Anyone who wishes to address the Commission regarding  
25 items not on the agenda may do so at this time. Please line up at the lectern when  
26 the Chair asks if there are any communications from the public. ***When you are***  
27 ***recognized, please give your name, spelling of last name, and address for***  
28 ***accurate recording in the minutes.***

29  
30 Sue Fox, 3800 W. Thornton Ave., Hemet, California approached the lectern and asked the  
31 Commission why nobody in her housing tract had received a public notice regarding one  
32 of the meetings on the agenda this evening. She also inquired as to who she would need  
33 to approach with the City to get the desert type area along Thornton Avenue cleaned up,  
34 as she and her neighbors have been having problems with rats, snakes and bugs, and  
35 nobody has been able to advise her who to contact to provide maintenance for the area.

36  
37 Chairman Duistermars responded to Ms. Fox that she would need to consult with the  
38 Planning Department regarding the lack of receipt of a public notice. He further advised  
39 her that she should contact Dave Oltman in the Public Works Department of the City  
40 regarding the area along Thornton Avenue.

41  
42 Commissioner Calkins advised Ms. Fox that he was very familiar with this area, and that  
43 he agreed that the stretch along Thornton Avenue to Cawston Avenue was a disaster and  
44 in need of being cleaned up. He stated that he had been in touch with various  
45 departments within the City and that nobody really seemed to know who the property

1 belonged to. He suggested that the City Council should be aware of the situation, and  
2 something should definitely be done.

3  
4  
5 **II. PLANNING COMMISSION RE-ORGANIZATION AND ELECTION FOR THE**  
6 **CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN**

7  
8 Chairman Duistermars turned the meeting over to Planning Director Masyczek to handle  
9 the nominations and voting in of a new Planning Commission Chairman.

10  
11 Planning Director Masyczek asked for nominations for Planning Commission Chairman.

12  
13 It was MOVED by Commissioner Calkins and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to  
14 nominate Bob Duistermars as the ongoing Chairman.

15  
16 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

17  
18 AYES: Planning Commissioners Calkins, Hicks, Jones and Rhoten  
19 NOES: None  
20 ABSTAIN: Planning Commissioner Duistermars  
21 ABSENT: None

22  
23 Planning Director Masyczek turned the meeting back over to Chairman Duistermars to  
24 handle the nominations and voting in of a new Vice Chairman for the Planning  
25 Commission.

26  
27 It was MOVED by Commissioner Rhoten and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to  
28 nominate Nick Jones as the new Vice Chairman for the Planning Commission.

29  
30 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

31  
32 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Hicks and Rhoten  
33 NOES: None  
34 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Jones  
35 ABSENT: None

36  
37  
38 **III. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE:** Update given by HUSD  
39 Director of Facilities, Sandy Packham

40  
41 Director of Facilities, Sandy Packham, reported to the Commission that the school district  
42 continued to have their ongoing projects moving quickly ahead. She stated that dirt was  
43 being brought in to the Cawston Elementary school site, and that Harmony and McSweeny  
44 Elementary schools were on the final push to open, with staff moving in on August 4, 2003.  
45 She further stated that Diamond Valley Middle School was moving forward very rapidly,  
46 and was currently ahead of schedule.

1 Ms. Packham reported that the modernization projects were continuing to move forward  
2 according to plan. She advised the Commission that they would be amazed at the  
3 transformation of the Hemet High School interior, explaining that new walls are being built,  
4 and bathrooms are being renovated.

5  
6 Ms. Packham reported that the Initial Study for New High School No. 1 was being mailed  
7 out on Monday. She explained that in the meantime the district was continuing to explore  
8 some alternate sites as required by CEQA, and advised them that one of the sites that was  
9 being considered was the Plantenga property on Cawston Avenue within Tract 31184 that  
10 is currently being processed by Lee Entitlements.

11  
12 Chairman Duistermars advised Ms. Packham that the Commission was trying to be extra  
13 sensitive in their efforts to avoid placing schools next to senior sites. He asked if the  
14 school district was also trying to be sensitive in this matter.

15  
16 Ms. Packham responded that she had been working with the Planning Department staff  
17 on school sites, and that this particular site was not adjacent to any senior sites.

18  
19 Ms. Packham concluded her report by advising the Commission that the school district  
20 would be asking their governing board on July 15, 2003 to make a decision on the location  
21 for the Jacob Weins Elementary School site, stating that the three possible sites were the  
22 Hemet Stock Farm, the old barrio area and the football stadium area at Santa Fe Middle  
23 School. She added that if the football stadium were chosen as the site, they would need  
24 to purchase the property across the street from Hemet High School to construct a new  
25 football stadium. She stated that once the governing board makes a decision they would  
26 be coming before the Planning Commission, as all three of the sites are within the City of  
27 Hemet.

28  
29 Commissioner Rhoten asked Ms. Packham, regarding the renovation of Hemet High  
30 School, if any funds would be applied to landscaping.

31  
32 Ms. Packham responded that the entire \$6.5 million was being used for the renovation of  
33 the interior. She stated that there was a minimal amount of site work being done, but that  
34 it was to resolve some drainage problems and did not include any new landscaping.

35  
36 The Commission thanked Ms. Packham for her report.

37  
38  
39 **IV. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**

40  
41 Planning Director Masyczek stated that an item should be added under Future Agenda  
42 Items for the scheduling of a joint meeting with the Park Commission as a follow-through  
43 to the joint meeting with the City Council.

