

CLOVIS PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
May 31, 2018

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

Flag salute led by Commissioner Cunningham

Present: Commissioners Antuna, Cunningham, Terrence, Hatcher, Chair Hinkle

Absent: None

Staff: Dwight Kroll, Planning and Development Services Director
Bryan Araki, City Planner
Orlando Ramirez, Senior Planner
George Gonzalez, Associate Planner
Sean Smith, Associate Civil Engineer
Maria Spera, Planning Technician II
David J. Wolfe, City Attorney
Michael Linden, Assistant City Attorney

MINUTES

The Commission approved the May 17, 2018, minutes by a vote of 5-0.

COMMISSION SECRETARY

None

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS

None

COMMUNICATIONS AND REFERRALS

Correspondence relating to Item X-A.

BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None

CONSENT CALENDAR

None

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Consider Approval Res. 18-___, **CUP2018-03**, A request to approve a conditional use permit for a proposed 28 bed memory care and 80 unit assisted senior living facility on

approximately 3.57 acres located at 587 & 637 W. Nees Avenue. O'Brien Development, LLC, owner/applicant; The Taylor Group Architects, representative

Senior Planner Orlando Ramirez presented the staff report.

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

Matt O'Brien, 7891 Dug Hill, San Diego, provided some background on the project and offered to answer questions.

Chair Hinkle sought and received confirmation that the perimeter of the project would be enclosed.

Commissioner Terrance inquired as to the type of fencing to be employed around the different part of the perimeter, in particular focusing on the area north of the Kenosha gate and pedestrian access to the surrounding community. Mr. O'Brien provided those details.

Christopher Brown of the Firm of Downey-Aaron, 8080 N. Palm Avenue, Fresno, on behalf of the applicant, also provided some background statements on the project.

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

Lee Smith, a partner of Colman and Horowitz, 499 W. Shaw Avenue, Fresno, representing the residents of the Buchanan Estates subdivision abutting the project site, opposed the project due to the size of the facility, parking on the residential streets, access for service vehicles, and traffic safety issues. The previous review by the City Council found, which was affirmed by the court, that this project would impair the integrity of the character of this area, listing the negative impacts. He stated that the project is inconsistent with the zoning, specific plan, and general plan, that the CEQA exemption is not appropriate and gave reasons why, and that the request for reasonable accommodation is not appropriate and why. He also stated that the parking calculations were incorrect and would lead to parking on the streets of his clients' neighborhood, and that the existing traffic and air studies are outdated. In addition, Mr. Smith stated that the noticing for the project was insufficient to allow his clients time to put together materials for this hearing.

Rod Lakovich of 617 W. Muncie Avenue assured that he is not against providing housing for seniors but rather opposed the project on the grounds that it was against the Clovis way of life, and stated that the applicant's operational statements were misleading or false and that the project would lead to problems with traffic and parking within the Buchanan development. He then went on to provide information he acquired on the operation of two local residential care facilities and compared them to the applicant's operational statement details, particularly in regards to staff numbers, parking, and traffic from staff, deliveries, visitors, etc.

David Ewing of 604 W. Muncie opposed the project based on the intensity of the use, referring to the previous denial of the earlier version of this project by the City Council. He also objected to the increased traffic/accident issues, citing current trouble gaining access to and from Timmy Avenue. He objected to a driveway access on Nees creating pedestrian conflicts with the adjacent school and other traffic problems such as narrow streets and safety impacts.

Jake Gallinetti of 637 W. Muncie Avenue objected not to housing for seniors or those with disabilities but rather on the grounds that the intensity, traffic, noise, and lighting will negatively impact the community and cannot be mitigated, regardless of exemptions. He referred to a policeman who had previously spoken against the project on the grounds that the increased traffic guaranteed a fatal accident. He questioned the project being brought up again after being denied. Mr. Gallinetti would not have bought his home if this project had been proposed.

Kim Ewing of 604 W. Muncie referred to transcripts from the previous City Council case and court case as showing that the neighbors are pro-senior, but that they oppose the project because of safety, traffic, and lack of services for the facility's needs. She expressed concern regarding the shape, size, and location of the lot, and her belief that some of the requirements for reasonable accommodation under the Fair Housing Act and American Disabilities Act are not fulfilled, explaining her reasoning. Mrs. Ewing also expressed that, as per the lawsuit, the requirements for a conditional use permit were not met.

