

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
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2002

THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION WAS CONVENED BY CHAIRMAN DUISTERMARS ON TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2002 AT 6:06 P.M. AT THE CITY OF HEMET COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 450 EAST LATHAM AVENUE, HEMET, CA.

Roll Call: Chairman Bob Duistermars and Commissioners Jim Calkins and Mayzelle Rhoten; Commissioner Jones present at 6:10 p.m.; Commissioner Hicks present at 6:16 p.m.

Absent: None

Staff Present: Senior Planner Joanna Crombie, Assistant Planner Maureen Losey, Planning Director Richard Masyczek, Assistant City Attorney Eric Vail, Minutes Secretary Nancie Shaw and City Engineer Roland Trietsch

Invocation and Flag Salute: Commissioner Calkins

I. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

There were no amendments or additions to the agenda.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR:

A. MINUTES

1. November 19, 2002

Chairman Duistermars pulled the November 19, 2002 Minutes from the agenda and addressed the fact that Line 22 on Page 4 should read:

“Vice Chairman Hicks” instead of “Vice Chairman Duistermars”.

With that change, he asked for a motion.

It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Calkins and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Rhoten to approve the consent calendar as amended.

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

AYES: Chairman Duistermars and Commissioners Calkins and Rhoten

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Vice Chairman Hicks and Commissioner Jones

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

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

Commissioner Jones joined the meeting at 6:10 p.m.

1
2
3 **IV. HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT UPDATE:**
4 Facilities, Sandy Packham.

Report given by HUSD Director of

5
6 Sandy Packham, Director of Facilities for the Hemet Unified School District reported to the Commission
7 that school district had their bid opening for the new middle school today, and that they were very excited
8 that the bids had come in at budget. She advised the Commission that they would be going before their
9 governing board on December 17, 2002 and that construction was scheduled to begin on January 6,
10 2003. She further advised the Commission that they would soon be getting their invitations for the
11 groundbreaking ceremony.

12
13 Ms. Packham reported that she would be leaving for Sacramento on the following day for a training
14 session on the Proposition 47 regulations and how the school district can apply for the new monies that
15 are available. She advised the Commission that the new AB1506 Labor Compliance rules would be
16 going into effect on January 1, 2003, and that the school district would be reviewing those rules to ensure
17 that they would be in compliance with them. She stated that the distribution of the Proposition 47 monies
18 that were due to come in on December 11, 2002 had been delayed until December 18, 2002, but that
19 they were on the list to receive these monies which was good news.

20
21 Ms. Packham advised the Commission that the new school board was currently working on bid packages
22 for Cawston Elementary, which would go out to bid on March 3, 2003, with the bid opening on April 3,
23 2003, and construction beginning in May of 2003. She stated that the school, which would be located on
24 the corner of Cawston and Menlo Avenues, would be scheduled to open in September of 2004.

25
26 Ms. Packham reported that the school district had spoken with the City Council last week regarding the
27 potential school site at the Hemet Stock Farm, as well as some property north of that site. She stated
28 that they would be working with the City on both of those sites, and were planning to meet with them on a
29 number of issues and joint ventures related to those properties. She advised the Commission that the
30 school district was currently in the process of testing the Hemet Stock Farm site, and that they had mailed
31 out "Permission to Enter" letters to the owners of the property to the north, and were waiting for
32 permission so that they could proceed with tests of that site.

33
34 Ms. Packham advised the Commission that the Department of Education would be coming into town on
35 December 18, 2002 to look at those two sites, as well as another potential Jacob Weins school site, and
36 some potential new high school sites in the northwest part of the district. She stated that they were
37 moving ahead with those new schools.

38
39 Ms. Packham addressed Chairman Duistermars, advising him that the school district was currently
40 working on the master plan and hoped to have a draft done by the end of January 2003.

41
42 A discussion ensued regarding the areas surrounding the Hemet Stock Farm site.

43
44 Chairman Duistermars expressed some concern regarding the tough gang area around this site, and
45 asked if this were the only open ground available for a school site.