1 **V. CONSENT CALENDAR:**

2  
3 There were no items on the consent calendar for approval.  
4

5  
6 **VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

7  
8 **A. TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 30968**

9 APPLICANT: Mark Cooper

10 LOCATION: Southwest corner of Sanderson and Stetson Avenues

11 PLANNER: Ron Running

12 DESCRIPTION: A subdivision of 39.83 acres into 16 lots for commercial  
13 development within the Page Community Plaza Master Plan  
14

15 The staff report was presented by City Planner Running who provided some details  
16 regarding the proposed project. He addressed some of the corrections that needed to  
17 made to the staff report that were not caught prior to distribution. He referred to a section  
18 of Page 3 regarding compliance with the subdivision map act, stating that the third  
19 paragraph references the incorrect Specific Plan, and should be revised to read "Page  
20 Plaza Specific Plan". In addition, he stated that "State Street" should be "Sanderson  
21 Avenue", on the same page. He added that the other streets that access the property are  
22 Stetson Avenue to the north and Thornton Avenue to the south. On page 7 of the staff  
23 report, he advised the Commission that the 6<sup>th</sup> Finding references State Street and Gibbel  
24 Road, which should be deleted, and in the 7<sup>th</sup> Finding which states that the design of the  
25 subdivision and the improvements will not conflict with the easements and rights-of-way,  
26 he listed Stetson Avenue, which does not have a Scenic Highway element, but explained  
27 that the proposed development will have an enhanced landscape setback along Stetson  
28 Avenue. He added that these revisions to the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Findings would also need to be  
29 made within the resolution. In the proposed Conditions of Approval, which begin on Page  
30 15 of the staff report, he advised the Commission that the date of "June 11, 2003" in the  
31 2<sup>nd</sup> Condition should read "July 11, 2003".  
32

33 City Planner Running explained to the Commission that the proposed map is an  
34 implementation of the Specific Plan that was previously adopted and deemed consistent  
35 with the commercial designation of the General Plan. He further explained that the  
36 previous environmental analysis had taken this type of subdivision of the property into  
37 consideration and that staff had determined that no additional environmental requirements  
38 were necessary.  
39

40 Commissioner Calkins asked if the conditions of approval were the first that had been  
41 distributed for the project.  
42

43 City Planner Running responded that there had been mitigations placed on the Specific  
44 Plan, and that conditions were imposed on the Miscellaneous Project that had been  
45 approved for the site.  
46  
47  
48

1 Commissioner Calkins asked for clarification that the conditions of approval indicated in  
2 this staff report were new conditions.

3  
4 City Planner Running responded that this was correct. He explained that some had been  
5 translated from the Miscellaneous Project.

6  
7 Commissioner Calkins expressed his concern with Condition No. 14, which stated that  
8 "*prior to development of any parcel the project shall be reviewed by the Planning*  
9 *Department staff.*" He suggested that the Planning Commission should be involved in the  
10 review of each parcel, rather than just staff. He added that he was concerned with the  
11 layout of the buildings, as the current layout is the third one that has been seen. He stated  
12 that the Commission had specifically asked that the corner lot be left open for visibility into  
13 the shopping center, and that the major building that appears on the current layout will not  
14 allow for visibility.

15  
16 City Planner Running responded that the applicant was intending to bring a revised site  
17 plan to the Commission for approval in the future.

18  
19 Commissioner Calkins stated that he wanted to be sure that the Commission was not  
20 locked into what was indicated in Attachment No. 7 of the staff report. He added that he  
21 did not think the protection of the residents along Thornton Avenue was adequately  
22 addressed, noting that the staff report merely said "*install parkway type sidewalk and*  
23 *enhanced parkway.*" He suggested that there should be some width designated, which he  
24 could not find.

25  
26 City Planner Running explained that the parkway would be designed according to the  
27 Specific Plan, but that additional language could be added if the Commissioner felt that  
28 it was necessary.

29  
30 Chairman Duistermars asked for confirmation that the width and landscaping as a buffer  
31 for this area had been addressed in the Specific Plan.

32  
33 City Planner Running confirmed that it had been addressed in both the Specific Plan and  
34 the subsequent Miscellaneous Project.

35  
36 Chairman Duistermars asked if they would be simply referencing something that was  
37 already approved.

38  
39 City Planner Running responded that in Condition No. 3 it was referenced that "*the project*  
40 *shall be developed in accordance with the Specific Plan and the Miscellaneous Project 02-*  
41 *12.*"

42  
43 Commissioner Calkins inquired about the new two-story building at Thornton Avenue that  
44 was indicated in the plan, but had not appeared in any previous plan. He asked for  
45 confirmation that the Commission would be reviewing each one of the parcels prior to  
46 development.

1 City Planner Running responded that the Commission would be reviewing them either in  
2 the form of a Conditional Use Permit or in a modification to the Specific Plan site plan that  
3 had been previously reviewed.

4  
5 Commissioner Calkins again expressed his concern that a drugstore would be a massive  
6 element that would block view into the shopping center.

7  
8 Vice Chairman Jones asked how the plan had transgressed from what was previously  
9 proposed to what was indicated in this proposal, when the Commission had been very  
10 clear on their expectations at the time of the original approval.

11  
12 City Planner Running responded that the applicant had indicated that it was his intent to  
13 bring back the modifications to the Planning Commission at a future meeting, but that the  
14 proposal at this meeting was for the subdivision of the property into sixteen lots that  
15 conform to the previously approved site plan.

16  
17 Chairman Duistermars asked for clarification that tonight the division of the land was the  
18 only thing that was being reviewed for approval, and not the use of the land or the footprint  
19 of the buildings.

20  
21 City Planner Running stated that this was correct.

22  
23 Vice Chairman Jones asked at what level financial analysis should be addressed relative  
24 to maintenance.

25  
26 City Planner Running responded that the developer would be absorbing the cost of  
27 financial analysis and would be providing the maintenance for the property as required by  
28 the Specific Plan. He added that the developer was eligible for the Sanderson frontage  
29 to become part of a Lighting & Landscaping Maintenance District (L&LMD) for that  
30 particular stretch of the property, but that the developer was not planning to utilize that  
31 option, instead choosing to assume control, and not have it placed within the L&LMD. He  
32 explained that he would be offering it for dedication, but that it would be up to the City to  
33 decide whether or not they want to accept the dedication.

34  
35 Vice Chairman Jones inquired about the necessity of a traffic study.

36  
37 City Planner Running responded that a traffic study had been completed for the project.

38  
39 Vice Chairman Jones asked if a new traffic study should be considered with the new  
40 Sanderson Lakes development and the addition of the new school on Cawston Avenue.

