

**Minutes of  
CITY OF COALINGA  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
April 13, 2010**

**CALL TO ORDER**

City Hall City Council Chambers, 6:30 p.m.

**Chairman Stoppenbrink** called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM, PDT.

**ROLL CALL:**

**Chairman:** Mr. Ken Stoppenbrink  
**Vice-Chairman:** Mr. Chris Hess  
**Commissioners:** Mrs. Anne Jorgens  
Mr. Rocco Papietro  
Mr. Jim Reckas

**Community Development Coordinator** Sean Brewer  
**City Clerk** Wanda Earls

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: February 23, 2010**

*Motion to Approve Minutes of February 23, 2010 Made by Commissioner Reckas, Seconded by Commissioner Jorgens. Motion **Approved** by a Voice Vote.*

**2. COMMUNICATIONS:**

**Item "A": Citizens to address the Planning Commission**

None

**Item "B": Commission Reports (Information only - No Action).**

Commission reports deferred to Staff Reports.

**3. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Item "A" Adopt Resolution No 010P-003 and Recommend to the City Council Approval of a General Plan Amendment for Tentative Tract No. 5683, City Application No. GPA 10-01.**

**Adopt Resolution No. 010P-004 and Recommend to the City Council Approval of a Re-Zoning of Tentative Track No.5683, City Application No. RZ 10-01**

**Recommendation: Approve with Conditions**

**Resolution #           010P-003  
                                  010P-004**

**Commissioner Reckas** declared a conflict of interest.

**Chairman Stoppenbrink** excused Commissioner Reckas from the meeting.

**Community Development Coordinator Brewer:**

On March 2, 2010 the City of Coalinga Community Development Department received a request to revise Tentative Map No. 5683, which was approved by the City Council on September 28, 2006. Over the past year the ownership has changed to particular parcels and a request has been made modify the existing Tentative Map. After review of the modification presented to staff by the applicants, it was determined that a General Plan Amendment and Re-Zone was necessary in order to reflect the redistribution land uses.

The owner is requesting a Re-Zone and General Plan Amendment for APN No's: 071-020-023, 071-020-039, 071-020-062 and 072-020-043 in order to reflect the redistribution of land uses. The proposed modification to Tentative Map #5683 were determined by the City Engineer to be in substantial compliance with the existing Tentative Map adopted by the City Council in 2006. To be consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Map, a General Plan Amendment and Re-Zone must occur prior to the submission of a final map application.

In filing for the application for land use entitlements, the Developer requested a PD Overlay District Designation to allow for the reduction in the minimum lot size (square footage) for the R-1 and R-2 Districts.

Landowners within a 300-foot radius of the project site were notified of the project proposal. No written concerns have been expressed.

- Relationship to Community Planning Goals Regarding Orderly Growth
- Relationship to Surrounding Land Uses
- Land Capability and Service Availability
- Relationship to Other General Plan Elements

The proposed re-zone is consistent with that of the General Plan goals and policies and will not adversely impact the surrounding land uses. The re-zoning of Tract Map #5683 is merely a redistribution of land uses and zoning designations requested by the applicant as part of a modification to the existing Tentative Map.

**City Manager Skinner** said he would like to give some background to the Commission and to the public pertaining to the previous approvals. In 2006 the Council approved the Lakes Subdivision (mixed use with a higher density type of development to include single family, duplexes, triplexes and higher density apartments and town-homes around a proposed lake. In looking at the geology of the area with the conversances of two creeks staff attempted to counsel the, then, developer that it would probably be unwise to put a lake in very sandy soil; they would, virtually, have to make a swimming pool.

Current developers concurred with that assessment along with their engineers. Based on a community need staff recommended a golf-type of subdivision which would be an amenity to the City.

The proposal is a reduction in the overall number of units proposed in 2006. This does not mitigate the developer's responsibility and the City's oversight to insure that

existing utility systems, water, sewer, storm water, traffic and access are not adversely affected by the development of this subdivision and the golf course. The Commission is only hearing two actions; the reorientation of the land use, which is the General Plan Amendment and consistency with the Zoning Ordinance. The Council will be charged at an upcoming meeting with the conditions of approval.

The conditions of approve will be very stringent as staff is conscientious in bringing only good projects to the Council and promoting them to the community. Part of these conditions of approval is that existing users of all City facilities/utilities will not have to subsidize this development. The new developer will pay their way for infrastructure, extension, line-over-sizing as well as the paving of the development impact fees on a per unit basis to include school district fees (at time of construction).

A major concern to staff was access and circulation (traffic movement). Cherry Lane will not be a through street; it will be a cul-de-sac street with emergency access for fire, police and medical. Major streets into the development will be improved at the developer's cost with signalized intersections. These conditions of approval have been previously set but will be reevaluated on a per-unit threshold. There is a tiered system for improvements to be done.

