

CLOVIS PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
June 25, 2020

A modified meeting of the Clovis Planning Commission was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chair Hatcher in the Clovis Council Chamber.

Flag salute led by Chair Hatcher

Present: Commissioners Bedsted (via Webex), Cunningham, Hinkle, Chair Hatcher

Absent: Commissioner Antuna

Staff: Dave Merchen, City Planner
Orlando Ramirez, Deputy City Planner
Ricky Caperton, Senior Planner
Maria Spera, Planning Technician II
Sean Smith, Supervising Civil Engineer

MINUTES

1. The Commission approved the May 28, 2020, minutes by a vote of 4-0-1.

COMMISSION SECRETARY

Deputy City Planner Orlando Ramirez announced the July 10th celebration of PDS Director Dwight Kroll's retirement and inquired as to who among the commissioners was chosen to speak at this event. Chair Hatcher stated that Commissioner Antuna had expressed her desire to do so via email, though Commissioner Hinkle also volunteered.

City Planner Dave Merchen, in a follow-up to discussion from the previous meeting regarding limiting future rental in a single-family housing project, informed that the City had examined the issue and determined that to impose such a condition is unlawful and opens the City to actions from various parties, and therefore such should not be considered by the City now or in the future.

City Planner Merchen informed that the City Council had echoed comments from the previous Planning Commission meeting requesting feedback on reviewing the large environmental document sections in the recent agenda packets. He provided details on changes to the packets in response to these comments as well as details on the relation between these studies and the Initial Study document, as an assurance that the Commission is not expected to read the entirety of the technical environmental studies unless they have specific questions that are answered by the technical studies.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS COMMENTS

Commissioner Hinkle stated that the previous meeting's discussion regarding rental control had been misunderstood, providing clarification on the actual intention behind the discussion and suggestion.

COMMUNICATIONS AND REFERRALS

Items of correspondence related to Agenda Item X-3.

BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

CONSENT CALENDAR

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. Consider Approval - **Res. 20-26, CUP2019-014**, A request to approve a conditional use permit for establishment of a government facility in a business campus setting with associated customer service and parking for the property generally bound by Peach, Dakota, a portion of Airways Blvd, Villa and Ashlan Avenues. County of Fresno- Department of Social Services, applicant; Cook Land Company, property owner; Arc Tec, representative.

Deputy City Planner Orlando Ramirez presented the staff report.

Commissioner Cunningham inquired as to the potential calls for service for this area from the Clovis Police Department and a comparison between that number and the current calls for service at the Walmart South (Shaw and Peach) and Walmart North (Herndopn and Clovis) locations. Deputy City Planner Ramirez responded with information provided by the Police Department.

Commissioner Cunningham inquired as to whether this project would cross geopolitical boundaries, especially the proposed south parking lot. Deputy City Planner Ramirez responded in the affirmative, providing details.

Commissioner Cunningham followed up with an inquiry as to whether any conditions added by the Commission would impact the area within the City of Fresno jurisdiction. Deputy City Planner Ramirez responded that staff will be working closely with the City of Fresno to ensure the area is developed per requirements.

Commissioner Hinkle informed that he had had the same question regarding parking and access, seeking and receiving confirmation that this issue will not be considered by the Commission but rather will be worked out between the two cities during the site plan review process.

At this point, the Chair opened the floor to the applicant.

Yohanes Makmur with Cook Land Company informed the Commission that the site plan review packet for the south parking lot has been submitted to the City of Fresno, providing details then offering to answer any other questions.

Commissioner Cunningham inquired as to the number of parking stalls anticipated in the creation of the southern parking lot and if there will be any improvements made to the sidewalk or the crossing between this lot and the central parking lot. Mr. Makmur provided the number and details regarding the proposed improvements to both the sidewalk and the pedestrian crossing.

Commissioner Cunningham informed that page 28 of the agenda packet referenced bilingual signage, but no such signage was in sight when he drove the project area. Mr. Makmur responded that a guidance plan is under review and that they will look into bilingual provisions.

Commissioner Cunningham remarked that the 9-11 Memorial, an important monument, is close to this site. He expressed concern for the memorial, as he has seen graffiti on the buildings at the current Department of Social Services campus at the intersection of Shields and Millbrook. Todd Cook of Cook Land Company assured that they will remain the property owners and managers, and that they will take the matter seriously, providing details. Mr. Cook also expressed his gratitude to City staff from the top down for their hard work on and support for this challenging project.

At this point, the Chair opened the floor to those in favor.

There being none, the Chair opened the floor to those in opposition.

There being none, the Chair closed the public portion.

Commissioner Hinkle expressed gratitude for all the hard work done by the Cook Land Company to bring all of the branches of this county department together, which will make it easier to provide services to DSS clientele and in areas that are more comfortable than some of the current locations.

Commissioner Cunningham echoed Commissioner Hinkle's comments, adding that he worked with the Cook Land Company during the creation of the 9-11 Memorial. He expressed his appreciation for their hard work on that and on making this a beautiful campus that will streamline the County's social services.

