

CLOVIS PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
October 24, 2019

A regular 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 Antuna, Bedsted, Cunningham, Hinkle, Chair Hatcher

Absent: None

Staff: David Merchen, City Planner
Orlando Ramirez, Deputy City Planner
Ricky Caperton, Senior Planner
Lily Cha, Assistant Planner
Sean Smith, Supervising Civil Engineer
Claudia Cazares, Management Analyst
Eric Aller, Parks Manager

MINUTES

1. The Commission approved the September 26, 2019, minutes by a vote of 5-0.

COMMISSION SECRETARY

Deputy City Planner Orlando Ramirez informed that the Landmark Commons Fresno County Library project needs to be scheduled for Planning Commission but cannot accommodate the December 21st meeting date. He inquired as to whether the Commission would consent to an additional, special meeting on December 5th and, on receiving assent, stated that this would become an action item during the November 21st meeting.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS COMMENTS

Commissioner Antuna reported, at the applicant's request, that on Monday, October 21st, she and Commissioner Bedsted met with Valley Coastal Development. However, no discussion regarding a decision on the project (Item X-3) had taken place with either the applicant or with Commissioner Bedsted.

Commissioner Cunningham reported that he had attended the Clovis Citizens Academy, expressed gratitude to Chad McCallum for allowing him to attend, as had Chair Hatcher and Commissioner Antuna previously. He expressed that it was very informative and time well-spent, encouraging the other commissioners to attend at the next opportunity.

COMMUNICATIONS AND REFERRALS

Items of correspondence related to Agenda Item X-3.

BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

CONSENT CALENDAR

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. Consider items associated with approximately 21.52 acres of property located along the south side of Shepherd Avenue between Clovis and Sunnyside Avenues. John and Kristen Sobaje, owners; Lennar Homes of California, Inc., applicant; Yamabe & Horn Engineering, Inc., representative.
 - a. Consider Approval, Res. 19-40, A request to adopt an environmental finding of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for General Plan Amendment GPA2019-001, R2019-003, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map TM6263.
 - b. Consider Approval, Res. 19-41, **GPA2019-001**, A request to amend the General Plan and Herndon-Shepherd Specific Plan to re-designate from the Low Density Residential (2.1 to 4.0 DU/Ac) to the Medium Density Residential (4.1 to 7.0 DU/Ac) classification.
 - c. Consider Approval, Res. 19-42, **R2019-003**, A request to approve a rezone from the R-1-7500 (Single Family Residential – 7,500 Sq. Ft.) to the R-1-PRD (Single Family Planned Residential) Zone District.
 - d. Consider Approval, Res. 19-43, **TM6263**, A request to approve a vesting tentative tract map for a 137-lot Planned Residential Development.

Senior Planner Ricky Caperton presented the staff report.

Commissioner Antuna requested elaboration on the concerns and requests for a gated community. Senior Planner Caperton provided details.

Chair Hatcher followed up with an inquiry as to the presence of a police department condition requesting that the project be gated. Senior Planner Caperton responded that he had sent a supplement on Monday revising that condition, as it was mistakenly included and was intended for a different project.

Commissioner Hinkle sought and received confirmation, for the record, regarding which tract map is up for consideration tonight, as there appeared to be two, with one from the traffic control company and one from Planning staff.

Commissioner Hinkle inquired as to whether this project is already in the Community Facilities District. Senior Planner Caperton responded in the positive, providing an explanation.

Commissioner Hinkle sought and received confirmation that none of the existing homes currently on the properties are historic dwellings.

Commissioner Hinkle inquired regarding the movement of Pruess Avenue. Senior Planner Caperton provided an explanation.

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

Dirk Poeschel of 923 Van Ness Avenue, Fresno, on behalf of Lennar Homes, provided background on the applicant and the project.

Commissioner Hinkle inquired as to whether there would be charging stations for vehicles in all of the proposed home. He believes that there will be state requirements for such by the time this project is ready for construction. Mr. Poeschel responded that he believes that there will be such stations as there will be sockets in all garages. He also stated that car manufacturers are working on the technology, which means that it may have significantly changed by the time state legislation comes about.

Commissioner Hinkle sought and received confirmation that the driveways will be eighteen feet or more in length.