This is a master plan community; we have to look at it as a long-range project of five, seven or ten years for build-out. This is why the Council will be asked to approve a full master plan. All conditions will be set for phases as well as a required golf course management plan. There is a river/trail system to inter-connect the subdivision. Conditions will be submitted to the Council at a May meeting.

Everyone is invited to attend the Council meeting. Staff is available to meet (even after hours) with you if you have questions/concerns.

Questions from the Commissioners were answered in reference to the PD overlay district, lot size, ingress/egress, Garfield/Polk improvements.

**Chairman Stoppenbrink** opened the public hearing.

**Mr. Edward Ramirez**, 323 Locust expressed his concerns regarding property value and apartments. Down the road, if the development does not pan out, what is going to keep it from going to lower income, Section 8.

**City Manager Skinner** indicated there are two maps, one existing, one proposed. In 2006 it was high density, multi-family. The developer, at that time, was looking at very compact, row houses, apartments and duplex type of development. The existing plan calls for R-2 and 5500 square-foot single-family lots. Once the general plan and zoning is set, it is cemented. It would take a revision and public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Council to affect a change. Staff does not feel apartments would work because of the high-density nature and the amount of traffic attempting to funnel through those narrow streets. Right now, all the traffic would be off-loaded on the one roadway. There will be secured fencing along the boundary, which is the old railroad right-away.

**Mr. Ramirez** asked what is going to keep our streets from becoming parking lots for the golf course?

**City Manager Skinner** explained there would be a solid block wall along that property boundary. All internal traffic would have to funnel to the internal roadway to be exited by one of the major intersections. The fire access on Cherry Lane through a cul-d-sac

has a breakaway type of gate. There will be no extension of Locust, Walnut or Cherry. The subdivision will be contained.

**Mr. Ramirez** indicated a major concern, as a community, is Valley Fever. Three members of his family are dealing with Valley Fever right now. Is there anything to be done to limit the stirring up of dust?

**City Manager Skinner** said the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District has very strict guidelines pertaining to construction addressing Valley Fever. We have public work crews on site and the building official on site to insure that, at time of grading/construction, water trucks are available wetting down the dirt. Staff has the ability to issue fines for noncompliance; we can, also, call the air board out to issue heftier fines. Complaints will be accepted and responded to immediately.

**Mr. Bob Allison**, 524 N. Garfield (Corner of Garfield/Roosevelt) indicated his major concern is that his corner is going to be the major access to the project area. It was indicated that Garfield is going to be upgraded prior to commencing construction. Being on that corner, we have Roosevelt on both sides without stop signs/lights. We have that dip on the corner of Roosevelt that floods. We have problems with the alleyway. What is the City going to do to insure good access and minimum traffic?

**City Manager Skinner** indicated in the first phase Garfield and Polk will have to be signalized.

Staff will have to reevaluate the drainage situation. We plan to pull a lot of the water from downtown through the Van Ness Storm Water Drain Project. As a Capital Improve Project we are looking at doing a storm water drain along Garfield connecting to the major storm water connection in this area. This leads out to the golf course through a series of bio swells (humps in the ground) where the water flows over them and filters out oil and pesticides then through catch basins in the golf course; then to a larger basin. When the new Wastewater Plant is established there will be siphon from the storm water line under the creek using an existing area as a ponding basin.

This intersection (pointing to map) will be fully signalized to Caltrans standards. This first phase is the Van Ness alignment, one of the major entries into this subdivision. By the 500<sup>th</sup> building permit there has to be a bridge crossing Los Gatos Creek connecting into Phelps. There will be three major entranceways. There are tiered improvements relating to thresholds and numbers of units constructed.

A full traffic study was completed in 2006. Caltrans approved the mitigation measures and the General Plan Updates.

**Mr. Allison** asked about the two side streets that meet up with Garfield. Currently, there are no stop signs.

**City Manager Skinner** indicated the traffic study detailed the average daily trips. (ADT) and stop signs will have to be installed at that location. The dips don't work. A storm water system will have to be installed; drainage inlets (DI's) should solve the problem.

**Mr. Allison** asked about the materials for the fencing.

**Mr. Greg Ward**, Developer said they are looking into the material for the solid wall. They are looking at block/concrete but there are some areas, in between, where wood could be used.

**Mr. Allison** asked if there would be a “gated” community?

**City Manager Skinner** responded to the negative.

**Mr. Allison** asked about the alleyway on the backside of Roosevelt? It is going to be enlarged?

**City Manager Skinner** responded that the normal size of an alley is 20-feet, large enough for a garbage truck or fire truck to navigate through.

**Mr. David McDaniel**, 224 E. Cherry Lane said you indicate a breakaway gate. We now get foot traffic from the trailer park. It appears, with this development, children walking to school would be going right down Cherry Lane.

