

**PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF SONORA
February 14, 2011
7:00 P.M.**

A regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Sonora was scheduled on this date at 7:00 p.m. in the Sonora City Hall Council Chambers.

The following members were present: Chairman John Andersen, Vice Chairman Dwain McDonald and Commissioners Chris Garnin, and John Richardson. Absent was Commissioner George Segarini.

Motion by Commissioner McDonald, seconded by Commissioner Richardson, unanimously carried (4-0), to approve the minutes of the meetings of October 12, 2010 and December 13, 2010.

PUBLIC APPEARANCES – None

PUBLIC HEARING – Application by David Bush, for design review related to an 11' x 13' storage shed with a concrete apron, walkways and an arbor/trellis, located at 574 S. Washington Street, in a C, Commercial zone; APN: 002-184-04.

Planning Consultant, Amy Augustine presented the staff report and reviewed the conditions, reasons for conditions and recommended approval.

Chairman Andersen opened the public hearing at 7:04 p.m.

David Bush, applicant objected to requirements for a building permit, submittal of a landscape plan, design review and the requirement to reconstruct the rock wall.

With no other public comment, the public hearing was closed at 7:12 p.m.

Commissioner Garnin stated he appreciated the improvements that the applicant has made to the building. He wanted to work with the applicant to be flexible regarding wall and landscaping requirements.

Commissioners McDonald and Richardson agreed with the flexibility, but not the elimination of the landscape requirements.

Staff clarified that rocks (either from or not from the rock wall, but in a pile uphill of the proposed shed) can be incorporated into the landscaping, and don't have to be used to rebuild a rock wall. Staff also noted that the landscaping condition was required by the Planning Commission with the approval of the 2007 Design Review/Parcel Map, and applied to both parcels. The landscape plan had not been submitted due to the applicant not constructing the second residence.

After reviewing all of the alternatives, Commissioner Garnin moved to approve per staff recommendations, including the requirement for a landscape plan with flexibility in its implementation. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McDonald, and approved on a vote of 4-0 with no further discussion.

Discussion Items

1. Amend Parcel Map approval procedures – options for streamlining Parcel Map (aka Minor Subdivision) Review.

Community Development Director Rachelle Kellogg introduced and explained that the item was presented upon a request of the City Council for staff to evaluate streamlining of permit processes. Amy discussed her written report and outlined the three options available for the Commission.

City Engineer Jerry Fuccillo provided history regarding parcel map processing and offers of dedication. Commissioners were favorable to option one, retain the requirement of a single public hearing and eliminate the City Council public hearing requirement for tentative parcel maps (except for appeals of Planning Commission decisions). Commissioners felt having the hearing at a Planning Commission meeting would provide better access to the public.

Commissioners directed staff to prepare an Ordinance for their consideration including option one, a single public hearing before the Planning Commission and option A – City Engineer to accept dedications on behalf of the City for parcel maps [(SMC 16.03.110)(F)].

2. Proposed Site Plan review – recommendations for required submittals and Ordinance revisions.

Community Development Director Kellogg introduced the discussion item and provided background information. This amendment was prepared at the request of the Planning Commission.

Amy Augustine discussed her written report, and reviewed the checklist for submittals and proposed Ordinance revisions. She asked that the Commission clarify whether the process is to verify compliance with Codes, (ministerial) or did the Planning Commission wish to exercise judgment and address other issues in rendering decisions on site plan reviews (discretionary)?

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission that the checklist was adequate with the addition of tree removal requirements and that the Community Development Director will be responsible for the content of the checklist. Ordinance revisions were approved as presented. Planning Commissioners wanted the process to be discretionary for the site plan approval process.

3. Update on the adoption of the City's Housing Element

Staff informed the Planning Commission that the Housing Element was recently approved and adopted by the State Housing and Community Development Department.

There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rachelle Kellogg,
Community Development Director