

1 that traffic calming methods should be implemented due to the increased amount of traffic
2 within the City and that rural standards relative to traffic should also be discussed.

3
4 Assistant Public Works Director Gow referred to the preliminary update of the Circulation
5 Element map regarding updates to the circulation element and changes to standards that
6 could be implemented. He discussed several issues that the Traffic Commission had been
7 concerned with in the recent past, including the following:

- 8
9 1. The creation of one-way streets.

10
11 Assistant Public Works Director Gow explained that the Traffic Commission was in favor
12 of creating some one-way streets within the circulation element. He added that no parking
13 areas would need to be created on the streets, and that the need for many stop signs
14 would be eliminated.

- 15
16 2. The mapping & Master Planning of streets on the west end of the city due to
17 the excessive amount of development in that area.

- 18
19 3. Annexed areas.

- 20
21 4. Changing Soboba Road to a 4-lane highway.

- 22
23 5. Consideration of regional roadways.

- 24
25 6. Cawston Avenue.

26
27 Assistant Public Works Director Gow discussed the fact that within the General Plan,
28 Cawston Avenue was not shown to go through between Stetson and Florida Avenues. He
29 explained that they would like to look at the reasons why it could not go through, as it could
30 be important to circulation on the west end of town.

- 31
32 7. The intersection at California Street and Devonshire Avenue as a formality

- 33
34 8. Acacia & Cawston Avenues

- 35
36 9. The efforts going on at the State level to install a signal at Cawston and
37 Florida Avenues.

- 38
39 10. Restricting or removing stops and signals on secondary highways.

- 40
41 11. The creation of a standard that would require 1/4 mile spacing for through
42 streets.

- 1 12. Increasing of the minimum intersection spacing for secondary highways.
- 2
- 3 13. Improvement of the response time for public safety departments by setting
- 4 a maximum number of turns that would be made to reach any residence.
- 5
- 6 14. Requiring as part of a development application, an overall plan of how the
- 7 development would tie in with the circulation plan.
- 8
- 9 15. Requiring traffic studies on certain types of larger projects.

10
11 Assistant Public Works Director Gow explained that there would be a need to establish
12 criteria and a need to analyze the fire department response time.

- 13
- 14 16. The possibility of creating wider intersections with additional lanes, such as
- 15 in the case of the Dairy Queen at Florida & Sanderson Avenues.
- 16
- 17 17. The synchronization of traffic signals.
- 18
- 19 18. The elimination of signals at Harvard Street and Florida Avenue and
- 20 Carmalita Street and Florida Avenue.
- 21
- 22 19. Stop signs on secondary highways, such as Fruitvale Avenue & State Street
- 23 or State Street & Central Avenue.
- 24
- 25 20. The extension of Cawston Avenue south to Domenigoni Parkway.

26
27 A discussion ensued regarding the procession of the widening of Sanderson Avenue.

28
29 Assistant Public Works Director Gow stated that there was a plan that needed to be
30 worked on at the present time, and referred to Sanderson Avenue, State Street, Cawston
31 Avenue and Florida Avenue. He mentioned the widening of Sanderson Avenue that was
32 taking place near the intersection of Fruitvale Avenue. He asked if there were any
33 questions.

34
35 Commissioner Calkins inquired as to why Florida Avenue, to the west of Acacia Avenue,
36 was not indicated as a major highway.

37
38 Assistant Public Works Director Gow responded that this was a good question, since it was
39 obviously a major highway. He noted that the plan should be updated.

1 Commissioner Hicks referred to his understanding of the Indian ruins on the south side of
2 town, stating that while he did not know how wide the path was, there should be some way
3 to go around it. He suggested that Lyon Avenue would provide the ideal form of access
4 to Domenigoni Parkway.

5
6 Assistant Public Works Director Gow agreed that this could be feasible, but that the
7 installation of a bridge would be required over Salt Creek.

8
9 Planning Director Masyczek added that it would have to go around the base of the hill.

10
11 Assistant Public Works Director Gow referred to the Specific Plan that was to be submitted
12 for this area in the near future, stating that from what he understood, Lyon Avenue was not
13 indicated to go through.

14
15 Traffic Commission Vice Chairman Walters stated that a majority of the Traffic Commission
16 was in favor of Lyon Avenue going through to Domenigoni Parkway.

17
18 Planning Director Masyczek stated that he and Assistant Public Works Director Gow would
19 work on the preparation of a program to submit to the Commissions for review.

20
21 Assistant Public Works Director Gow added that he would like to work study any program
22 with the City Council so that they would be aware of their efforts.

23
24 The Commissions embarked upon a discussion of traffic calming.

25
26 Traffic Commission Vice Chairman Walters stated that they had been given some very
27 good briefings on traffic calming, but that a majority of the traffic calming efforts were not
28 really thought of in a positive manner by most others. He explained that he was concerned
29 with the **flow** of traffic, rather than the **slow** of traffic, and that it was necessary to make
30 sure that the Public Works Department would have absolute access both inside and
31 outside of the traffic calming areas. He stated that there were no specific
32 recommendations at this time.

33
34 Traffic Commissioner Searl brought up the fact that the issue had gone back and forth.
35 He stated that perhaps the methods of traffic calming should be indicated as suggestions
36 rather than requirements, so as to refrain from adding any unnecessary expenses to the
37 developers. He questioned whether the various "attractive" traffic calming methods did
38 indeed calm traffic. He stated that the concept was great, and suggested that there should
39 be a book to hand out to developers so that they could consider traffic calming in the early
40 stages of their design, adding that what they chose to do with the suggestions to calm
41 traffic should really be up to the developers. He stated that he would like to get the
42 Planning Commission's input on these ideas.