**City Manager Skinner** said unfortunately that would probably happen. The cul-de-sac or dead end street at Cherry Lane is called a “key lock” or “day lighted cul-de-sac” which, allows for limited pedestrian access. The breakaway gate will be a swinging gate with a chain allowing access by the fire department. In order to create the viability of a “walking community” there has to be that enter connection for pedestrians in that area.

To address your concern regarding the children from the trailer park, we are realigning Cherry Lane, which should help. As this development occurs in phases, there will be blocked off walls. They have to cross the creek. The footbridge that is there will no longer be a viable route for them. Staff is applying for grants for an urban trail system safe routes to school, which would run a trail system along the creek bed to the high school.

**Mr. McDaniel** said there are not sidewalks to accommodate the foot traffic on Cherry Lane. He has a sidewalk in front of his house.

**City Manager Skinner** said we are living with the sins of the past. When Cherry Lane was constructed, it was constructed as a substandard street; it is not wide enough. To put sidewalks in, residents along Cherry Lane would have to give up a portion of their property, move utility lines, etc. It would become a Valley Street type of situation. A quad-cab pickup cannot be marked without it intruding on the sidewalk.

The City currently receives Community Block Grant Money (CDBG), a federal program administrated by the Housing and Community Development Department (State). Previous councils decided to join Fresno County as a pool to obtain these funds. If we move out of that group, we can apply with other cities for competitive grants. CDBG funds can be used for curb, gutter, sidewalks, storm water improvement, housing improvements, etc. Instead of receiving \$100K from the County, we have the talent, aggressiveness and ambition to receive millions of dollars per year to do these improvements. Prior to any application, we would have a town hall meeting and asked residents to bring their suggestions.

On the fifteen acre partial, if the school district decides to tear the building down, 500-800 homes qualifies for one elementary school for future generations. Mr. Dobbs and City staff have a good working relationship. Before anything happens like this, public hearing would have to be held.

**Mr. Greg Ward**, 3566 Beard Road, Fremont, California (Developer) said they have been very surprised at the welcome they have received from the community. The City has demonstrated a willingness to work with them. They are willing to work with the City for everyone’s concern. They like the City and look forward to moving forward.

**Chairman Stoppenbrink** asked about the build-out time.

**Mr. Ward** indicated it would probably be around five years or less. It depends on the market swings, the type of housing, traffic from other areas, etc. The City needs a community center, golf course and good restaurant.

**Chairman Stoppenbrink** closed the public hearing.

**Chairman Stoppenbrink** asked about the number of units and density level.

**Mr. Brewer** indicated said staff does not have an exact number of units projected. Changing from R-3 to R-2 reduces the number of units. The single-family has been reduced significantly.

**City Manager Skinner** offered the following explanation:

- R-3 = 15-17 units per acre
- R-2 = 8-10 units per acre
- R-1 = 4 1/2 units per acre

**Chairman Stoppenbrink** asked about the water. Wasn't this land included in the previous allocation water studies for the area?

**City Manager Skinner** said the City required a SB610 study in 2006. The water study indicated the allocation from the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation was sufficient (within the City Limits) to handle all build out. With the water allocation being reduced, we still have enough with conservation efforts. It is called MNI water and part of our federal contract for municipal/industrial water is for health and safety reasons, the government cannot reduce our water supply.

The golf course management plan indicates the requirement for storm water to be reused from those catch basins to irrigate the golf course. An agricultural well would be drilled using a black pipe system not for human consumption. There would be no potable water used for turf irrigation.

**Chairman Stoppenbrink** called for the motion.

*Motion to Approve Resolution No. 010P-003 a Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Coalinga, California Recommending to the City Council a General Plan Amendment for Tract #5683 – Assessors Parcel Numbers: 071-020-023, 071-020-039, 071-020-062 and 071-020-043 Made by Vice-Chairman Hess, Seconded by Commissioner Jorgens. Motion **Approved** by a Roll-call Vote:*

Ayes:	Hess, Jorgens, Stoppenbrink
Noes:	None
Abstained:	Reckas (Conflict of Interest)
Absent:	Papietro

*Motion to Approve Resolution No. 010P-004 a Resolution of the City of Coalinga Planning Commission Recommending to the City Council Approval of a Re-Zoning Application*

submitted by Mr. Greg Ward for a Re-Zoning from High Density Residential, R-3 (74.53 acres) SFR, R-1 (103.59 acres) and Open Space, OS (20.65 acres) with a Planned Development Overlay District to Low Density Multiple Family Residential R-2 (75.72 acres, Open Space O (61.14 acres) and SFR, R-1 (74.80 acres) with a Planned Development Overlay District for Fresno County Assessors Parcel Number 071-020-023, 071-020-039, 071-020-062, 071-020-043 Made by Vice-Chairman Hess, Seconded by Commissioner Jorgens. Motion **Approved** by a Roll-call Vote:

