

1 **III. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA:**

2
3 Planning Director Masyczek announced that work-study items A, B, and C will not be discussed
4 tonight and will be moved to a future date.
5

6
7 **IV. CONSENT CALENDAR:**

8
9 No items have been submitted at this time.
10

11
12 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS:**

13
14 **A. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NO. 03-20**

15 APPLICANT: George Zeber, Meeker Companies

16 LOCATION: North side of Menlo Avenue, 1,200 feet west of Sanderson Avenue

17 PLANNER: Maureen Losey

18 DESCRIPTION: The applicant is requesting approval of the site development plans,
19 including architectural elevations and landscaping/walls, for
20 Tentative Tract No. 28558.
21

22 Commissioner Hicks excused himself due to a conflict of interest.
23

24 Assistant Planner Maureen Losey presented the project to the Commission and informed them that
25 it is the old John Crean project that they had looked at before and approved, however now there
26 is a new developer. She reviewed some of the details of the project, and noted that in the second
27 paragraph on page 4 of the Staff Report, staff is asking to remove the word "not" so that it reads
28 "side or rear elevation is visible from the street".
29

30 Ms. Losey reported that staff has reviewed the design and feel they are in compliance with the
31 Residential Design Guidelines, however, staff is recommending making it a condition that the
32 houses backing up to Menlo and Fruitvale be single-story.
33

34 Ms. Losey indicated that Staff is recommending approval of the project, with the addition of
35 condition #11.
36

37 Chairman Duistermars asked if anyone had any comments.
38

39 Chuck Styken, the project architect from LSA Architecture, 476 western circle, Anaheim, stated that
40 he agrees with the staff report recommendations with the exception of condition #11.
41
42
43
44

1 Chairman Duistermars indicated his desire to keep the homes there one-story, and prohibit two-
2 story homes along thoroughfares. He added that with the two-story homes, you can see things
3 such as air conditioners and peoples laundry from the street. He announced that they are working
4 with staff to see if they can amend the Residential Design Guidelines to prohibit two-story homes
5 along thoroughfares.

6
7 Commissioner Calkins stated that he disagrees to a certain extent, though he understands the
8 reasoning. He suggested that perhaps they could have a condition where there is not more than
9 5 two-story homes in a row.

10
11 Commissioner Jones stated that he agrees with Chairman Duistermars wholeheartedly, and added
12 that those are not the type of homes that we want to see 20 years from now.

13 Commissioner Calkins added that he thinks that they should introduce one or two, to break up the
14 view from the street.

15
16 It was MOVED by Commissioner Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to approve the
17 project as amended.

18
19 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

20
21 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Commissioner Jones and Commissioner Rhoten

22 NOES: Commissioner Calkins

23 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Hicks

24 ABSENT: None

25
26
27 **B. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NO. 03-22**

28 APPLICANT: Thomas Walker

29 LOCATION: West side of Carriage Circle, approximately 200 feet north of Auto
30 Boulevard

31 PLANNER: Loretta Domenigoni

32 DESCRIPTION: The applicant is requesting approval to construct a 6,679 square-
33 foot Suzuki Dealership within the Hemet Auto Mall.

34
35 Planning Technician Loretta Domenigoni approached the lectern and presented the project to the
36 Commission. There were no questions or concerns, and Chairman Duistermars asked for a
37 Motion.

38
39 It was MOVED by Commissioner Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Calkins to accept staff
40 recommendation and approve the project as presented.

1 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

2
3 AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins, Hicks, Jones, and Rhoten.

4 NOES: None

5 ABSTAIN: None

6 ABSENT: None

7
8
9 **VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

10
11 **A. VESTING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 31075 (Continued from November 4,**
12 **2003)**

13 APPLICANT: John Karubian, Karubian Family Joint Venture

14 LOCATION: The northeast corner of State Street and Gibbel Road

15 PLANNER: Maureen Losey

16 DESCRIPTION: The applicant is requesting to subdivide 21.5 acres into eight (8)
17 lots for future commercial development within the Diamond Valley
18 Gateway Specific Plan.

19
20 Assistant Planner Losey addressed the Commission and reminded them that this project was
21 continued from November 4, 2003, because of concerns regarding consistency with the General
22 Plan. She distributed a handout to the Commission pertaining to the land uses.

