

Reedley Planning Commission Regular Minutes – January 21, 2010

The agenda for the Planning commission meeting of January 21, 2010 was duly posted in accordance with Government code Section 54954.2.

The regular meeting of the Reedley Planning Commission was held Thursday, January 21, 2010, in the City of Reedley Council Chambers, 845 "G" Street, Reedley, California. Chairman Nord called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - The pledge of allegiance was led by Chairman Nord.

ROLL CALL

Commissioners

Present: Barker, Clements, Tartaglia and Nord.

Excused Absence: Cisneros.

Staff Present: David Brletic, City Planner; Noe Martinez, City Engineer; Mike Pardo, Lead Senior Engineering Assistant; Rob Terry Assistant Planner; and Frances Wiles, Administrative Assistant.

Others Present: Mark A. Garza, Ron Kusch, Vince DiMaggio, Todd Barsoom, Mike Schuil, Cheryl Lingo and others.

INTRODUCTION OF NEWLY APPOINTED PLANNING COMMISSIONER TED TARTAGLIA

Chairman Nord introduced and welcomed new Commissioner Ted Tartaglia who replaces Commissioner Jason Chavez whose term ended November 2009.

City Planner Brletic introduced newly hired City Engineer Noe Martinez who replaces City Engineer Bruce Webber.

PUBLIC COMMENT - None.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING, JANUARY 7, 2010

C. Nord moved, C. Barker seconded, to approve the minutes of January 7, 2010. Motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Nord and Barker.  
NOES: None.  
ABSTAIN: Clements and Tartaglia.  
ABSENT: Cisneros.

2. BUILDING REPORT FOR THE MONTH OF DECEMBER, 2009

C. Clements moved, C. Tartaglia seconded, to approve the building report for the month of December, 2009. Motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Clements, Tartaglia, Barker and Nord.  
NOES: None.  
ABSTAIN: None.  
ABSENT: Cisneros.

PUBLIC HEARING

2. ANNEXATION & RELATED ENTITLEMENTS (BLOSSOM TRAIL SUBDIVISION)

- a. Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts
- b. Manning-Zumwalt Reorganization, Annexation No. 2008-1
- c. General Plan/Specific Plan Amendment No. 2008-2
- d. Change of Zone No. 304
- e. Blossom Trail Tentative Subdivision Map Tract No. 5942
- f. Conditional Use Permit No. 448
- g. Conditional Use Permit No. 450

City Planner Brletic presented a Powerpoint presentation and reported that this is a request of Barsoom Bros. Co. for annexation of 82.3± acres of land; change in General Plan/Specific Plan land use designation from county Agricultural and Reedley Specific Plan Medium Density Residential to city Neighborhood Commercial, High Density Residential, Medium Density Residential & Open Space; change in zoning designation from county AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural) to city CN (Neighborhood Commercial), RM-(SP) (Multiple-Family Residential, Specific Plan), R-1-(SP) (Single-Family Residential, Specific Plan) and RCO (Resource, Conservation and Open Space); and a 125-lot subdivision for neighborhood commercial, multiple-family residential, single-family residential, and park development purposes that includes conditional use permits for a 24-lot and a 96-lot planned unit development on property located on the southwest corner of Manning Avenue and Zumwalt Avenue in Reedley, APN 370-040-31, -37, -21 & -09T. Staff recommends approval.

Chairman Nord opened the public hearing at 5:19 p.m.