Alice Silverman of 458 W. Kenosha Avenue, adjacent to the orthodontist office which has a new business, detailed increased traffic and accidents due to the business as her reason for objecting to the project, as it's not far from the proposed project site. She also expressed her belief that this project would not anything to the Clovis way of life.

Robert Kolbert of 619 W. Enterprise Avenue objected to the project based on traffic/safety issues, as he feels that the implications for the proposed project are not fully understood and there are already many near-accidents.

Arwa Muraisi of 612 W. Lexington Avenue opposed the project based on her feeling that it was to bring capital benefit a developer and it brings the potential for harm to the neighborhood, though she is not opposed to senior housing or housing for the disabled. She referred to personal concerns from the previous project review. She also expressed that the previous court decision upheld the neighborhood concerns and that it protected the integrity of the neighborhood, as this project in her view is inconsistent with past practices in the City of Clovis in terms of density.

Kathy Gallinetti of 637 W. Muncie opposed the project based on lighting impacts on homes on the south side of Nees Avenue, as well as the impact to parking at certain times of year. She also brought up the safety issue of children running/skating across the street. She mentioned getting three hundred and fifty signatures on a petition against the project.

Daryl Barallon of 669 W. Enterprise Avenue explained that he is a nursing instructor and he moved to Clovis to know his neighbors, spoke about his daughter's volunteering and sports, stated that he is not opposed to seniors, and he and several neighbors would not have moved into this neighborhood if this project had been there or they had known about it. He stated that a facility like this has many issues that would impact the community, detailing them. Mr. Barallon asked for either a denial, or a continuance to allow the residents to gather and prepare more.

Elizabeth Cao of 787 Omaha Avenue opposed the project on the grounds of traffic at shift changes, and also that the rooms are too small for the patients.

Nancy Donnelly of 1592 N. Gateway Avenue explained that she had owned and operated a licensed care facility in Redding that, though much smaller than this proposed facility, had five

times the proposed staff in proportion to the number of residents. With the lack of socializing space, the small size of the rooms, and the lack of recreational outdoor space, she would not put her parents here. She also expressed concern about the safety of children from the adjacent school, and that this a financial burden on the neighborhood to fight against this project again.

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

Russell Taylor of 410 Park Creek Drive, the architect of the project, stated that it's a good design and offered to answer architectural questions.

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

Mr. O'Brien addressed the different aspects of the traffic issue, such as emergency response and where it would come in from and what types of response would be likely at this facility, what things have been done to address previous concerns. He next addressed the occupancy percentages of facilities in the community, as it had been mentioned by opposition, referring to a study and his own research, as well as the differences between them and his proposed facility. Mr. O'Brien also addressed the health/situations of seniors that would be served by this type of facility, including the types of events likely to take place in it and the low impact of such events on traffic. He also refuted the concerns about space in the rooms and possible socialization activities for the residents of the facility. He spoke about the experience of being near an assisted care facility with a close-by school in another location.

Commissioner Cunningham inquired as to how many meetings the applicant conducted with neighbors on this second go-around. Mr. O'Brien responded that he hadn't had any, as it was clear after the first meeting, which hadn't been productive, that nothing but single-family homes would be acceptable, even with reducing the size.

Commissioner Cunningham then sought and received information on how to access the second floor of the proposed facility.

Commissioner Cunningham followed up with an inquiry as to any other ADA-facilitating changes to the design from the original. Mr. O'Brien responded that the ADA components are built in, providing some explanation.

Commissioner Hatcher inquired as to the level of assistance to be provided, medical related. Mr. O'Brien explained in detail. Commissioner Hatcher sought confirmation from the explanation regarding the number and level of medically-trained staff, which prompted a further explanation from Mr. O'Brien.

Commissioner Hatcher then inquired as to what traffic exactly would be exiting the facility into the residential area, between deliveries, services, and staff. Mr. O'Brien assured that one goal is to keep down such traffic, giving detailed explanations of what traffic would and would not be generated by his proposed facility.

Chair Hinkle inquired as to the number of beds in the proposed facility. Mr. O'Brien gave the number of 108, providing some details.

Chair Hinkle then inquired as to whether the facility would receive assistance from community or occupational colleges. Mr. O'Brien responded that he had made contact with one program, and that though he has no plans currently, he's certain that he could set things up quickly.

Commissioner Antuna inquired as to the number of staff estimated to be present on a daily basis, in particular in the dementia unit. Mr. O'Brien provided numbers and explanations.

