

# MINUTES

## TURLOCK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION THURSDAY, MAY 7, 2009 7:00 PM

YOSEMITE COMMUNITY ROOM  
TURLOCK CITY HALL, 156 SOUTH BROADWAY

---

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Hackler, Williams, Hillberg, Brem, Bean, Fregosi, Dias

**ALTERNATE COMMISSIONERS (Non Voting):** Pedroza, Salcedo

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Debra Whitmore, Deputy Director of Development Services; Mike Pitcock, Director of Development Services; Sergeant Nino Amirfar; Rich Fultz, Development Services Supervisor; Rose Stillo, Senior Planner; Adrienne Werner, Planning Technician; Katie Melson, Assistant Planner; Sean Scully, Assistant Planner; and Dorinda Soiseth, Staff Services Technician, who arrived at 8:45 p.m.

---

**A. CALL TO ORDER** The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

City Clerk Rhonda Greenlee administered the Oath of Office for New Alternate Planning Commissioner Alex Salcedo.

**B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chairman Brem asked for corrections or a motion for approval of the minutes of the Special Workshop of March 26, 2009, and regular Planning Commission meeting of April 2, 2009.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Bean moved, Commissioner Fregosi seconded that the Planning Commission approve the minutes from the March 26, 2009 workshop as submitted.

**AYES:** Brem, Fregosi, Pedroza and Williams  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSTAIN:** Bean, Hillberg, Dias, and Hackler  
**ABSENT:** None  
**NOT PARTICIPATING:** None

**MOTION:** Commissioner Hillberg moved, Commissioner Dias seconded that the Planning Commission approve the minutes from the April 2, 2009 meeting as submitted.

**AYES:** Hackler, Williams, Hillberg, Bean, Fregosi, Dias and Pedroza  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSTAIN:** None  
**ABSENT:** None  
**NOT PARTICIPATING:** None

**C. ANNOUNCEMENTS –**

Debbie noted the green sheets provided for the Commissioners explaining that staff had received several comments from neighbors regarding the fence at 1000 N. Johnson and a letter from Evergreen Packaging regarding Planned Development 264. These letters were received after the agenda had been printed and delivered to the Commissioners.

Staff also received a letter from a resident who lives in the vicinity of the new Public Safety Facility suggesting possible alternative designs for the communications tower.

Staff also received a letter from Mr. Pat Noda concerning the location of the Public Transportation Hub that included several hundred signatures requesting the Hub be located downtown.

The architect for the Public Safety Facility had a scheduling conflict and has requested the discussion on the communications tower be continued to the June 4, 2009 meeting.

**D. CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATION: -**

Commissioner Dias stated he had a conflict with Item G1 (Rezone 2008-03 [Planned Development 263]) and G3 (Turlock Memorial Park Sign) and will be stepping down during those hearings,

**E. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: - None**

**F. CONSENT CALENDAR: - None**

**H. 1. PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING COMMUNICATIONS TOWER** Chairman Brem suggested the Commission take action on this item now as there has been a formal request for continuance.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Fregosi moved, Commissioner Bean seconded, that the Planning Commission continue the consideration of the final design and rendering of the Public Safety Building Communications Tower to June 4, 2009. Motion carried unanimously.

**G. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**CONSENT ITEMS\*:**

None

**NONCONSENT ITEMS:**

*To avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest Commissioner Dias steps down.*

**1. REZONE NO. 2008-03 (PLANNED DEVELOPMENT 263 - JOHNSON ROAD AREA REZONE)**  
City-initiated rezone for a Planned Development (PD 263) to allow for a reduction in the fifteen-

foot corner side yard setback for new fences over three feet in height. (Existing fences, constructed according to specifications at the time of construction, do not require this exception.) If approved, the properties located on corner lots within the proposed Planned Development boundaries, would be permitted to construct fences up to seven feet in height within the required setback, provided that a 30-foot "Clear Vision Triangle" at corners is maintained. The project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA Exemption: Section 15305, "Minor Alterations in Land Use Limitations.")

**STAFF REPORT:**

Rose Stillo presented the staff report. Rose provided background on the project explaining that in July of 2008, a complaint came in to the Planning Division that a fence located at the corner of N. Johnson and El Capitan was constructed and appeared to be out of compliance with City regulations. After the property was surveyed, it was determined that the fence was in fact only 5 feet from the public right of way, instead of the required fifteen foot distance. Planning staff and Neighborhood Preservation notified the property owner that the fence would need to be moved back 10 feet in order to comply with the city's regulations. The property owner appealed staff's decision to the City Council. The City Council directed staff to investigate the possibility of creating a Planned Development to allow the deviation from City standards. Rose explained that in order to approve a Planned Development the following findings must be made:

1. That the proposed rezoning is consistent with the General Plan.
2. That the proposed site is suitable for the type of potential development.
3. That the site is suitable for the intensity of the proposed use.
4. That the proposed rezoning will not cause substantial environmental damage.
5. That the public necessity, convenience and general welfare require the proposed amendment.
6. Building and site designs are consistent with the Turlock General Plan and other applicable plans and policies adopted by the Turlock City Council.
7. The proposed changes are compensated for or mitigated by higher building or site development standards elsewhere on the site.
8. The proposed changes will not adversely affect adjoining properties.