1 Traffic Commission Vice Chairman Walters stated that a majority of the objections
2 regarding traffic calming devices were from the street sweepers, the fire department and
3 the refuse truck operators. He mentioned that speed bumps were not even to be
4 considered due to the public safety issues. He suggested that, during the consultation with
5 the developers that occurs while processing tract maps, staff should make them aware
6 that, regarding some of the traffic calming devices, many of the city departments have
7 issues that should be considered.
8

9 Assistant Public Works Director Gow referred to traffic calming devices, including bulbouts,
10 entry ways, speed bumps, roundabouts, curvilinear streets and street widths. He explained
11 that from a Public Works perspective, many of the modern methods of traffic calming may
12 appear an improvement over the traditional speed bumps, but they also tend to hinder the
13 performance of various public works efforts. He suggested that both staff and the
14 Commissions should be aware of the impacts that these items have on public works
15 maintenance.
16

17 A discussion ensued regarding bulbouts and the fact that the landscaping included with
18 these devices would require maintenance and watering. It was also discussed that street
19 sweepers often have trouble getting into these areas, and that a modification of the typical
20 bulbout design to make it more triangular would be helpful. It was agreed that drainage
21 could still be a problem, and that while there may be ways to minimize the problem, it was
22 not likely that it could be eliminated completely.
23

24 A discussion of entryways followed, including the fact that with certain entryway types, the
25 sight distance tended to become a 12-foot window rather than a 20-foot window.
26

27 It was discussed that speed bumps tend to hinder maintenance in terms of access, and
28 that they also hinder the response of public safety personnel. It was further noted, that
29 speed bumps often cause more accidents than they prevent, and that while there were
30 ways to minimize the negative effects of speed bumps, they remained a concern.
31

32 A discussion ensued regarding roundabouts and the fact that they create a maintenance
33 issue as oncoming traffic from both directions must be considered while negotiating a
34 relatively tight turn. While studies tended to show that roundabouts improve safety, there
35 were no indications of existing accident problems in any of the intersections where the
36 roundabouts would be most effective, so the necessity of this type of traffic calming device
37 was not apparent.
38

39 All agreed that they were in favor of curvilinear streets as a method of traffic calming,
40 although it was mentioned that nobody wanted to see the problem that had occurred on
41 Johnston Avenue between Kirby Street and Sanderson Avenue, where stop signs needed
42 to be installed due to a problem with the sight distance.
43
44

1 It was agreed that the current city standards for street widths should be maintained,
2 although it was noted that from a Public Works perspective that the focus was on refuse
3 truck operators, who would like to have a provision for as much room as possible since
4 they often have to negotiate cars. Concern was expressed that there may be an increase
5 in accidents as a result of wider streets.

6
7 Fire Chief Stacey expressed his concerns regarding some of the traffic calming devices
8 that had been discussed, adding that he would be adamantly opposed to speed bumps.

9
10 Police Lieutenant Cabrera reiterated Fire Chief Stacey's concerns.

11
12 Chairman Duistermars asked if there was any input on rural standards.

13
14 Assistant Public Works Director Gow responded that this was not really seen as a traffic
15 issue, but more as an aesthetic issue. He stated that, except for the narrowing of roads,
16 they would not approach this through a traffic scope.

17
18 Chairman Duistermars asked if there were any other general questions.

19
20 Since there were none, Chairman Duistermars thanked the Traffic Commisison for
21 participating in the discussion.

22
23 There was a short break at 5:57 p.m.

24
25 The meeting resumed at 6:07 p.m.

26 27 28 **II. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

29
30 There were no members of the public who wished to address the Commission.

31 32 33 **III. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE**

34
35 There was no update given due to the absence of Hemet Unified School District Director
36 of Facilities, Sandy Packham.

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

40
41 Chairman Duistermars recommended that the agenda be revised so that Public Hearing
42 Item No. VI. D. was the first item to be heard.

1 It was MOVED by Commissioner Hicks and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
2 amend the agenda as recommended.

3
4 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

5
6 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Hicks and Rhoten
7 NOES: None
8 ABSTAIN: None
9 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones

10
11
12 **V. CONSENT CALENDAR**

13
14 **A. MINUTES**

15
16 _____ 1. September 2, 2003

17
18 It was MOVED by Commissioner Calkins and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
19 approve the consent calendar as presented.

20
21 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

22
23 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Hicks and Rhoten
24 NOES: None
25 ABSTAIN: None
26 ABSENT: Vice Chairman Jones

27
28
29 **VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

30
31 **D. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 02-6**

32 APPLICANT: West Coast Faith Church
33 LOCATION: 1285 South State Street (Southwest corner of State
34 Street and Stetson Avenue / APN: 451-062-037)
35 PLANNER: Maureen Losey
36 DESCRIPTION: A request for approval to expand an existing church into
37 an adjacent 15,000 square-foot lease space to
38 accommodate 703 fixed seats for Sunday and
39 Wednesday church services.
40
41
42
43
44

1 Principal Planner Bassi distributed some late incoming letters to the Commission regarding
2 the proposed Church. He then presented the staff report, providing some details of the
3 project. He displayed a copy of the site plan and indicated what the applicant was
4 proposing to do. He explained that there were two (2) primary issues: parking and land use
5 compatibility. He discussed the issue of parking, explaining that there had been a question
6 of whether or not the shopping center had enough parking area to accommodate the
7 expansion of the church during peak hour demands. He advised the Commission that it
8 had been determined that, at the current time, parking was sufficient for the project. He
9 explained that a Parking Study had been completed at the expense of the applicant, which
10 assessed the peak parking hours, and that the study indicated that there was a surplus of
11 parking even during the peak hours. Regarding the church being an appropriate land use
12 for the area, Principal Planner Bassi noted that churches were a permitted use in the zone.
13 He explained, however, that consideration had been given to whether a stand-alone church
14 might be a more appropriate use than a church in a multi-tenant commercial/retail center.
15

