

Reedley Planning Commission Regular Minutes – March 5, 2009

The agenda for the Planning Commission meeting of March 5, 2009 was duly posted in accordance with Government code Section 54954.2.

The regular meeting of the Reedley Planning Commission was held Thursday, March 5, 2009 in the City of Reedley Council Chambers, 845 “G” Street, Reedley, California. Chairman Nord called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

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

**ROLL CALL**

- Commissioners Present: Cisneros, Clements, and Nord.
- Absent: Chavez.
- Staff Present: David Brletic, City Planner; Rob Terry, Assistant Planner, Mike Pardo, Sr. Engineering Assistant; Dianne Guzman, Planning Consultant; Darlene Mata, Planning Consultant; and Kay Pierce, City Clerk.
- Others Present: Tom Payseno, Anita Betancourt, Tammie Zaczek, Chris Zaczek, Rachel Zuniga, Amanda Burton, Marlowe Fossen, Eric Burton, Andy Friesen, Emily Roberts, Rodnie Roberts, Steve Rapada, Cheryl Lingo and others.

**PUBLIC COMMENT** - None.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

1. Minutes of Regular Meeting, November 20, 2008

C. Cisneros moved, C. Clements, seconded to approve CONSENT AGENDA Item No. 1. Motion carried by the following vote:

- AYES: Cisneros, Clements, and Nord.
- NOES: None.
- ABSTAIN: None.
- ABSENT: Chavez.

2. Minutes of Regular Meeting, February 5, 2009

C. Clements moved, C. Cisneros seconded, to approve CONSENT AGENDA Item No. 2. Motion carried by the following vote:

- AYES: Clements, Cisneros, and Nord.
- NOES: None.
- ABSTAIN: None.
- ABSENT: Chavez.

3. Building Report for the Month of January, 2009

C. Clements moved, C. Cisneros seconded, to approve CONSENT AGENDA Item No. 3. Motion carried by the following vote:

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

**NEW BUSINESS**

4. PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING – PREPARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 2007-1, CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 302 AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 446 – REEDLEY FAMILY APARTMENTS

City Planner Brletic advised that this is a public scoping meeting for the preparation of the environmental impact report for Reedley Family Apartments project, which is an 80-unit affordable housing apartment complex east of East Avenue and south of Dinuba Avenue. The proposed project includes a general plan amendment, zone change, and a conditional use permit to construct the 80-unit apartment complex, changing from general industrial to high density residential. The proposed project was presented before the Planning Commission and was forwarded to the City Council by the Planning Commission with recommendations. Following review by the City Council, they directed staff to have an EIR prepared. The notice of preparation and initial study was circulated to agencies for their review. City staff will be receiving comments back and these comments will be addressed in the EIR. Tonight's scoping meeting is an opportunity for the audience and Planning Commission to provide their input on what needs to be analyzed in the EIR. No decisions will be made this evening. Everything provided this evening will be addressed in the EIR. Following completion of the EIR, the document will be circulated for public review and then presented to the Planning Commission at a future public hearing. The public hearing will give the audience an opportunity to provide testimony on the adequacy of that analysis and then for the Planning Commission to take action. In addition to the comments that will be received this evening, the comment period will be opened until March 21, 2009, at 5:00 p.m. Comments received this evening by the audience can also be submitted in writing by March 21, 2009. The environmental evaluation document has been made available to the public. With the notice that was mailed to the neighbors, it was made clear that this document was available for viewing at city hall and is also available for viewing on the City website with the Planning Commission packet. Electronic copies can also be made.

Chairman Nord wanted the audience to be aware that there are a number of things that are traditionally covered in an EIR and in most cases are also covered in the environmental document. However, there might be other things that might need to be looked at.

Travis Crawford with Quad Knopf advised that the initial study and notice of preparation basically mirrors the same impact area analysis that is in the EIR. The purpose is to weed out anything that isn't going to likely be an impact. For example, mineral resources, Quad Knopf knows there isn't an impact and they are, therefore, able to scope it out in this document and focus only on the issues such as noise, traffic and related items, in the EIR.