Commissioner Cunningham inquired as to the general price point for these homes. Mr. Poeschel responded that the houses will cost a minimum of \$200 per square foot, with the homes averaging 2,040 square feet in size. This will create expensive houses that many people in the Chamber will not be able afford.

Commissioner Cunningham explained that this is a concern to him, due to the current status of the northeast corner of this site as part of the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation and to the recent filing of litigation. In addition, this is the first of two projects before the Planning Commission this evening that will ask to overlook this requirement. Even though there is currently a surplus of home sites, this surplus is finite. Therefore, he requested an explanation of the thought process behind removing that property from the RHNA allotment. Mr. Poeschel provided a detailed explanation.

Commissioner Cunningham followed up by expressing concern regarding the request to amend the General Plan, as such exists specifically to plan for expansion, and this is the first of two such requests before the Commission for this meeting. Mr. Poeschel responded with a brief explanation.

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

Steven Jacobsen of 812 Beauregard Land expressed concern regarding green space for this area, stating that the park proposed for this project appears too small to be anything more than essentially a dog park, especially in comparison to the HOA-maintained parks in his subdivision. The Lennar project park west of Clovis Avenue is significantly larger than this proposal. He also expressed concern regarding the impact on Clovis Unified schools as well as the difference between the applicant's numbers and those he found from census data. Another concern of his is traffic impacts and a potential increase in crime.

Chair Hatcher confirmed that Mr. Jacobsen was intending to speak in opposition rather than in favor, then requested others wait until the floor is opened for opposition.

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

Steve Fitzgerald of 1123 Lester Avenue stated his opposition on the basis that the proposal for the project's green space is different than what had been promised previously, not meeting the General Plan, and the fact that the project concerned Clovis Unified School District. He objected to an increase in density and called for parks to be developed instead. He concluded with his belief that a gated community would make this a better project.

Joseph Smith of 1208 Everglade Avenue first provided the disclaimer that he had worked for Commissioner Cunningham in the Sheriff's office two decades ago. He objected to the density, stating while he understands the pressure State of California housing policy is exerting on the City of Clovis to increase housing density, but he moved to this area with the understanding that development of the subject site would be low density. As a member of law enforcement, he states that gating communities reduces crime, though he understands why Lennar would be reluctant to do so. After one of the neighborhood meetings with Lennar, he and a neighbor distributed flyers throughout the surrounding neighborhoods and was disheartened to hear that many people believed it would have no effect as the Planning Commission would side with the developer because of the financial impact to the City. Finally, he is concerned about how many students will actually be added to Woods Elementary School versus the number put forward by the applicant.

Gerry Galvin of 1097 Loyola Avenue expressed concern with the proposed density and the traffic problems it will create. As a law enforcement officer, he believes that more children walking on Clovis Avenue will be a problem as will the proposed circulation. He stated that the area has a low crime rate, which will be changed if the new community is not gated. He questioned Senior Planner Caperton regarding the average lot and home sizes of this project versus the Lennar project north of Clovis Avenue (TM6200) until Chair Hatcher intervened. Mr. Galvin concluded with an expressed wish to have larger lot sizes such as those in the other project, or at least more negotiation with Lennar.

Gary Oliver of 1810 N. Duke Avenue had been involved in the Herndon-Shepherd Specific Plan committee and had moved to this area based on the zoning outlined in the Plan. He expressed appreciation for Senior Planner Caperton's helpfulness in providing information, then objected

to the project based on lot size compared to the project on the north side of Shepherd Avenue (TM6200) and traffic concerns.

Commissioner Hinkle inquired as to whether Mr. Oliver would object to a project containing forty units per acre and standing forty feet high. Mr. Oliver responded that he likely would object as such is not likely consistent with the Herndon-Shepherd Specific Plan.

Tim Riordan of 1134 Riordan Avenue stated that the Herndon-Shepherd Specific Plan was created to guide the growth of the area, with previous project approvals making it possible for Lennar to put forward a proposal that needs more discussion due to how much it goes against the principles of the Plan. He urged the Planning Commission to stay committed to the Specific Plan and not breach the trust of the neighborhood community.