Testimony in Favor or in Opposition: Vince DiMaggio, DW Land Development, P.O. Box 1941, Salinas, stated that he has been working with City staff on this project since late 2007. He intends to open this part of town with neighborhood commercial services that is not serving the eastern portion of Reedley. His policy is to have a hand in the design of a project. He compliments City Planner David Brletic who worked with him on this project. We paid a lot of attention to the subdivision design because, once we established the commercial presence, we would see children/students coming from the school. We worked with your City engineers and Public Works Department paying attention to the design of the street so that pedestrian areas were clearly defined and separated from the vehicular areas so children/students would have a safe passage to the commercial center reflected in the site plan. We centrally located the park so you can grab something to eat at the future shopping center, go to the park and enjoy the open space. Some decisions we made on the residential is due to the economic downturn we have experienced. His philosophy is to do projects for all socioeconomic groups in the community that can live in the same area. We would like to have the bank teller live in the same neighborhood as the bank president. Typically, a 6,000 square foot standard lot with a 2,500-3,000 square foot house would be for a higher income individual that can afford that. Our site plan has apartments that might be for a single parent that might be a part-time employee. Eventually, we will have apartments adjacent to the commercial in close proximity without having to drive for their needs. The lane lots are a unique opportunity to get first-time home buyers back into the market because many people that have been affected by the economy are going to have to start over. They will have to do the equity game and get into a small home. For newly married young couples, college graduates or those still in school, we can get them into a product they can afford and then, as they progress in their careers, they can sell, buy the next lot or move into a larger home as their needs change. That has always been what we wanted to accomplish in the neighborhoods that we design. This a thumbnail sketch taking you through our thoughts back in late 2007 and working with City Planner Brletic and the rest of the City staff bringing this to fruition today in 2010.

Chairman Nord asked Mr. DiMaggio if the lane lots are for single-family residences and would they have a garage and off-street parking. Mr. DiMaggio stated yes and would most likely be two-story homes to get the maximum square footage. We talked to city staff to make sure we meet the proper parking requirements to meet city standards for both residential and guest parking. Chairman Nord asked what the footprint looks like on a 2,400 square-foot lot. Mr. DiMaggio stated that there is an exhibit of those lane

lots. City Planner Brletic stated that the exhibit was not included with the staff report. These are all single-family detached homes with designated areas for garbage.

C. Clements asked City Planner Brletic if this is unique to the Specific Plan. City Planner Brletic stated no. The Boulevard Overlay District was specific to duplexes and triplexes. This is using a multi-family density of building a single-family product and suggested using High Density Residential. There is a condition for submittal of development plans that shows elevations and floor plans. Mr. DiMaggio stated he took this idea from an area close to where he lives. Attention was placed on brick. He can bring exhibits of examples from where he took his inspiration from.

Mark Garza, on behalf of Kings Canyon Unified School District, stated that the impact on our schools is significant. Currently, Silas Bartsch School is at capacity. We are looking at a 10-year growth pattern and will require a new school. We would like to make sure that bike lanes are lighted for safety. They do pay developer fees but they are never enough. It is a good project and looks forward to the annexation process.

Chairman Nord closed the public hearing at 5:31 p.m.

C. Tartaglia asked if there is a noise mitigation that applies to the lane lots. There is a promise to mitigate. Mr. DiMaggio stated that in working with staff our first thought was to have a wrought iron fence but Manning Avenue carries a lot of traffic. We then looked at a berm. He is trying to avoid a block wall. C. Tartaglia asked if that will come back to the Commission when Mr. DiMaggio submits a site plan for those units. City Planner Brletic replied that the conditions indicate that it comes back to the Commission for your approval before filing for a building permit. C. Tartaglia asked what is the approximate size envisioned of the structures on the lane lots. Mr. DiMaggio stated the sizes of the homes will be in the 1,200 square foot range.

C. Barker asked if there are any old wells; he noticed a condition to cap them. City Planner Brletic stated that if there is, it would have to be removed in accordance with Fresno County. Todd Barsoom, property owner, stated there is an electric pump but not a well. C. Barker asked if any of these wells have been tested. Mr. DiMaggio stated that he had a Phase 1 and 2 done and there is very little contamination. There is a mitigation measure that we will comply with.

City Planner Brletic stated that Fresno County and Fresno LAFCo have directed they would like to see the school site come in along with two other parcels. The current city limits ends at the Salwasser property. The school will come in zoned for school purposes, and the other parcels will come in pre-zoned as noted on the existing General Plan and Reedley Specific Plan. The two-acre parcel for the apartments is being zoned RM-SP (Multiple-Family Residential, Specific Plan) which is a minimum 2,000 square feet per dwelling unit; roughly a density of 20 units per acre or a maximum of 40 units that could fit on that parcel.