41  
42 City Planner Running responded that the scope and intensity of this particular project had  
43 not changed, so the major traffic problems would be occurring further to the south on  
44 Sanderson Avenue.

1 Vice Chairman Jones stated that it would not be that much further to the south, and that  
2 the impact would all come back to that intersection at the main entrance to the shopping  
3 center.

4  
5 Commissioner Calkins addressed the fact that the signals would not need to be installed  
6 until 150,000 square-feet of leasable space had been built.

7  
8 Chairman Duistermars asked who would handle the impacts of projects that were  
9 subsequently approved in the area where another project had been approved, questioning  
10 whether it would be the developer of the initially approved project who would have to  
11 resolve the impacts, or the developer of the subsequent project.

12  
13 City Planner Running explained that mitigation of impacts would typically defer to the most  
14 recent developer, but that in this case there were subsequent approvals that were  
15 necessary, and that the first phase of this project would trigger the 150,000 square-feet of  
16 leasable space being built, so the signals would assumably be installed in the first phase  
17 of this project.

18  
19 Chairman Duistermars asked for clarification regarding whether or not this Specific Plan  
20 would be impacted by subsequent traffic analysis.

21  
22 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the initial project developer would essentially  
23 have to mitigate what has been identified as impacts associated with the project, and that  
24 when a subsequent project is submitted, an accumulative analysis is done in addition to  
25 what the project is proposing. He added that the subsequent developer is responsible for  
26 any additional impacts associated with the project, so additional mitigation would not be  
27 imposed on the original approval, especially in this case where there is an approved  
28 Development Agreement locking the mitigation in place. He explained that at this time the  
29 Planning Commission is not looking at revising the mitigation that has been approved, but  
30 rather simply a review of the subdivision of land as consistent with the original Specific  
31 Plan.

32  
33 Acting Assistant City Attorney Messinger added that these types of approvals usually have  
34 a time frame associated with them, and that environmental documentation may become  
35 stale if a project is not acted upon. He suggested that if three, five or perhaps seven years  
36 were to pass without the project being developed, further analysis and possibly additional  
37 mitigation could be required.

38  
39 Commissioner Calkins asked if the Commission would be approving the proposed  
40 conditions of approval at this time.

41  
42 City Planner Running responded that they were.

43  
44 Commissioner Calkins reiterated the fact that he continued to have a problem with  
45 Condition No. 14, allowing staff approval of individual parcels.

1 Chairman Duistermars asked if commercial development of any size would require review  
2 by the Planning Commission.

3  
4 City Planner Running responded that it would not.

5  
6 Planning Director Masyczek stated that the review would have to be consistent with the  
7 Specific Plan and asked City Planner Running what the Specific Plan stated regarding  
8 review by the Planning Commission.

9  
10 City Planner Running responded that "*architectural and detailed site plan review*" was  
11 required by the Planning Commission, and that this review had been completed with  
12 approval of the Miscellaneous Project. He added that subsequent review would be  
13 completed by staff, just as other commercially zoned properties within the city, which do  
14 not require review by the Planning Commission.

15  
16 Chairman Duistermars stated that it had been the Commission's understanding at the time  
17 of the previous approvals, that the project would not change from the original proposal.

18  
19 City Planner Running explained that this understanding was correct, and that it was the  
20 applicant's intent to bring back any changes that may become necessary once he finalizes  
21 negotiations with various tenants. He explained that if the development was going to vary  
22 from the original proposal, the applicant would be coming back to the Commission with the  
23 modification.

24  
25 Commissioner Calkins asked how this worked with Condition No. 14 in place.

26  
27 City Planner Running responded that if what ended up being proposed was consistent with  
28 what had been approved in the Specific Plan and Miscellaneous Project 02-12, the  
29 development would be reviewed by staff for consistency and taken through the building  
30 plan-check process. However, if there was a variation to the proposal, it would need to  
31 come back before the Planning Commission for review, either as a conditional use permit,  
32 such as for drive-through facilities, or as a major change to the configuration or building  
33 intensity.

34  
35 Commissioner Calkins asked if the relocation of the gas station from the corner lot, and  
36 the addition of a drugstore would be considered a major change.

37  
38 City Planner Running responded that this would indeed be considered a major change and  
39 would require Planning Commission review and approval.

40  
41 Chairman Duistermars asked if the Specific Plan required maintenance of the shopping  
42 center to be borne by the developer.

43  
44 City Planner Running responded that it did.

45  
46  
47  
48

1 Chairman Duistermars asked if, in terms of these conditions, was it clear enough for the  
2 Commission that the Specific Plan and the Miscellaneous Project are referenced, or were  
3 there areas that they would like specific references to certain items pulled out of the  
4 Specific Plan or Miscellaneous Project and added to these conditions.

5  
6 Commissioner Calkins stated that as long as they were not locked into any building  
7 placements, such as what is shown in Attachment No. 7, he was okay with the current  
8 references to the Specific Plan and Miscellaneous Project.

9  
10 Commissioner Hicks asked if this were the proper time and the proper vehicle to maintain  
11 control of the buildings and make sure that they fit into the neighborhood.

12  
13 Acting Assistant City Attorney Messinger responded that at this stage of the project, they  
14 were simply carving up the land, and that the Commission would have an opportunity at  
15 a later time to review the facades and building footprints via revisions to the Specific Plan.

16  
17 Commissioner Hicks stated that with this confirmation he was ready to move forward with  
18 the approval process.

19  
20 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:43 p.m.

21  
22 Barb Johnston, 3537 W. Thornton Avenue, Hemet, California approached the lectern to  
23 inquire about the 30-foot buffer zone along Thornton Avenue that had been recommended  
24 by Planning Director Masyczek at the time of the approval of the original Specific Plan.  
25 She stated that she would like to make sure that this buffer zone was still planned to be  
26 installed. She added that at the time of approval the residents of her neighborhood had  
27 been advised that the anchor store would be something such as a Lowe's or a Home  
28 Depot, but stated that since then it has been brought to her attention that the footprint for  
29 the anchor store would accommodate something more like a Super Wal-Mart. She stated  
30 that as a homeowner she had a huge problem with this, as the cleanliness of a Wal-Mart  
31 parking lot is much different than that of a Lowe's or a Home Depot. Thirdly, she stated  
32 that she would like to know when construction might begin.