23 Commissioner Calkins stated that the matrix indicated on the handout does not designate Highway
24 and Commercial, and one of the concerns that the Commission has had is the types of uses that
25 were allowed there.

26
27 Commissioner Jones indicated that he failed to find anything on the environmental issue of this
28 project.

29
30 Planning Director Masyczek explained that this project, under the previous Specific Plan, did have
31 a Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared, and what Staff is recommending to the Planning
32 Commission is that the previous environmental suffice for this project. He explained to the
33 Commission that CEQA says that you can use a previous environmental document as long as there
34 is no change in the project and/or circumstances that the project was originally approved in.

35
36 Mr. Masyczek advised the Commission that since the City Council approved the McSweeney Farms
37 Specific Plan last week, that has created a significant change in the "setting" of this project, as well
38 as several others. He clarified that one of the issues before the Commission is the setting of this
39 project;. It is not same now as it was when it was originally approved in 1997. He advised that one
40 of the options available to the Commission is to say that there is a change of circumstances, and
41 deny staff's recommendation. If that is the case, then the project fails for lack of adequate
42 environmental consideration.

1 Assistant Attorney Vail stated that he didn't think that the previous Mitigated Negative Declaration
2 for the Specific Plan had been submitted or reviewed. He noted some concerns, one of which is
3 that the Mitigated measures wouldn't pass under CEQA today. Another concern is that there is no
4 analysis of the cumulative impacts of other projects. He stated further that in looking at the
5 Biological Resource Section, he noticed that the Mitigative Negative Declaration states that the
6 Coastal Sage, a plant found to be on site at the time that it was done, is within the size range that
7 might support the California Gnat Catcher, which is a Federally Endangered Species. He added
8 that a biological survey was not conducted to detect the presence of the gnat catcher, therefore,
9 it is possible that there could be gnat catchers on site.

10
11 Mr. Vail explained that it presents a problem for the City because they have a document that says
12 that there could be gnat catchers on site, and it acknowledges that no environmental review was
13 done to determine if there were any on site. He advised that you are supposed to study and
14 mitigate things at the time that you do your project approval, and that by relying on this document,
15 the error would get carried forward. Mr. Vail added further that the Biological Survey that was
16 performed indicated that it was done in a "drive-by" format, which is not the proper way to check
17 for gnat catchers on the site. He advised that you have to actually be out there and monitor the
18 site, which was clearly not done.

19
20 Planning Director Masyczek stated that there is a variety of concerns with the previous
21 environmental work, but most importantly is the cumulative impact analysis with the surrounding
22 projects. He explained that even though the other projects such as McSweeny took into account
23 the Karubian property as part of their Environmental Impact Analysis, that doesn't allow the
24 McSweeny project to mitigate for the Karubian project. Each project has to stand on it's own in
25 terms of mitigation. He added that staff has grave concerns with approving the previous
26 Environmental Determination given the variety of factors that have occurred.

27
28 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 6:30 p.m.

29
30 Jim Unland of Unland & Associates, 3550 East Florida Avenue, Hemet, California, addressed the
31 Commission as a representative of the applicant. He stated that as far as the gnat catcher goes,
32 they are usually found up on the hillside, and that is not where their parcel map is. He indicated that
33 the Specific Plan was approved well before the McSweeny project, and it should have precedent
34 as compared to the McSweeny project.

35
36 Mr. Unland confessed that he has not read the McSweeny conditions, but if he had, he's certain
37 that he would find that they are mitigating things which would include this project in it's
38 consideration, and that their mitigation measures would take care of any issues relative to this
39 project.