46
47 Ms. Packham responded that it was. She explained that the school district had looked at three other sites
48 outside of the Jacob Weins boundary, and had even considered expanding the boundary in order to allow
49 the consideration of those sites for the school, but had then discovered that all three of those sites were
50 on earthquake faults, and thus had to be excluded from the selection process. She stated that the Hemet
51 Stock Farm site and the site to the north of it were the only two sites left in the Jacob Weins boundary that
52 could be considered without condemning property and relocating residents.

53
54 Chairman Duistermars suggested that developing a school next to a senior community and up the street
55 from a known drug inhabited area could be a problem

1
2 Ms. Packham responded that she felt the entire boundary could be somewhat of a challenge, due to the
3 demographics, but that the school district would need a 10 to 12 acre site for the school, and that they
4 were trying to avoid condemning an entire city block and relocating all of the families from that block in
5 order to accommodate that need. She stated that they would definitely be open to suggestions.

6
7 Chairman Duistermars stated he had some grave concerns with that particular area, and that the City is
8 often the recipient of problems downstream.

9
10 Commissioner Calkins asked if the school district would encompass the entire Stock Farm site.

11
12 Ms. Packham responded that they would not. She stated that they were testing the entire property, but
13 that the primary site that they were considering was at the southeast corner of the Stock Farm property,
14 and that the alternative was a 12 acre site to the north.

15
16 The Commission thanked Ms. Packham for her report.

17
18 Vice Chairman Hicks joined the meeting at 6:16 p.m.

19
20
21 **V. PUBLIC MEETINGS:**

22
23 **a. MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT 02-15**

24 _____ APPLICANT/OWNER: Covenant Development
25 Inc.

26 _____ PROJECT LOCATION: Northwest corner of
27 Kirby and Commonwealth Avenues

28 _____ PROJECT PLANNER: Maureen Losey

29 PROJECT DESCRIPTION: A request for Planning Commission review and
30 approval of the site development, architectural elevations, landscaping and wall plans for
31 Tentative Tract Map No. 29581 located at the southwest Corner of Kirby and
32 Commonwealth Avenues.

33
34 Assistant Planner Losey presented the staff report, explaining some of the details of the proposed project
35 to the Commission, including the fact that the incorrect location had been indicated on the report, which
36 should be the "Northwest" rather than the "Southwest" corner of Kirby and Commonwealth Avenues. She
37 advised the Commission that Staff had been working with the applicant, and felt that they were in
38 compliance with all of the conditions of approval.

39
40 Chairman Duistermars asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the project.

41
42 Since there were none, Chairman Duistermars asked for a motion.

43
44 It was MOVED by Vice Chairman Hicks and SECONDED by Commissioner Jones to adopt **Resolution**
45 **No. 02-35** approving Miscellaneous Project 02-15.

46
47 The MOTION was carried by the following vote:

48
49 AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Hicks and Commissioners Calkins, Jones and
50 Rhoten

51 NOES: None

52 ABSTAIN: None

53 ABSENT: None
54
55

1 VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS:
2

3 A. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 01-1 / SPECIFIC PLAN 01-2 / ZONE CHANGE
4 01-4 - McSweeney Farms Specific Plan

5 APPLICANT/OWNER: Patricia McSweeney-
6 McCauley and Nora P. McClure

7 AUTHORIZED AGENT: Thomas Olsen

8 PROJECT LOCATION: Southeast corner of
9 State Street and Gibbel Road in unincorporated Riverside
10 County within the City of Hemet sphere of influence.

11 PROJECT PLANNER: Joanna Crombie

12 PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The adoption of a General Plan Amendment, Zone
13 Change, and Specific Plan to pre-zone 673± acres in anticipation of annexation to the
14 City of Hemet. The proposed project would allow development of up to 2,227 dwelling
15 units, including both single-family and multi-family homes; commercial and multi-use
16 areas; a school site; active and passive parks/open space; and drainage facilities.
17

18 Chairman Duistermars advised the audience that this item was being changed from a public hearing to a
19 public meeting, due to the fact that the Commission did not have all of the necessary information to
20 review the project prior to the meeting. He further advised that when the project was rescheduled for a
21 future public hearing, a new notice would be mailed out to the applicable residents. He explained that he
22 had been advised by Assistant City Attorney Vail that he should open and then close the public hearing.
23