33  
34 Mark Cooper of Page Plaza Partners, 4801 W. 96<sup>th</sup> Street, Overland Park, Kansas  
35 approached the lectern as the project applicant and explained that his current intent for the  
36 project remained the same as it had when he had last met with the residents of the  
37 adjacent neighborhood. He explained that there were very few things that he wished to  
38 change within the Specific Plan. He added that he would be back before the Commission  
39 for approval of the proposed development of the parcels through Conditional Use Permits  
40 or revisions to the Specific Plan, and that since he was expecting to appear before the  
41 Commission for approval of these items, he was therefore not overly concerned with  
42 resolving the issues in question at this time, but rather as the development of the parcels  
43 occurs. He added that it continued to be his intention to provide maintenance of the  
44 shopping center, and explained that at this time there were no tenants under contract, and  
45 that he had several different site plans that he was utilizing for marketing purposes.

1 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:54 p.m.

2  
3 It was MOVED by Commissioner Hicks and SECONDED by Vice Chairman Jones to adopt  
4 **Resolution No. 03-29** approving the subject project.

5  
6 Planning Director Masyczek suggested the following changes for clarification, and to  
7 alleviate the concern regarding consistency with the Specific Plan:

8  
9 In Condition Nos. 29, 35 and 43, following where they refer to installation of the parkway  
10 sidewalk type and the Public Works Construction Standards, add the phrase: "**and as**  
11 **shown in the Page Plaza Specific Plan.**"

12  
13 He stated that this should guarantee consistency with the Specific Plan and address the  
14 concerns that the residents may have.

15  
16 The Commission concurred with the change.

17  
18 Commissioner Hicks withdrew his original motion and Vice Chairman Jones withdrew his  
19 original second.

20  
21 It was MOVED by Commissioner Hicks and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to  
22 adopt **Resolution No. 03-29**, approving the subject project, **as amended**.

23  
24 The MOTION was carried by the following vot:

25  
26 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,  
27 Hicks and Rhoten

28 NOES: None

29 ABSTAIN: None

30 ABSENT: None

31  
32  
33 **B. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 03-4**

34 APPLICANT: Norman Soren

35 LOCATION: 3510 Tanya Avenue

36 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni

37 DESCRIPTION: A Conditional Use Permit to operate a "Test Only" smog shop  
38 in an existing industrial building.

39  
40  
41 Planning Technician Domenigoni presented the staff report, explaining some details of the  
42 subject project.

43  
44 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:59 p.m.

45  
46 Since there were no members of the public who wished to address the Commission,  
47

1 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 7:00 p.m.

2  
3  
4 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to  
5 adopt **Resolution No. 03-26** approving the subject project.

6  
7 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

8  
9 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,  
10 Hicks and Rhoten

11 NOES: None

12 ABSTAIN: None

13 ABSENT: None

14  
15  
16 **C. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 01-2; SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 01-3; AND**  
17 **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 03-19**

18 APPLICANT: Kevin Lynch, Lennar Homes

19 LOCATION: Northwest corner of Cawston and Menlo Avenues

20 PLANNER: Matthew Bassi

21 DESCRIPTION: A request for approval of an amendment to the Land Use Map  
22 of the General Plan to change the land use designation from  
23 R-1 (Single Family Residential) to SP (Specific Plan), a  
24 change the zoning from A-2-C (Heavy Agricultural) to SP  
25 (Specific Plan), adoption of the Peppertree Specific Plan, and  
26 adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

27  
28 Principal Planner Bassi presented the staff report explaining some details of the proposed  
29 project, including some of the changes that had been made to address the Commission's  
30 concerns which had been voiced at previous work study sessions.

31  
32 Chairman Duistermars inquired about the swimming pool complexes within the project,  
33 asking for clarification that there were four pool areas.

34  
35 Principal Planner Bassi stated that there were four in the primary planning areas and one  
36 by the recreation center. He added that development of each of the planning areas would  
37 be coming back to the Planning Commission for review, and that a Vesting Tentative Tract  
38 Map would be reviewed by the Commission once the General Plan Amendment and  
39 Specific Plan were approved by the City Council.

40  
41 Commissioner Calkins stated that he did not see any reference in either the bungalows or  
42 the gardens as to how many parking spaces were provided per dwelling unit. He added  
43 that in one of the exterior elevations a single-car garage was indicated as a design  
44 element in the bungalows, which may indicate that only a single-car garage was going to  
45 be provided.

1 Commissioner Rhoten asked for clarification that they would need to know how many  
2 bedrooms were going to be provided in order to determine the amount of parking that  
3 would be required.

4  
5  
6 Commissioner Calkins stated that there were many things that they needed to know. He  
7 suggested that at this point they would need more specifics regarding the individual lot  
8 layouts, since what was indicated appeared to be very sketchy.

9  
10 Principal Planner Bassi responded that this was a marketing issue, since there was not yet  
11 a developer that is ready to develop the site. He stated that the Commission had made  
12 a very strong point that the architectural guidelines should be compatible with the  
13 residential design guidelines that were approved by the City Council, and that staff had  
14 worked very hard with the applicant to make sure that this was the case.

15  
16 Commissioner Calkins suggested that there was a problem if they could not get a decent  
17 sized dwelling unit and two-car parking on a lot.

18  
19 Principal Planner Bassi stated that the parking provisions would have to comply with the  
20 zoning code.

21  
22 Commissioner Calkins inquired about the fact that on either the Resort or the Manor area  
23 of this plan, it specifically states "*one car per unit.*"

24  
25 Principal Planner Bassi responded that this was because the area was going to be  
26 developed as a multi-family area.