16 Planning Director Masyczek added that he had consulted with the City Attorney regarding
17 this project, and that he thought the fundamental question before the Planning Commission
18 was whether or not this was an appropriate use for the shopping center. He suggested
19 that if this were a vibrant shopping center, and the current status of the shopping center
20 had been stripped away, this would not be an appropriate use. He noted that the issue
21 had come up before regarding whether or not an interim facility would be appropriate, and
22 whether a "sunset clause" should be imposed. He explained that after discussing the
23 project with the City Attorney, it had been discovered that the Commission did not have the
24 ability to insert a "sunset clause", and that the use should be reviewed as a permanent one.
25 He went on to say that there had only been one or two instances where a church had been
26 permitted within a shopping center, noting that both of them had been vacated. He
27 explained that churches have typically been in stand-alone buildings, as has been the
28 character of the city for sometime. He noted that the City had even gone so far as to
29 establish a special zone for churches, called the S-1 zone. He explained to the
30 Commission that the question at this time was one of land use.
31

32 Acting Assistant City Attorney Messinger advised the Commission that a termination clause
33 or "sunset clause" was prohibited by law, and that the only way to terminate a conditional
34 use permit was through a due process hearing to make a determination that it had become
35 a nuisance and thus revoke the permit. He noted that the ability to deny an application was
36 subject to a much lower threshold than the Commission would need to make findings on,
37 adding that once a conditional use permit is issued for any use, the ability to find that it is
38 a nuisance requires a higher threshold of findings.
39
40
41
42
43
44

1 Commissioner Hicks asked if the conditional use permit law had changed, explaining that
2 he was asking because back in 1978 he had obtained a conditional use permit in
3 Tehachapee, from the County, to put a trailer on an empty lot in a substation facility. He
4 noted that there had been a five-year limit placed on his conditional use permit. He asked
5 if the ability to place a time limit on a conditional use permit was no longer available.
6

7 Acting Assistant City Attorney Messinger responded that this was correct – that a
8 conditional use permit runs with the land, and that although he was aware of some public
9 agencies who had imposed time limits, if they were challenged in court they would lose.
10

11 Vice Chairman Jones asked if the Redevelopment Agency could work on this behalf.
12

13 Planning Director Masyczek responded that, typically, if a project is within an RDA area,
14 the RDA has the ability to bend the rules if they find an overriding economic benefit,
15 however the Planning Commission was not concerned with economics.
16

17 A discussion ensued.
18

19 Chairman Duistermars asked if an applicant could voluntarily agree to terminate their
20 conditional use permit at a certain point.
21

22 Acting Assistant City Attorney Messinger responded that they could agree, but that if they
23 were to transfer the land, or the use, because the conditional use permit runs with the land,
24 the new tenant would not be constrained, and there was no ability to place any restrictions
25 on the transfer of the land.
26

27 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:22 p.m.
28

29 Rhonda Wesson, 26917 Dartmouth Street, Hemet, California addressed the Commission
30 as the co-pastor of the West Coast Faith Center. She stated that she wanted to bring
31 some clarification to a letter of protest that had been circulated, and had received some
32 signatures, which she was confident the Commission had been given a copy of. She
33 discussed the parking issue, explaining that the church had paid \$10,000 for a consultant
34 to complete a parking study, and noting that the study indicated that there would be
35 sufficient parking available in the center even if all units within the shopping center were
36 leased. She advised the Commission that the church had already agreed to the “sunset
37 clause” that had been discussed at a previous meeting. She referred to the protest letter,
38 disputing some of the points that had been made within the letter.
39

40 Helen Hermestroff, 1105 S. State Street, Hemet, California addressed the Commission as
41 one of the owners of the Diamond Valley Shopping Center. She stated that the CC’s&R’s
42
43
44

1 that were signed by all of the owners of the Diamond Valley Shopping Center were also
2 something that ran with the land. She asked if they could be overridden.

3
4 Acting Assistant City Attorney Messinger responded that CC's&R's were binding between
5 private parties with respect to real property. He pointed out, however, that the City was not
6 able to enforce CC's&R's unless there was a condition of the original development
7 approval that required compliance with the CC's&R's. He explained that CC's&R's are
8 typically enforced by the private parties that are signatories to them, and that if there is a
9 violation and a party wishes to find a remedy, legal counsel could be retained to obtain an
10 injunction to prohibit the continuing violation.

11
12 Chairman Duistermars asked if it was the City's habit to become a party to CC's&R's on
13 developments such as this one.

14
15 Planning Director Masyczek responded that it would not be likely that the City was involved
16 with the CC's&R's for older projects such as this one.

17
18 Ms. Hermestroff asked if the Commission could overrule or set aside the CC's&R's that
19 were in place for the Diamond Valley Shopping Center.

20
21 Chairman Duistermars responded that the CC's&R's and any violation of them would be
22 a civil matter.

23
24 Ms. Hermestroff advised the Commission that she had met with many potential tenants for
25 the bank building that she owned within the Diamond Valley Shopping Center, and that all
26 of them had declined leasing her building due to the presence of the church in the center.
27 She gave a lengthy speech, offering various reasons why she felt that the conditional use
28 permit for the church should not be granted.

29
30 Geneva Maffziger, 1208 Sapphire Place, Hemet, California advised the Commission that
31 she had been witness to the parking problem for the center that tended to occur on
32 Sundays. She further noted that the southwest corner of the lot had become a haven to
33 the homeless, and that it was not being maintained. She attributed this situation to the
34 presence of the church, and asked if they should not be cleaning the area up.

35
36 Michael Van Camp, 1117 S. State Street, Hemet, California addressed the Commission
37 as the owner of Desert South Management Company, stating that his company managed
38 over 3,000 Home Owner Associations, almost all of which were seniors. He advised the
39 Commission that his company orientated over 500 families each year, and that they were
40 looking for a place close to the area in which they do the majority of their business in. He
41
42
43
44

1 stated that they had been very interested in Ms. Hermestroff's property at the northeast
2 corner of the shopping center, but that what had kept him from leasing the property was
3 the presence of the church facility. He noted that he was not against the church, but the
4 location of the church, as it was not a use that belonged in a retail center.

5
6 George Hermestroff, 1105 S. State Street, Hemet, California reiterated the testimony that
7 his wife, Helen Hermestroff had made, opposing approval of the conditional use permit for
8 the church.