Rose explained that staff does not believe findings #1, 4, 7, and 8 can be made, therefore staff recommends that the Planning Commission deny the proposed Planned Development.

Commissioner Brem asked how the issue got to this point.

Rose answered that the Planning Division received a complaint regarding the placement of the fence and started the code enforcement process. The McBay's appealed the code enforcement decision to the City Council and the City Council asked staff to look at establishing a Planned Development. City staff surveyed the property to determine where the right of way was in preparation for the City Council meeting.

Commissioner Williams stated he was at the Council during the appeal and provided the Commissioners with background information regarding the discussion during the Council meeting.

Ian McBay made himself available to answer questions.

Commissioner Fregosi asked Mr. McBay how many neighbors had spoke to him regarding the fence.

Mr. McBay responded that he had received several favorable comments about his fence.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

Chairman Brem opened the public hearing.

Ken McBay stated that this fence is not any different from other fences he looked at in the neighborhood. Mr. McBay spoke in favor of the Planned Development.

Barbara Holm spoke against the location of the fence. Mrs. Holm stated that the fence does not fit in with the neighborhood.

Lawrence and Judy Souza spoke in favor of the Planned Development

Joyce Truitt spoke against a Planned Development and the location of the fence. Mrs. Truitt asked if a permit was required for the fence.

Mike Pitcock, city engineer, clarified that a permit is not required to construct a fence, Mr. Pitcock further clarified that staff instructs customers to measure from their property line when trying to determine where their setbacks are and where they can place their fence. Mr. Pitcock explained that the property was surveyed as a result of the appeal to the City Council. Staff does not usually survey properties for customers as this would be in direct competition with public sector.

Julie Mcbay explained that they did try to do the right thing and that the fence is well constructed and they plan to landscape around the fence also. Mrs. McBay spoke in favor of the Planned Development.

Commissioner Pedroza asked Mrs. McBay why the fence was moved and taller.

Mrs. McBay answered that they wanted to move the fence to allow more space in the backyard for their children to play. The new fence is a foot taller than the previous fence.

Ed Holm spoke against the Planned Development and requested that the fence be moved back to meet the Municipal Code requirements.

Chairman Brem closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Bean expressed concern that Municipal Code requirements are not communicated clearly enough and asked if a handout would help explain the requirements better.

Debbie Whitmore, Planning Commission Secretary, answered that there is a handout. The difficulty in this specific case was determining the location of property line. A professional would need to be consulted.

Commissioner Salcedo asked if it would be easy for a property owner to come in to City Hall and find out where their property lines are located.

Debbie answered that general information can be provided through the City's Geographic Information System (GIS) but the information is not accurate enough to determine the definite location of property lines.

Commissioner Williams asked for clarification as to why the property was surveyed after the property was referred for code enforcement and not before.

Debbie answered that once the Planning Division received the complaint and started the code enforcement process staff was required to confirm the location of the public right of way as part of our due diligence.

The Commissioners discussed the Municipal Code requirements and the location of the fence. While the property is quite visually different from before the fence itself is not unattractive and appears to be well constructed. The issue is the location of the fence.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Fregosi moved, Commissioner Bean seconded, that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council deny Rezone 2008-03 and Planned Development 263, having determined that the appropriate findings, specifically finding nos. 1, 4, 7 and 8 cannot be made in Draft Planning Commission Resolution 2009-10.

<b>AYES:</b>	Hackler, Hillberg, Bean, Fregosi, and Brem
<b>NOES:</b>	Williams
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None
<b>NOT PARTICIPATING:</b>	Dias

*Commissioner Dias is re-seated.*

- 2. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 2009-01, REZONE 2009-01, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT 264 (STARKWEATHER)** To request a change in the General Plan land use designation and zoning of this site from Industrial to Community Commercial, and approve a Planned Development to allow for a commercial center consisting of retail, event center, and warehouse space. The two buildings on this property will be remodeled to accommodate these uses. The proposed building elevations are designed to incorporate these buildings into the existing retail development at 1200 and 1300 West Main Street. This project also includes relocating the existing storm water detention basin to the rear of this site, and constructing a parking lot in its place. The existing loading dock on the Main Street side of "Building 1" would be relocated to the rear of the building, and replaced with storefronts. The subject property is located at 1400 W. Main Street ( APN: 050-001-027 ) A "Mitigated Negative Declaration" is proposed, declaring that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment, incorporating mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study, and subject to the appropriate conditions of approval.