At this point, the Chair reopened the floor to the applicant for rebuttal.

Mr. Cook expressed appreciation for the comments recognizing the hard work that was put into this project and assured that their intention is to make something that all will be proud of. In conclusion, he is in support of this project.

Commissioner Bedsted echoed comments of fellow commissioners, and expressed appreciation of the Cook Company's commitment to care for the memorial. In conclusion, he is also in support of this project.

At this point, a motion was made by Commissioner Cunningham and seconded by Commissioner Hinkle to approve CUP2019-014. The motion was approved by a vote of 4-0-1.

3. Consider items associated with approximately 52 acres of land located in the southeast area of Leonard and Barstow Avenues. Glen H. Millhollin and Darlene A. Millhollin, Trustees of the Millhollin Family Trust, property owners; Bonadelle Neighborhoods, applicant; Harbour & Associates, representative.
 - a. Consider Approval, **Res. 20-27**, A request to approve an environmental finding of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for General Plan Amendment GPA2020-001, Prezone R2020-001, & Vesting Tentative Tract Map TM6304.
 - b. Consider Approval, **Res. 20-28**, GPA2020-001, A request to amend the General Plan to re-designate approximately 34 acres from the Low Density Residential (2.1 to 4.0 DU/Ac) classification to the Medium Density Residential (4.1 to 7.0 DU/Ac) classification.
 - c. Consider Approval, **Res. 20-29**, R2020-001, A request to prezone approximately 34 acres from the County AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural) Zone District to the Clovis R-1-PRD (Single-Family Planned Residential Development) and approximately 18 acres from the County AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural) to the Clovis O (Open Space Conservation) Zone District.
 - d. Consider Approval, **Res. 20-30**, TM6304, A request to approve a vesting tentative tract map for a 217-lot single-family subdivision on approximately 34 acres of land.

Senior Planner Ricky Caperton presented the staff report.

Commissioner Bedsted requested elaboration on the proposed masonry walls. Senior Planner Caperton provided an explanation regarding the masonry walls and fences.

Commissioner Cunningham sought and received confirmation that though there are lots within the flood plain, staff will work with FEMA to mitigate the risk to those properties. Supervising Civil Engineer Sean Smith further confirmed that there will be many steps taken in the process to ensure that those homes are protected.

Commissioner Hinkle inquired as to whether the reduction in home numbers for this project affects the City's RHNA numbers. Senior Planner Caperton responded in the negative.

Commissioner Hinkle inquired as to the extent of the developer's responsibility for landscaping. Senior Planner Caperton provided an explanation.

Commissioner Hinkle inquired as to the fate of the existing homes in the proposed park area, confirming that current residents would be able to sell their homes anytime to anyone. Senior Planner Caperton provided a detailed explanation.

Commissioner Hinkle referenced previous discussions regarding access from the driveway to the five-foot side yards of proposed subdivision lots and inquired as to whether the paving of this area is being considered with this project. This is a concern for him as residents leaving trash

toters in driveways or the streets degrades the desired look of these subdivisions. Senior Planner Caperton responded that staff has no mechanism at this time to require such, and therefore it is the choice of the developer to pave or not.

Commissioner Hinkle inquired as to whether the temporary turnabout on the south end of Hermosa Avenue will be installed with this project or with the tract map to the south. Senior Planner Caperton responded that when the tract to the south develops, it will connect there, but that for now it will remain a stub street.

Commissioner Hinkle sought and received confirmation that the temporary access will be off of Las Rosas Avenue and that there will be some form of temporary road, regardless of the state of relations between the two developers, even if that means waiting for the development to the south to go through.

Commissioner Cunningham remarked that there appeared to be a parcel at the southwest corner of the subject area belonging to TM6181 that seemed to be in danger of becoming landlocked by TM6304. Senior Planner Caperton responded that staff and the applicant are aware of the issue and assured that there are conditions in place to ensure the parcel will have access of some kind.

At this point, the Chair opened the floor to the applicant.

John Bonadelle of 7030 N. Fruit Avenue, Suite #101, provided background on the proposed project, then John Bonadelle Senior addressed some of the issues brought up the commissioners and the matter of neighborhood outreach.

At this point, the Chair opened the floor to those in favor.

Correspondence from Jeff and Dawnlynn Suglian in support of the project was read and then placed into the record.

At this point, the Chair opened the floor to those in opposition.

Betty Kemp of 5333 N. Highland Avenue expressed gratitude to staff and the Commission for their efforts in ensuring compatibility between developments and their surroundings, then informed that one of her neighbors believes that the project has already been approved with the process being a mere formality. She expressed dissatisfaction with the neighborhood meeting notice sent by the developer, the current lack of standards for those notices, and, as a result, the lack of viability of the first neighborhood meeting in her view, as well as with the proposed medium density of the project, preferring low density development in this area. In addition, she expressed confusion over the combination of several entitlements into a single project item, stating that it appears that the project is being rushed. She concluded by requesting a continuance of the project to provide more time for the neighbors to work with the applicant.