1 Mr. Unland next mentioned that he had talked with City Engineer Roland Trietsch at the last
2 meeting about Condition #51, which has to do with connecting sewer to the site, and Mr. Trietsch
3 had confirmed that his indications found their way into the conditions.
4

5 Chairman Duistermars clarified that he thought the discussion was that when the sewer is run,
6 there is no requirement at that time for those buildings to connect until they want to, and we wanted
7 to find out whether they had to connect. The agreement was that they would connect when the
8 sewer was run.
9

10 Commissioner Hicks asked Assistant City Attorney Vail to again address the comments regarding
11 the possibility of the presence of a gnat catcher.
12

13 Assistant City Attorney Vail prefaced that with trying to respond to Mr. Unland's question regarding
14 the McSweeney Farms EIR, stating no one has ever accused CEQA of being a reasonable
15 document. He explained that CEQA states that just because the project next to you has prepared
16 an EIR doesn't give you the right to relay on what that document says. CEQA wants you to do an
17 analysis of your own project.
18

19 Mr. Vail then spoke regarding the gnat catcher. The document that was referred to was the
20 Mitigated Negative Declaration that was prepared for the Specific Plan, (SP 96-001) General Plan
21 Amendment, (GPA 96-002) and Zone Change (ZC 96-004) for this project. He explained that the
22 Mitigated Negative Declaration identifies that there is the type of environment on the property that
23 could be the habitat for the gnat catcher, a federally endangered species. If they had a document
24 that said there are absolutely none here, that would be sufficient. Unfortunately, the Mitigated
25 Negative Declaration, and the Focus Survey that was done, does not identify the areas where the
26 gnat catcher may or may not be. Mr. Vail indicated that he thinks there were some inadequacies
27 in the original document.
28

29 Mr. Vail suggested to the Commission that they can say that they are not going to adopt unless
30 they see more of the environmental. He explained some of the other options available, stressing
31 that this doesn't reflect on the fact that the map is consistent with the existing design standards of
32 the Municipal Code or the Specific Plan, but rather has to do with the environmental work-up. He
33 stated that CEQA requires that they have the environmental review completed in order to approve
34 a new project, and that if they can't get past the environmental review, then they can't approve the
35 map.
36

37 Commissioner Hicks inquired as to what the City's liability would be if they allow this to move
38 forward without further environmental work-up, and a gnat catcher is found on the property.
39

40 Assistant City Attorney Vail answered that in other projects there were similar situations where
41 there were inadequacies in the environmental, and it may have been fine at the time, then the
42 property changes hands, the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the State or the Army Corps of
43
44

1 Engineers comes out later when the project goes to development, saying that they will not issue
2 permits because the environmental is inadequate. He explained that in some of these cases, the
3 developer has come back and said that they would hold the City responsible for not doing what
4 they were supposed to do.

5
6 Planning Director Masyczek stated for the Commission that one addition concern is that the original
7 Mitigated Negative Declaration never did disclose the fact that there is a blue line stream on the
8 property. The City has identified that there is Jurisdictional Waters of the United States along State
9 Street that are not reflected in this document, and given what we went through on Tres Cerritos,
10 he would feel very uncomfortable with having a Mitigated Negative Declaration that says that there
11 is no Jurisdictional Waters of the United States, when we know that there is. Based on that, as well
12 as others, He feels uncomfortable saying that we should utilize this document.

13
14 Commissioner Calkins inquired if the Specific Plan can be amended to limit the Commercial uses.
15 Mr. Vail answered that they could process a Specific Plan Amendment to make any changes that
16 it thought would be appropriate, and added that the changes cannot be made via the vesting parcel
17 map.

18
19 Mr. Vail pointed out to the Commission that this is a Vesting Tentative Map, the land uses and
20 standards that apply to this map and the applicant will obtain a vested right to rely upon and
21 develop are those in existence at the time that the map was deemed substantially complete.

22
23 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 6:46 p.m. and asked for a motion.

24
25 Commissioner Jones MOVED to decline the environmental issue and asked for help in the wording.

26
27 Assistant City Attorney Vail explained the options available to the Commission. He stated that they
28 could either deny the map, or work out a continuance with the applicant.

29
30 Chairman Duistermars inquired if the applicant had a preference. Since no preference was stated,
31 Commissioner Hicks MOVED to deny the project and requested the appropriate language.

32
33 Commissioner Calkins stated that the fee on the TUMF would be a substantial amount of money,
34 and it wouldn't be fair to the property owner. Chairman Duistermars answered that the property
35 owner doesn't care.