24 Chairman Duistermars opened and closed the public hearing at 6:22 p.m.
25

26 Chairman Duistermars advised the members of the audience that those of them who were present to
27 speak regarding this project should line up at the lectern and that each would be given 3 minutes for their
28 questions and comments.
29

30 Sandy Packham of the Hemet Unified School District, 2350 W. Latham Ave., Hemet, California
31 approached the lectern and advised the Commission that the school district had met with the agent for
32 the McSweeney project, and that they had reached an agreement for the provision of an elementary school
33 site and a five-year option for a middle school site. She explained that the agreement had been based on
34 the fact that the project had been downgraded from 2200 units to 1800 units, and that if that was not the
35 case, the agreement may not be valid.
36

37 Brenda Scott, 29290 Girard St., Hemet, California, approached the lectern and advised the Commission
38 that she was a resident near the proposed McSweeney development, and that she wanted to be heard.
39 She explained how she and several of her neighbors had formed a group called the "Diamond Valley
40 Country Coalition", which was composed of approximately 150 people who were trying to preserve their
41 rural lifestyle. On behalf of the group, she expressed their concern with the density of the proposed
42 McSweeney project, stating that it was inconsistent with the Riverside County General Plan, and that there
43 was no transition of density from the rural area that was adjacent to the project. She further expressed
44 their concern regarding the water supply for such a large project, as well as emergency services, traffic,
45 wildlife, the fact that the area is in a flood plain and many others. She advised the Commission that the
46 group had constructed a website that listed their various concerns. She explained that while they were
47 not opposed to progress, they
48

49 would like to reach some kind of common ground regarding the issues that they had with the proposed
50 McSweeney project.
51

52 Pat Hanz, 41480 Polly Butte Drive, Hemet, California approached the lectern and explained the location
53 of her property relative to the proposed project. She advised the Commission that she was a professor at
54 the Menifee campus of Mount San Jacinto College, and that she had made a commitment to stay in this
55 community two years ago when she and her husband had purchased their property and invested

1 everything they had into their home. She explained that they had built their home with their own hands,
2 and that she did not consider it to be a "house on a street", but a "retreat" that they want to go to at the
3 end of the day when they leave their jobs in education. She suggested that there is a counterintuitive
4 motion of unfunded growth in the State of California, and that it is a fragile state of affairs for the
5 educational system, that would not be solved and could not be changed by adding more students to the
6 population. She stated that 15 years ago communities were concerned with bringing people to them in
7 order to ensure prosperity, but that society has arrived at a time that calls for a different perspective. She
8 told how she drives every day across the valley to Menifee where she sees homes that are larger in
9 square-footage than the lots that they are built on. She expressed her concerns with traffic congestion,
10 unfunded growth in the schools, losing the peacefulness of a healthy environment, the water and air
11 quality being threatened, the fear of the possibility of fires in the area and being trapped behind a sea of
12 roofs, but most of all the loss of the community spirit that is present in all of those members of the group
13 known as the "Diamond Valley Country Coalition".
14

15 Sonya Fichen, 40100 Avis Rd., Hemet, California, approached the lectern and advised the Commission
16 that she was a mother and a real estate agent who had moved to the Diamond Valley area 10 months
17 ago to get away from city life. She explained that she loved the area that they live in, and that her
18 children enjoy biking in the hills and getting away from television. She stated that this way of life was a
19 great way to raise children and that she was concerned that, should the proposed McSweeny project be
20 approved, it would be taken away. She expressed her concern with increases in traffic that would
21 ultimately mean her children would no longer be safe on their bicycles. She suggested that the proposed
22 plan would be creating "bedroom communities" with latchkey kids, which raised various other concerns as
23 well.
24

25 Penny Pribbenow, 40366 Vista Rd., Hemet, California, approached the lectern and advised the
26 Commission that her family had been residents of the Diamond Valley area for 4 ½ years and did not
27 want to see their community change. She stated that if the surrounding area had to be developed, she
28 would like to help see that the neighborhood maintained its country atmosphere. She inquired regarding
29 how far the project was in the LAFCO process.
30

31 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the Specific Plan needed to be approved by the City Council
32 as a "pre-zoning" project, prior to being submitted to LAFCO, so at this point in time there had been no
33 formal LAFCO submittal.
34