Commissioner Terrance inquired as to the types and frequencies of deliveries, such as those mentioned earlier, would be expected on a daily basis. Mr. O'Brien responded with an explanation of how such traffic would only enter and exit onto Nees Avenue.

At this point, the Chair closed the public portion.

City Attorney David Wolfe referred to Attachment 5 for the description of ADA features. Mr. Wolfe then addressed the question of why the proposed facility does fit the definition required for a conditional use permit.

Commissioner Antuna inquired as to the capacity of the current wastewater service capacity versus future flow from the addition of the project, and whether those concerns from the previous review would be addressed by the adoption of the pending 2018 Wastewater and Water Facilities Master Plan. Associate Civil Engineer Sean Smith confirmed that there is still capacity and there are plans to deal with those concerns.

Commissioner Terrance inquired as to whether there were additional considerations by the City to traffic and especially the safety issue. Associate Civil Engineer Smith responded that the traffic study did not generate additional concern, explaining in detail.

Commissioner Hatcher inquired as to what other types of projects could potentially be allowed in this lot under a conditional use permit. Senior Planner Ramirez explained that this lot could allow up to fifteen houses instead of the originally proposed ten, and that a conditional use permit could allow a church. City Planner Bryan Araki also provided other options, such as a daycare, a private school, or a firing range.

Commissioner Antuna inquired as to whether consideration is given to the high density of the build in such a case, given its surroundings. City Planner Araki explained that it falls outside the density requirements, hence the use permit requirement. City Planner Araki also addressed that this conditional use permit would be specific to this project and any changes would need to come back through this process.

Chair Hinkle inquired as to the possibility of placing "No Parking" signs along Timmy Avenue to try to alleviate parking concerns. Associate Civil Engineer Smith explained that there are homes that front onto Timmy Avenue, preventing such a measure, but that they can take a look at other measures if it becomes a bigger issue.

Chair Hinkle remarked that there are a number of laws in process in Sacramento under the heading of Affordable Housing that could lead to a lot like this having up to forty homes at three-stories, and that this option is more palatable than those alternatives. He also remarked that the whole area will see increased traffic in the next ten years due to the development of Heritage Grove, with the proposed project generating a small amount in comparison.

A member of the public called out a question regarding parking for visitors at the proposed facility and potential overflow into the neighborhood. Chair Hinkle responded that the parking has been addressed in the studies and reminded the audience that the public portion is closed.

Commissioner Hatcher sought and received confirmation from Associate Civil Engineer Smith that the streets in the residential area of the project site are public streets, not private streets.

At this point a motion was made by Commissioner Cunningham and seconded by Commissioner Hatcher to approve the CEQA Exemption for CUP2018-03. The motion was approved by a vote of 5-0.

Commissioner Hatcher expressed her appreciation for the audience attending and participating in the review process, and explained that the Planning Commission has strict parameters for review regarding zoning and planning. In terms of the safety of children crossing the street, as a mother she understands that fear but that when crossing the street in front of a shopping center there is inherent danger which will require patience and vigilance. She also expressed her belief that this project will not have drastic effect on traffic and therefore the safety of children than any other projects. In terms of the building height and lighting, the zoning already allows two-story buildings, and that there could be other projects here that would have bigger impacts.

Commissioner Antuna expressed her gratitude for the audience letting their voices be heard, and that as Commissioner Hatcher expressed there are strict guidelines to what they can consider. Having family members in congregate care, she is familiar with the parking overflow issue. As for the safety issue, delivery trucks were limited to times children would not be going to and from school.

Commissioner Terrance echoed the comments of his fellow commissioners, also remarking that he lives near this project site and that he too has no wish to compromise the integrity of the neighborhood on Kenosha Avenue through traffic, an issue that has been addressed by the applicant. He reminded the chamber that, according to the traffic engineers, Nees Avenue would carry the burden of the additional traffic.

Chair Hinkle explained the difficulty his family had placing his mother in such a facility, remarking that for the next thirteen or so years the Baby-Boomers would be reaching the age of needing assistance of varying levels and would need their housing needs would to be addressed.

At this point a motion was made by Commissioner Cunningham and seconded by Commissioner Hatcher to approve CUP2018-03. The motion was approved by a vote of 5-0.