9
10 Charlotte Page, 30748 Flossie Way, Winchester, California addressed the Commission as
11 the owner of the beauty salon that was located within the Diamond Valley Shopping
12 Center. She spoke in opposition to the proposed conditional use permit.

13
14 Sharon Bashera, addressed the Commission as the owner of *An Island of Hair* in the
15 Diamond Valley Shopping Center. She advised the Commission that she was not against
16 the church, but that she did not feel that they belonged in the Diamond Valley Shopping
17 Center.

18
19 Jedith Mejia, addressed the Commission as an employee of *An Island of Hair* and
20 reiterated Ms. Bashera's testimony that she did not feel a church belonged in a retail
21 shopping center.

22
23 Bernard Mechanic, addressed the Commission as one of the new tenants in the Diamond
24 Valley Shopping Center, and owner of the pet shop there. He expressed his frustration
25 with the fact that the West Coast Faith Center would only erect a decent sign if a
26 conditional use permit was granted to them for the expansion. He suggested that if they
27 could not keep an agreement to put up a respectable sign, how could the tenants of the
28 center know what would happen over the next several years.

29
30 John Pollock, 30748 Flossie Way, Winchester, California addressed the Commission as
31 the co-owner of the beauty salon in the Diamond Valley Shopping Center, and also as an
32 investor. He spoke in opposition to the proposed conditional use permit for the church at
33 this location. He expressed concern regarding the parking situation as well.

34
35 Merrill Brinton, 27464 Tierra Verde, Hemet California spoke in opposition to the proposed
36 project.

37
38 Ms. Wesson re-approached the lectern and advised the Commission that the West Coast
39 Faith Center did not have an outreach program for the homeless people of the community,
40 which seemed to be what many of the people who had spoken believed. She added that
41 the church was in possession of a lease, and that whether the conditional use permit was
42
43
44

1 granted or not, they continued to have a building for which they were paying. She noted
2 that the only reason the new sign had not been erected was because they were required
3 to have a conditional use permit to do so. She further noted that without the conditional
4 use permit the building would continue to look as it did at the present time.

5
6 Helen Hermestroff re-approached the lectern, and expressed her concern with the idea
7 that if this church moved on, another church could move into its location.

8
9 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 7:04 p.m.

10
11 Commissioner Hicks asked what would happen with the church if the conditional use
12 permit were denied.

13
14 Planning Director Masyczek responded that there was already an existing conditional use
15 permit, and that this proposed conditional use permit would allow the additional square-
16 footage. He explained that if the Commission denied the conditional use permit at this
17 time, the original conditional use permit would still stand, and there would be an existing
18 church, but it could not expand beyond its current square-footage.

19
20 Acting Assistant City Attorney Messinger advised the Commission that the decision they
21 chose to make on this matter should be based on the evidence that was presented. He
22 explained that it was a quasi-judicial proceeding, and that although they did not use formal
23 rules of evidence, the Commission was obligated to weigh both the written and verbal
24 testimony that had been presented in making their decision.

25
26 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Hicks to direct
27 staff to prepare a resolution and findings supporting the evidence presented at the
28 meeting, denying the proposed conditional use permit.

29
30 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

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

37
38 The Commission agreed to take a short break at 7:11 p.m. to allow the audience time to
39 clear.

40
41 The meeting reconvened at 7:16 p.m.
42
43
44

1 Chairman Duistermars stated that another adjustment was going to made to the agenda,
2 to hear Item No. VI. C. prior to other public hearings.

3
4 **C. ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-7 & ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 03-35**

5 _____ APPLICANT: All Star Super Storage / Stephen Manfredi
6 LOCATION: Southeast corner of Lyon and Acacia Avenues
7 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni
8 DESCRIPTION: A request to change the zone from C-M (Commercial-
9 Manufacturing) to M-1 (Light-Manufacturing) to
10 accommodate an expansion of an existing mini-storage
11 facility.
12

13 The staff report was presented by Planning Technician Domenigoni, who provided some
14 details regarding the proposed zone change.

15
16 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 7:22 p.m.

17
18 Since there were no members of the public who wished to speak regarding the project,
19 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 7:22 p.m.

20
21 It was **MOVED** by Vice Chairman Jones and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Calkins to
22 adopt **Resolution No. 03-13EA** recommending approval to the City Council of
23 Environmental Assessment No. 03-35 for the adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration
24 for Zone Change No. 03-7.

25
26 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

27
28 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,
29 Hicks and Rhoten
30 NOES: None
31 ABSTAIN: None
32 ABSENT: None
33

34 It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Hicks and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Rhoten to
35 adopt **Resolution No. 03-40** recommending approval to the City Council of Zone Change
36 No. 03-7.

37
38 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

39
40 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,
41 Hicks and Rhoten
42 NOES: None
43
44

1 ABSTAIN: None

2 ABSENT: None

3
4 **A. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 01-1 - EXTENSION OF TIME**

5 APPLICANT: The Salvation Army

6 AGENT: Tony Finaldi / STK Architecture

7 LOCATION: Southwest corner of Palm and Acacia Avenues

8 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni

9 DESCRIPTION: A request for a one-year time extension and minor
10 architecture and landscaping modifications for the
11 construction of a 13,572 square-foot, one-story building
12 containing a worship chapel, classrooms, offices and a
13 multi-purpose room.
14

15 The staff report was presented by Planning Technician Domenigoni who provided some
16 details regarding the proposed project. She advised the Commission that the applicant
17 had revised the site plan and wanted a revision to Condition No. 25, regarding landscaping
18 of the undeveloped area of the site. She noted that minimal changes had been made to
19 the architecture adding a breezeway on the Acacia Avenue frontage.
20

21 Chairman Duistermars asked that the changes to the architecture be pointed out.
22

23 Planning Technician Domenigoni indicated the changes.
24

25 Chairman Duistermars asked for clarification regarding the requested change to the
26 landscaping condition.
27

28 Planning Technician Domenigoni explained that the original condition required the vacant
29 area of the site, on the corner of Central and Palm Avenues, to be landscaped with
30 irrigation. She stated that for cost reasons this would not be feasible for the church and
31 noted that they were requesting that the condition be revised to require berming with
32 irrigation along the street frontages, and hydro-seeding with wildflowers in the center, which
33 would not require irrigation.
34