35 Ms. Pribbenow asked if there were a time frame as to when that submittal might occur.
36

37 Planning Director Masyczek responded that the time frame would depend on the outcome of tonight's
38 meeting.
39

40 John Hoak, 40375 Walnut St., Hemet, California, approached the lectern and advised the Commission
41 that he had resided at this address for over 25 years. He stated that he was basing his reaction on his
42 perception of the proposal. He expressed his confusion about the different maps, and advised the
43 Commission that he had noted that the lot sizes in the proposal were smaller than what he was told were
44 the allowable minimum lot sizes in the City of Hemet. He suggested that if lot sizes of this small size were
45 not permitted within the City limits, it did not make much sense to him why they would be allowed in a
46 rural area. He expressed his concern that while the current residents are accustomed to the smell and
47 flies that go with ranches and farm areas, he suspected that many of the potential new residents would be
48 expecting more of a "city" type of lifestyle, and would end up complaining about the smell and the flies.
49 He further expressed his concern that State Street is a major corridor in and out of the City of Hemet, and
50 that traffic would be a great concern if this development were to be approved. He stated that he did not
51 want to see State Street turn into another Winchester Road, nor did he want to see the quality of life that
52 the residents of the area currently have, be changed.
53

54 Tim Young, 42405 Avery Canyon Road, Hemet, California approached the lectern and addressed the
55 Commission regarding the Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan, and the fact that it was necessary to

1 purchase land to compensate for environmental impacts. He stated that 673 acres of land were being
2 affected by this project, and that in March 2003, the County of Riverside would be increasing their
3 litigation fees from \$472 to \$821 per acre. He stated that the County would lose out on a great deal of
4 money if this project were approved before March 2003, and that somebody would have to pay those
5 fees, and he was concerned that it would end up being the current property owners. He advised the
6 Commission that his concern was multifaceted, explaining that the City has stated that they are expecting
7 thousands of visitors each day for the new recreation plan that is associated with Diamond Valley Lake,
8 which was already a cause for traffic concern, and that this project would make the traffic issue an even
9 greater concern.

10
11 Ann Sugar, 2091 Avenida Estrada, Hemet, California, approached the lectern and advised the
12 Commission that she resided within the Valle Hermosa community, which was composed of mostly 2
13 bedroom homes that were not on 5 acres of land, and were not worth \$250,000. She suggested that this
14 development would change the character of the community as a whole, as one development after another
15 seemed to be going in, and that for those in the community with ordinary lives, this character change was
16 perceived as a threat. She explained that some of her particular concerns included the adverse
17 environmental impacts regarding traffic, pollution, air quality, habitat and waste. She suggested that each
18 of these issues would create adverse effects and would require overriding, which she strongly objected
19 to. She stated that traffic is already extremely dense on Florida Avenue, as well as many other streets,
20 and that this concern should not be overlooked. She inquired regarding who would pay for the new
21 signals that would be required, asking if it would be the taxpayers in general or the citizens moving into
22 the proposed new homes. She stated that she was also very concerned with the inevitable pollution that
23 the mountains surrounding our community tends to hold in, and asked what would be done about this
24 issue. She then expressed her concern with the habitat whose homes would be taken from them, and
25 explained that we should be empathetic with the fate of those animals. Finally, she expressed her
26 concern with the water supply, and the fact that with the water shortage, the price of water had greatly
27 increased already..

28
29 Joanna Adams, 40854 Gibble Rd., Hemet, California approached the lectern and advised the
30 Commission that she was a lifelong resident of the City of Hemet, who had lived on Gibbel Road since
31 she was 6 months old. She stated that she loved the country lifestyle that her neighborhood offered and
32 that if she had wanted to live in the City she would have moved into a more urban area. She suggested
33 that she was not opposed to growth, but that if development was going to occur in this neighborhood, she
34 would like to see it comparable to something that was already there.

35
36 Kelly Ashman, 40911 Gibbel Rd., Hemet, California, approached the lectern and advised the Commission
37 that she was a member of the Diamond Valley Country Coalition, and that she was opposed to the
38 proposed development. She distributed a copy of her letter that she claimed had been omitted from the
39 staff report, and asked that it be added to the record. She stated that she would like to see alternate types
40 of developments considered by the Commission. She suggested that by lowering density and eliminating
41 the multi-family portion of the project, along with the small lot sizes, the proposed development would be
42 much more acceptable to the surrounding residents and the community as a whole. She stated that the
43 members of the Coalition would like to see development that is consistent with what is currently
44 developed.

