AGENDA

ORANGE COVE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 2015
REGULAR MEETING AT 6:30 P.M.

Orange Cove Council Chambers
633 6th Street,
Orange Cove, California 93646

Coy Weldon, Planning Commissioner
Rev. Rick Applegarth, Planning Commissioner
Benjamin Camarillo, Planning Commissioner

A. Call to Order/Welcome

1. Roll Call
2. Flag Salute

B. Confirmation of Agenda

(Materials regarding an item on this agenda submitted to the Planning Commission after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the City Clerk's Office at 633 6th Street, Orange Cove, CA 93646 during normal business hours.)

C. Administration

CITY ENGINEER

1. **SUBJECT:** Workshop – General Plan and Zoning Map Recommendations and Proposed Zoning Ordinance and General Plan Revisions

   Recommendation: Commission to review report and provide input

D. Adjournment

Public Comment: Members of the public shall have an opportunity to address the City Council concerning this matter.

ADA Notice: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk at (559) 626-4488 ext. 214. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

Documents: Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public

inspection at front counter at City Hall and at the Orange Cove Library located at 815 Park Blvd., Orange Cove, CA during normal business hours. In addition, most documents are posted on City's website at cityoforangecove.com.

NOTICE

If you challenge the nature of the proposed action in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the public entity conducting the hearing at, or prior to, the public hearing. (Government Code Section 65009.)

STATEMENT ON RULES OF DECORUM AND ENFORCEMENT

The Brown Act provides that members of the public have a right to attend public meetings, to provide public comment on action items and under the public forum section of the agenda, and to criticize the policies, procedures, or services of the city or of the acts or omissions of the city council. The Brown Act also provides that the Planning Commission has the right to exclude all persons who willfully cause a disruption of a meeting so that it cannot be conducted in an orderly fashion.

During a meeting of the Orange Cove Planning Commission, there is a need for civility and expedition in the carrying out of public business in order to ensure that the public has a full opportunity to be heard and that the Commissioners has an opportunity to conduct business in an orderly manner. The following is provided to place everyone on notice of the rules of decorum and enforcement.

GENERAL RULES OF DECORUM

While any meeting of the Planning Commission is in session, the following rules of decorum shall be observed:

1. All remarks shall be addressed to the Planning Commission as a whole and not to any single member, unless in response to a question from a member of the City Council.
2. A person who addresses the Planning Commission under public comment for a specific agenda item or under the Public Forum section of the agenda may not engage in speech or conduct (i) which is likely to provoke others to violent or riotous behavior, (ii) which disturbs the peace of the meeting by loud and unreasonable noise, (iii) which is irrelevant or repetitive, or (iv) which

disrupts, disturbs, or otherwise impedes the orderly conduct of any Planning Commission meeting.

3. A person, other than members of the Planning Commission and the person who has the floor, shall not be permitted to enter into the discussion unless requested by the Chairman to speak.
4. Members of the Planning Commission may not interrupt a person who has the floor and is making public comments. Members of the Planning Commission shall wait until a person completes his or her public comments before asking questions or commenting. The Chairman shall then ask the Planning Commissioners if they have comments or questions.
5. No person in the audience at a Planning Commission meeting shall engage in disorderly or boisterous conduct, including the utterance of loud, threatening or abusive language, whistling, stamping of feet or other acts which disturb, disrupt or otherwise impede the orderly conduct of any Planning meeting.

ENFORCEMENT OF DECORUM RULES

While the Planning Commission is in session, all persons must preserve order and decorum. A person who addresses the Planning Commission under public comment for a specific agenda item or under the Public Forum section of the agenda may not engage in speech or conduct which is likely to provoke others to violent or riotous behavior, which disturbs the peace of the meeting by loud and unreasonable noise, which is irrelevant or repetitive, or which disrupts, disturbs, or otherwise impedes the orderly conduct of any Planning meeting.

The Chairman or other presiding officer shall request that a person who is breaching the rules of decorum cease such conduct. If after receiving such a warning, the person persists in breaching the rules of decorum, the Chairman or other presiding officer may order the person to leave the City Council meeting. If such person does not leave, the Chairman or presiding officer may request any law enforcement officer who is on duty at the meeting as sergeant-at-arms to remove the person from the Council Chambers. In the event there is no one from law enforcement present, the Chairman or presiding officer may direct the City Manager to contact law enforcement.