- B. Consider Approval Res. 18-__, **CUP2018-02**, A request to approve a conditional use permit to allow a 24-hour drive-up/ drive-thru window use, including outdoor seating in association with a proposed Starbucks for property located near the northwest corner of Shaw and Leonard Avenues. Cloverleaf Capital, LLC, owner/applicant.

Associate Planner George Gonzalez presented the staff report.

Commissioner Cunningham sought and received confirmation on the location of the paseo.

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

Samer Sabbah, 5101 W. Merlot Court, offered to answer any questions.

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

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

There being none, the Chair closed the public portion.

Planning and Development Services Dwight Kroll provided some background on the location of this proposed drive-thru versus the proposed locations of such in the design of Loma Vista and the Shaw Avenue Corridor. He also provided some more information about the design of the paseo and of the architecture.

Chair Hinkle confirmed that the 24-hour aspect of the use is being allowed because there is no residential area nearby, as such uses are not allowed adjacent to residences.

At this point a motion was made by Commissioner Hatcher and seconded by Commissioner Antuna to approve CUP2018-02. The motion was approved by a vote of 5-0.

C. Consider items associated with properties located on the north and south sides of Herndon Avenue and the west and east sides of Temperance Avenue. Clovis Community Medical Center, owner/applicant.

1. Consider Approval Res. 18-__, A request to approve a Program Environmental Impact Report for CUP85-18A11, and widening of Herndon Avenue.
2. Consider Approval Res. 18-__, **CUP85-18A11**, A request to approve a conditional use permit amendment for the expansion of the Clovis Medical Center Master Plan located on the north and south sides of Herndon Avenue at Temperance Avenue. Clovis Community Medical Center, owner/applicant.

City Planner Bryan Araki and Scott Odell of Odell Planning and Research presented the staff report.

Chair Hinkle remarked that at a previous Planning Commission Academy, they were told to plan for fifty years in the future, and this project is out at thirty years, getting closer to that goal. He also inquired as to what would happen to the geese that live in this area, being a community feature. City Planner Araki responded that he would leave that for the applicant to answer.

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

Todd Cook of 11600 E. Herndon Avenue explained that he served on the General Plan Update Committee with Chair Hinkle for four years, that this area was covered in great detail, and this proposal fits in with the intent of the plans for this area. He remarked that he will be immediately affected by this project and that this is a privilege to have a private employer willing to invest billions of dollars to improve the lives of this community, and strongly supports it.

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

Sarah Taylor of 3001 Lava Ridge Court Suite #120, Roseville, the firm of Mitchell & Chadwick, on behalf of Suburban Propane, wished not to oppose the project but to alert the Planning Commission to the current existence of a large storage tank near to this site so that the client would not be asked to relocate it in the future. She also expressed appreciation for the thorough response to their comment letter, and requested that future commercial development be kept as far from the tank as possible.

George Allen of 7027 N. De Wolf Avenue, sent a formal letter of opposition that he wished to follow up on. He stated that he did not receive notice of this meeting until forty-eight hours previous, and requested that the widening of Herndon Avenue be pushed further down the road due to the short notice time frame, preventing research. He expressed that his concerns involved the area east of the canal, as he sees no plan for it or mitigation of negative impacts. He also addressed safety concerns due to street width narrowing up to and after the Enterprise Canal, wishing to know what the plan is for this area.

Chair Hinkle remarked that the Herndon portion of the project will be going before the City Council, and that the area east of the canal belongs to the County of Fresno.

Mr. Allen inquired as to whether or not that area is within the City's Sphere of Influence. City Planner Araki responded that it is not, but that the Herndon Avenue project is in cooperation with the County, and they would like his input as they put together that plan.

Mr. Allen then inquired as to what is the goal of this meeting. City Planner Araki responded that it is to evaluate the worst case scenario environmental impacts. He then directed him to contact Associate Civil Engineer Smith for more information on what exactly is being changed, when, and how and to provide input in the planning process.

At this point, the Chair closed the public portion.

Commissioner Terrance disclosed that he is currently a candidate for a political office, actively campaigning for the next five days, and because of a potential conflict of interest that he just learned of, he will be abstaining from voting on this project.

At this point a motion was made by Commissioner Cunningham and seconded by Commissioner Antuna to approve the Program Environmental Impact Report for CUP85-18A11 and the Herndon Avenue Widening Project. The motion was approved by a vote of 4-0-1.

At this point a motion was made by Commissioner Cunningham and seconded by Commissioner Antuna to approve CUP85-18A11. The motion was approved by a vote of 4-0-1.