35 A discussion ensued regarding what the Commission's intent had been for this vacant area
36 at the original hearing.
37

38 Planning Director Masyczek clarified that they had wanted it to be a landscaped area.
39

40 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 7:34 p.m.
41
42
43
44

1 Tonv Finaldi of STK Architecture approached the lectern and addressed the Commission
2 as a representative for the applicant. He referred to the landscaping issue and indicated
3 the revised landscape plan that had been provided to the Commission with their staff
4 report. He displayed a copy of the plan. He advised the Commission that they were
5 proposing a berm around the perimeter of the vacant area, with trees, low shrubs and
6 actual turf on the outside perimeter area, which would provide a visual barrier to the center.
7 The center, he added, would be hydro-seeded with a wildflower mix during the rainy
8 season so that it would be more certain to grow. He noted that after it died off it would be
9 mowed down to an inch, which should keep things relatively dust-free. He suggested that
10 it may need to be mowed 2-3 times per year, but that they were willing to take on that
11 responsibility. He stated that he did not think this would be an aesthetic detriment to the
12 property at this point.

13
14 Vice Chairman Jones stated that he had taken a look at some of the areas in Temecula
15 and Moreno Valley where some of the developers had done water-conservation
16 landscaping that was not flat to the ground. He noted that he was visualizing this proposal
17 as being flat to the ground. He suggested some landscaping with high plants that open up
18 and are attractive, noting that they were low-water and easy to maintain.

19
20 Mr. Finaldi stated that this was the intent for the perimeter of the vacant area.

21
22 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that something similar be done to the inside, as it would
23 be aesthetically pleasing from the road.

24
25 Mr. Finaldi responded that it seemed they were referring to similar ideas. He noted that
26 the perimeter would be pleasing from view, but would remain natural on the interior. He
27 added that at the current time it was unnatural, since it was disced.

28
29 Chairman Duistermars stated that what he was understanding was a proposal for
30 xeriscape with low-impact plants. He noted that the Commission was not particularly
31 desirous of wildflowers. He advised Mr. Finaldi that the one thing that had changed since
32 the original approval was the fact that there was now a water issue, and he noted that they
33 would be irresponsible if they did not discuss an alternative to landscaping that required
34 constant irrigation. He added that what the Commission would like to see was a
35 landscaping plan that was agreeable to the Planning Department, which included some
36 low-need plants and was maintained with some walkways and interior landscaping
37 provisions.

38
39 A discussion ensued.

40
41 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that Condition No. 25 be amended, and discussed
42 some possible wording for the amendment.

43
44

1 Planning Director Masyczek noted that the applicant would also be required to do the full
2 edge treatment, as proposed.

3
4 Chairman Duistermars stated that another issue he would like to have looked at was the
5 provision for lighting in the area.

6
7 Mr. Finaldi noted that they were already required to provide street lights, which they
8 planned to do.

9
10 Chairman Duistermars responded that street lights were on the street, but that 30-feet
11 back, if there were bushes and trees, there may be a need for lighting on the interior
12 portion of the vacant area. He suggested that a plan be provided that was acceptable to
13 the Planning Department staff.

14
15 Commissioner Calkins commented that he had observed the improvement in the site plan
16 and the appearance of the buildings. He noted, however, that the hip roof on the multi-
17 purpose building seemed somewhat out of character with the others, but that he could see
18 that there was probably some justification, as it might start crowding the breezeway, to
19 have gable ends on both buildings. He added that when you simply looked at the northern
20 elevation as a flat elevation it had an odd appearance that seemed to have a different roof
21 pitch than the chapel, but that it might not be too bothersome.

22
23 G.V. Salts approached the lectern as a representative for the applicant. He stated that he
24 had seen the original design of the building, and that he had noted three functions, with
25 specific uses and needs. He explained some of the reasoning for the current design.

26
27 A discussion ensued.

28
29 Since there were no other questions or comments, Chairman Duistermars closed the public
30 hearing at 7:52 p.m.

31
32 Planning Director Masyczek noted the revision to Condition No. 25, stating that where it
33 read "**shall be hydroseeded**", the wording after "**hyrdroseeded**" should be deleted and
34 replaced with: "**developed with a xeriscape concept with walkways, drip irrigation and**
35 **low-voltage lighting for security and safety reasons as approved by the Planning**
36 **Director.**"

37
38 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Hicks to adopt
39 **Resolution No. 03-34** approving a one-year extension of time for Conditional Use Permit
40 No. 01-1, as amended.

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:
2

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

5 NOES: None

6 ABSTAIN: None

7 ABSENT: None
8

9 **B. ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-2 & ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 03-17**

10 APPLICANT: Osborne Development, Inc.

11 AGENT: Bob Osborne

12 LOCATION: Southwest corner of Palm and Eaton Avenues

13 PLANNER: Matthew Bassi

14 DESCRIPTION: A request to change the zoning classification from A-1-
15 C-1 (Light-Agricultural - 1-acre minimum) and R-A
16 (Residential Agriculutre) to A-1 (Light-Agricultural - ½-
17 acre minimum) and R-1-15 (Single-Family Residential -
18 15,000 square-foot minimum), including adoption of a
19 Negative Declaration.
20

21 The staff report was presented by Principal Planner Bassi, who provided some details
22 regarding the proposed project. He noted that the map had been revised from it's current
23 design in response to compatibility issues that had been raised.
24

25 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 8:05 p.m.
26

27 Blaine Womer of Womer Engineering, approached the lectern as a representative for the
28 applicant. He asked if the Commission had any questions.
29

30 Commissioner Calkins asked if there would be any CC's&R's on the development.
31

32 Mr. Womer responded that he believed there would be, but that he would need to defer
33 that question to the applicant, Bob Osborne, who was not present for the hearing.
34

35 Commissioner Calkins asked if a definitive answer could be provided when it came time
36 to review the tentative map for the project.
37

38 Mr. Womer responded that this would not be a problem.
39

40 Acting Assistant City Attorney Messinger proposed that the City may wish to become party
41 to the CC's&R's for residential developments, to ensure continued maintenance and
42 compliance with other conditions.
43
44

1 A discussion ensued regarding how many sets of CC's&R's the City was a party to.

2
3 Planning Director Masyczek suggested that the Commission could give staff direction to
4 present this issue to the City Council as an item separately from the current action.