27  
28 Commissioner Calkins stated that the residents may still have two cars if they live in a  
29 multi-family dwelling. He referred to page V-7, which stated that there would be "*one  
30 space for each dwelling unit, plus one guest parking for every ten units.*"

31  
32 Principal Planner Bassi stated that this was out of the zoning code.

33  
34 Commissioner Calkins stated that he did not think it was, suggesting that two-bedroom  
35 apartments require two parking spaces.

36  
37 Principal Planner Bassi responded that there were different requirements for senior  
38 apartments.

39  
40 Planning Director Masyczek proceeded to look up the requirements in the municipal code.

41  
42 Commissioner Calkins inquired regarding the fact that within the bungalow area, there  
43 appeared to be some guest parking along one of the streets, but that it appeared to be  
44 several hundred feet from the residential buildings. He asked if this was the intent.

45  
46 Principal Planner Bassi responded that this was in the area of single-family detached  
47  
48

1 homes, explaining that there were no visitor parking requirements for these types of  
2 homes.

3  
4 Commissioner Calkins expressed concern with the fact that there was no street parking  
5 available, as there were no streets, since these particular houses did not face the street  
6  
7 and no parking would be permitted in the alley, according to the information that had been  
8 provided.

9  
10 Principal Planner Bassi stated that visitor parking was to be provided at the end of each  
11 section.

12  
13 Commissioner Calkins reiterated his concern with the fact that a visitor would have to walk  
14 up to 9 lots to reach the person that they were visiting.

15  
16 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the zoning code requires one  
17 space for each dwelling unit in senior restricted zones.

18  
19 Commissioner Rhoten asked for clarification that this meant that a two-bedroom unit could  
20 have only one parking space.

21  
22 Planning Director Masyczek responded that, according to the City's zoning code, yes they  
23 could.

24  
25 Commissioner Calkins asked for clarification that because this was a Specific Plan, it was  
26 not subject to all of the requirements of the zoning code.

27  
28 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the requirements could be modified if the  
29 Commission desired to do so.

30  
31 Commissioner Calkins inquired, regarding manors, resorts and courts, as to whether the  
32 parking spaces were covered or not.

33  
34 Principal Planner Bassi stated that this was not indicated, but that they would have to  
35 comply with the code when the site is developed.

36  
37 Commissioner Calkins stated that for the resorts, there were elevations for the garage  
38 doors, but there was no access indicated to the garages.

39  
40 Principal Planner Bassi suggested that the applicant should address this issue.

41  
42 Commissioner Calkins inquired regarding the provision for covered patios for the  
43 bungalows and garden units with the setbacks that were indicated.

44  
45 Principal Planner Bassi responded that regarding the provisions for porches, they would  
46 have to meet the setback requirements. He added that depending on where the home is  
47

48

1 placed on the lot when developed, they may not be able to erect a patio.

2  
3 Commissioner Calkins stated that one of the issues that has been encountered is that of  
4 a family buying a house, but being unaware of the restrictions on what they could build in  
5 their back yard.

6  
7  
8 Commissioner Calkins suggested that there could be CC&R's that preclude added patios.  
9 He then stated that his biggest concerns were with the lack of visitor parking, the number  
10 of garages in relation to the units, and the congestion that could be caused by the so-  
11 called 29-foot wide alleys being the only vehicular access to the bungalow units.

12  
13 Principal Planner Bassi explained that they were private streets, and were 4-feet wider  
14 than a normal drive aisle for fire code purposes. He suggested that 29-feet was a  
15 standard width for a private street or alley.

16  
17 Vice Chairman Jones asked if, when compared with a standard street in the City, these  
18 private streets would conform.

19  
20 Principal Planner Bassi responded that they would not because they are not public streets,  
21 as is a standard street in the City.

22  
23 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that while they are private streets now their status could  
24 change to public in the future.

25  
26 Principal Planner Bassi explained that they could not, because the map would designate  
27 them as private streets, and if they were going to be designated as public streets they  
28 would all have to be widened.

29  
30 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that they were private streets only because they were  
31 within a gated community.

32  
33 Planning Director Masyczek stated that he was aware of some concerns that had been  
34 expressed by the City Council regarding whether private streets should be required to  
35 meet the same standards as public streets. He explained that the issue in some  
36 communities is that once the first bill comes in, ten years after the fact, for maintenance  
37 of those private streets, the community will request that the city take over the maintenance.  
38 He stated that the city, in such cases, would be under no obligation to take over the  
39 maintenance of these streets, since it was not built to public standards, however, the  
40 responses from some cities has been to take over the streets due to political pressures.  
41 He explained that usually a L&LMD would be put in place, so that the City would not  
42 actually be bearing the cost of the maintenance, but would simply be recouping it through  
43 another mechanism. He suggested that the issue before the Commission, and ultimately  
44 before the City Council, is that the City does not have a standard on how to deal with  
45 private streets. He added that in the past they had approved private streets that are  
46 smaller than the standards of public streets, but that this did not obligate the Commission

1 to do so with this project. He suggested that this could be an issue that the Commission  
2 may want to address.

3  
4 Commissioner Calkins asked if the project would be subject to City trash pick-up.

5  
6 Principal Planner Bassi responded that it would.

7  
8 Commissioner Calkins asked who would be paying for the street lights.

9  
10 Principal Planner Bassi stated that they would be funded out of a Home Owner's  
11 Association (HOA), since it is a private community.

12  
13 Chairman Duistermars stated that he did not see the HOA spelled out in the Specific Plan.

14  
15 Principal Planner Bassi responded that he would not see that until review of the tract map.

16  
17 Chairman Duistermars stated that he would feel more comfortable if some wording could  
18 be added to the Specific Plan which would indicate the requirement of a HOA.

19  
20 Vice Chairman Jones asked what would stop the project from going from a senior  
21 designation to a non-age restricted designation twenty years down the road.

22  
23 Principal Planner Bassi stated that it would be inconsistent with the typical single-family  
24 development standards, so it would have to come back before the Commission to re-vamp  
25 the entire Specific Plan if it had not been built.