45
46 Belinda Horne of Applied Earthworks, 3292 E. Florida Ave., Hemet, California approached the lectern and
47 addressed the Commission, stating that she was present to discuss cultural resources relative to the
48 McSweeney Farms project. She stated that while she respects the quality of work that had been
49 completed in the Environmental Impact Report, she felt that the portion relative to cultural resources was
50 inadequate. She explained that she had done extensive research on the cultural resources of this area,
51 and that she believed that the site had served as an Indian village location, and that it held many artifacts
52 that would qualify it as a sacred site. She advised the Commission that the site was listed on the registry
53 of historic resources, and that in-place preservation may be the only feasible way to maintain the cultural
54 value of this site.
55

1 Kevin Galt, 39789 Vista Rd., Hemet, California, approached the lectern and advised the Commission that
2 he concurred with the concerns of the other neighborhood residents. He referred to various communities,
3 suggesting that their layout could be considered as more appropriate for development in this area. He
4 stated that the current plan of development provided for an insufficient transition of density, which was of
5 great concern. He explained that he did not want to see Hemet turn into another congested Temecula,
6 that he likes to listen to the coyotes at night, that he enjoys riding his horses through the hills, and that he
7 was extremely concerned over the possibility of losing his rural lifestyle. He suggested that any new
8 development should be similar to what is already developed. He explained that many of the residents felt
9 that, because of the ramifications, this had come on very quickly, and that he would like to suggest that
10 approval of the project be delayed so that alternate types of development could be considered.
11

12 Daniel Mirana, 40560 Starlight Mesa, Hemet, California approached the lectern and advised the
13 Commission that he has resided at this address for 6 years. He stated that one of his concerns is that the
14 street lights from the new development will take away the starlight view that he has from his home. He
15 further stated that he is also unhappy with the transition of density, and that while he respects the
16 McSweeny's right to develop, he hopes the concerns of the surrounding residents will be considered.
17

18 Alison Burke, 39980 Saddle Ridge Rd., Hemet, California, approached the lectern and advised the
19 Commission that she has lived at this address for 25 years. She stated that she would like to re-submit
20 her letter that had been omitted from the staff report, and distributed copies of it to the Commission. She
21 expressed her concern that other letters may have been omitted as well. She explained to the
22 Commission that she and her neighbors like the "dark" at night, that they don't need concrete sidewalks
23 or sewers, and that she thinks that the McSweeny's should do a feasibility study on one-acre parcels
24 without sidewalks & streetlights.
25

26 David Thomas, 41329 Gibbel Rd., Hemet, California, approached the lectern and advised the
27 Commission that he works in Winchester making cheese. He expressed his concern regarding what is
28 done with the kangaroo rat fees that are collected when development occurs.
29

30 Tony Greer, 30459 Stephanie, Hemet, California, approached the lectern and expressed his concern that,
31 with developments such as this one, Hemet might become another Murrieta, with lots of kids who had
32 nothing to do. He questioned what would happen to those kids. He shared with the Commission that he
33 had come across an eagle while walking through the hills near his home, and expressed concern
34 regarding what would happen to the eagles and other wildlife if so many people move into their
35 community.
36

37 Steven Craig, 40100 Avis Rd., Hemet, California, approached the lectern and advised the Commission
38 that he felt the proposed project was a bad idea because there are already enough houses in his
39 neighborhood, as well as enough traffic. He stated that he loves his neighborhood and asked the
40 Commission to please not change it.
41

42 Commissioner Jones asked Mr. Harley Garbani if he would give the Commission an update on his
43 knowledge regarding the site for the proposed development.
44

45 Harley Garbani, Saddleback Mobile Home Park, 1536 S. State St., Hemet, California, approached the
46 lectern and advised the Commission that he had been collecting records regarding this site for many
47 years. He stated that, as Ms. Horne of Applied Earthworks had said, the site is culturally valuable. He
48 described the arrowheads that had been found there, and how you could see where campfires were
49 burned over many, many years. He described some of the areas surrounding the project site that had
50 proven to be great archaeological sites. He stated that some of those sites were no longer there, and that
51 he would like to see this site preserved.
52

53 Belinda Horne of Applied Earthworks re-approached the lectern and advised the Commission that there
54 were several avenues that the developer could take regarding the project site. She suggested that it
55 could be preserved as an open space area within the development property, or the McSweeny family

1 could be asked to donate the site to one of two non-profit organizations that she was aware of – the
2 Archaeological Conservancy or the Pechanga Band of Mission Indians – which would be a tax write-off.