5
6 The Commission concurred that this would be a good idea, although Chairman
7 Duistermars suggested that they may want to give it a little attention prior to making that
8 recommendation.

9
10 Planning Director Masyczek noted that he would not be present for the September 30th
11 Planning Commission meeting, but that they may want to set up a work study on the
12 October 7th agenda. He suggested that some examples of how other cities participate with
13 CC's&R's could be provided.

14
15 The Commission concurred that this should be added to the October 7th agenda.

16
17 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 8:17 p.m. and asked for a motion.

18
19 It was MOVED by Commissioner Hicks and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
20 adopt **Resolution No. 03-14EA** recommending approval to the City Council of
21 Environmental Assessment No. 03-17 for a Negative Declaration for Zone Change No. 03-
22 2.

23
24 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

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 It was MOVED by Commissioner Hicks and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to
33 adopt **Resolution No. 03-42** recommending approval to the City Council of Zone Change
34 No. 03-2.

35
36 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

37
38 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,
39 Hicks and Rhoten

40 NOES: None

41 ABSTAIN: None

42 ABSENT: None

1 **E. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT NO. 03-8**

2 APPLICANT: City of Hemet
3 LOCATION: City-wide
4 PLANNER: David Sawyer
5 DESCRIPTION: An amendment to the Hemet Municipal Code Section
6 90-1424(a) to change the minimum required size of a
7 standard parking stall for commercial uses from 9-feet
8 x 18-feet to 10-feet x 20-feet.
9

10 The staff report was presented by Principal Planner Sawyer, who provided some details
11 for the project.

12
13 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding whether, if by removing 2-feet from the back-up
14 requirements for the stalls that are currently in existence, the minimum back-up
15 requirements would be violated.

16
17 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that the back-up requirements would not be changed,
18 and that the drive aisle standards would stay the same for parking lots that were currently
19 in place under the 9-foot x 18-foot standard, noting that they would be grand-fathered in,
20 and therefore not subject to the 10-foot x 20-foot requirement.

21
22 Chairman Duistermars asked if a new buyer of a building with a parking lot behind it, who
23 was being required to bring the building up to the current code, would be subject to the 10-
24 foot x 20-foot requirement.

25
26 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that such a scenario went beyond the scope of what
27 this particular zoning ordinance amendment was trying to accomplish.

28
29 Chairman Duistermars asked if the issue could be addressed with the City Attorney, since
30 he foresaw a major nightmare with having a certain standard for existing parking areas, a
31 different standard for brand new parking areas, and a quasi-standard for property owners
32 who were upgrading and having to bring everything else up to current standards and then
33 abandoning the current standards for the parking requirement. He stated that he knew this
34 direction was coming from the City Council, and that it was, therefore, a concern, but that
35 he was concerned that it would place an undue burden on existing parking lots and
36 structures if this change were made. He asked if the public hearing could be opened and
37 continued by the Commission, pending answers to these questions.

38
39 Acting Assistant City Attorney Messenger responded that this would be appropriate.

40
41 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 8:33 p.m. and asked for a motion to
42 continue.
43
44

1 It was MOVED by Commissioner Hicks and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to
2 continue the public hearing, open, to the meeting of October 21, 2003.

3
4 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

5
6 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Calkins,
7 Hicks and Rhoten

8 NOES: None

9 ABSTAIN: None

10 ABSENT: None

11
12 Chairman Duistermars asked that the agenda be further modified to hear Agenda Item No.
13 VII. D. prior to the other work study items, as there were members in the audience present
14 for that item.

15
16 The Commission concurred.

17
18
19 **VII. WORK STUDY**

20
21 **D. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT NO. 03-10 (D-3 ZONE)**

22 A work study session to provide an update from staff regarding the
23 September 3, 2003 neighborhood meeting and potential uses and
24 regulations with discussion and possible direction to staff.

25
26 The work study session was initiated by Principal Planner Sawyer who advised the
27 Commission that a neighborhood meeting had been held on September 3rd, which was
28 attended by approximately a dozen residents. He stated that the study area analysis had
29 been presented to those residents which was followed by a an hour long session of
30 questions & answers.

31
32 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that there were three primary issues
33 that had been addressed, which included property maintenance, parking and the actual
34 "mixed-use" concept. He referred to the concerns regarding property maintenance
35 requirements, stating that the residents felt that property maintenance would be good, but
36 that it should be focused on curb appeal rather than going into a lot of detail regarding
37 overall property maintenance, particularly with over-regulating maintenance in backyards
38 and side-yards. He added that there had also been a discussion regarding parkways, and
39 the need to have the parkways in the area improved, but noted that the question of
40 maintenance had come up, and that the group was split regarding whether this should be
41 the property owner's responsibility or the City's responsibility. He suggested, however, that
42
43
44

1 the general idea had been that if you are trying to improve your area, the parkways were
2 a key portion, and that the group was open to the idea of a uniform improvement program
3 for the parkways, and an area type of responsibility for those parkways which could be met
4 in a couple of different ways. He went on to discuss the issue of parking, which had been
5 of great concern. He stated that it had been determined that parking was primarily okay
6 in the rear-yards of residences that would be converted from residential to non-residential
7 uses. He noted that the residents had made a good point, which was that many of the
8 residences and structures in the area would actually prevent the use of the rear yards for
9 parking because of their configuration and their location on the lots, which would prevent
10 access. He continued, advising the Commission that the group had been mixed on the
11 idea that businesses would be able to rely solely on on-street parking, as some felt that this
12 would not be a bad idea, while others felt that this would be an infringement or impact on
13 the single-family character of the neighborhood. He noted, regarding off-street parking
14 lots, that most of the residents had been non-committal in their feelings, but that it had
15 been suggested that instead of having public off-street parking lots, that something should
16 be worked out with the churches in the area, as there were some existing parking lots, and
17 perhaps a "shared" concept could be worked out.