Kim Bigelow of 1850 N. Dupree Lane spoke against the project as she has not heard anything to assure her that the proposed houses will be in compliance with California Department of Forestry and Fire Department requirements regarding water storage and availability, or with the new Title 24 building codes taking effect in January regarding energy efficiency. She suggested possibly making the houses smaller than those proposed but make them more energy neutral.

Rich Nino of 1122 Lester Avenue expressed gratitude to the Planning Commission for taking the time to listen to the neighborhood, confusion over Mr. Poeschel's estimate for how many students this project will add to the school system, and his belief that precedent has already been set for either larger lots or gates (both of which he finds preferable to the current proposal) with the already existing developments in the area.

Chris Hansen of 1143 Lester Avenue expressed agreement with his neighbors' statements and informed that each time a project rezoning to the R-2 Zone District has been approved for this area previously, it created a gated community. He requested that this precedent be followed.

George Goddard of 1890 N. Duke Avenue expressed his admiration for Clovis then his belief that the heart of the neighborhood concerns is density. He stated that the small lot size will eventually lead to the project becoming a rental community, as happened with the Centex development, which will then lead to problems for the surrounding neighborhoods. He believes that gating the proposed community will resolve many of the neighbors' concerns such as traffic circulation.

Mike Elrod of 1299 Everglade Avenue explained that in the process of running along Shepherd Avenue, he has noticed that after Minnewawa Avenue communities have entries on Shepherd Avenue and is confused as to why this one cannot do the same. He expressed concern regarding traffic, child safety, and the impact to the local elementary school (and possible repercussions of such to the area families). He requested opportunity to continue conversation with Lennar in regards to several issues that have been previously mentioned.

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

Mr. Poeschel addressed the various issues brought up by the speakers.

At this point, the Chair closed the public portion.

Commissioner Cunningham inquired as to the applicant's willingness to work with the neighborhood and the extent of such willingness. Mr. Poeschel assured that they are absolutely willing to do so, then elaborated on the extent of that willingness.

Commissioner Bedsted remarked that the neighborhood appears willing to concede on the proposed density if the project is gated and expressed his concern regarding the project density's impact on schools in the area. Mr. Poeschel reminded about the removal of a potential multifamily project from density calculations for the school district.

Commissioner Bedsted followed up with a statement that the Planning Commission desires accommodations between the public and developers, particularly with infill projects, then inquired as to the applicant's willingness to take this project back to the neighborhood in an attempt to reach further accommodations. Mr. Poeschel responded in the positive, with the caveat that discussions must be productive.

John Binaski, City of Clovis Fire Chief, provided a detailed explanation regarding Fire Department requirements for access points and water services in regards to gating the community and water capacity for the houses. He also informed that density issues in terms of call volume and crime had been considered extensively by staff in 2018.

Commissioner Hinkle assured that, though the Trailhead Park is different from Centennial Park, it is still a park. He informed that the state government is promoting higher density housing, such as that found in San Francisco, in particular on infill lots such as this one, and that if the project is held off for five or six months, then the developer could potentially come back with a high density proposal. The legislation would not only prohibit neighborhood concerns from affecting outcome, it would also prohibit the Planning Commission from reviewing the project at all by making it by-right. He expressed concern that some people hold the opinion that the Planning Commission will simply go along with whatever developers want, as they have previously stopped projects or made the developers change them. The Commission is under pressure to comply with state legislation while also trying to balance it with maintaining Clovis values.

Commissioner Cunningham endorsed Commissioner Hinkle's comments, expressed gratitude to the audience for participating, and informed that the commissioners are essentially ordinary citizen volunteers. He informed that the Regional Housing Needs Allocation is part of the housing legislation mentioned by Commissioner Hinkle, requiring higher density, multistory apartments and condominiums that are by-right, and therefore unstoppable by either the Planning Commission or the City Council. Such issues are why the Commission encourages developers and citizens to work together on accommodations, but that both sides must have respect for each other and be willing to compromise. He also expressed personal reservations regarding general plan amendments that will nevertheless not prevent him from voting for this project.

A member of the audience called out an inquiry as to what recourse the City has against such state legislation. Chair Hatcher recommended speaking to Senior Planner Caperton for such information at a later time, reminding that the public portion of the project presentation is closed. Commissioner Cunningham informed that another venue would be to attend a City Council and present the question during the time devoted to allow items not on the agenda to be brought forward.