3
4 Planning Director Masyczek advised the audience that tonight had been a public meeting, and that the
5 next step in the process would be a public hearing before the Planning Commission, at which time the
6 Environmental Impact Report, the General Plan Amendment and the Specific Plan would be reviewed.
7 He stated that those residents within 1000 feet of the project site would be notified of the public hearing,
8 and that it would be advertised in the newspaper. He suggested that anybody who was not already on
9 the notification list could be added to it by e-mailing the project planner, Joanna Crombie, at
10 Jcrombie@cityofhemet.org, or mail their request to Ms. Crombie at 445 E. Florida Avenue, Hemet,
11 California, 92543. He assured the audience that all comments would be considered and addressed. He
12 explained that so many comments had been received thus far, that the Commission had not yet had
13 sufficient time to review them. He further explained that once the public hearing was held before the
14 Planning Commission, they would recommend either approval or denial of the project to the City Council.
15 He stated that the project was not currently within the city limits, and that any approval was merely a pre-
16 zoning for a potential annexation. He explained that before the project could actually be developed the
17 applicant and the City would still need to go through the annexation process.

18 Beverly Banks, 30285 Morse Rd., Hemet, California, approached the lectern and advised the
19 Commission that she had moved to the area 2 ½ years ago after spending most of her life in Calexico
20 and Los Angeles. She explained that she had moved here to enjoy the peace and quiet of a smaller
21 community, and that she did not want to lose that.

22 The Commission thanked the audience for their attendance and advised them that they would be invited
23 back for the public hearing.

24
25 It was agreed to take a short break at 7:15 p.m.

26
27 The meeting resumed at 7:25 p.m.

28
29 Commissioner Jones asked for an update on the Guaranty Bank at the corner of Meridian Street and
30 Florida Avenue.

31
32 Planning Director Masyczek responded that they had been granted a temporary Certificate of Occupancy.
33 He explained that several things had not yet been completed, including the

34
35 installation of the landscaping, and that a permanent Certificate of Occupancy would not be issued until
36 all conditions had been met.

37
38 Planning Director Masyczek advised the Commission that the Community Development Committee
39 (CDC) would be meeting on a variety of standards, including the Residential Design Standards. He
40 stated that questions had arisen regarding the process that the City uses to develop approved projects,
41 and that a meeting was scheduled for December 16, 2002 to review the process. He explained that some
42 of the Departments seemed to be unaware of correspondence between other Departments and
43 developers.

44
45 Commissioner Calkins stated that somebody needed to monitor developments. He advised the
46 Commission that the County of Riverside's new design guidelines were very similar to those of the City of
47 Hemet.

48
49 Commissioner Rhoten inquired regarding what department would be responsible for making sure that
50 development is carried out as it is supposed to be.

51
52 Chairman Duistermars stated that he had understood that landscaping was a condition of occupancy.

53
54 Planning Director Masyczek responded with a "yes" and a "no", stating that the City of Hemet was
55 growing at a rapid pace and that many policies and procedures had not kept up with the growth of the

1 City. He explained that many staff members believe that the pace at which the City is moving is
2 incompatible with the pace of development, and that an agreeable level needed to be reached.
3
4

5 **VII. ADJOURNMENT:** It was MOVED by Commissioner Jones, SECONDED by Commissioner
6 Rhoten and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 7:34 p.m. to the regularly
7 scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, December 17, 2002 at 6:00 p.m. at
8 the City of Hemet Council Chambers, 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet, California 92543.
9

10
11
12 Chairman Bob Duistermars
13
14

15
16 ATTEST:
17
18

19
20 Nancie Shaw, Minutes Secretary
21