In accordance with the Point of Order Rule 4.6, the majority of the Planning Commission may overrule the Chairman if the majority of the Planning Commission believes the Chairman or other presiding officer is not applying the rules of decorum appropriately.

CITY OF ORANGE COVE
REPORT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

To: Orange Cove Planning Commission

From: Gary D. Horn, City Engineer

Subject: Workshop – General Plan and Zoning Map Recommendations and Proposed Zoning Ordinance & General Plan Revisions

Attachments: General Plan and Zoning Map Recommendations and Maps

RECOMMENDATION:

Planning Commission conduct a workshop to review the proposed changes in the General Plan and Zoning Maps and Ordinances.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The current zoning map is out of date and does not reflect recommendations contained in the last update of the General Plan. Owners who wish to improve their property are faced with the requirement for a general plan revision or change in zoning, which are time-consuming and expensive. Staff feels this is the most important need that needs to be addressed.

BACKGROUND:

The Fresno Council of Governments has offered limited planning services by Land Use Associates at no charge to the City of Orange Cove. The Council approved the Staff recommendation that their services concentrate on the Zoning Ordinance to provide for consistency with the General Plan by updating the Zoning Map, developing regulations for a mixed use zone district and analysis of the Sphere of Influence line on the east side of Hills Valley Road.

During the review with your staff, several areas of inconsistencies were noted and have been addressed. Attached is the summary report by Mr. O'Neal outlining his recommendations, including maps that key his proposed changes. Also attached are two maps prepared by Mr. Hoak,

Prepared by: GH Approved by: _____

REVIEW: City Manager: SE Finance: _____ City Attorney: _____

TYPE OF ITEM: **COUNCIL ACTION:** **APPROVED** **DENIED** **NO ACTION**

____ Consent
____ Info Item
____ Action Item
____ Department Report
____ Redevelopment Agency

____ Public Hearing
____ Matter Initiated by a Council Member
____ Other
____ Continued to: _____

the city Building Inspector which show additional changes he is recommending.

A public hearing has been scheduled for September 15 to allow public input. Planning Commission recommendations will be submitted to the City Council for final action.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:

This workshop will allow staff to present the proposed changes to the Planning Commission for discussion and information before the public hearing.

CITY OF ORANGE COVE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING MAP RECOMMENDATIONS

State planning law requires that zoning be consistent with the General Plan. There are many inconsistencies between the Orange Cove Zoning Map and the General Plan land use map (2007) and land use element text. An initial analysis was prepared and reviewed by City staff. Based on the review, recommendations have been developed for formal amendment of the zoning ordinance and land use element. The recommendations are contained in the following sections:

- **ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENTS**
- **GENERAL PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT TEXT AMENDMENTS**
- **GENERAL PLAN LAND USE MAP AMENDMENTS**
- **ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS TO BE CONSISTENT WITH REVISED LAND USE MAP**

A. ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENTS

The General Plan contains several recommendations to amend the zoning ordinance. Some of these recommendations should move forward while others should be removed from the General Plan. Those that should move forward in a formal zoning ordinance text amendment are:

1. The following zone districts should be eliminated:

   - R-A (single family/agricultural)
   - RM-H (residential manufactured home)
   - P (off street parking)
   - UR (Urban Reserve)

2. The following zone districts should be prepared and/or amended:

   - The existing C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial) district should remain and the General Plan should contain a Neighborhood Commercial designation, including on the legend of the Land Use Map. Although no areas are now zoned C-1, the zone district could be used in future planning.

   - The Service Commercial designation would be implemented with the M-1 zone district, rather than a reconfigured C-1 district as recommended by the General Plan.

   - A Mixed Use (M-U) district should be adopted to implement the new <u>Mixed Use</u> land use designation to combine residential and commercial uses on a single site or within a single building. Mixed use projects would require a CUP.

   - A zoning text amendment to permit auto repair and towing by CUP in the C-3 district.