Commissioner Antuna requested elaboration regarding why access is not being allowed on Shepherd Avenue. Supervising Civil Engineer Sean Smith provided an explanation.

Commissioner Antuna expressed gratitude to the audience for participating in this process and the Commission's desire to hear their opinions. She concurred with Commissioner Cunningham regarding the potential fate of the site portion designated for higher density and expressed her opinion that the developer choosing not to take that route is beneficial. She expressed that general plan amendments do not happen often, and that they are a mechanism to make accommodations, even in specific plan areas, for the way growth actually occurs in the decades following the creation of specific plans or designations by general plans. Commissioner Antuna noted that the Fire Chief explained the reasoning behind not gating the project, and Lennar proposed a good product, and therefore she is in support of this project.

Commissioner Bedsted echoed his fellow commissioners' statements then admitted to struggling with the uncertainty regarding the ability of further discussions between the developer and the community to solve all issues brought up by the speakers. In particular, the concern regarding the impact of growth and development on the school system is something that will not change in the near future and needs to be planned for by Clovis Unified School District. Though he would like to see if further concessions can be made in this project, he stated that nothing will get done if people are not prepared to compromise. He concluded by requesting the audience consider the risk of by-right multifamily development going forward.

Commissioner Hinkle expressed gratitude for the public coming out and exercising their right to speak their opinion, then reminded that there will be another chance to be heard by the City Council, regardless of the Planning Commission's decision. He remarked that there have been changes in how projects are presented within the last year and that a beneficial feature of this proposal is the prevalence of sidewalks. Presence or lack of sidewalks impact buyers after they have purchased a home, possibly forcing people to move later in life. He expressed his appreciation for the lack of multistory multifamily development in the northeast section of the project site, and that he is in support of what he believes is a good development.

Commissioner Antuna returned to Commissioner Bedsted's wish to potentially allow more discussion between the developer and the community before a vote by the Commission. The first issue, regarding gating the community, was addressed by the Fire Chief. The second concern raised, regarding density, was addressed in that the developer is not building at the highest density they potentially could. Finally, the school district concern is something that neither party has control over. Therefore, she is ready to vote.

Chair Hatcher inquired as to whether the project could be gated if a way was found for there to be two points of entry. Fire Chief Binaski provided details regarding the difficulty of such in this location and confirmed that the Fire Department would be fine if it is something that can be worked out and agreed on.

Chair Hatcher inquired as to whether the applicant would be willing to continue the project in order to engage in further discussions with the neighborhood or would prefer to have the Planning Commission vote to have it on the record. Senior Planner Caperton interjected with a reminder that as the project includes a general plan amendment, the applicant is required to have another neighborhood meeting before the project goes to the City Council. Commissioner Cunningham also reminded that the Commission's decision is only a recommendation to the City Council. Senior Planner Caperton also offered clarification regarding the generation rates for the school district. Mr. Poeschel stated that they would like to proceed with the vote with the caveat that they would like to meet with staff regarding circulation alternatives, including an ingress point into Shepherd Avenue, providing detail on how that would likely affect their project.

Commissioner Bedsted expressed gratitude to Senior Planner Caperton for clarifying the requirement of another neighborhood meeting and to Mr. Poeschel for his willingness to entertain the neighbors' concerns. He supports bringing it to a vote.

Chair Hatcher expressed gratitude to everyone for participating in the process, even when things got somewhat contentious, and her disturbance regarding statements from speakers that they believed the Planning Commission had already made up its decision and is 'owned' by the developers. She refuted both statements, stating that the commissioners are ordinary citizens who could in the future be replaced by one of the people in the audience. Though she personally does not prefer the proposed product, she is aware that it is what the housing market calls for. She also stated that when buying a house next to a vacant lot, no one can promise it will be zoned the same as your property, encouraging research. She does not necessarily believe that gating makes a community safer and has some concerns regarding density; however, in the Clovis Unified School District there is no guarantee that your child will go to the school nearest your property or will even stay in the same school for the duration of their education. She concluded that she does not believe access onto Shepherd Avenue is a good idea.

At this point, a motion was made by Commissioner Cunningham and seconded by Commissioner Hinkle to approve a finding of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for GPA2019-001, R2019-003, and TM6263. The motion was approved by a vote of 5-0.