18
19 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that regarding the "mixed-use" concept,
20 itself, the group had been mixed with some feeling that it was a good idea and progressive
21 thinking, while others felt that it was a bad idea. Still others were caught somewhere in
22 between. He noted that there had been a concern with signage regarding how it would be
23 displayed for the converted residences, how it would affect the single-family character of
24 the neighborhood, and whether the single-family character that is currently present would
25 be lost. He noted that a good question had been asked regarding how the continued
26 maintenance would be handled for a structure that had been converted to non-residential
27 and perhaps went out of business and remained vacant, and how this would impact the
28 neighborhood. He stated that the issues regarding the mixed-use concept had been
29 wrapped up with the question of whether this really needed to be done at the current time,
30 with the downtown area's current status.

31
32 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that some of the suggestions from the
33 group had been to: 1) Re-zone the R-2 and R-3 areas in the neighborhood back to an R-1
34 zoning to preserve the single-family character of the neighborhood; or 2) Wait 2 or 3 years
35 and then re-approach the conversion issue again.

36
37 Principal Planner Sawyer stated that, for the 2nd portion of the work study session he would
38 like to run through some ideas for potential uses that could be included in a D-3 zone, and
39 what they might look like. He stated that if they were to go forward at this time with the D-3
40 concept, staff's recommendation would be to restrict the residential uses to single-family
41 residential with associated accessory dwelling units or 2nd units, rather than a full duplex,
42
43
44

1 tri-plex or four-plex situation. He noted that arts & crafts studios, barber and beauty shops,
2 flower shops, office uses and dining & restaurant uses scaled to the size of the structure
3 in question would be uses that would be recommended as permitted under the D-3 zone,
4 with the initial conversion of a structure to a non-residential use requiring a conditional use
5 permit. He noted that the conversion would need to go through the whole design review
6 process.

7
8 Chairman Duistermars asked for clarification that any one of the suggested uses would
9 require a conditional use permit.

10
11 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that the actual conversion would be processed
12 through a conditional use permit, but once the structure was converted the uses would be
13 permitted.

14
15 Principal Planner Sawyer went on to discuss the fact that a big question had been parking,
16 and that staff was looking at the idea of having no on-site parking requirements, but that
17 to mitigate the parking impact on the neighborhood, staff would be looking at following up
18 with some off-street parking facilities either through the shared-use concept, or an off-
19 street public parking program.

20
21 Principal Planner Sawyer continued by stating that there were alternatives to the D-3 zone,
22 which included: 1) Returning most of the areas to the R-1 zoning, with the exception of the
23 churches which could be zoned "S-1" and the R-P properties which could remain "R-P",
24 and a possibility of an overlay zone which could address the issue of off-street parking for
25 uses that could justify a reduction in the parking for any number of reasons; or 2) Leave
26 the zoning as is, and look at the parking overlay as something that could be applied city-
27 wide, and not be based on just this area. He asked the Commission for comments and
28 direction.

29
30 Kathy Kains, 145 S. Thompson St., Hemet, California addressed the Commission as a
31 resident of the effected neighborhood. She noted that when she had moved into the
32 neighborhood eight years earlier, she had been a single mother with four children. She
33 stated that there had been many things that attracted her to the area, including the fact that
34 her parents conveniently lived next door, which was a big plus, but also because the
35 neighborhood had the feeling of a "community". She stated that she wanted to keep the
36 character of the neighborhood in place, and did not want to see it become more business
37 oriented than family oriented.

38
39 Barry Sutton, 157 S. Thompson St., Hemet, California advised the Commission that he had
40 been in his home for 27 years and that he had seen many negative changes already,
41 particularly relative to traffic. He suggested that the area was not business conducive, and
42
43
44

1 that he did not want to see the City try to change it to be such. He noted that this was the
2 general consensus of the residents in his neighborhood.

3
4 Michelle Slawtis, 139 S. Thompson St., Hemet, California advised the Commission that she
5 and her family had lived in the neighborhood for 10 years. She stated that the area was
6 a quiet one that they felt safe in, and that she would like it to stay that way.

7
8 Jean Baxter, 320 E. Acacia Ave., Hemet, California advised the Commission that she
9 enjoyed her neighborhood, and inquired regarding why the D-3 zone was even being
10 proposed, and what the goal of the City was in doing proposing it.

11
12 Chairman Duistermars responded that there were several non-conforming uses in the
13 neighborhood, and that the D-3 zone would bring some of those non-conforming uses into
14 compliance, as well as allow some other businesses to filter into the downtown area.

15
16 A discussion of the parking issue ensued, and some of the reasons why the D-3 zone was
17 being considered.

18
19 Ms. Baxter suggested that a survey be completed to see how some of the homes in the
20 area were selling. She added that a commercialization of the area would not add positively
21 to what was being attempted with the downtown restoration.

22
23 Commissioner Hicks asked of Principal Planner Sawyer what the prevailing desire of the
24 residents at the neighborhood meeting had been.

25
26 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that the residents had come together by the end of
27 the evening on the suggestion that the properties with a R-2 or R-3 zoning be re-zoned to
28 R-1, and that the mixed-use concept should not be considered at the current time.

29
30 The Commission concurred that this would be their recommendation their recommendation
31 to the City Council.

32
33 **A. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 03-8 - VERIZON WIRELESS**

34 A work study session regarding a proposal by Hemet Enterprises for Verizon
35 Wireless to erect a 67-foot tall monopine at the northeast portion of the
36 Mountain R.V. Park which is located at the northwest corner of Lyon and
37 Acacia Avenues.

38
39 The work study session was initiated by Planning Technician Domenigoni.

40
41 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that staff advise the applicant that this location was not
42 appropriate for a cell tower.