26  
27 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that the Commission ask the applicant to agree to  
28 add the following language to the Specific Plan:

29  
30 ***“The mix of uses, densities and lot sizes established in this Specific Plan, having  
31 been considered and approved based upon the applicant’s representation that the  
32 mix of residents will be restricted to seniors (persons 55 years or older), represents  
33 higher densities and smaller lot sizes than may have otherwise been approved. The  
34 applicant therefore has agreed to provide a declaration of Conditions, Covenants  
35 & Restrictions restricting sales and lease of any dwelling unit of the property to  
36 seniors for each tract or tracts, prior to the recordation of the final map. In the event  
37 the applicant or property owner decides not to so restrict the sale or lease of the  
38 residences to seniors, then no tentative tract map shall be approved, and no  
39 building permit issued until the City has reviewed and reconsidered the  
40 appropriateness of the mix of uses, densities and lot sizes for the new residential  
41 units proposed.”***

42  
43 Planning Director Masyczek explained that the City Attorney had indicated that it is illegal  
44 for the City to require a senior zoning designation, but since the Commission’s  
45 consideration is based on the “senior only” status, they would need to have the applicant  
46 voluntarily concur to include this condition, and that if they chose not do so , the  
47

1 Commission would have the ability to say that they do not have adequate assurance of the  
2 senior designation in order to consider the project.

3  
4 Commissioner Calkins inquired regarding the provision that the minimum lot sizes for the  
5 Courts, Manors and Resorts would be 3,000 square-feet, stating that he did not  
6 understand this reference when apartments would not have a lot size.

7  
8 Principal Planner Bassi expressed his concurrence, explaining that when the Commission  
9 reviews the tract map they would see that the site size is actually more than two acres. He  
10 stated that one of his thoughts had been that they should tie them in on the lot sizes to the  
11  
12 lots that are actually shown on the map. He suggested that this was an option that the  
13 Commission could add to the Specific Plan.

14  
15 Commissioner Calkins asked if they could simply eliminate the statement regarding the lot  
16 size.

17  
18 Principal Planner Bassi responded that the applicant could address this, but that there  
19 would always be the possibility that maybe the apartments would not be built, and instead  
20 a detached product could be proposed for the area, in which case a designated minimum  
21 lot size would be necessary.

22  
23 Commissioner Calkins stated that 4,000 square-feet was bad enough for a minimum lot  
24 size, and that he would definitely not be in favor of 3,000 square-feet. He added that he  
25 was not against this project, but that he did want to make sure that it was designed better  
26 than the Heartland project had been.

27  
28 Assistant City Attorney Messinger explained that if the Commission wished to request a  
29 larger lot size than what was being proposed, and in the future the applicant were to find  
30 that the economics would not work for the apartments, the applicant could then come in  
31 for an amendment to the Specific Plan, and the Commission could then decide how low  
32 they would want to go on the lot sizes.

33  
34 Chairman Duistermars suggested that with the proposal currently being for apartments,  
35 he did not think a lot size should be referenced, and that if the applicant were to choose  
36 to develop something other than apartments later on down the line, the applicant could  
37 submit a Specific Plan Amendment.

38  
39 Vice Chairman Jones inquired as to whether they should ask the applicant to standardize  
40 the streets to be consistent with city standards to date.

41  
42 Planning Director Masyczek responded that in his opinion, this kind of development blends  
43 itself with smaller streets as a more intimate style. He suggested that it would also add to  
44 the aesthetics of the project since it is a gated community, and stated that he felt  
45 comfortable with the private streets within this particular project, but did not think that this  
46 should be a precedent for future projects.

1 Chairman Duistermars asked if the project had been reviewed by Public Works, Fire and  
2 Police.

3  
4 Principal Planner Bassi responded that all departments had reviewed the project  
5 extensively, and that no issues had been presented.

6  
7 Commissioner Calkins asked if approval of the Specific Plan this evening would lock them  
8 into the proposed setbacks.

9  
10 Principal Planner Bassi responded that it would.

11  
12 A discussion of the trails that were being proposed within the project ensued.

13  
14 Planning Director Masyczek referred to the various bike trails, equestrian trails and  
15 pedestrian trails that were indicated on the trails map that Principal Planner Bassi  
16 displayed for the Commission to review.

17  
18 A brief discussion ensued regarding this issue.

19  
20 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 7:36 p.m.

21  
22 Kevin Lynch of Lennar Communities, 391 N. Main St., Corona, California, approached the  
23 lectern as a representative for the applicant. He addressed the parking concerns for the  
24 Bungalows area of the Specific Plan, explaining that a variety of one- and two-car garages  
25 were being proposed. He added that they planned to propose two-car garages for the  
26 Gardens area of the Specific Plan. He explained that the exhibit for the Resorts area  
27 needed to be corrected, as there was an error in the exhibit regarding the provisions for  
28 garages.

29  
30 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the minimum lot sizes being proposed for the  
31 Resorts area, asking if there would be any objection to the omission of the provision for  
32 a minimum lot size.

33  
34 Mr. Lynch stated that he would not object to this omission.

35  
36 Chairman Duistermars asked if every lot would have a 4-foot setback in the Gardens  
37 section.

38  
39 Mr. Lynch responded that it was his understanding that while there would be 8-feet  
40 between buildings, the setbacks could be 6-feet and 2-feet, and not necessarily 4-feet and  
41 4-feet, as long as the distance between the buildings remained at 8-feet.

42  
43 The Commission concurred that they would prefer setbacks of 4-feet and 4-feet only.

44  
45 Mr. Lynch agreed to the 4-foot setback requirement.

46  
47  
48

1 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that with all of the proposed changes it was impossible  
2 for the Commission to visualize the finished project and cast a vote for approval.

3  
4 Chairman Duistermars agreed, but stated that he would like to get the major issues on the  
5 table.

6  
7 Commissioner Calkins stated that he continued to have an issue with the setbacks.

8  
9 The issue of public streets vs. private streets was approached, and there was discussion  
10 of the fact that since the community would be gated the private streets would not be a  
11 problem.