36
37 John Karubian, 2140 Tremble Lane, Los Angeles, approached the lectern and addressed the
38 Commission, stating that he represents the Karubian Family Joint Venture that owns the property
39 of which this is a portion. He stated that he would like to complement staff and the Council on their
40 responsiveness to the direction given by the Commission in the last hearing where the Chairman
41 appealed to everyone in the room to find reason not to approve this.

1 Mr. Karubian added that they would pursue their protection to all of their rights and entitlements,
2 and if for some reason they lose their exemption from TUMF because of action of this Commission,
3 on behalf of the City, they would pursue every regress that is available.

4
5 Mr. Karubian stated that anyone who has driven by this area knows that this particular area has no
6 vegetation on it at all, with the exception of winter wheat that is dry-farmed by Chuck McSweeny
7 from time to time. He indicated that he doesn't understand the logic, and if there are concerns
8 about uses that are in the Specific Plan as it was adopted, no one has given him a list and asked
9 him to take them out.

10
11 Mr. Karubian referred to the draft minutes of the June 17 Planning Commission meeting, where the
12 topic of discussion was on amending the Specific Plan to restrict uses. He indicated that Mr. Jones
13 had said that he believes this should be set aside to allow that amendment to be completed, and
14 Eric Vail had said that since it is a vesting parcel map, it will not lock you into what is in the Specific
15 Plan.

16
17 Mr. Karubian stated that they had worked hard to get the application in, conscious of the timing of
18 the TUMF situation, and it was all in good order. He indicated that staff has made the same
19 recommendation 4 different times to this Commission. He concluded by asking the Commission
20 to do what is fair.

21
22 Commissioner Jones asked Mr. Karubian if he would like the Commission to do what Mr. Vail
23 recommended, so he can save the TUMF fees. He explained that when Mr. Unland stood before
24 the Commission the first time, he had indicated that the whole reason for this was to get a map on
25 record before July, so as to be exempt. Since then, they have had an opportunity to look at it, and
26 found that there are other mitigating circumstances. He again listed the options available to the
27 applicant, and asked which direction he wanted to take.

28
29 Mr. Karubian stated that they do not want to incur the TUMF fees. He then referred to a
30 conversation he'd had with Mr. Masyczek, who, when asked why the project didn't get approved,
31 answered that there are the technical issues and the political issues, and it didn't get approved
32 because of the political issues. Mr. Karubian then answered that of course, they prefer to work
33 something out.

34
35 Mr. Vail stated that he would like to add to the record that he has no recollection of ever making
36 a statement to the applicant either in person or on the phone in which he said that there would be
37 no problem in getting this project approved. He announced that at the last meeting, it was noted
38 to him by Commissioner Jones that he did not have the Mitigated Negative Declaration in front of
39 him that this was being relied on to support this project, and it needed to be supplied to him. In the
40 meantime, he's had a chance to look at it, as well as the Commissioners, and legitimate
41 environmental concerns have been raised.

1 Mr. Vail noted that to be fair to the applicant, if the intent of the Commission is to change uses,
2 environmental concerns are not an appropriate way to do that. Resolution of those environmental
3 concerns might not change this map at all.

4
5 Commissioner Hicks stated that the he is not interested in changing the uses agreed upon in the
6 past, his main concern is the environmental issues that have been raised. He further stated that
7 he is not aware of any political issues. The thing that he is concerned with is protecting the City
8 from any litigation should there be the slightest chance that a gnat catcher, or anything else be on
9 that property, and we're relying on a 7 year old document.

10
11 Chairman Duistermars asked for assistance in crafting the motion.

12
13 Planning Director Masyczek stated that what he would have is "A Resolution of the Planning
14 Commission of the City of Hemet, California denying the Environmental Determination of utilizing
15 a previous Mitigated Negative Declaration as the appropriate environmental documentation for
16 Tentative Parcel Map 31075.

17
18 Mr. Vail stated that it would be an appropriate wording, however Commissioner Jones had a Motion
19 on the table. Commissioner Calkins took back his Second, and Commissioned Jones took back
20 his First.

21
22 Assistant City Attorney Vail voiced for the record that as he understands it, the Motion that originally
23 made by Commissioner Jones has been rescinded. The Motion that was made by Commissioner
24 Hicks and Seconded by Commissioner Calkins has been rescinded, and a new motion will be made
25 to take the matter off of the calendar. Mr. Vail suggested that he get the applicant's concurrence
26 in that process.