Chairman Nord asked Mr. Crawford to briefly review what kinds of things are traditionally looked at in this document. Mr. Crawford advised there are approximately 17 impact areas such as air quality, agriculture resources, biological resources, cultural resources hydrology, land use, hazard assessments, noise, traffic, public services, utilities, transportation and a few more. Additionally in the EIR, there will be an analysis of alternative sites for this project available for public input and comment. Chairman Nord advised that the public hearing this evening is to look beyond the traditional items to things that the neighbors might be aware of to be brought forward to look at. Mr. Crawford advised that the issues to be raised at this time have to be environmental issues that can be analyzed in the EIR. Other issues that are beyond the scope are not relevant to this conversation and must be an environmental impact as it relates to the project and that is the only thing that can be analyzed in the EIR.

Reedley Planning Commission Regular Minutes – March 5, 2009

Chairman Nord opened the public hearing at 5:13 p.m.

Rodnie Roberts, 427 E. Beech, Reedley, advised he would like to see the traffic investigated in this EIR. His main focus was on the intersection of Dinuba and "I" Street and any additional traffic impacts that would be completely unsafe. He sees close calls every day at this intersection and plans his route to avoid this intersection. His house seems to shake more when the train goes by. He is located some distance from the tracks and the people who would live in the apartments would not only have the noise from the train whistle but are also going to experience the shaking of the ground from the train. Mr. Roberts referred to the mineral composition of the ground and suggested that maybe this also needs to be evaluated to see if it is due to sandy soil in this area. He also referred to the zone change and feels that Reedley needs more businesses located near the railroad tracks rather than apartments.

Chairman Nord asked if quality of life issues are appropriate for the EIR. Mr. Crawford advised that typically, these types of issues are not analyzed in the EIR.

Planning Consultant Guzman advised issues are analyzed in terms of impacts. There needs to be something that is measurable. The whole purpose of the CEQA document is analysis and documentation so that there is full disclosure as decisions are made on a project. Traffic issues are a good example where an increase in traffic on a particular street beyond the thresholds set up can certainly affect the quality of life for the residents on that street.

Chairman Nord asked if it is appropriate for an EIR to try to look at past practices within a town similar in size to Reedley, where low cost housing such as being proposed is placed in an area and watch the value of the property adjacent over a period of years and also in relation to how close it happens to be to that; this could potentially be a measurable item as compared to a similar neighborhood where either that type of housing was not built or a different type of housing which was not as intense.

Planning Consultant Guzman advised that it has to be something that can be measured and proven. The issue of affects on adjacent properties is a little more difficult one to calculate because there are a lot of factors that could come into play, but a comment that could be made in the scoping if there is concern, that there will be an impact and staff can see if there is anything that can be documented on that. An example now is that there has been a huge affect on property values that have nothing what so ever to do with adjacent land uses. There are so many factors that have an impact on property value. Generally, that has never been one seen documented in an EIR. It's a concern that Planning Commissioners and City Council Members can factor into discretionary decisions on the general plan and on projects to the extent that the Commission has discretionary decision making.

C. Cisneros advised he already sees the property values going down without the apartments being constructed. Many homes are going into foreclosure and this has nothing to do with the apartments.

Planning Consultant Guzman advised that the purpose tonight is to listen to the concerns of the Planning Commission and the audience and make sure they are addressed. If, for example, the Commission would direct staff to do the EIR to study whether there will be a negative affect on the value of the surrounding housing. This would then be listed as one of the comments and then staff will prepare a response that states that generally not been documented as an environmental discrepancy.

Steven Rapada, 723 N. Lourae, Reedley, advised he wants to make sure that as we are going through the EIR that the noise is considered. Previous engineers performed a noise study in a noise model in a computer. Mr. Rapada wants to have an actual noise study done. He has information from the Fresno County Library. Fowler built a library next to their railroad tracks and their biggest concern was mitigating noise levels. People living in these apartments are going to have to sleep next to the railroad tracks. Fowler took a Brule and Kahar type 4230 sound level meter equipped with a BNK type 4176.5 microphone. This was placed at the site by the tracks on a tripod 5 feet above the existing ground level

and found that three train events measured in a single day were between 99 and 107 decibels with an average of 104 decibels. For the library, the standards by the County were the same as what it is in Reedley which is a 45 decibel interior level. Planning Consultant Guzman advised that there is also a factor of amount of exposure, not just of time. Mr. Rapada advised that he is concerned about the noise levels and the time frame. The trains go through Fowler during the day, where in Reedley, they go through at night. In order to mitigate the noise level, Fowler not only had to build a 10-inch wide, 10-foot high concrete wall, but also install foam acoustical insulation in all the walls. In Reedley, the apartments will be closer to the tracks than the library in Fowler which was over 100-feet. The apartments could be approximately 23-feet. The report states that the noise levels were measured at different heights to figure out the mitigation. The proposed apartments are two-story, which means they will be well above any 8- or 10-foot wall that could be constructed. The Fowler library is single story. Mr. Rapada doesn't feel the quality of life will be very good for the people living at the proposed apartments due to the noise level from the trains. He is also concerned with the size of the apartment project. The request from the applicant is for 80-units, while Reedley's ordinance is for a maximum of 50-units. Fresno County will not build a low to moderate income apartment complex through their entity of more than 50-units if the land that it sits on isn't greater than five acres. Reedley's proposed project is under four acres. What is acceptable in putting how many people in a small confined space?

Christopher Zaczek, 303 E. Shoemake, Reedley, advised in this study, he would like to see some soil samples taken since this area has been an orchard for many years and he would like to make sure the soil isn't contaminated. He would also like to see what kind of impact it is going to have on the children as they will have to attend the new Zumwalt School. At the last meeting it was mentioned that there will be no busing for these children. He would like to know how walking all that way to school on Dinuba Avenue will affect the children since many of these families only have one vehicle and this vehicle will probably be used by the parent who goes to work. How will this impact their education if they can't get to school since it is over two miles to the school?

Chairman Nord asked Mr. Crawford if these studies are possible. Mr. Crawford replied that a phase one background investigation can be done on the site and a determination would be made of whether or not soil sampling is something that needs to be done. As far as the school issue, this can be analyzed under the public services section of the EIR. There is an area for school services and how this project will impact school services. Typically, the EIR comes to the school site for the review.

Mr. Rapada advised that they need to take a good hard look at the soil samples because the Shimizu property and the property proposed for the apartments was the landing zone for spray rigs. That is where chemicals were mixed and the spray rigs and trucks did pickups. Mr. Crawford advised that the consultant doing the EIR would review the history of the site and if there was anything that could potentially cause contamination, they would then go a step further.

Mark Edwards, 342 E. Shimizu, Reedley, referred to page 330 of the initial study which states that there has been at least one affect that has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and has been addressed by mitigation measures. What page does that refer to in the report? Mr. Crawford advised this refers to environmental impacts that were covered in the City of Reedley general plan. Things such as loss of ag land have already been covered by the general plan as well as other items. The attached pages referred to is the checklist. Mr. Edwards asked what has been analyzed besides agriculture. Mr. Crawford replied that everything else is going to be analyzed for this project specifically. The consultant is relying on the general plan for thresholds of significance and how this project fits in with the general plan. As far as relying specifically on a finding of a significant impact, it was agricultural resources only. Mr. Edwards referred to the scope of the noise and asked if that is going to be based on what has been presented at this meeting this evening? Will it be changed to potentially significant impact to broaden the scope to do more analysis on a noise study or will we rely on what has already been presented in this document? Mr. Crawford advised there will be a full analysis in the EIR of the noise impacts. Mr. Edwards referred to public services and advised that all items were checked as

less than significant impact. He asked if this was going to also be broadened in the scope of the EIR to look at the affect of public services pertaining to transportation. Mr. Crawford replied that transportation is a separate issue, but under public services, they can bring up the school issue that has been raised and address that. Mr. Edwards stated that he is concerned about long-term aesthetics and asked if this is something that is within the scope? There has been evidence presented regarding the property manager and the fact that he has allowed much graffiti and deterioration of their neighborhoods over time. This will have a major impact on the aesthetic value as a neighborhood. He asked if this can be analyzed within the EIR. Mr. Crawford advised this can be done in the EIR.

Marlowe Fossen, 150 E. Curtis, Reedley, stated that this is the first public hearing he has attended on this project and asked what stage is this project in? Chairman Nord replied that this apartment project is being proposed but is not yet approved. Mr. Fossen referred to quality of life issues for the people who would live in the apartments, as well as for the surrounding neighborhood. He advised that low-income housing, regardless of where it is located, will lower the median income of Reedley. He feels this should be of concern to Reedley and that we should be raising the median income instead. Chairman Nord advised Mr. Fossen that this is actually backwards of what the State does. The State requires every city to provide opportunity for housing at a variety of levels; low income, medium income and higher income. The city is not considering this project by choice, but rather we are required to look at the project and make an opportunity based on State law as State law overrules city ordinances. State law mandates that Reedley and other cities must provide opportunity for development in this area. Mr. Fossen asked why this particular area was picked for these apartments.

City Planner Brletic advised that the point of this public hearing is to let staff know what the concerns are of the citizens. These concerns may or may not be able to be addressed in the EIR. It is fair for it to be voiced that people have concerns about quality of life for both the tenants and neighbors. Site selection is also part of this EIR and there will be alternative sites listed. Mr. Fossen advised that many people who have already purchased homes around the proposed project without previous knowledge of the project. If these people had previous knowledge of the proposed project, many would not have purchased these homes. The homeowners did not have the option of having this knowledge presented to them before they purchased their homes. This neighborhood does not need another Meadowbrook apartment complex. Property values will drop even more if the apartments are built in this area which are already at an all time low and we shouldn't add to it by approving this project. Mr. Fossen is also concerned about where the tenants will work. The project site would be better suited to industry for jobs that are sorely needed in Reedley since Safety-Kleen and the city corporation yard are located in this area.

Bryan Eidal, 405 E. Shoemake, Reedley, stated that in front of the City corporation yard, there is no sidewalk and for anyone to walk in that area, installation of sidewalk would be a plus. Will the sidewalk installation be part of the project paid for by the contractor or will the city have to put in sidewalk?

Rodnie Roberts, 427 E. Beech, Reedley, referred to a statement regarding property values not dropping, and advised that homes in his neighborhood have dropped and most of the end caps are the homes up for sale. He feels that people are selling their homes because they know there is a possibility that the apartments are going to be built next to their neighborhood. He also feels it will be a hardship for the tenants to get to grocery stores since there are no grocery stores close to the neighborhood. He also feels people will move out of their current apartments into the new apartments and this will hurt those apartment complex owners. Another aspect of the EIR could be the potential expansion of Safety-Kleen when the city yard is moved next to the sports park. This will put Safety-Kleen closer to the apartments and they will have trucks running 24/7 and other issues with Safety-Kleen.

Mark Edwards, 342 E. Shimizu, asked if there have been properties already identified for the alternatives that are required under the EIR. City Planner Brletic replied that there are potential alternative sites that will be analyzed as well as taking anything into consideration that was addressed in the mitigated negative

Reedley Planning Commission Regular Minutes – March 5, 2009

declaration. Mr. Crawford advised there is a list of alternative sites that will be analyzed. He welcomes any other alternatives sites not listed. Mr. Edwards asked for a list of those alternative sites.

Planning Consultant Guzman advised that a draft EIR will be prepared and made available to the public. That is when people will see the list of alternative sites and the analysis and make comments. All comments have to be considered before the EIR is finalized. At this point, the work is still in a very rough draft form. However, if the audience does have suggested alternative sites to be looked at, please specify what they are. Staff has looked at all the sites the developer looked at before choosing the site in question. Staff also added several sites that they felt have some feasibility within the city limits, and one outside city limits. Mr. Edwards advised that he just wanted the opportunity to comment on the draft EIR and to make a request that other sites be considered. Planning Consultant Guzman advised that is an essential part of State law on doing EIR's that staff goes through the process of asking citizens what they believe needs to be studied. Staff then does the analysis, prepares a report and sends the draft out for comments to both the adjacent neighbors, other public agencies and the applicant. Through this public process is when everyone would comment. Staff then will have to finalize the EIR and that will be done before the Planning Commission and the City Council. They are the ones that will make the final determination as to what will be in the final EIR. Mr. Edwards asked if there is timeframe when the draft EIR will be ready. Mr. Crawford advised they are shooting for April, 2009.

Tom Payseno, 272 E. Shimizu, Reedley, referred to property values advising that the end house on Shimizu is listed for \$214,000 and originally sold for \$360,000 and is still for sale. He advised his house has been up for sale for over one year and has dropped in value by \$100,000. It is not so much that the values won't recover, but now they will be slower to recover because of the low-income property in the neighborhood that is non-traditional. If the apartments are not there, the value of the homes would recover in a normal way. Once those apartments are OK'd to be built, to sell a home in the neighborhood, the home owner has to notify the potential buyer of this project possibly coming in. That's why most of the homes in this neighborhood are not selling. Lower income housing really does affect the neighborhood in home values and this should be part of the EIR.

Amanda Burton, 334 E. Huntsman, Reedley, asked who will own the apartment complex. City Planner Brletic replied that the owner will be Corporation for Better Housing, currently Lynx Development. Ms. Burton stated that her concern is the width of the streets. In the new neighborhood the width of the streets are narrower than the older subdivisions. If cars are parked on the streets, two cars cannot pass each other; one has to pull over to let the other pass. If this apartment complex is built, there will be even more traffic to deal with and more people parking on the streets. It will be more hazardous for kids playing or for cars driving through the neighborhood.

Christopher Zaczek, 303 E. Shoemake, stated that he has been a paramedic for 13 years and has spent a lot of time in low-income housing. He would like to see in the EIR a study about crime rates in low-income housing and how they affect the outlying areas. He is not saying that all people that live in low-income housing are bad, but he does see it everyday and it is a fact. He would also like to see how it is going to impact public services such as fire and police. If there are more calls for service at the apartments, it will take away from other parts of the city.

Chairman Nord closed the public hearing at 6:02 p.m.

C. Clements stated that the sidewalk connectivity should be the responsibility of the contractor and should be a condition of development. He would also like to see sidewalk along Safety-Kleen that could connect to the Rail Trail which could then be accessed as a good pedestrian crossing in order to make it over to the grocery store on Dinuba Avenue. There should also be sidewalk in front of the DMV or Davis Road Oil to access the grocery store. He also referred to the possibility of Safety-Kleen purchasing the property adjacent to the proposed project. He would like to know if Safety-Kleen does expand their plant, what impact of the VOC's from that facility might have on the residents adjacent to that property.

City Planner Brletic advised that the cost of the EIR is the responsibility of the applicant. They pay the cost of the EIR, plus ten percent to cover administrative costs of city staff. The city selected the consultant to prepare the EIR.

Planning Consultant Guzman advised it would be better for any comments to come through city staff and then staff will pass the comments on to Quad Knopf. This way staff we will have a complete record of all comments.

Chairman Nord reminded those present that all this information can be accessed on the city's website to try to keep up to date.

## 5. REPORT ON GENERAL PLAN UPDATE AND SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY BLUEPRINT

Planning Consultant Guzman advised that the public hearing this evening on the EIR will familiarize the Commissioners with what will be done on the general plan. We have reached a conclusion with the map and made a few changes to the map. We have added a little area and added the airport so it shows on the map because the airport is part of the city. We have retained the firm of EMC from Monterey to prepare the EIR for the general plan update. The last general plan that was done had a full and complete EIR and it is very appropriate that this general plan update, which is a very comprehensive update, also have a full and complete EIR. Staff has had the initial meetings with EMC and the work is getting started. The Commission will have a scoping hearing for the general plan EIR which will be very similar to this scoping hearing in that the comments will be allowed to be received for a period of time. Then a draft EIR will be prepared and sent out for comments. The difference on a general plan EIR is that it is a little different kind of document. It is not down to the block and the detail on streets, it is of the overall community patterns. Because it is a general plan EIR, it has to be sent to a whole array of State agencies and other cities and the county. Because it is such a high level policy document, we need to coordinate with many other local and state-wide governmental agencies. With regard to the period of time that it takes to do an EIR on a general plan, we are provided a longer period of time and statute for the review and comment. Instead of the normal 30 days to review something on a general plan EIR, we will require 45 days for each separate phase. At the time that we are getting into that process of the EIR for the general plan, we are also working on several other things. Reedley is doing the general plan update at a time of great change and turmoil and economic upset. We have conflicting and different directions that we have to work into. For example, we need to have a complete draft text and staff is currently working on this. Staff is trying to weave in all these things that the State of California is telling staff they must do. There is AB32 which requires every jurisdiction to come up with a plan for how to reduce the Greenhouse Gases that are being produced within our community. Questions regarding Safety-Kleen and the odors and potentially what they are doing make Safety-Kleen one of the sources of greenhouse gases within the community that will have to be addressed. There is also SB375, which basically requires Reedley to do smart growth and climate change kind of policies, weaving in the reduction of greenhouse gases and reducing vehicle miles traveled and doing much more environmentally acceptable development than what has happened in the past. By environmentally acceptable, they measure such things as impact on air quality, impact on transportation, impact on water use, and ability to provide services. One of items discussed a lot is making our community more walkable as was discussed this evening. Do we have sidewalks or a plan to have sidewalks so that people can easily walk in our community, because every one of these bills talks about having people walk more instead of drive? These are part of the tasks that staff is trying to weave in to make sure we not only have the land use pattern, but the policies in place.

Planning Consultant Guzman referred to an article in the Fresno Bee with the headline "Air Quality Deadlines Threaten Valley Development." Many of the Commissioners will remember Sara Reyes who was Reedley's Assembly Person before her term was up. One of the things she sponsored was a bill that required by June 30, 2009, that we have much more attention to meeting air quality standards built into our

## Reedley Planning Commission Regular Minutes – March 5, 2009

general plan. AB32 and SB375 have come after this, but AB170 hasn't been taken off the books yet. We are going to be weaving this in because the process we went through and things we are trying to do in Reedley are moving in the direction that the State wants us to go. We are not downtown Los Angeles or Fresno, we are still going to be Reedley and what is appropriate in Reedley. However, we have some laws pushing us and maybe some incentives pulling us, but we also have the incentive of this being Reedley, a town with a lot of history and a lot of community commitment and the people here care about where Reedley is going. The general plan is one of our strongest vehicles for making sure that Reedley goes the way we want Reedley to go. We don't live on an island, but in the State of California in Fresno County and we have to deal with this. Staff will be back to the Commissioners with more details.

Planning Consultant Guzman advised that the Blueprint effort has been underway for several years. The Blueprint started with an effort in the Sacramento area to do a better job and a more efficient kind of land use planning and a way of having a very livable community, but didn't have to have as many roads, as much air quality emissions, etc. The Blueprint for the Sacramento area was very well received by the State of California that they, along with some elected officials from the Valley, decided that they would fund a similar effort for the whole San Joaquin Valley. For the past several years, through the Council of Governments, this Blueprint planning process has been underway and we are at the stage where there are some preliminary documents that have come out. Staff is working with them and looking at these documents. One of thing that has been talked about is the urban density that will be acceptable. Fresno County area is opting for the higher end of the density which could be 9 to 10 dwelling units per acre. Planning Consultant Guzman was on the Blueprint Steering Committee. Clovis and Fresno are going to see much higher densities than Reedley, but Reedley's densities will be higher than it used to be. This is the direction many things are going to. One, are we going to have enough money to provide future services to the area? When you hear that there is this overall density, it doesn't necessarily mean that is what we have to have in Reedley, but we are all moving in that direction. In the next year, there is going to be a process where we start really trying to figure out what the Blueprint means for Reedley. It's good that we are where we are in the general plan because we have a good sense in our mind where we want to be so we can go talk to them about where they are trying to push us or pull us and we can have some meaningful dialogue. That is another thing that is going to be happening at the same time we are trying to do the EIR and eventually adopt the general plan and comply with all these new state laws. If that isn't enough, you might have read approximately two weeks ago that with regard to the model farm land conservation program, that basically the American Farm Land Trust sees this area of Reedley, Parlier, Sanger and other adjoining communities, as the "Golden Triangle" of prime ag land in the State of California. They don't want to see Reedley converting any farm land. There is a committee that has been working and talking about this and they haven't come up with any decision either. One of the things that might need to be talked about before we get done with this whole process is the concept of mitigation measure. Several places are requiring an "offset". In other words, if you convert this acre of farm land, you will have to buy an acre somewhere else or two acres, and put that land under a type of restriction by signing over the development rights or something similar, so this land will stay ag land. As we convert each acre of farm land that is appropriate for conversion, we know we are preserving at least an equal amount in perpetuity. This is not a popular idea with all folks. It is not a recommendation at this point, but is being brought up so that the Commissioners are aware that we have to start talking about a lot these issues. Staff has started a consultation process with various local agencies that have a role in commenting on Reedley's general plan, specifically, Fresno County. We have the MOU with the County on tax sharing and part of what we agreed to is they have a say-so over how much we expand and where outside our sphere of influence. The process has been started and our staff has been talking to them at staff level. Eventually, it will get to the elected official level one by one. Staff has also been talking to LAFCo because growth is planned for Reedley and eventually LAFCo is the agency that has the absolute yes or no over Reedley's future sphere of influence and over individual annexations. Keeping LAFCo apprised of where Reedley is going with the general plan and how we are approaching it. Staff has important objectives in mind and has spent a lot of time getting a handle on what is wanted for Reedley. Now we get to go into several months of working, manipulating, analyzing, and preparing reports and commenting back and forth. Planning Consultant Guzman advised she has heard mixed things with

regard to this process. Some who says “just get it done. Why do we have to have all this process?” But we don’t exist in a vacuum. We have to be working together with these other parties and now more than ever, given the economic problems we are in, we are going to have to work our way through this process. The process is going to be as important as the content, forging agreements and getting to something that we can get support for. In this regard, staff has decided to add even more emphasis in the general plan text on the whole concept of economic development and the economy and how we are going to survive well as a city and as an area. Ms. Guzman will be back talking to the Commission as staff goes through all of these things and reminds the Commission that there is a plan for the growth of Reedley in the future. We want to preserve the historic parts of Reedley and want to have adequate community facilities. Staff is doing some planning for those now that there is a land use map to work on. We definitely need to have a good financial future for the City of Reedley.

Chairman Nord asked Ms. Guzman when she might anticipate having early public hearings on the general plan. Planning Consultant Guzman advised she hoped sooner, but with all the things that staff has to work through, there probably won’t be any public hearings until summer and may be later since the summers in the Valley are very hot and people try to get away, so it might be early fall. It is uncertain at this time. She promised to be here to follow this process through and help Reedley with this General Plan Update to the end.

C. Clements asked when the general plan update might be concluded. Planning Consultant Guzman advised the hearing process to adopt a general plan and adopt an EIR is three to four months. She has seen some general plan updates take years, but she doesn’t feel Reedley’s will be that lengthy because the approach being used with the community workshops and all the input, plus we are building on what Reedley has done in the past. We are not starting from scratch.

## **COMMISSION COMMENTS AND REPORTS**

### **6. RECEIVE AND DISCUSS REPORTS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS REGARDING PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIVITIES**

City Planner Brletic advised that the biggest construction project currently going on is the new Walgreen’s. Their target date to open is September. There are also 11 self-help homes under construction. The commercial building on “I” Street is also under construction. The Landscaping and Lighting Maintenance District issue is resolved and Fresh and Easy is ready to pull their building permit.

Chairman Nord asked what is happening on “I” Street at 13<sup>th</sup> Street. City Planner Brletic replied that a contractor has a site plan currently under review by City staff. The contractor is remodeling to accommodate some light industrial service commercial uses, possibly auto related. They originally started this remodel without a permit and had to stop until they pulled a building permit and went through a site plan review process, which is currently under review by staff. They also have to show a structural plan with regard to the holes they have already cut in the building.

Chairman Nord asked about the Krystal Kleen Car Wash on 11<sup>th</sup> Street and whether staff had made contact with the owners in relation to the requirement of a block wall or some type of fencing behind the building? City Planner Brletic will follow up on this request.

C. Clements referred to the former Bret’s car lot and advised it’s starting to look run down with weeds. City Planner Brletic will turn this over to code enforcement for a follow-up.

C. Clements referred to 630 Herbert and the “mother-in-law” quarters, which no longer seems to be a mother-in-law quarters since a guy riding a motorcycle lives there now and is the third tenant since the house sold. City Planner Brletic will have staff check if the unit was properly permitted with the intent of one of the units being occupied by the property owner’s mother.

Reedley Planning Commission Regular Minutes – March 5, 2009

C. Cisneros referred to 681 E. Curtis advising that the homeowner appears to be building a carport and doesn't seem to be up to code.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Nord adjourned the meeting at 6:40 p.m.

---

George Nord, Chairman  
Reedley Planning Commission

ATTEST:

---

David Brletic, Secretary