Ayes: Hess, Jorgens, Stoppenbrink  
Noes: None  
Abstained: Reckas (Conflict of Interest)  
Absent: Papietro

**Commissioner Reckas** returned to the meeting.

**4. NEW BUSINESS:** None

**5. STAFF REPORTS:**

**Item "A" Community Development Department Update:**

**City Manager Skinner** gave the following updates:

- Cherry/Elm Realignment/Signalization Project
- Elm Street 3<sup>rd</sup>/7<sup>th</sup>
- Old Caltrans Yard/Old Vet's Office Demolition
- Van Ness Storm Water Line (Phase 1)
- Sports Park – Phase 1A

**Upcoming Projects:**

- Plaza Reconstruction – site survey completed
- Sixth Street – Elm to Cedar – Site survey completed
- Octagon House landscaping plan – complete at end of April
- Polk/Forest Realignment/Signalization – September release bid
- Safe Routes to School – application due in September for Baker Street
- Site Plan for Shopping Center @ Old Caltrans Yard
- Phelps (Elm to Posa Chanet) Reconstruction Project – July release of bid

Staff will be working really hard over the summer then, after a brief rest, we will be gearing up for the 2011 projects.

**Commissioner Reckas** ask if lights at Cherry Lane would be synchronized with the one at Phelps. Will there be a light at Cambridge?

**City Manager Skinner** replied the lights would be synchronized at Cherry and Phelps. The Cambridge signalization is figured into our five-year capital improvement plan. The developers for the golf course will pay impact fees in addition to doing improvements for themselves as mitigation measures. There are two things, mitigation and actual construction and payment per unit of impact fees. Staff is calculating those impact fees to be sufficient to pay for the T-intersection at Cambridge to be signalized. Once the sports park is completed the City wants to redo Cambridge with a center median island all the way down to Elm.

**Commissioner Reckas** asked if Cherry Lane was going to be fully signalized or just be a flashing beckon.

**City Manager Skinner** replied the intersection would be fully signalized with red, yellow and green and synced with the other signals for traffic flow.

**Commissioner Reckas** asked about storm water drain down Van Ness and how much would the street be torn up because that will be going on during school.

**City Manager Skinner** said the first phase of Van Ness is from Elm Street going east to the project area. It will tear up the street substantially as it comes from the west toward the east from Elm Street into the golf course area to that natural drainage swell. We have enough frontage right-away (people will have their yards torn up) we should be able to stay out of the geometric section.

**Commissioner Jorgens** asked at what phase do we need to have the new sewer plant in operation.

**City Manager Skinner** indicated it would be the 3<sup>rd</sup> phase.

Thursday we are going into bond meetings to determine how much money it is going to cost the City. That dovetails into how much the rate increases will be. We have to back into the schedule. Once we get the cost estimate and the rate increase passed to prove to the bonding agencies we can repay, it should be approximately eighteen months from the time the bid is awarded until the new plant comes on line.

The Council will hold public forums and work-studies on several Saturdays. Staff is going to run the water and sewer as Series A & B bonds at the same time.

Our water system is in jeopardy; we are one major disaster away from having no water.

The plans are competed. We are only waiting on two items, the approved rate increases and Chevron deeding us an acre of land next to the existing Palmer Reservoir. They have agreed but they want a request letter with his signature for insert in cooperate format, which, they can easily countersign.

**6. DEFERRED BUSINESS:**

**Item "A" Planning Commissioners (Chair/Vice Chairman) Annual Reorganization**

*Commissioner Jorgens Nominated Commissioner Stoppenbrink as Planning Commission Chairperson. Commissioner Stoppenbrink Accepted the Nomination.*

*Roll-call Vote to Elect Commissioner Stoppenbrink as Planning Commission Chairperson:*

Ayes:	Jorgens, Reckas, Hess, Stoppenbrink
Noes:	None
Abstained:	None
Absent:	Papietro

*Chairman Stoppenbrink Nominated Commissioner Hess as Planning Commission Vice-Chairperson. Commissioner Hess Accepted the Nomination:*

*Roll-call Vote to Elect Commissioner Hess as Planning Commission Vice-Chairperson:*

Ayes: Stoppenbrink, Reckas, Jorgens, Hess  
Noes: None  
Abstained: None  
Absent: Papietro

**7. ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

None

**8. ADJOURNMENT:**

Next Resolution Number: **010P-005**

Next Planning Commission Meeting Scheduled: **April 27, 2010**

**Chairman Stoppenbrink** adjourned the meeting at 7:30 PM, PDT.

---

**Ken Stoppenbrink**, Chairman

---

**Wanda Earls**, City Clerk

---

Date