27
28 Chairman Duistermars informed the applicant that if that is what he would like the Commissioners
29 to do, then it is important that he state that he is in agreement.

30
31 Mr. Karubian answered that he doesn't have counsel there to advise him.

32
33 Commissioner Jones MOTIONED to continue the project.

34
35 Chairman Duistermars inquired as to what would happen if they continue the project and the time
36 runs out on CEQA, would that be an automatic approval? Mr. Masyczek answered no, stating that
37 CEQA is unclear. There is no clear direction on what would happen to the City.

38
39 Mr. Vail clarified that the continuance of the CEQA time lines is unclear, as the courts change their
40 minds frequently. He added that if they do not get the applicant's official concurrence with this
41 continuance, then they are not entitled to go back and challenge the action that they have agreed
42 to.

1 Mr. Vail further explained that if the project is taken off of the calendar, but is not denied, the
2 application remains "deemed complete" under the TUMF Ordinance, and that is all that is
3 necessary to obtain an exemption from TUMF. However, if they were to deny this project, it has
4 to start over again and is no longer entitled to the exemption.

5
6 Commissioner Hicks stated that his desire is for this project to have an environmental report done,
7 and the applicant not to have to pay the TUMF fee, and he doesn't care how they do that.
8 It was MOVED by Commissioner Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Hicks to continue the
9 project to a future date uncertain, pending additional environmental review.

10
11 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

12
13 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Commissioners Calkins, Hicks, Jones, and Rhoten.
14 NOES: None
15 ABSTAIN: None
16 ABSENT: None

17
18 **B. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 03-6**

19 APPLICANT: Starbridge Communications/sprint PCS
20 LOCATION: Northwest corner of Sanderson and Menlo Avenues (Prince of
21 Peace Church)
22 PLANNER: Maureen Losey
23 DESCRIPTION: The applicant is requesting to establish a co-location for a wireless
24 telecommunications facility on an existing 67.5-foot Monopine.

25
26 Assistant Planner Maureen Losey presented the project to the Commission and reminded them that
27 they approved the original pine, now they want to add 12 additional antennas, painted to match.
28 She advised the Commission that the project substantially complies, and that staff is
29 recommending approval.

30
31 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 7:15 p.m.

32
33 Steve Olson, Starbridge Communications, addressed the Commission and described what the
34 intentions were regarding the project. He explained that the antennas that they are seeing in the
35 pictures are not theirs, they belong to Sprint PCS. He stated that they brought theirs in, and they
36 substantially comply.

37
38 The public hearing closed at 7:18.

39
40 Commissioner Hicks questioned whether the only way to hide the additional antennas was with
41 additional branches. Assistant Planner Losey confirmed that was correct.

42
43 The public hearing re-opened at 7:20 p.m. so that Steve Olson could respond.
44

1 Mr. Olson prefaced his response by talking about stealth, stating that there are lots of ways that
2 an antenna can be concealed.

3
4 It was MOVED by Commissioner Hicks and SECONDED by Commissioner Rhoten to continue the
5 item and direct it back to staff.

6
7 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

8
9 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Commissioner Hicks, and Commissioner Rhoten.

10 NOES: Commissioner Jones

11 ABSTAIN: Commissioner Calkins

12 ABSENT: None

13
14 **C. TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 31697**

15 APPLICANT: Dr. Milan Chakrabarty

16 LOCATION: South side of Florida Avenue, approximately 300-feet east of Santa
17 Fe Street

18 PLANNER: Maureen Losey

19 DESCRIPTION: The applicant is requesting to create a one (1) lot condominium
20 map for an approved medical office facility.

21
22 Assistant Planner Maureen Losey presented the staff report to the Commission and explained
23 some of the details of the project.

24
25 Chairman Duistermars opened the public hearing at 7:25 p.m.

26
27 Mr. MacIntyre, 26076 Dumont Road, Valle Vista, informed the Commission that he owns lots 9, 10,
28 and 11, adjacent to and to the east of the subject property. He stated that he is familiar with the
29 project and is 100% in favor of it. He added that it is apparent that the Doctor has adequate
30 parking behind his building, and it is a good use for the land.