D. Consider items associated with approximately 4.20 acres of property located north of Sierra Avenue between Fowler and Armstrong Avenues. De Young Properties, owner/applicant; Scott Zaayer, representative.

1. Consider Approval Res. 18-___, **R2018-05**, A request to rezone from the R-A (Single-Family Residential Very Low Density) Zone District to the R-1-MD (Single-Family Residential Medium Density) Zone District.
2. Consider Approval Res. 18-___, **TM6155**, A request to approve a tentative tract map for a 20-lot single family residential subdivision.

Planning Technician II Maria Spera presented the staff report.

Chair Hinkle sought and received confirmation that the cul-de-sac on the north end would allow access for future development on the western portion of the property, that the two lots on the west end of Sierra Avenue would have access onto Sierra Avenue, and that the existing home on the project site would be razed.

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

Ernie Escobedo of 2358 Winwood Avenue, of De Young Properties, provided some background on the proposed project.

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

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

There being none, the Chair closed the public portion.

At this point a motion was made by Commissioner Antuna and seconded by Commissioner Terrance to approve R2018-05. The motion was approved by a vote of 5-0.

At this point a motion was made by Commissioner Antuna and seconded by Commissioner Terrance to approve TM6155. The motion was approved by a vote of 5-0.

- E. Consider items associated with approximately 168 acres of land located on the northwest corner of Shepherd and Sunnyside Avenues. Various Owners; Lennar, applicant; Yamabe & Horn Engineering, representative.
 1. Consider Approval Res. 18-___, Approval of an environmental finding of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for GPA2017-07, R2017-18, CUP2017-17, and TM6200.
 2. Consider Approval Res. 18-___, **GPA2017-07**, A request to amend the circulation element of the General Plan and Heritage Grove Specific Plan for placement of a Shepherd Avenue access point on the north side of Shepherd Avenue, west of Sunnyside Avenue for future development. Additionally, a request to provide for reclassification of the designated Open Space are to a Mixed Use classification and relocation of the required Open Space within the Project site.
 3. Consider Approval Res. 18-___, **R2017-18**, A request to approve a prezone from the AE-20 (Agricultural Exempt) Zone District to the R-1 (Single Family Residential) and P-F (Public Facilities) Zone Districts.
 4. Consider Approval Res. 18-___, **CUP2017-17**, A request to approve a 586-lot Planned Residential Development with public streets.
 5. Consider Approval Res. 18-___, **TM6200**, A request to approve a vesting tentative tract map for a 586-lot single-family planned residential development.

Senior Planner Orlando Ramirez presented the staff report.

Commissioner Cunningham expressed concern regarding the side setback of four feet, as listed on page 102 of the staff report's TM6200 proposed setback table, in terms of ability to move trash containers within such a setback, and after a meeting with the City Council had decided on a setback of five feet and three feet. Though there are few lots in this proposed tract where this would be an issue, he worried about such an issue becoming more common if a precedence is set and would not support this tract map as so. Senior Planner Ramirez responded that staff had addressed this concern with the applicant, who appeared amicable to reorienting that setback and will address the Commission on it.

Commissioner Antuna inquired as to the locations of the project's common area and parks and their acreage. Senior Planner Ramirez provided that information.

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

Arakel Arisian of 389 Clovis Avenue, Suite #100, on behalf of Lennar Homes and the Ricchiuti Family, expressed appreciation for staff, addressed the setback and park space concerns, and then provided background information on the project.

Commissioner Cunningham inquired as to what 'affordable housing' means to the applicant, given what it is to the Planning Commission as defined by the State of California, which speaks to density. Mr. Arisian provided his definition and a detailed explanation of it.

Chair Hinkle inquired as to the applicant's willingness to have paved access from the driveway to the side intended to store trash totes, as people have chosen to leave totes in driveways rather than pull them over bark in drought-tolerant landscaping. He expressed his belief that such a move would benefit not only this neighborhood but Heritage Grove as a whole. Mr. Arisian expressed that they are open to such a feature and have other projects with such.

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

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

Norman Morrison of 8195 Sunnyside Avenue, expressed opposition not to the development itself but rather to the right in-right out movement on proposed for Shepherd Avenue and its impact on traffic on Sunnyside Avenue, which is already experiencing safety issues. He stated that he had not had sufficient time to supply written comments after the project documents became available and that neither he nor his neighbors were invited to meetings and were made aware of the right in-right out only recently, even though they will be affected. Mr. Morrison also stated that there was no discussion of how other developments in the area will affect the traffic with that right in-right out added. He requested traffic calming measures be employed if the intent is to use Sunnyside Avenue.