1 Chairman Duistermars inquired regarding the status of the telecommunications ordinance.

2
3 Principal Planner Sawyer responded that the ordinance was under CEQA review and that
4 it would be presented to the Commission through a public hearing on October 7th.

5
6 Chairman Duistermars noted that he had seen a proliferation of the little barrels hanging
7 on the sides of palm trees. He stated that he would prefer not to see them on these poles
8 unless a better method of hiding them was developed.

9
10 Principal Planner Sawyer advised the Commission that the new ordinance would require
11 conditional use permits, which would be looking at stealthing, and that through that process
12 they would be able to address what is seen and what is not seen, and whether it appears
13 natural or not.

14
15 Commissioner Calkins suggested that in the picture that had been provided it did not look
16 so bad, but that if the site were to become an apartment complex, as had been suggested
17 at a recent work study session, and all of the trees were removed to make room for the
18 apartments, it would then be standing by itself and would become an eyesore.

19
20 Ahmad Smith of Verizon Wireless addressed the Commission as a representative for the
21 applicant. He advised the Commission that the question of the trees had come up in a
22 discussion, and that it had been noted that a majority of the trees indicated in the picture
23 were within the City right-of-way, and would not likely be removed.

24
25 Chairman Duistermars again expressed his concern for the "drum thing on the end".

26
27 Mr. Smith clarified that it was a parabolic antenna, which was designed for use in the event
28 of a catastrophe. He explained that if a catastrophe were to occur, and the power lines to
29 that cell site went down, the parabolic antenna would receive telephone signals from other
30 cell sites, enabling the site to continuing functioning.

31
32 Commissioner Hicks asked if there might be a way to place the tower on the back portion
33 of the property so as to prevent it from having an adverse effect on the surrounding
34 property owners, and to move it away from the street.

35
36 Mr. Smith responded that the proposed location had been chosen because the tower
37 needed to be at least 600-feet away from the intersection on Florida Avenue. He pointed
38 out that it was 660-feet away from Florida Avenue, and that there was some coverage and
39 concealment provided by the other trees that were present.

40
41 Commissioner Hicks stated that in his opinion it stuck out like a sore thumb. He noted that
42 Lyon Avenue was also a major thoroughfare, and that the tower was too close to it.

43
44

1 Principal Planner Bassi advised the Commission that one of the issues that staff had with
2 the project was the location of the cell tower. He stated that staff would be visiting the
3 property and would likely be encouraging the applicant to move the tower to the center of
4 the site where it would be less visible from the street.

5
6 Commissioner Hicks stated that he would prefer to see it in the center, or at least 150 to
7 200-feet off of the street.

8
9 Commissioner Rhoten asked what the pole portion of the tree was made of.

10
11 Mr. Smith responded that it was made of underlying steel, with the outside being composed
12 of a bark-like texture – perhaps some type of rubber – that would be textured and colored
13 to look and feel like a palm tree. He added that none of the steel would be visible.

14
15 Commissioner Rhoten asked if there were other types of materials that the poles were
16 made from.

17
18 Mr. Smith responded that there were several other types of materials.

19
20 Commissioner Hicks stated that he did not have so much of a problem with the pole, but
21 rather with the panels that were not well-hidden by the palm fronds.

22
23 Mr. Smith suggested that, to mitigate the antennae, they could recess them closer to the
24 pole and increase the frond count on the outside to ensure that the panels were better
25 concealed.

26
27 Commissioner Hicks asked if the tower could also be moved away from the street.

28
29 Mr. Smith responded that it could.

30
31 Vice Chairman Jones suggested that the tower be located in the back of the site near the
32 alley, noting that the old two-story grocery store and the trees would help to conceal it from
33 both Florida and Lyon Avenues and the surrounding properties.

34
35 The Commission concurred that this was a good suggestion.

36
37 Commissioner Hicks stated that he could not think of a single street within the city where
38 a cell tower would be okay at the front of a site, noting that they should be concealed as
39 much as possible no matter where they were located.

1 **B. VESTING TENANTIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31188**

2 A work study session to discuss the subdivision of 13.9 acres into 28 lots for
3 single-family residential development located at the southwest corner of
4 Palm and Eaton Avenues (related project is Zone Change No. 03-2).

5
6 The work study session was initiated by Principal Planner Bassi, who provided some
7 details regarding the project.

8
9 A discussion of the amenities ensued.

10
11 Principal Planner Bassi stated that the applicant would be required to comply with the
12 Single-family Residential Design Guidelines. He asked the Commission if they had any
13 comments, suggestions or other input for the applicant.

14
15 The Commission concurred that the project appeared to be acceptable as designed.

16
17 **C. RUDEX BROADCASTING ANTENNA (Tony Finaldi)**

18 A work study session to discuss the development of three (3) radio station
19 antennae near the northwest corner of Menlo Avenue and Garfield Street.

20
21 Principal Planner Bassi initiated the work study session.

22
23 Chairman Duistermars vehemently stated that he was absolutely opposed to the project.
24 He noted that it was in the middle of a residential neighborhood, and that there was no
25 stealth technology for the antennae. He stated that he had lived near the radio station
26 that had been located at Gibbel Park, and that he could hear the interference on his stereo
27 even when it was turned off. He added that the project was aesthetically in the wrong
28 place, and that while he was only one of five, he was adamantly opposed it.

29
30 The balance of the Commission concurred with Chairman Duistermars opposition.

31
32
33 **VIII. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

34
35 There were no comments made by the Commission.

36
37
38 **IX. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

39
40 There were no future agenda items requested.

1 **X. ADJOURNMENT**

2
3 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Jones, SECONDED by Commissioner Hicks and
4 unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 9:07 p.m. to the regularly adjourned
5 meeting of the City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for Tuesday, September 30,
6 2003 at 6:00 p.m. to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E.
7 Latham Avenue, Hemet, California 92543.

8
9
10
11
12 _____
13 Bob Duistermars, Chairman

14
15 ATTEST:

16
17
18 _____
19 Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary