

PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES OF MARCH 18, 2008

THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF HEMET PLANNING COMMISSION WAS CONVENED BY CHAIRMAN DUISTERMARS ON TUESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2007 AT P.M. AT THE CITY OF HEMET COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 450 EAST LATHAM AVENUE, HEMET, CALIFORNIA.

Present: Chairman Bob Duistermars, Vice Chairman Nick Jones, Commissioners Rick Crimeni, Wigsbert Mendoza and Mayzelle Rhoten

Absent: None

Staff Present: Brian Hann-Planning, Bernard Chase-Planning, Richard Masyczek-Planning Director, Tom Jex-City Attorney,

Invocation and Flag Salute: Commissioner Rick Crimeni

I. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

II. AMENDMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA

CUP 08-002 Burger King moved to the April 1st Meeting

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Project: ANNEXATION NO. 05-152, SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 05-002 & ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. NO. 05-013 [CANYON TRAILS]

Applicant: McRae Group of Companies c/o Ron McRae

Agent: Tom Nieves – AEI-CASC

Location: Adjacent to the northern boundary of the Heartland Specific Plan “Four Seasons” and bestriding California Avenue to the northeast

Planner: Brian Hann, Assistant Planner

Description: A request for a Planning Commission work study to consider the proposed project and receive public comments on the pre-zoning and annexation of a 394-acre area containing the Maze Stone Village mobile home park, three adjoining residential parcels (8.8 acres), and the vacant lands of the proposed Specific Plan No. 05-02 development area (363.3 acres) adjoining the City along the northern boundary of the Heartland Specific Plan No. 88-01 "Four Seasons" in order to determine the zoning to be established under proposed Annexation No. 05-152 and to review Environmental Impact Report No. 05-13 for Specific Plan No. 05-02

Staff Presentation:

Richard Masyczek - spoke about the issues this evening and the recommendation is to hear comments and continue to the April 15, 2008 meeting.

Public Hearing Discussion with Applicant and Representatives:

Chairman Bob Duistermars opened the public hearing at 8:00 p.m. and closed at 9:02 p.m.

Sam Alhadeff, 41607 Margarita Rd, Temecula California – Compiled a summary of responses to issues raised at the March 4, 2008 PC work-study meeting.

Kelly Black, 41607 Margarita Rd, Temecula, CA – Gave presentation regarding Tab 9 of the summary of issues document provided to staff and Commissioners, entitled question and answer chart.

Wes Alston, Peacock Street, Moreno Valley, CA - 32 years county fire dept. 20 years in fire protection and planning. Fire chief in Moreno Valley. Only fire in 10-year period that burned through project site. Success rate of initial attack has been very successful in extinguishing fires. Secondary access is one of the first things, CA improved to a 54' wide street and protected by fuel modification, second access through Heartland tract (tab 27).

Vice Chairman Nick Jones – asked about 2000 cars coming out and fire resources going in?

Wes Alston – responded that his presentation would address this

Wes Alston – We can talk about protection in place. There will be a 100' fuel modification zone. The wind is the driving factor in moving the fire down hill. Consistently in this valley fires do not move as fast or burn as hot down hill. The idea behind this tract is to leave the residents in place and let the fire defense systems mitigate the fire. With the two points of access and the fire protection systems we believe this is a stand-alone project that can withstand fire. Animal evacuations- this particular project provides a place for the animals to be evacuated to in the event of a disaster. "R.E.A.R.S." (Riverside Emergency

Animal Rescue System) trained volunteers from various law enforcement agencies will evacuate and stage the animals in a designated safe area. The project also contributes to a new fire station and this will reduce response times and initial success rates and enhanced medical aid.

Vice Chairman Nick Jones – Wes is a personal friend and has also had a past business relationship. Asking if you have looked into all of the ramifications. If the fire had occurred with winds at 125 mph would the fire have spread with this project in place?