Patrick Menagh of 9459 Purdue Avenue echoed Mr. Morrison's concerns regarding traffic on Sunnyside Avenue and provided further details, though he is not against the project itself, and requested a stop light and for Shepherd Avenue to be four lanes. He also expressed concerns with child safety crossing the street near the proposed park without a stop light. Mr. Menagh requested that the project not move forward without more explanation of how the developer will deal with these traffic concerns. His second concern was with water supply availability and how

it will be addressed in this development, offering some suggestions and asking for more information.

Phillip Janzer of 5104 Perrin Road stated that he has many questions about the design (the block wall, the setbacks, the landscape design, roofing material, etc.) and the density of the project on Sunnyside Avenue, and how traffic and water issues will be addressed. He also expressed confusion about the mentioned neighborhood meeting, as neither he nor his neighbors received any invitation regarding it.

Jared Callister 9318 N. Sunnyside Avenue stated that the neighborhood had met twice, not including the Lennar meeting, and that they had many concerns and questions regarding this project, echoing the concerns expressed by the previous speakers. One of his main concerns is that there would be no transition/cohesion between lot sizes in the area and that there should be a greater buffer between the road and the wall. The other issue he has is with the proposed roundabout on Sunnyside Avenue, touching on the traffic concerns mentioned by the other speakers and his own.

Joseph Pass of 5150 E. Perrin Road stated that he had not received a notice about any meetings that took place, and only found out about the project from his neighbors. He echoed the concerns already voiced and that his neighbors share them.

Ronda Schmidt of 9710 N. Stanford Avenue stated her concern that the traffic for the nearby schools will go through her neighborhood, which will affect the traffic particularly on Sunnyside Avenue, which will not be alleviated by the planned future school for some time to come.

Jennifer Hickman of 5364 E. Ticonderoga Avenue echoed Mrs. Schmidt's concerns regarding school traffic and its impact on her. She also stated that when the intersection Fowler and Shepherd was closed to put in a stop sign, there was an increase in racing, crime (mailbox break-ins), litter, and traffic. She's not against the project, but rather wants more attention brought to the issues being brought up.

Matt Ruiz of 5141 E. Lexington Avenue expressed that he would not have purchased this home based on this plan and its density levels. His first concern was infrastructure, listing the development of Clovis Avenue to alleviate traffic, water, and high-speed internet as particular issues. He requested that development not go too fast, that the residents be given chances for input, and that the Planning Commission act as their advocates in terms of major infrastructure impacts.

Jeff Evans of 5161 E. Serena Avenue expressed that he is not opposed to the project but that he has concerns with the traffic. He expressed concern for the safety of pedestrians that use the Enterprise Canal Trail due to the increase in traffic, and for the increase in traffic on Sunnyside Avenue. He requested a neighborhood meeting with the developer involving all who would be impacted rather than just those within eight hundred feet.

Jill Poulsen of 9324 N. Purdue Avenue echoed the concerns already expressed and added that one of her main concerns is water availability with the proposed removal of the orchards, as this area is currently functioning as a recharge area. She inquired as to whether there had been any studies on this or if one was planned. Another concern for her is the entrance on Sunnyside Avenue, wondering why there has to be an entrance there, and requesting input in how it will be done if it's necessary.

Diedre Childers of 9398 N. Purdue Avenue expressed her concern about not only traffic and water but also the fate of the wildlife that would be displaced by the development, as she already has some creatures invading her home. Some of these are endangered species, and so she wonders what will be done to preserve them.

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

Mr. Arisian expressed his gratitude for the speakers for their participation, assured them that the noticing process and mailing list provided by the City staff were followed, and offered to take names, emails, and phones to invite people to the next neighborhood meeting. He also assured that the City staff is knowledgeable and skilled in their guidance of the applicant. He addressed the traffic concerns with an explanation of the proposed street development that would go along with this project.

Commissioner Cunningham inquired as to a timeline for a stop light at the intersection of Minnewawa and Shepherd Avenues. Associate Civil Engineer responded that it is under design and set for next year.

Mr. Arisian assured that part of their development would be to develop streets, and listed some of the access issues that were taken into consideration in designing the access points. He also assured that everything proposed is with the intent of staying within the General Plan and Heritage Grove design guidelines. He also addressed the water issue, the density and lot size issue, the traffic issue, infrastructure, and wildlife. Mr. Arisian assured that there will be another neighborhood meeting with a wider radius, offered to answer further questions, and requested that the process be allowed to move forward.

Commissioner Terrance inquired as to whether sidewalks would be part of the project, concerned about encouraging pedestrian activity and reducing vehicle traffic. Mr. Arisian assured that there would be not only sidewalks but also seven foot planter strips between the sidewalks and the roads, providing details.

Commissioner Antuna followed up with an inquiry into the applicant's intent to install any traffic-calming measures along Sunnyside Avenue. Mr. Arisian responded that it is in the County's jurisdiction, deferring to staff on it, and that they are focused on pedestrian safety within the bounds of their project.

A member of the audience protested that she had no idea who on the Commission had represented the neighbors in the meetings and that she and those further outside the notice area having to go add their names to a list for the next meeting rather than being automatically invited is not appropriate and not representing Clovis, especially since some of those invited are in Fresno County rather than in Clovis.

Senior Planner Ramirez explained the mailing list radius and how many homeowners were noticed.

Chair Hinkle suggested that, since there will be other projects going into this area, if someone is interested, they contact the Planning Department and get their names added to a list. He gave an example of a previous neighborhood meeting on the Clovis Avenue extension that addressed a lot of the concerns brought up tonight but had low attendance.

Mr. Arisian followed up with an invitation to anyone who wants to be involved in the next meeting, as they use the lists they are given to send out invitations.

Planning and Development Services Director Kroll reiterated that there are three possible actions for the Commission to take tonight: consider approval, recommend denial, and continue the item.

City Planner Araki suggested working with the applicant to include this neighborhood in the noticing process.

Commissioner Cunningham agreed and also requested that anyone present interested in further meetings contact the Planning Department as a double check.

Commissioner Hatcher inquired of what will happen to the neighbors in terms of water and losing that recharge area. Associate Civil Engineer Smith responded that there is currently an environmental impact report in progress studying and planning for the water and sewer issues in the area, providing details.

Commissioner Hatcher remarked that she would prefer to continue this project until the EIR is done and the neighbors have had a chance to meet with the developer, as she felt that it would be premature to move on this project before that.

Commissioner Terrance supported that idea, as there are issues of significant magnitude to still be discussed, though the applicant has been thorough and reasonable.

Commissioner Cunningham expressed agreement with his fellow commissioners. His understanding is that the developer is willing to work with the neighbors, and that the neighbors are not necessarily against the project but want to be consulted. He referred to the Dry Creek Preserve project process as an example of taking time to get everyone in agreement.

Commissioner Antuna expressed appreciation for the developer's proposed product, its utilization of the existing area and maintenance of the spirit of Heritage Grove. She also expressed agreement that there needs to be a continuance to allow a closure of the disconnection between the present neighbors and the developer. She also requested that the neighbors be open to the developers, describing the effort they expend in designing projects.

Chair Hinkle expressed appreciation for the quality of this development and the developer's willingness to work with the City. He inquired as to whether they should approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration tonight. City Planner Araki responded that it is entirely up to the Commission as to what actions to take.

Mr. Arisian expressed appreciation for the feedback, and requested that the project not be suspended until after the EIR's completion, as final approval would already have to wait for it and extending that timeline would cause significant issues. However, continuing the project and giving them time to meet with the neighbors would work, as there would still be the guarantee that the project would not go before the City Council until the EIR is done.

Commissioner Cunningham inquired as to whether the vesting tentative tract map could be approved or if it would be better to continue that as well, procedurally speaking. City Planner

Araki responded that the map cannot be approved without the general plan amendment and prezone, but that there is the option of considering the environmental tonight and the project later, and recommended continuing to a date uncertain if it does get continued, as continuing to a certain date will remove the noticing requirement, which is counter to the intention of noticing all involved and interested parties.

At this point the Commission approved by consensus to continue the project to a date uncertain.

Chair Hinkle expressed that meetings now would be between the neighbors and staff, and the applicant.

Commissioner Antuna encouraged the neighbors to speak with Mr. Arisian to get their contact information added to mailing lists.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

None

ADJOURNMENT AT 10:35 P.M. UNTIL the Planning Commission meeting on June 28, 2018.