At this point, a motion was made by Commissioner Cunningham and seconded by Commissioner Hinkle to approve GPA2019-001. The motion was approved by a vote of 4-1.

At this point, a motion was made by Commissioner Cunningham and seconded by Commissioner Bedsted to approve R2019-003. The motion was approved by a vote of 4-1.

At this point, a motion was made by Commissioner Cunningham and seconded by Commissioner Bedsted to approve TM6263. The motion was approved by a vote of 4-1.

3. Consider items associated with approximately 42.39 acres of property within area bounded by Teague Avenue to the south, Powers Avenue to the north, between Temperance and DeWolf Avenues. John & Patricia Baldwin, Robert & Deborah Brach Brach, Vincent & Diane Genco, Vong & Mindy Her, James & Leanore McKoane, Janet Nicholson, Edward & Roxanna Stevens, James White, Delores Whitford, Valley Coastal Development LLC., owners; Valley Coastal Development LLC. –Drew Phelps, applicant.
 - a. Consider Approval, Res. 19-44, A request to adopt an environmental finding of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for General Plan Amendment GPA2019-004, Rezone R2019-005, Rezone R2019-006, Vesting Tentative Tract Map TM6264, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map TM6239.
 - b. Consider Approval, Res. 19-45, **GPA2019-004**, A request to amend the General Plan and Herndon-Shepherd Specific Plan to re-designate approximately 42.39 acres of property from Very Low Density Residential (0.6 to 2.0 DU/Ac) to Medium Density Residential (4.1 to 7.0 DU/Ac) classification.
 - c. Consider Approval, Res. 19-46, **R2019-005**, A request to approve a rezone of approximately 5 acres of property from the R-1-AH (Single Family Residential – 18,000 Sq. Ft.) to the R-1-PRD (Single Family Planned Residential Development) Zone District.
 - d. Consider Approval, Res. 19-47, **R2019-006**, A request to approve a rezone of approximately 37.39 acres of property from the R-1-AH (Single Family Residential – 18,000 Sq. Ft.) to the R-1-PRD (Single Family Planned Residential Development) Zone District.
 - e. Consider Approval, Res. 19-48, **TM6264**, A request to approve a vesting tentative tract map for a 36-lot planned single family residential development on approximately 5 acres of property.
 - f. Consider Approval, Res. 19-49, **TM6239**, A request to approve a vesting tentative tract map for a 170-lot planned single family residential development on approximately 39.39 acres of property.

Assistant Planner Lily Cha presented the staff report.

Commissioner Cunningham sought clarification regarding the extent of the paseo. Assistant Planner Cha provided explanation.

Commissioner Cunningham then inquired as to whether there is a RHNA overlay. Assistant Planner Cha responded in the positive, providing details.

Commissioner Antuna inquired as to the locations of sidewalks in TM6264. Assistant Planner Cha explained.

Commissioner Antuna followed up by seeking and receiving confirmation that there are only sidewalks along one side of the street inside TM6264.

Commissioner Hinkle sought elaboration regarding the safety of the design of the relocation of the Trenton Avenue trail. Assistant Planner Cha provided an explanation. Deputy City Planner Ramirez provided further clarification.

Commissioner Bedsted remarked that the area indicated by Commissioner Hinkle, on Attachment "A," appeared more as part of a sidewalk rather than a pass-through. Deputy City Planner Ramirez confirmed that staff is concerned about this area and will work with the applicant to bring it into compliance.

Commissioner Hinkle expressed concurrence with staff concerns regarding this area. Deputy City Planner Ramirez explained that Planning Commission approval would be tentative and that following final approval, the tract would be subject to the residential site plan review process and amended accordingly.

Commissioner Hinkle remarked that the three-foot setback for TM6264 recalls to his mind that several tracts in the Loma Vista area have that same setback which turned out to cause access issues for the Fire Department, leading to a four-foot setback being implemented instead. He questioned the return of three-foot setback after that. Fire Chief Binaski explained the Fire Department's points of consideration in relation to the three-foot setback.

Commissioner Hinkle stated that he was concerned also with the four-foot setback on the other side in relation to the storage of trash totes and first responder access to backyards. He had previously spoken to the police department and it is a problem for them, and he does not see how the Fire Department does not also have a problem with it. Fire Chief Binaski acknowledged that it is an issue that has been brought to the City Council many times, but that regardless of the provided guidance, Fire staff makes it work, remarking that the slope in front of the garage door, causing staff to trip. Additionally, the undeveloped side yard causes his staff more trouble.

Commissioner Hinkle followed up with an inquiry as to how many times Fire staff has had to move to the backyard with a charged hose because of fire movement and if the hose has to be uncharged. Fire Chief Binaski responded that nine times out of ten, Fire staff come in through the front door of the house, providing a detailed explanation of that response as well as an explanation of the remaining one time out of ten.

Commissioner Cunningham sought clarification regarding the Fresno Irrigation District comments on page 941 of the agenda packet. Supervising Civil Engineer Smith provided an explanation.

Commissioner Hinkle sought confirmation that many of the streets in TM6239 lack sidewalks, as he neither saw them in the exhibits nor read anything in the report. Assistant Planner Cha explained that the applicant proposed sidewalks on all of the public streets of the tract that they controlled.

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

Drew Phelps of 1396 W. Herndon Avenue provided background on the project.

Commissioner Cunningham inquired as to how many meetings had happened between the applicant and the neighbors. Mr. Phelps provided the information.

Commissioner Hinkle inquired as to the reasoning for not providing sidewalks on the interior lots for TM6264. Mr. Phelps responded with an explanation of that reasoning and a statement that it is open for discussion.

Commissioner Hinkle sought and received confirmation that, due to the sidewalk pattern, someone with challenged mobility would need to cross a street to reach sidewalk in this development. He is concerned that these new developments lacking sidewalks will pose future ADA problems for the City. He concluded that this issue needs to be addressed in this meeting, as Clovis is a walkable city and this needs to be maintained.

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

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

Randy Dhindsa of 1771 N. Twinberry Avenue explained that he was unable to attend the first neighborhood meeting last year and was unaware of the second meeting scheduled for Monday. He expressed dismay that the low-density 'oasis' promised by Wathen-Castanos at the time they bought their house will be gone, after having paid a premium price to live in a large-lot community. He also expressed concern for the safety of children due to lack of crosswalks and sidewalks currently and the increased number of children who will face those safety risks with approval of this project.

Elizabeth Pahel of 1711 N. Locan Avenue first expressed unwillingness to have her property rezoned in order to keep their animals. After Assistant Planner Cha assured that the inclusion of her property in the rezone exhibit was in error and that her property was not subject to rezoning, Mrs. Pahel expressed discontent with the lack of sidewalk continuation that leads to walkers such as her having to cross streets multiple times. In addition, when walking through an already existing development with sidewalks on one side only, she and her daughter are forced to walk in the street due to obstructions such as basketball courts or oversized trucks. She also expressed discontent regarding changes made to the open space and trail between the first neighborhood meeting and this hearing. Finally, she expressed concern for how Loyola Avenue will be affected by the proposed phasing of construction.

Dale Pahel of 1711 N. Locan Avenue elaborated on their concerns with the trail design presented for this hearing versus what was presented at the neighborhood meeting a year ago. He also expressed regarding walkability and safety due to lack of sidewalks.

Jacob Ward of 1751 N. Twinberry Avenue explained the difficulty in finding a large lot to purchase, then expressed dismay that the low-density oasis present when he researched before

purchasing his property. He expressed opposition to small lots across the street from his home and the accompanying diminishment of value in his house.

Nicole Hill of 1779 N. Blackwood referred to Chair Hatcher's comment regarding buying a home next to an empty lot, stating that her family had not done so but rather purchased a home next to rural properties. She also expressed dismay, in regards to the previous presentation, that citizens are losing their voice due to legislation while assuring that she is aware that this is not the fault of the Planning Commission. She expressed her concern for the safety of children crossing DeWolf Avenue with the lack of crosswalks as well as her concern for traffic safety due to circulation issues on Loyola Avenue.

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

Mr. Phelps expressed gratitude for the airing of concerns, explained that the noticing for the neighborhood meeting was mailed on Monday, then addressed the sidewalk, density, trail location feasibility, Locan Avenue crossing safety, and phasing concerns.

Commissioner Antuna requested the neighborhood meeting information in the event that the invitations do not arrive in time. Mr. Phelps provided the information as well as his phone number for those who may have trouble finding it.

Commissioner Hinkle inquired as to the intended driveway setback for TM6264. Mr. Phelps responded that it is twenty feet.

At this point, the Chair closed the public portion.

Chair Hatcher inquired as to the timelines and locations for street signals north of these developments based on the traffic study. Supervising Civil Engineer Smith provided information.

Commissioner Antuna sought clarification regarding the design of a particular area of trail in relation to a partial cul-de-sac. Assistant Planner Cha provided a detailed explanation and assured that staff will continue to work with the applicant on areas of concern to find feasible alternatives.

Chair Hatcher sought and received confirmation regarding the new location of the trail versus the originally proposed location.

Chair Hatcher sought and received confirmation that the previous location of the trail is difficult now because of development to the north. Deputy City Planner Ramirez provided further clarification regarding the changes made to the trail relocation.

Chair Hatcher followed up with an inquiry as to whether there is a scenario that would allow the trail to remain at its original location but at less than a thirty-foot width, and if there had been other circumstances in which the trail had been moved from its originally intended location. Deputy City Planner Ramirez responded that it is policy for the trail to be thirty feet wide with a ten-foot sidewalk, that such a width-reduction is something staff can consider but he is unaware

of any such circumstances in which it has been done. He then provided details of several instances in the Loma Vista area in which the trail has been moved.

Chair Hatcher remarked that she personally dislikes developments with sidewalks on only one side of the streets, though it has been requested a great deal, especially in gated communities. She does not believe that such is a safe environment, but expressed appreciation for the larger tract proposing sidewalks on both sides of the streets. She expressed understanding of the audience's concerns regarding the density change and the impact it will have on their lives.

Commissioner Hinkle informed that he had been involved in the latest update to the general plan, explaining that a general plan may state something different for land use than what the current zoning calls for. Therefore, when buying a house, especially if there are vacant lots around, he urges researching the general plan designations for the area. Development leads to changes to the designations of nearby areas. He also remarked that, based on how the state government is legislating, such changes are likely to happen faster than will be appreciated.

Commissioner Bedsted, in reference to Commissioner Hinkle's concerns with setbacks, informed that the Planning Department had provided the Commission with an excel sheet detailing these variances that have occurred historically. He expressed appreciation for the ability to see the data presented in such a format as well as for Fire Chief Binaski's input on the impacts of the setbacks. He noted that there had been three instances of three-foot setbacks, excluding those that were three-foot/five-foot setbacks. He concluded with a remark expressing a desire for that table to be updated for tracking when a precedent is either being set or followed.

Commissioner Hinkle responded that though the Commission has tried different things to see if they will work, there is time to change things that are found to not work.

Chair Hatcher, in reference to a piece of correspondence requesting speed bumps on Loyola Avenue, inquired as to the process for seeking such. Supervising Civil Engineer Smith responded that there is such a process, then offered both his business card and his assistance to the audience with the requirements and steps of that process.

At this point a motion was made by Commissioner Bedsted and seconded by Chair Hatcher to approve a finding of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for GPA2019-004, R2019-005, R2019-006, TM6264, and TM6239. The motion was approved by a vote of 5-0.

At this point a motion was made by Commissioner Bedsted and seconded by Commissioner Cunningham to approve GPA2019-004. The motion was approved by a vote of 4-1.

At this point a motion was made by Commissioner Bedsted and seconded by Commissioner Cunningham to approve R2019-005. The motion was approved by a vote of 4-1.

At this point a motion was made by Commissioner Bedsted and seconded by Commissioner Cunningham to approve R2019-006. The motion was approved by a vote of 4-1.

At this point a motion was made by Commissioner Bedsted and seconded by Commissioner Cunningham to approve TM6264. The motion was denied by a vote of 2-3. (Commissioner Hinkle requested an amendment to Commissioner Bedsted's motion. Upon recommendation from the City Planner, Commissioner Hinkle requested a motion to reconsider TM6264 with added conditions. The motion did not receive a second, voiding the motion.

At this point a motion was made by Commissioner Bedsted and seconded by Commissioner Cunningham to approve TM6239. The motion was approved by a vote of 4-1.