Wes Alston - In the extreme wind conditions there are two things: the winds have to settle to a 20' level

Vice Chairman Nick Jones – what if there was criminal intent involved with multiple points of origin and the 150 mph winds - would the residents be able to evacuate?

Wes Alston – When you increase wind speed it creates longer flame lengths but not higher BTU's and with the fire systems in place it reduces flame lengths and BTU's. With the existing structures it gives the residents a safe place to evacuate to.

Vice Chairman Nick Jones – what impact would large clouds retaining the smoke have on the canyon?

Wes Alston – Creates an inversion and need to evacuate but normally but it is generally the winds that create greater danger.

Vice Chairman Nick Jones –do you really think in your expert opinion do you think 2000 people will fit in the 19-acre park

Wes Alston – we wouldn't evacuate 2000 people, the idea is protect in place

Vice Chairman Nick Jones – do you really feel people would stay in place and not panic and evacuate

Wes Alston – Yes, the whole point of this exercise is to protect in place

Vice Chairman Nick Jones – The articles I have read are emphatic about two points of ingress and egress, do you really feel this is adequate

Wes Alston – proper signage and trained volunteers and structures designed to protect in place

Commissioner Mayzelle Rhoten – what about the people in Mazestone?

Wes Alston – Is not aware of the current response time

Commissioner Rick Crimeni - what is the response time now and if the new one is built?

Dave Van Verst, Fire Marshal – 7 minutes now and would be 5 minutes

Chairman Bob Duistermars – I did not see a requirement to build a new fire station

Richard Masyczek – the requirement is part of the environmental mitigation measures to build and man a new fire station. Approx. 1.3 million to build and staff a fire station.

Chairman Bob Duistermars – protection in place, heard a speech regarding protection in place and said the exercise was a disaster and the residents fled the area. Would like to see some kind of calculation of what would happen if all of the residents did indeed evacuate. Some discussion needs to be had with the fire dept regarding this scenario.

Dave Van Verst, Fire Marshal – This topic was discussed; his opinion is that the two access roads will provide adequate evacuation routes for emergency vehicles, horse trailers and cars. Very comfortable with the fire protection mechanisms put in place for this project

Vice Chairman Nick Jones – the exits require to be primary exits not emergency exits

Dave Van Verst, Fire Marshal – One is a primary and the other through K. Hov. is an emergency exit

Vice Chairman Nick Jones – do you feel they would be safe

Dave Van Verst, Fire Marshal – I feel they would be safer with the project then it is now

Commissioner Wigs Mendoza – Have you ever shared these designs with the fire marshal in Riverside county? And were they accepted?

Wes Alston – No I have not with these same conditions but similar scenarios were presented and they were accepted

Sam Alhadeff – read an article from the NC Times regarding protection in place

Vice Chairman Nick Jones – responded with his own information regarding the San Diego wild fires stating that the Bing Crosby example relayed by Sam Alhadeff at the last meeting is 1.48 miles wide and Reinhardt Canyon is only .8 miles wide from ridge to ridge.

Sam Alhadeff – reiterated what Cash Hovivian - said that he had 10 signatures from Mazestone. Indicated there were 16 signatures. Claims letters were put in the resident mailboxes indicating there would be children to play on the streets and start fires, etc... Refuting other information provided by other speakers opposing the project at the last work-study meeting.

Vice Chairman Nick Jones – How does all this effect our decision as a Planning Commission?

Sam Alhadeff – it affects your judgment with regards to the petition submitted

Vice Chairman Nick Jones – we would like to hear about the environmental issues we have asked about

Mike Naggar – Spoke with regards to the EIR issues that were brought up at the last meeting. The EIR was independently composed and is the property of the City and impartial. The mitigation measures are quite intense. Spoke about the land development and it's consistency with the surrounding areas.