3. The are several recommended zoning amendments for multifamily development in the R-2, R-3, R-3-A or R-1-12 and R-1-6 districts, including:

   - limit multifamily development to 100 units on any site (R-2, R-3, R-3-A);
   - allow duplex/triplex buildings or corner lots in single family subdivisions by CUP (R-1-12, R-1-6);

4. The *Land Use/Zoning Consistency Matrix* shown below is an amendment to the land use element and contains both existing and new land use designations from the General Plan and those zone districts consistent with the designations. The matrix is, in effect, a requirement for applying consistent zoning to Sites shown on the land use map or when the General Plan is amended.

Orange Cove General Plan
Land Use/Zoning Consistency Table

State planning law requires that the zoning on every Site be consistent with the General Plan land use designation for that Site. The table below is a matrix that shows which General Plan land use designations are consistent with which zone districts. Land use designations are listed in the left column of the matrix while zone districts run across the top. Shaded boxes show consistency between a land use category and a zone district. For example, a Site zoned R-1-6 would be consistent with the Medium Density designation.

	R-1-12	R-1-6	R-2	R-3-A	R-3	MHP	C-1	C-2	C-3	M-U	M-1	M-2	O	PF	PUD
Land Use Designation															
Low Density															
Medium Density															
High Density															
Neighborhood Commercial															
General Commercial															
Central Commercial															
Service Commercial															
Mixed Use															
Industrial															
Public Facilities															
Open Space															

Note: The land use map contains a single "Industrial" designation, but the matrix includes both M-1 (light industrial) and M-2 (heavy Industrial) as consistent districts. This would leave the decision to the City Council to zone heavy industrial uses M-2 on a case-by-case basis.

5. The following zoning provisions recommended by the General Plan should not be adopted:

   - The Smart Development Zone (S-D) to implement smart growth design techniques, including narrow streets, architecture, common areas, and pedestrian features. These objectives could be achieved through adoption of design guidelines.
   - The General Plan recommends that the C-3 district be amended to permit residential development with a CUP. This objective will be met by preparing a new Mixed Use (M-U) district.
   - Permit multifamily development on the periphery of single family subdivisions along collector and arterial streets instead of a masonry sound wall.

B. GENERAL PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT TEXT AMENDMENTS

1. Text within the Land Use Element should be eliminated or edited to implement the recommendations of items A.1-5, above.

C. GENERAL PLAN LAND USE MAP AMENDMENTS

The General Plan land use map is attached and numbered for discussion of individual items. The following amendments are recommended:

1. Site No. 1 is City owned and partially developed with an OHV park and should be designated Open Space.
2. Site No. 2 have been approved in the past for industrial uses and should be designated Industrial.
3. Site No. 3 has been annexed to the City, zoned R-3 and P-F, and should be designated High Density Residential and Public Facility.
4. The zoning configuration for Site No. 4 was changed by Ordinance No. 358 adopted in 2012. Designations on the land use map should also be changed to be consistent with this rezoning (see Items Nos. 10-14 on the zoning map for the land use configuration).
5. Sites No. 5 are the only parcels on the land use map designated Service Commercial, a new designation. They should be changed to Industrial in keeping with existing land use (and zoned M-1).
6. Site No. 6 should be changed to General Commercial (and zoned C-2).
7. Site No. 7 is designated Mixed Use but should be designated Central Commercial (and zoned C-3).
8. Site No. 8 should be designated Public Facility (and zoned P-F).
9. Site No. 9 should be designated Central Commercial (and zoned C-3).
10. Site No. 10 is residential and should be designated Medium Density (and zoned R-1-6).
11. Site No. 11 have been developed with a multifamily project and should be designated Medium Density to match existing R-2 zoning.

12. Site No. 12 has been zoned C-3 and will become part of the Mixed Use designation (see No. 15, below).

13. Site No. 13 should be changed to Public Facility (and zoned P-F).

14. Site No. 14 should be changed to Mixed Use (and zoned M-U when the district is adopted).

15. The seniors housing project in Site No. 15 should be changed to High Density (and zoned R-3).

16. Site No. 16 should be changed to Industrial to be compatible with existing M-2 zoning.

17. All the R – Reserve areas should be removed from the land use map as the Urban Reserve designation and zone district should be eliminated.