4. 2019 City of Clovis Dog Parks Master Plan

- a. **Consider Recommendation for Approval, Res. 19-50**, A request to approve an environmental finding of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 2019 City of Clovis Dog Parks Master Plan.
- b. **Consider Recommendation for Approval, Res. 19-51**, A request to approve the Draft 2019 City of Clovis Dog Parks Master Plan.

Management Analyst Claudia Cazares, Chad Kennedy of O'Dell Engineering, Inc., and Parks Manager Eric Aller presented the staff report.

Commissioner Bedsted recused himself during the staff report due to potential conflict of interest with the park on an investment property located in close proximity.

Commissioner Cunningham inquired as to whether the temporary dog park would undergo modification if it becomes permanent. Parks Manager Aller provided details regarding the modifications.

Commissioner Cunningham inquired as to the cost of the temporary dog park. Parks Manager Aller provided both the bid estimate and the actual, lower cost.

Commissioner Antuna inquired as to whether the applicant considered having any types of water features for the dog parks, given the hot climate of the area. Parks Manager Aller responded that they have not considered such at this time due to the water situation, but it can be considered for feasibility. Mr. Kennedy clarified that it had been discussed in the document in relation to the regional dog park but not the smaller ones. Maintenance is an issue, but it is recommended to consider water features for the larger parks.

Commissioner Hinkle expressed his satisfaction with the timeliness of consideration of this action, what with the increase in service and companion dogs, as well as his appreciation that the Heritage Grove is addressed. He expressed that though this should have been done a long time ago, this is the right time for it now.

Chair Hatcher inquired as to whether Bicentennial Park would need to be closed for a time to become permanent, if this plan is approved and funded. Such a closure would deprive the public of a dog park for a time, which she foresees as causing a public outcry. Parks Manager Aller

responded that it may indeed be closed for a short amount of time, providing a detailed explanation.

Commissioner Hinkle proposed a possible method to keep the dog park open during such construction. Parks Manager Aller acknowledged that such a method could be used, remarking that the neighborhood may need to be noticed regarding the action they take.

Commissioner Antuna expressed approval of noticing the neighborhood, with at least signage on the fence, to let the public know what is happening with the park.

Commissioner Cunningham offered compliments to staff and the consultants for their work on this project. He has been involved since the beginning and has attended most of the meetings, and he expressed his admiration for the progress that has been made.

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

Josie McGuire of 87 Joshua Avenue informed that she had started the petition to create a dog park and that there were a couple of issues that needed to be addressed, such as flooding in Bicentennial Park when it rains. She praised Parks Manager Aller and expressed gratitude for the effort that has been put into this plan.

Alex Rangel of 954 Sunnyside Avenue expressed gratitude to City staff for their hard work and getting the plan to this point so quickly as well as for their attentiveness. She expressed her appreciation for the park and her hope that it will continue to be funded.

William Holland of 1175 Palo Alto Avenue expressed gratitude to staff, as it has been a long road but the process has worked out well. He uses the park twice a day and is greatly pleased both with what currently exists and with the possible expansion. In his time spent in the park, he has not seen any problems and has only heard of two that have been resolved. He informed that the public helps keep the dog park maintained and that working with staff and Parks Manager Aller in particular was a pleasant experience. He concluded by requesting approval for the plan.

A member of the public inquired as to whether there will be lights, as it is getting dark early now and many people use the park after work. Parks Manager Aller responded that they are not currently on the list of amenities but that they could be added later.

The member of the public provided an explanation of the now-resolved problem Mr. Holland had referred to.

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

There being none, the Chair reopened the floor to the applicant.

The applicant chose not to rebut.

At this point, the Chair closed the public portion.

At this point a motion was made by Commissioner Hinkle and seconded by Commissioner Antuna to approve a finding of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 2019 City of Clovis Dog Parks Master Plan. 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 the Draft 2019 City of Clovis Dog Parks Master Plan. The motion was approved by a vote of 4-0-1.

City Planner David Merchen clarified, for the record, the Commissions actions regarding Item X-3. All resolutions had been approved with the exception of the resolution to approve TM6264. The motion to approve a revised resolution failed, resulting in denial. A motion was made to reconsider the resolution that did not receive a second.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

None

ADJOURNMENT AT 9:58 P.M. UNTIL the Planning Commission meeting on November 21, 2019.



Amy Hatcher, Chair