31
32 H. A. Frick, 41581 Johnson Ave., Hemet, addressed the Commission as the Engineer on the
33 project and stated that he concurred with the Contractor of the shift of 2-inches, and would like the
34 Commission to consider the change.

35
36 Marge Tandy, 1885 Plain Creek, Hemet, addressed the Assistant City Attorney and stated that
37 there was a City Council vote earlier that afternoon pertaining to this project, and at that time, they
38 were not aware of this condominium map request.

39
40 Mr. Vail clarified for Ms. Tandy that the action of the Redevelopment Agency was to direct staff to
41 bring back a modified agreement. He stated that the council has not approved it and assured her
42 that it would come back.

1 Karen Miller, 2750 Vista Way, Hemet, addressed the Commission and stated that she owns the
2 building across the street from the project site and is concerned with parking and traffic. She
3 advised that the accident potential is unbelievable, and has witnessed multiple accidents in that
4 area already. Commissioner Jones asked if she realized that this was just going to be a medical
5 office.

6
7 A discussion ensued regarding parking issues in the area.

8
9 Chairman Duistermars closed the public hearing at 7:33 p.m. and asked for a motion.

10
11 It was MOVED by Commissioner Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Hicks to approve the
12 project as presented.

13
14 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

15
16 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, and Commissioners Calkins, Hicks, Jones, and Rhoten

17 NOES: None

18 ABSTAIN: None

19 ABSENT: None
20
21

22 VII. WORK STUDY:

23
24 Work study items A, B, and C were removed from the Agenda.

25
26 **A. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31807 – Matthew Bassi**

27 A proposal to subdivide 60.5 acres into 249 single-family lots within the 'Rancho
28 Diamante Specific Plan area.

29
30 **B. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31808 – Matthew Bassi**

31 A proposal to subdivide 95.8 acres into 408 single-family lots within the Rancho
32 Diamante Specific Plan area.

33
34 **C. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31737/ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-14 – Maureen Losey**

35 A proposal to subdivide 19.0 acres into 19 single-family lots (1-acre lots) and a zone
36 change from A-1-C-1 & A-2-C-5 to A-1 (light agricultural) located on the
37 northwest/southwest corner of Palm and Commonwealth Avenues.

38
39 **D. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 03-13 – Maureen Losey**

40 A proposal to develop 90-bed assisted care facility for the elderly, located on the north
41 side of Stetson Avenue, approximately 300-feet east of Gilbert Avenue.
42
43
44

1 Assistant Planner Maureen Losey explained to the Commission that there were some fire concerns
2 when this went before the Staff Review Committee on November 10, and the applicant knows that
3 the plans need to be revised.

4
5 Chairman Duistermars mentioned that with 98 units, it seems a little dense. He instructed Planning
6 Director Masyczek to make sure there was adequate visitor parking.

7
8 The Commission voiced their concerns with parking, age restrictions, and the extensive
9 landscaping that would be required.

10
11
12 **VIII. PLANNING DIRECTOR ITEMS:**

13
14 No items planned at the time of agenda preparation.

15
16
17 **IX. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS:**

18
19 Commissioner Jones brought up some of the concerns of the people downtown. Commissioner
20 Calkins mentioned that he still has concerns regarding commercial and industrial fencing, and
21 stated that he is seeing all sorts of weird things on Stetson, and on State Street south of Stetson,
22 and on Kirby. Planning Director Masyczek added that we can put that issue on the first meeting
23 in January.

24
25 **X. ADJOURNMENT:**

26
27 It was MOVED by Commissioner Jones and SECONDED by Commissioner Hicks to adjourn the
28 meeting at 8:46 p.m. to the regular meeting of the City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled
29 for Tuesday, December 26, 2003.

30
31 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

32
33 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Commissioners Calkins, Hicks, Jones, and Rhoten

34 NOES: None

35 ABSTAIN: None

36 ABSENT: None

37
38
39 _____
Chairman, Bob Duistermars

40 ATTEST:

41
42 _____
43 Myrna Kasick, Minutes Secretary
44

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

**Planning Commission Minutes
December 2, 2003**