C. Barker asked how this project would affect the school district along with the 80 units. Mr. Garza replied that with high density there are more kids. We may have to shuffle students to other schools. City Planner Brletic stated that the City can only require payment of school district impact fees. Mr. Garza added that it is still not enough.

City Planner Brletic stated that our standard lot size is 6,000 square feet. When the Reedley Specific Plan was adopted in 2001, it was a movement towards density prior to the housing catastrophe. 5,000 Square feet is what everybody wants now. We had 6,000 to 8,000 square foot lots and it changed. We had developers coming in with 1,500 square foot homes that were more affordable. The Reedley Specific Plan sought to build 5 units per acre but now it is 8 units per acre. The Reedley Specific Plan permits up to 20% of the lots to be 5,000 square feet. C. Clements asked if he is saying we are changing the Specific Plan language from 20% to 55%. He does not have a problem with this project but would like to revisit the Reedley Specific Plan. City Planner Brletic stated that it was a unique proposal from the City's standpoint.

C. Clements asked for his perspective of a future development, if they came in and wanted to do the whole project at 55% and not have mixed use. City Planner Brletic stated that if they wanted to build all the lots at 5,000 square feet, it will come back to you for review and a recommendation.

City Planner Brletic stated the proposal before you reflects the Reedley Specific Plan goals. We have worked with pocket parks in the past on single 8,000 to 10,000 square foot lots, but they are not usable. This park is two and a half times larger than a pocket park and is for neighborhood use and not intended for people coming from outside the area and does not include parking.

City Planner Brletic stated the standard Reedley Specific Plan street width is 35 feet curb to curb which is what you have seen in the newer subdivisions like the Generation Homes to the south with a setback sidewalk and landscape strip with street trees.

Discussion followed on the subdivision and connectivity to other streets, bike lanes, and block walls.

Mr. DiMaggio stated that he is required to come back and show the Commission elevations and the specs and would commit to bringing actual photographs of built projects that show this concept.

Chairman Nord stated, regarding the lane lots or small lots and even the units built, the city as a whole does not have a good plan in place for enforcement of some of the things that keep our community looking good. Extra cars are parked in places for an extended time as well as motor homes, trailers and what not. We treat those on a complaint basis which is irritating. The apartment complex has a manager, but when you have a tight community like this and the tighter we live, the more problems that develop. City Planner Brletic stated that staff has the same concerns. Mr. DiMaggio stated that the safety valve is a Home Owners Association with this project. City Planner Brletic stated that in addressing the 5,000 square foot lots, if you're not inclined to go with staff's direction in permitting 5,000 square foot lots, then let us do that Reedley Specific Plan wide or if you are looking to do it through planning development that is what Conditional Use Permit No. 450 accomplishes.

City Planner Brletic stated that the San Joaquin Valley blueprint is for all the cities to be consistent. All the discussion is when we get to the next level going before Fresno LAFCO and having agencies like Fresno County weighing in on what we're doing, we get to say we are following the direction that we've all agreed to follow. We don't need to come up with an explanation why we are coming forward with a subdivision of 12,000 square foot lots. Another consideration is what is the opportunity out there today for new home construction. We can insist we only approve certain size lots with certain size homes, but there may not be a market for that. Mr. DiMaggio is here today to tell you he is successful building new homes and other developments throughout the Valley and believes this is a product that is going to be in demand, if not today, it will be soon, and thinks this a good use of that property.