Mike Naggar – the general plan as current in County of Riverside would provide for up to 498 homes if an application was submitted to the county. 5 acre lots would not be compatible with the Heartland Specific Plan. Understands the equestrian uses of the park would need to be positioned as far away from Mazestone as possible. Several community meetings have been held with the residents of Heartland, Mazestone and other residents of the canyon. Traffic – California is going to be widened to four lanes but will be striped to two per public works. He also stated he was willing to work with the residents.

Vice Chairman Nick Jones – have you been told by EMWD that you need to find you own water source and have you received

Mike Naggar – No EMWD has not told us we need find another source

Vice Chairman Nick Jones – is part of the Mazestone septic system on the canyon trails property and have the residents been told that if they do not approve the project they will not have their system

Mike Naggar – answered question, that MOU was already in place to replace their system to sewer when available at Canyon Trails expense.

Commissioner Wigs Mendoza – disclosed he has met with Mr. Naggar and some of the residents previously. How would you mitigate the fire dangers while construction is ongoing?

Mike Naggar- we have EIR mitigation measure that says that the fire station needs to be in place by the 200th home permit to have the station built, staffed and equipped.

Richard Masyczek – there are two kinds of activity in this kind of projects. The fire dept has put in place the condition that the fire station needs to be operating before any activity requiring combustible materials are brought onto the site

Richard Masyczek – read the EIR mitigation measure that declares that before the first residential building permit is issued they will have a temporary fire station operating to comply with the City's General Plan requirement for emergency response time of 5 minutes or less.

Chairman Bob Duistermars – add language to the Specific Plan if it has not already been done

Sam Alhadeff – Thanked the Commission for listening.

Vice Chairman Nick Jones – asked about the 68 homes that were supposedly approved by the County

Sam Alhadeff – The previous general plan allowed 68 units but the new updated General Plan allows for more units.

Public Comments:

1. Bonnie Specht, 590 Olazabal – Four seasons residents moved into to live in a country environment. Quality of life threatened by development. Opposed to annexation. More traffic, pollution and crime. The evacuation plan proposed by the project is dangerous to Four Seasons elderly residents. Documents given to clerk for distribution to the Commissioners ⁱ
2. Terry M. Smigun, 24515 Calif. #20 – Mazestone Village resident. Asked about the 900,000 cubic yards of aggregate removed from the site stated in the EIR. Also asked about the grading permits and the impact on residences
3. David Perrault, 649 Weir – Four Seasons Resident – Keep in mind that he suffers from COPD and significant other is undergoing Chemotherapy. The air quality hazards created by the existing project and the proposed project are unbearable. Blasting is also a concern to the existing residents along with the traffic and overall air quality. Has 5 questions for the board – is this a place you would want to live? Is this...? Would you want your elderly parents to reside with this in their backyard? Subtracting from my quality of life. ⁱⁱIs this fair to residents? Does this help community longevity?
4. _____ – Mazestone Village Resident – Wording in MOU can be considered bribery and intimidation. Question for Mike Naggar? Is the McRae group going to sue Mazestone Village if they oppose project. ⁱⁱⁱ
5. Sharon Deuber, 585 Parwevik Dr, Hemet – Four Seasons Resident presented current evacuation plan. Streets are designated for resident use. Evacuation plan as proposed will utilize the same assets utilized currently by Four Seasons residents in an evacuation situation. ^{iv}

Vice Chairman Nick Jones – is she correct are using this street and the curbs in Four Seasons to evacuate

Richard Masyczek – yes, further explanation

Dave Van Verst, Fire Marshal – We have no intention of evacuating 4400 people through that route. When the plan was designed it was not designed to evacuate 4400 residents but the “at risk” residents

6. Susanna Rodriguez, 24515 Calif. Ave Sp # 59 – Mazestone Village Resident – Re; Good Faith and Relationship Mike Naggar spoke about. Those were closed door meetings with the seven development committee members and residents were not given minutes. Dealt with only 7 committee members. Money does not buy our vote. Good faith was only done buy seven people. Secretary of the development committee and was not allowed a copy of the minutes or any notification of the meetings.