18. "Overlay" should be removed from Mixed Use Overlay

D. ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS TO BE CONSISTENT WITH REVISED LAND USE MAP

The existing Zone Map is attached and numbered for discussion of individual items. Recommendations for rezoning to be consistent with the revised Land Use Map are:

1. Site No. 1 is developed with a high school and middle school and should be zoned PF (according to staff, zoning has been changed to PF, but should be reflected on the zone map).

2. Site No. 2 has an OHV park and city-owned land and should be zoned O. See item C.1.

3. Site No. 3 is an extension of an existing public facility and should be zoned PF (according to staff, zoning has been changed to PF, but should be reflected on the zone map).

4. Site No. 4 has been developed with a multifamily project and should be zoned R-2 (according to staff, zoning has been changed to R-2, but should be reflected on the zone map).

5. Site No. 5 is designated High Density and should be zoned R-2. (according to staff, zoning has been changed to R-2, but should be reflected on the zone map).

6. Site No. 6 have been approved in the past for industrial uses and should be zoned M-1 (see item No C-2).

7. Site No. 7 has been annexed to the City and should be zoned R-3. (according to staff, zoning has been changed to R-3, but should be reflected on the zone map).

8. Site No. 8 has been annexed to the City and should be zoned PF (according to staff, zoning has been changed to PF, but should be reflected on the zone map).

9. Site No. 9 is developed with a single family subdivision and should be zoned R-1-6 consistent with the designation on the land use map.

10. Site No. 10 is developed with single family homes and should be zoned R-1-6 consistent with the designation on the land use map.

11. Site No. 11 is developed with a public facility and should be zoned PF consistent with the designation on the land use map.

12. Site No. 12 should be zoned C-2 (according to staff, zoning has been changed to C-2, but should be reflected on the zone map). Please see comment C.4.

13. Site No. 13 should be R-3 (according to staff, zoning has been changed to R-3, but should be reflected on the zone map). Please see comment C.4.

14. Site No. 14 should be zoned R-1-6 (according to staff, zoning has been changed to R-1-6, but should be reflected on the zone map). Please see comment C.4.

15. Site No. 15 should be zoned C-3 (according to staff, zoning has been changed to C-3, but should be reflected on the zone map). Please see comment C.4.

16. Site No. 16 should be zoned PF (according to staff, zoning has been changed to PF, but should be reflected on the zone map). Please see comment C.4.

17. Site No. 17 should be zoned C-2 (according to staff, zoning has been changed to C-2, but should be reflected on the zone map).

18. Site No. 18 should be zoned C-2.

19. Site No. 19 should be changed from R-1-6 to R-2. (according to staff, zoning has been changed to R-2, but should be reflected on the zone map).

20. Site No. 20 is designated Central Commercial and zoning should be changed to C-3 (according to staff, zoning has been changed to C-3 for a portion of the site, but the entire site to C-3 should be reflected on the zone map).

21. Site No. 21 should be zoned PF.

22. Site No. 22 should be zoned C-3 (with a zoning text amendment to permit auto repair and towing by CUP in the C-3 district).

23. Site No. 23 should be zoned C-3. See item C.7.

24. Site No. 24 should be zoned R-1-6.

25. Site No. 25 should be zoned R-2.

26. Site No. 26 should be zoned R-1-6.

27. Site No. 27 should be zoned R-2.

28. Site No. 28 should be zoned R-1-6. See No. C.10.

29. Site No. 29 is designated as open space for the former railroad corridor and zoned PF. Zoning should be changed to O.

30. Site No. 30 should be zoned PF (according to staff, zoning has been changed to PF but should be reflected on the zone map). See item No. C.8

31. Site No. 31 should be zoned C-3. See item No. C.9.

32. Site No. 32 should be zoned R-3.

33. Site No. 33 should be zoned R-2. See item C.11.

34. Site No. 34 should be zoned M-U after development and adoption of the new district. See No. C.14.

35. Site No. 35 should be zoned R-3-A.

36. Site No. 36 should be zoned O (according to staff, zoning has been changed to PF, but should be changed to O).

37. Site No. 37 should be zoned R-1-12 (according to staff, zoning has been changed to R-A, but should be changed to R-1-12).

38. Site No. 38 should be zoned R-1-6.

39. Site No. 39 should be zoned R-1-6.

40. Site No. 40 should be zoned R-3. See No. C.15.

41. Site No. 41 should be zoned P-F. See No. C.13.