Larry Miller of 5157 N. Highland Avenue stated that details are easy to overlook in a project this complex, following up by informing that some of his objections were removed when the applicant

stated that the project would not move forward if the temporary access through the orchard cannot be secured. He expressed dissatisfaction with the neighborhood meeting notice, the mitigated negative declaration, and the traffic study. He then provided details regarding the effect the project would have on his internet service, informing that he has been discussing the problem with the developer but there is no agreement yet. Due to the short notice to the neighbors and the unresolved issues, he requests a delay in the project.

Paul McKenney of 5277 N. Highland Avenue informed that he too did not get a notice for the neighborhood meeting, expressing his belief that the problem of the neighbors in that regard is more with the City than with the applicant. He stated that he had attended one of the meetings and that the applicant had been very helpful and cooperative, as opposed to other developers doing whatever they want no matter what.

Stephen Lee of 5215 N. Highland Avenue expressed that he had some concerns and informed that he had not been notified of the original neighborhood meeting. However, at the second meeting, the applicant making concessions was something he had not been expecting, in contradiction to a similar meeting he attended several years ago. He concluded by expressing appreciation for the applicant's efforts in working with the neighbors.

Jeff Suglian of 5389 N. Highland Avenue, author of the correspondence earlier read into the record, reiterated that though he enjoys the rural lifestyle and does not want development behind his neighborhood, he accepts that such is inevitable. He also expressed appreciation for the applicant's good faith efforts in listening to and addressing the neighborhood's concerns, and he hopes that this will continue going forward, including when future development occurs to the south.

At this point, the Chair closed the public portion.

At this point, the Chair reopened the floor to the applicant.

Mr. Bonadelle elected not to take the opportunity for rebuttal.

Commissioner Hinkle informed that he has served on the Planning Commission for eight years and that in that time, almost all projects brought for consideration have had multiple items together. He requested that Mr. Miller keep an open mind as Mr. Bonadelle works with him. He then informed the members of the public that they should be grateful to Mr. Bonadelle for working with them and reducing the number of houses, as there are bills in committee currently in the state capitol that will take control of such development away from the cities and give it to state-appointed committees that may care more for their agenda than for the local history and lifestyle. In conclusion, he expressed gratitude to Mr. Bonadelle for working with the neighborhood, as he has seen many instances where developers would not make concessions. He is in favor of the project.

Commissioner Cunningham echoed Commissioner Hinkle, then expressed gratitude to the members of the public for attending and sharing concerns or appreciation. Though he has served on the Commission for only four years, he has in that time seen successful joint ventures

between developers and neighbors, leading to everyone winning. He informed that staff will look into improving the notification process, but that going strictly by the law, Mr. Bonadelle has exceeded requirements. He detailed concessions the applicant has made, stating that those indicate a desire to be a good neighbor on the developer's part. He concluded by commending the developer on working with the neighbors and encouraging them to continue doing so.

Commissioner Bedsted assured Ms. Kemp and the other members of the public that the project's approval or denial has not been pre-decided and that the Commission wants to hear from property owners. He informed that he personally desires to see concessions from developers and surrounding property owners with projects. Though he understands that not everyone will get the outcome they desire, enough compromise can make things favorable for both parties, which he is in favor of. Based on everything he has heard, the developer wants to be a partner with the neighbors and he expressed appreciation for the concessions made. He concluded by expressing his confidence that with subsequent dialogue further concessions may be made, and he is in favor of this project.

Chair Hatcher echoed her fellow commissioners in stating that a single project will often have multiple items together and that there is no foregone conclusion regarding how a vote will go. She expressed her belief that the applicant has worked hard with the neighbors and has made many concessions, whereas many projects that are more hotly contested have come before the Commission with little collaboration between applicant and neighbors. She expressed her apologies that many did not receive the first neighborhood meeting notice but also her faith that City staff will come up with set guidelines for notification. She detailed several details that were present in this project that the Commission has previously pushed for in other project. She concluded by stating that the developer has done a good job and she too is in favor of this project.

At this point, a motion was made by Commissioner Hinkle and seconded by Commissioner Cunningham to approve a finding of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for GPA2020-001, R2020-001, & TM6304. The motion was approved by a vote of 4-0-1.

At this point, a motion was made by Commissioner Hinkle and seconded by Chair Hatcher to approve GPA2020-001. The motion was approved by a vote of 4-0-1.

At this point, a motion was made by Commissioner Hinkle and seconded by Chair Hatcher to approve R2020-001. The motion was approved by a vote of 4-0-1.

At this point, a motion was made by Commissioner Hinkle and seconded by Chair Hatcher to approve TM6304. The motion was approved by a vote of 4-0-1.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT AT 7:38 P.M. UNTIL the Planning Commission meeting on July 23, 2020.



Amy Hatcher, Chair