7. Bob & Linda Morriss, 460 Langer Ct, Hemet – Four Seasons resident – Impression is that this is being hustled through the process. A minimum of seven turns within their proposed evacuation route and it’s flawed. There have been several meetings and this is the first he’s heard of it. Mike Naggar stated that Four Seasons was in favor

8. Gary Bieber, 24515 Calif. Ave. #50, Hemet CA – Mazestone Village Resident – Mazestone Village easements in place when property was purchased by the McRae group. Why would Canyon Trails state that they would have to move.....Several questions regarding the easements and Was part of development committee and spoke with regards to the minutes.^v

9. Tony Criscenti, 214 Furyk Way, Hemet CA – Four Seasons resident and Board of Directors Member – It has been said that 4 Seasons residents are in favor of the project when indeed they are not. This annexation has generated over 600 signatures opposing this proposed project.

10. Jeanette Bieber, 24515 Calif. Ave. Sp. 50, Hemet CA - Mazestone Village Resident – Are the McRae group going to file a 1099 form for any of the proposed improvements to the Mazestone Village as this would burden the residents^{vi}

11. Russ Brown, 8259 Parry Dr., Hemet – Four Seasons resident – several years of experience with responding to wildfire situations. Fire agency officials have continually urged Planning Commissions to revise their fire standards. Evacuation plan does not take into consideration human behavior Currently Hemet is not an approved^{vii}

12. Edith Hasse, 24515 Calif. Ave. #37, Hemet – Mazestone Village Resident – Red Cross disaster volunteer for 26 years. In favor of the proposed project and annexation and believes it will help the infrastructure

13. Pam Rousseau, 209 Furyk, Hemet CA – Four Seasons Resident - Spoke about her qualifications regarding kids. Spoke about the lack of counseling services and/or supervised activities for children. The bus system is also inadequate to service the amount of proposed homes. Opposed to project. Gave several statistics regarding in support of her comments.^{viii}

14. Ray Packham, 23985 Calif. Ave. – Spoke regarding the general Plan Update survey available on our website and its findings regarding what the citizens had to say. Water will not reach the first dirt road; he has done the research and tried to have EMWD bring him water. The amount of traffic generated. Laying a freeway in the backyard of these people.^{ix}

15. Jeff Specht, 590 Olazabal – A long Time Real estate agent - Spoke regarding real estate value. This is not an upscale community and the values they are quoting are not accurate for the size they are proposing. There are also too many available homes in Hemet. Who is going to pay for the streets? Who is paying for the for the fire station

16. George Walton, 24515 Calif. Ave #10, Hemet CA – Sports the development and the annexation but would like to see an age restricted component especially near Mazestone Village

17. Clay Wilson, 456 Olazabal Rd, Hemet – RE Broker, Has questions regarding 5 acre parcels already existing. Could have put in 2 to 3 acre parcels that would fit with the surrounding area. 92 homes would be perfect; they could fit in the area and still make a profit.^x

18. Lois Hild, 24310 Three Springs Rd, Hemet – Address the secondary evacuation plan proposed, she gave it a try today with a non-emergency situation and only two cars on the street. With the streets not as wide as they should be and with a class A driver it was still extremely difficult. Showed an exhibit showing the issue at the very first turn. Also showed several other exhibiting the issues stated.

19. Brett R. Grundl, 24951 Calif. Ave, Hemet CA – House 2.5 acres not 2 acres as stated by Mike Naggar. 578 of the proposed homes are ¼ acre and are not compatible with the current residences. Stated issues with the lot and home sizes proposed in consideration of the surrounding area.

20. D. Joy Gould, 23746 Calif. Ave, Hemet – Above the first dirt road. Was not satisfied with answers received in the mail. Had a concern about the widening of the road and who would pay for it and get it done. Fire hazard is the main concern with horse trailers and will not be able to make the curves in the exit

plan. Has over 700 signatures in opposition to the project and it's not in the best interest of the community.