C. Barker asked if there is more of a market for a 5,000 vs. a 6,000 square foot lot as a starter. Mr. DiMaggio stated that it is a market necessity. For a developer, the land is the costliest piece of the equation. In trying to lower the sales price of a house that people can afford and in looking at the past two years, you will see a move toward 5,000 square feet as a vehicle to continue to get people to afford homes. In our case not everything is 5,000 square feet. We have 5,000 next to 6,000, and 7,000 square feet. His intent is to put different home types and different people with different incomes next to each other and build a sense of community. We wanted the proposal to go above your current Specific Plan limits and try to achieve the density your Specific Plan calls for. It is market ready at a price people can afford.

C. Barker asked if the developer will be putting in the landscaping. Mr. DiMaggio stated he will be doing all the landscaping in the front yards. City Planner Brletic stated that most CC&R's require front yard landscaping be completed with new subdivisions but not the back yard. Street trees in the public right away are going to be consistent.

Mike Schuil from Schuil & Associates Diversified Real Estate stated that the key is affordable; the lower the price the larger the market. There is a market for everything, but there is just a bigger market for smaller lots.

Reedley Planning Commission Regular Minutes – January 21, 2010

C. Clements moved, C. Barker seconded, whereas the Planning Commission makes the required findings and recommends approval of the Mitigated Negative Declaration of environmental impacts and to include a noise mitigation measure from traffic on Manning Avenue for the lane apartments, by the adoption of Resolution No. 2010-6. Motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Clements, Barker, Tartaglia and Nord.  
NOES: None.  
ABSTAIN: None.  
ABSENT: Cisneros.

C. Barker moved, C. Clements seconded, whereas the Planning Commission makes the required findings and recommends approval of Manning-Zumwalt Reorganization, Annexation No. 2008-1 by the adoption of Resolution No. 2010-7. Motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Barker, Clements, Tartaglia and Nord.  
NOES: None.  
ABSTAIN: None.  
ABSENT: Cisneros.

C. Clements moved, C. Tartaglia seconded, whereas the Planning Commission makes the required findings and recommends approval of General Plan/Specific Plan Amendment No. 2008-2 by the adoption of Resolution No. 2010-8. Motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Clements, Tartaglia, Barker and Nord.  
NOES: None.  
ABSTAIN: None.  
ABSENT: Cisneros.

C. Barker moved, C. Clements seconded, whereas the Planning Commission makes the required findings and recommends approval of Change of Zone No. 304 by the adoption of Resolution No. 2010-9. Motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Barker, Clements, Tartaglia and Nord.  
NOES: None.  
ABSTAIN: None.  
ABSENT: Cisneros.

C. Clements moved, C. Tartaglia seconded, whereas the Planning Commission makes the required findings and recommends approval of Blossom Trail Tentative Subdivision Map Tract No. 5942, including Exhibit "A" conditions of approval, by the adoption of Resolution No. 2010-10. Motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Clements, Tartaglia, Barker and Nord.  
NOES: None.  
ABSTAIN: None.  
ABSENT: Cisneros.

C. Tartaglia moved, C. Clements seconded, whereas the Planning Commission makes the required findings and recommends approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 448, including Exhibit "A" conditions of approval, by the adoption of Resolution No. 2010-11. Motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Tartaglia, Clements, Barker and Nord.  
NOES: None.  
ABSTAIN: None.  
ABSENT: Cisneros.

Reedley Planning Commission Regular Minutes – January 21, 2010

C. Tartaglia moved, C. Barker seconded, whereas the Planning Commission makes the required findings and recommends approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 450, including Exhibit “A” conditions of approval, by the adoption of Resolution No. 2010-12. Motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Tartaglia, Barker, Clements and Nord.  
NOES: None.  
ABSTAIN: None.  
ABSENT: Cisneros.

COMMISSION COMMENTS AND REPORTS

3. RECEIVE AND DISCUSS REPORTS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS REGARDING PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIVITIES

City Planner Brletic reported that there will not be a Planning Commission meeting on February 4<sup>th</sup>, but we have a couple of items to bring to the Commission on February 18.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Nord the meeting at 6:31 p.m.

---

George Nord, Chairman  
Reedley Planning Commission

ATTEST:

---

David Brletic, Secretary