12  
13 Mr. Lynch assured the Commission that the community would indeed be gated.

14  
15 Chairman Duistermars stated that there was a need to mandate that a HOA be put in place  
16 for maintenance purposes, and that he would like language to be added within the Specific  
17 Plan designating this provision. He asked Mr. Lynch if he would concur with the addition  
18 of such language to the Specific Plan.

19  
20 Mr. Lynch responded that he would concur with the addition of such language.

21  
22 Chairman Duistermars asked if there would be a problem regarding the requirement of  
23 CC&R's for the project.

24  
25 Mr. Lynch responded that there would not.

26  
27 A discussion of a L&LMD being established for maintenance of the public areas of the  
28 project ensued followed by a discussion of the trails system.

29  
30 Chairman Duistermars asked if there were any other issues that should be addressed.

31  
32 Commissioner Rhoten suggested that she would like to see the item come back before the  
33 Commission with the incorporation of the changes referred to this evening into the Specific  
34 Plan.

35  
36 Mr. Lynch stated that he would not have a problem making the changes requested by the  
37 Planning Commission this evening, but that he would really like to get approval on the  
38 project tonight.

39  
40 A discussion again ensued regarding the lack of visitor parking.

41  
42 Vice Chairman Jones expressed his concurrence with Commissioner Rhoten regarding  
43 having the project come back to the Commission with the proposed changes incorporated  
44 into the Specific Plan

45  
46 Lynn Baldwin, 3172 Florence St., Hemet, California approached the lectern and asked for  
47

1 confirmation that the trails system would be a Class 4, which would accommodate horses.

2  
3 The Commission confirmed that this was correct.

4  
5 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 8:00 p.m.

6  
7 It was MOVED by Commissioner Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to  
8 continue General Plan Amendment No. 01-2, Specific Plan No. 01-3 and Environmental  
9 Assessment No. 03-19 to the Planning Commission meeting of July 15, 2003, to allow the  
10 applicant time to make the agreed changes to the Specific Plan.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

16  
17 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,  
18 Hicks and Rhoten

19 NOES: None

20 ABSTAIN: None

21 ABSENT: None

22  
23  
24 **VII. WORK STUDY ITEMS:**

25  
26 **A. VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 29843 - Matthew Bassi**

27 A work study session to discuss Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 29843  
28 consisting of the subdivision of 82.52 acres into 130 lots for the future  
29 development of 456 senior residential dwelling units within the Peppertree  
30 Specific Plan.

31  
32 Principal Planner Bassi advised the Commission that the changes that were being made  
33 to the Specific Plan as a result of the previous public hearing may affect the design of the  
34 map, and suggested that this work study session may therefore be in vain.

35  
36 It was agreed to continue with the work study session.

37  
38 Jim Unland of Unland & Associates, 3550 E. Florida Avenue, Hemet, California,  
39 approached the lectern as the engineer for the project and discussed some details of the  
40 proposed tentative map. He inquired, regarding the trail system, as to whether the larger  
41 setback was usual for a trail system.

42  
43 Planning Director Masyczek stated that staff could work with the applicant regarding the  
44 setback issue.

45  
46 Mr. Unland asked for confirmation that the Home Owner's Association would need to be  
47

1 in place prior to recordation of the final map, rather than prior to approval of the final map.

2  
3 Planning Director Masyczek confirmed that this was correct.

4  
5 Chairman Duistermars asked if the plotting would be seen at a Miscellaneous Project  
6 Review.

7  
8 Planning Director Masyczek explained that plotting studies could be requested at the time  
9 of the approval of the Tentative Map.

10  
11 Tom Shollin, 2901 Orange Ave., Long Beach, California approached the lectern as a  
12 representative for the adjacent property owners to the proposed project. He expressed his  
13 lack of understanding regarding the drainage of the property, and asked if an explanation  
14 could be provided.

15  
16 Mr. Unland explained that the property would continue to drain where it goes now  
17 naturally.

18  
19 Mr. Shollin asked Planning Director Masyczek when the global drainage study that was  
20 being worked on with the County would be completed.

21  
22 A discussion ensued regarding this issue.

23  
24  
25 **B. HEMET AUTO MALL (AREA D DEVELOPMENT) - Matthew Bassi**

26 A work study session to discuss the preliminary site plan and architecture for  
27 development of Area D (14.63 acres) in the Hemet Auto Mall consisting of auto  
28 service uses.

29  
30 Principal Planner Bassi explained some details of the proposed project, which would  
31 consist of various auto service uses along with some retail uses. He added that an  
32 amendment to the Specific Plan would be necessary to add these uses to the list of  
33 permitted uses. He provided some additional details of the proposal.

34  
35 Bill Worthington, 2950 Fairmont Blvd., Riverside, California approached the lectern and  
36 addressed the Commission as a representative for the applicant. He provided some  
37 details of the proposal, explaining that market studies had been completed which indicate  
38 that the addition of auto dealerships within the community would not be economically  
39 feasible as the nature of the community would not support any more dealerships. He  
40 explained that with this in mind, they had strived to come up with some alternate uses for  
41 Area D of the Hemet Auto Mall Specific Plan, in order to utilize the currently vacant land.  
42 He explained that while he was not a representative for any dealerships, he had met with  
43 some of the auto dealers that operate within the Hemet Auto Mall, including the Gosch's,  
44 and that they had expressed some interest in his proposal. He asked if the Planning  
45 Commission would positively entertain a Specific Plan amendment to add some additional  
46 uses that are not included in the current Specific Plan, which may include food uses that

1 could accommodate not only the public, but also the employees that currently work within  
2 the Hemet Auto Mall. He explained that they merely wished to expand the list of uses  
3 permitted within the plan, rather than change any existing uses.

4  
5 Chairman Duistermars stated that as long as the committee for the Auto Mall was not in  
6 objection to the proposal he would not have a problem with the expansion of the list of  
7 uses.