21. John Eddy, 127 Lopez Way, Hemet CA – 18 days ago left to take up residence in Four Seasons. They left to move here to avoid traffic, clean air and He feels this project endangers those issues. Also concerned about crime and that is why they moved to low density populations.

22. Marsha Kennedy, 394 Casper Dr. – Concerned about how this annexation will affect the city. Gave statistics regarding the population and crime rates given to the rotary club by the police dept. Spoke regarding the McRae group's website and goals, provided copies of the web page in question. More police protection required for the additional number of homes proposed. ^{xi}

23. Ingrid Poehler, 8245 Pavin Ln, Hemet – 4 Seasons Resident – Spoke regarding the fact or myth exhibit provided by McRae group. Member of Community response team. Hearing tonight that their community will be used as a secondary egress, how will they take care of themselves and then additionally the other community residents. The fire station should be paid for by the developer and the developer alone. Will the tax increase realized by the City be enough to cover the fire station and other City services?

24. Steve Bovee, 24515 Calif. Ave #58, Hemet – Chairman of the Mazestone Developer Committee – 68 meetings that the committee has and only 3 meetings were missing the rest have been published. Was present and gave a report at all monthly board meetings except three. Worked in good faith with Mike Naggar. Supports the project.

Commissioner Rick Crimeni – how many attended the meeting

24. Steve Bovee – about 25

25. Tom Joy, 8324 Maroyana Dr, Hemet CA – Prior CHP officer – observed traffic at Calif. and Devonshire Ave. Sneaker traffic avoiding Florida Ave... ^{xii}

26. Doris Hokett, 24515 Calif. Ave #15, Hemet – Mazestone Village Resident – Believes the project is in the best interest of Mazestone Village. Believes they have a very good relationship with the McRae group and supports the project

27. Allen Fuller, 35480 Pony Trail RD, Hemet CA – Spoke regarding shelter in place. If you go on-line and do research there is not a consensus on this in the fire prevention world. Quoted the former Fire Marshall of the State of Calif. The CFD says there is no such thing as fire safe building.

28. Reggis Sherman, 23801 Calif. – 29 year resident. - Questions 10 and 11 spoke regarding the second access required. Stated California Avenue is not adequate and the majority of the residents will exit onto California Avenue. Currently one lane with a hard curb.

29. Sharon Carou, 615 Parnevik Dr., Hemet - 4 Seasons Resident – Earthquake disaster and impact. Currently about 8 minute response time. Opposing annexation and project.

30. Julie Smith, 24515 Calif. Ave #45 – Mazestone Village resident – read ballot given to residents and says people were intimidated to sign in favor of annexation. Opposes annexation and development.

31. Richard Shirek, Western Land Co., 2740 Pachea Trail, Hemet – Owns over 320 acres and supports the opposition and petition. Spent several occasions with EMWD and other agencies regarding the water and says they have no intention of supplying water

32. Gerri Rogers, 24515 Calif. Ave. Sp. 48, Hemet CA – Mazestone Village resident – opposes the development. Has COPD and cancer. Has no intention of testing the theory of protect in place

33. Wayne Norton, 40661 Vera Ct, Hemet CA – spoke regarding the McRae group and their website and entry level homes. There's no transition between entry level homes and current residences. Wants to preserve the flavor of the horse areas. Plenty of land in the valley they could build^{xiii}

34. Cash Hovovian, 35051 Tres Cerritos, Hemet CA – there is ½ acre zoning currently in Reinhart Canyon. Gave information on previous developments proposed to the county at the same site. In 2000 there was a project approved for 70 lots with 2 ½ acre lots. Quoted the Riverside County Principal Planner. Quoted Riverside County Fire Moratorium from EMWD regarding water service.^{xiv}

35 – Don Digby – Has issues with protect in place and “Firewise”. Supplied information on what’s going on in the North County. Says that “Firewise’ did not address 100 mile an hour winds. Every person he spoke to says protect in place gives a false sense of hope.

36. Robert Lopez, 23935 Calif. Ave., Hemet – opposes annexation and canyon trails project. Reiterates what everybody else has said.^{xv}

37. Virginia Lopez, 23935 Calif. Ave – opposes canyon trails and annexation

38. Sherri West, 23295 Beech St., Hemet CA – Quoted Abraham Lincoln, please listen to the people that have been spoken, the approx. 200 people that showed up to oppose the annexation and the canyon trails development. Why is the developer more important then the over 1000 residents that oppose the development?

39. David Smith, 24515 Calif. Ave. #45, Hemet CA – Mazestone Village resident, against annexation and development. Spoke regarding support from Mazestone

Village. Over 50% of the residents oppose the annexation. Says several residents are being bullied to support the annexation. Says the McRae Group is offering the residents money in exchange for property and the annexation vote.^{xvi}

40 President of Mazestone Village – Claims this development will go through either through the county or the City. If it goes through the County the only loser will be Mazestone Village.

Vice Chairman Nick Jones – asked what they would lose if it went through the county

40. Jim Gannon, 29515 Calif. Ave 5, Hemet – If the annexation does not go through we lose the money from the McRae Group to pay for improvements

41. Kathy Smigun, 24515 Calif. Ave #20, Hemet CA. – Mr. Alhadeff insinuated there has been undue pressure to sign the petition. Says in fact it has been the other way around.^{xvii}

42. H.E. West, 23295 Beech St, Hemet CA. – Certified Appraiser, Concerned about property values especially if they get entry level houses in the area.

43. Beau Day, 565 Olazabal, Hemet CA – Spoke regarding concerns about evacuation routes, certified aerial.... You're not going to get any aerial fire fighters into that area.

44. Jack Schlaman, 25100 Thoroughbred Ln. – Are you familiar with Tres Cerritos. Check out the area. We have camels, buffalos and zebras. We have so much to lose if the area is developed.

45. Joyce Ivers, 24210 Three Springs Rd., Hemet CA – Spoke about concerns with air quality and is against Canyon Trails and the annexation

Vice Chairman Nick Jones – Tab 15 stopped at 1995 is there something after that?

Sam Alhadeff– yes and we will furnish that

MOTION:

1. It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Mayzelle Rhoten to continue the meeting open to the April 15, 2008 meeting, and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Commissioner Rick Crimeni.

The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote: 5-0

AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Crimeni, Mendoza and Rhoten

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

It was **MOVED** by Chairman Bob Duistermars to continue the current meeting passed the 9:00 p.m scheduled time and continue to hear the remaining agenda items., and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Commissioner Mayzelle Rhoten
The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote: 3-2

B. Project: EXTENSION OF TIME NO. 06-001 FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 02-7A

Applicant: Rico Enterprises, Inc.

Agent: Craig Heaps

Location: North side of Acacia Avenue, between Sanderson and Acacia Avenues

Description: A request for Planning Commission review and approval of an extension of the time during which use in reliance can be established for the previously approved design, construction, and operation of a senior, multiple-family residential project in two phases, with 240 dwelling units in 21 buildings, along with carports and garages, recreation facilities, and appurtenant site improvements, on a 270,288-square foot site

Staff Presentation:

The staff report was presented by Assigned Planner who provided various details and exhibits regarding the proposed project.

Chairman Bob Duistermars opened the public hearing at 8:56 p.m. and closed at 8:59 p.m.

Public Hearing Discussion:

None

MOTION:

1. It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Wigs Mendoza to approve EOT 06-001 and adopt Resolution No. 08-007., and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Commissioner Mayzelle Rhoten.