8  
9 Commissioner Hicks advised Mr. Worthington that while the Gosch's may be a large player  
10 within the Auto Mall, they were not the only player, and that all involved members of the  
11 committee would need to buy off on the proposal in order for the Commission to consider  
12 it's approval.

13  
14 Mr. Worthington expressed his appreciation of the Commission's suggestions, adding that  
15 he felt that the proposal would be beneficial to all members of the Auto Mall group.

16  
17 The Commission expressed their concurrence to consider the proposal further.

18  
19 Chairman Duistermars suggested that he would prefer to see a plan for the entire area of  
20 vacant acreage rather than just 3-acres.

21  
22 The Commission thanked Mr. Worthington for his presentation and wished him luck in his  
23 endeavors.

24  
25  
26 **C. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 03-1; ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-3;**  
27 **VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31179** - Maureen Losey

28 A work study session to discuss a proposed General Plan Amendment from R-R  
29 to R-1, a Zone Change from R-A to R-1 and a Tract Map for an eight (8) lot  
30 residential subdivision located on the west side Soboba Street just north of  
31 Florida Avenue.

32  
33 Assistant Planner Losey provided some details of the proposed project to the Commission,  
34 including the surrounding land uses and zoning designations.

35  
36 Commissioner Jones inquired regarding the lot sizes.

37  
38 Assistant Planner Losey responded that the proposed lots would range in size from 9,000  
39 square-feet to 12,000 square-feet.

40  
41 Commissioner Calkins asked for clarification regarding the block wall provision on the  
42 north and south sides as indicated in the map.

43  
44 Brian Fox, of Kevin Cozad & Associates, 151 S. Girard, Hemet, California approached the  
45 lectern as the project engineer. He explained that there would be a 6-foot perimeter wall  
46 with a 2 ½-foot retaining wall included.

1 Additional discussion regarding the wall ensued.

2  
3 The Commission suggested that the applicant should be sure to have Principal Engineer,  
4 Mike Gow, review the project prior to proceeding with any further plan.

5  
6  
7 **D. ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-1 - Maureen Losey**

8 A work study session to discuss a proposed Zone Change from R-2 to R-P to  
9 allow the future development of office uses located at the northeast corner of  
10 Santa Fe Street and St. John Place.

11  
12 Assistant Planner Losey provided some details of the proposal to the Commission,  
13 explaining that most of the existing zoning surrounding the site was R-P (Residential-  
14 Professional), and that this was the only site on St. John Place that had not been re-zoned  
15 to an R-P designation.

16  
17 The Commission concurred with the proposal without comment.

18  
19  
20 **E. HEMET QUALITY INN - Loretta Domenigoni**

21 A work study session to discuss the proposed development of a 28 room hotel,  
22 including a conversion of a single family residence into a honeymoon suites  
23 located at 127 S. Hamilton Avenue (just north of Florida Avenue).

24  
25 Planning Technician Domenigoni advised the Commission that the applicant was not  
26 present. She asked if she should continue with the work study.

27  
28 The Commission expressed their concern with the proposed location for the hotel, and all  
29 concurred that they would not be in favor of a hotel at this site. They suggested that she  
30 recommend to the applicant that he not submit this type of proposal at that particular  
31 location.

32  
33  
34 **VIII. DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**

35  
36 There were no items on the Director's Report for discussion.

37  
38  
39 **IX. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

40  
41 Vice Chairman Jones inquired regarding a 404 Permit, and what was going to happen with  
42 Devonshire going through to Warren Road.

43  
44 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the Army Corps of Engineers had declared  
45 that they would need to do a Section 7 consultation with the property. He explained that  
46 the City was working with them, and would hopefully be proceeding with an avoidance  
47

1 situation. He added that the applicant for the JLP property was in the process of  
2 completing their environmental studies, and had found some vernal pools where they had  
3 never expected them, so it could be approximately a month or more before any direction  
4 was given.

5  
6 Chairman Duistermars commented on Dr. Duffin's letter to the Planning Commission,  
7 stating that he was offended by the letter.

8  
9 The Planning Commission concurred that they were all offended by the letter.

10  
11 Chairman Duistermars stated that he did not think there had been either a City Council or  
12 Planning Commission in recent history that has worked harder to improve development in  
13 the community, and that he was completely discounting the comments and insinuations  
14 that Dr. Duffin had made.

15  
16  
17  
18 Commissioner Hicks stated that it was his opinion that Dr. Duffin was extremely far off in  
19 his letter, and suggested that perhaps the City Council should respond to the letter and  
20 defend the honor of the Planning Commission.

21  
22  
23 **X. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

24  
25 Chairman Duistermars stated that there was a need to schedule a joint meeting with the  
26 Parks Commission and asked for input regarding possible dates.

27  
28 Planning Director Masyczek informed the Commission that their agendas were booked up  
29 through the beginning of October.

30  
31 Chairman Duistermars proposed that two representatives of the Planning Commission  
32 meet with the Parks Commission at a Parks Commission meeting to discuss the issues that  
33 need to be discussed, including the development of a Parks and Trails plan. He added  
34 that the Parks Commission and Valley-Wide Recreation should be participants in the  
35 establishment of this plan.

36  
37 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the next Parks Commission  
38 meeting would be held on July 28, 2003 at 4:00 p.m. at the Council Chambers.

39  
40 Commissioner Hicks agreed to attend this meeting with Chairman Duistermars.

41  
42 Planning Director Masyczek stated that he would contact Mike Gow regarding adding this  
43 to the Parks Commission agenda for that date.

44  
45  
46 **XI. ADJOURNMENT:** It was MOVED by Commissioner Hicks, SECONDED by  
47  
48

1 Commissioner Calkins and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 9:08  
2 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City of Hemet Planning Commission, scheduled for  
3 Tuesday, July 15, 2003 at 6:00 p.m. to be held at the City of Hemet Council  
4 Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet, California, 92543.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 \_\_\_\_\_  
11 Bob Duistermars, Chairman  
12

13 ATTEST:  
14

15  
16 \_\_\_\_\_  
17 Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary  
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

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Planning Commission Minutes**  
**July 1, 2003**