The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote: 4-0

AYES: Chairman Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Crimeni, Mendoza and Rhoten

NOES:

ABSTAIN: Vice Chairman Nick Jones

ABSENT:

IV. WORK STUDY

- A. Project: **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 08-002 (BURGER KING)**
Applicant: Jerry W. Kittrell Trust
Agent: Frank Nin
Location: Southwest corner of Florida Avenue and Yale Street
Planner: Bernie Chase, Associate Planner
Description: A request for Planning Commission work study review of a conditional use permit allowing the construction and operation of a 2,681-square foot drive-through restaurant on an outter-parcel within an existing shopping center site

Removed from agenda and re-scheduled for the April 1, 2008 meeting

V. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Project: **SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW NO. 07-009**
Applicant: Woodside Homes/Woodside McSweeny 148
Agent: Woodside Homes/Woodside McSweeny 148
Location: Phase 1 of McSweeny Farms - NEC Gibbel Road and State Street
Planner: Carole Kendrick, Assistant Planner
Description: Architectural review of 40 SFR within TM 32717-3 of MCSweeny Farms

MOTION:

1. It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Wigs Mendoza to adopt Resolution No. 08-009 denying SDR 07-009, and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Commissioner Mayzelle Rhoten.
The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote: 3-0
AYES: Chairman Bon Duistermars, Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Crimeni, Mendoza and Rhoten
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

B. Meeting Minutes of December 18, 2007

MOTION:

1. It was **MOVED** by Commissioner Wigs Mendoza to approve as presented, and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Commissioner Mayzelle Rhoten.
The **MOTION** was carried by the following vote: 3-0
AYES: Vice Chairman Jones and Commissioners Mendoza and Rhoten
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Chairman Bon Duistermars and Commissioner Crimeni
ABSENT: None

VI. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

None

VII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

None

VIII. ADJOURNMENT:

It was **MOVED** by Chairman Bob Duistermars, **SECONDED** by Chairman Bob Duistermars and unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting to the regularly scheduled meeting of the City of Hemet Planning Commission scheduled for ***Tuesday, April 1, 2008 at 6:00 p.m.*** to be held at the City of Hemet Council Chambers located at 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hemet, California, 92543.

**Bob Duistermars, Chairman
Hemet Planning Commission**

ATTEST:

**Michele Carothers, Minutes Secretary
Hemet Planning Commission**

Note: All Planning Commission meetings are digitally recorded. Copies of these recordings, in their entirety, on compact disc are available upon request from the Planning Department. Contact (951) 765-2375 for more information.

Note: Copies of all referenced documents submitted by the Applicant and/or the public are hereby incorporated into this record and are available for review.

-
- ⁱ Submitted 175 page document for the Planning Commissions consideration.
 - ⁱⁱ Submitted 3 page document for the Planning Commissions consideration.
 - ⁱⁱⁱ Submitted 18 page document for the Planning Commissions consideration.
 - ^{iv} Submitted 11x17 laminated map document for the Planning Commissions consideration.
 - ^v Submitted 2 page document for the Planning Commissions consideration.
 - ^{vi} Submitted 1 page document for the Planning Commissions consideration.
 - ^{vii} Submitted 3 page document for the Planning Commissions consideration.

-
- viii Submitted 4 page document for the Planning Commissions consideration.
 - ix Submitted 5 page document for the Planning Commissions consideration.
 - x Submitted 2 additional petition signatures in opposition of the proposed project
 - xi Submitted 1 page document for the Planning Commissions consideration.
 - xii Submitted 2 page document for the Planning Commissions consideration.
 - xiii Submitted 7 page document for the Planning Commissions consideration.
 - xiv Submitted 123 page document for the Planning Commissions consideration.
 - xv Submitted 23 page document for the Planning Commissions consideration.
 - xvi Submitted 1 page document for the Planning Commissions consideration.
 - xvii Submitted 1 page document for the Planning Commissions consideration.