**Staff Report:**

Rose Stillo presented the staff report and briefly described the project. She said that the applicant is proposing a new use in the existing building at 1400 West Main to allow for a 12,500 square foot entertainment and event center that would be open Tuesdays through Saturdays, 7:00 p.m. until 12:00 midnight. Also proposed at the same location is a 5,700 square foot ice cream warehouse with an adjoining 1,500 square foot ice cream parlor. A smaller, 6,000 square foot building to the rear of 1400 W. Main is proposed to be used for weddings and other private parties. Rose advised that the standard conditions of approval submitted by the Police Department do not permit live entertainment, and also noted that the project includes relocating the existing storm water retention basin. She also provided information on parking requirements for the project and a condition that requires closing off the median on West Main to prevent left turns.

Rose noted that staff has received a letter from the property owner at 305 S. Soderquist expressing concern about water capacity in the new basin. She advised that a hydrology study and basin plans

must be submitted to Engineering for review and approval before any dirt is moved on site.

Staff has also received a letter from the manager of the packaging business to the west of the project site expressing concern that commercial uses and the customers visiting the retail stores might wander onto the industrial site near a loading dock creating an unsafe situation.

Rose concluded by saying that staff is requesting approval and offered to answer questions.

There were questions and discussion on the hydrology study, the adjacent loading dock, the median on West Main Street and freeway access should the median be closed.

The project applicant, Dr. T.W. Starkweather, addressed the Commission and was available to answer questions. He also addressed the concerns of the adjacent businesses. He said that live music for the event center is important for the use of the building and is appropriate for a wedding environment.

Commissioner Williams asked about the existing mobile food vendors on the property.

Dr. Starkweather advised that the existing mobile food vendors will be terminated once construction is complete.

There were questions and discussion on the storm drain basin fence, the occupancy of the event center, the types of events to be held in the facility, and the possible need for some sort of barrier between properties.

Sergeant Nino Amirfar, Turlock Police Services, addressed the Commission and expressed concern that the information in the business plan submitted for the project conflicted with what was presented tonight. He said the Police Dept. is concerned with concerts taking place at the event center, the impact to public safety and asked for clarification on the operations of the event center as the business plan describes a nightclub and bar.

There was discussion on the number of existing bars and restaurants in the vicinity of the proposed project.

**Public Hearing:**

Chairman Brem opened the public hearing.

Celia Fuentes-Sanchez spoke in favor of the project and said there is a need for a facility like this in Turlock.

Dr. Starkweather asked for the Commission's approval of the project.

Chairman Brem closed the public hearing.

There was discussion about the definition of live music and whether the project could be approved to allow for weddings with live music and alcohol.

Debbie Whitmore said she spoke to the Police Chief who expressed concern about the impacts to the police service levels when alcohol and live entertainment are provided in the same venue.

Commissioner Dias asked if Condition No. 22 could be modified to define what type of alcohol license could be permitted because the standard conditions from the Police Dept. do not define the

type of license.

Sergeant Amirfar stated he cannot change the standard conditions as established by the Police Dept.

There was discussion about the difference between an event center versus a wedding venue, the different types of alcohol licenses, and the business plan and hours of operation of the project.

Dr. Starkweather stated that his project **will not** be a for-sale ticket music event facility, but will serve as a venue for different social events such as weddings and service club activities.

Commissioner Dias suggested changing Condition No. 22 to: Live entertainment will only be allowed with a catering ABC license at the premises at any time.

The Commission discussed what type of alcohol can be served with each type of license, the risk of setting a precedent for other businesses that may come before them with a similar request, and the concerns of the Police Department.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Dias moved, Commissioner Hackler seconded, that the Planning Commission adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Effect, having determined that the City of Turlock, as lead agency for the proposed project, has prepared an Initial Study to make the findings contained in Draft Planning Commission Resolutions 2009-05 and 2009-06.

<b>AYES:</b>	Hackler, Williams, Hillberg, Bean, Fregosi, Dias and Brem
<b>NOES:</b>	None
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None
<b>NOT PARTICIPATING:</b>	None

**MOTION:** Commissioner Dias moved, Commissioner Hackler seconded, that the Planning Commission approve an amendment to Conditional Use Permit 2003-13, having determined that the appropriate findings can be made, subject to the conditions and amending condition no. 22, contained in Draft Planning Commission Resolution 2009-08.

<b>AYES:</b>	Hackler, Williams, Hillberg, Bean, Fregosi, Dias and Brem
<b>NOES:</b>	None
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None
<b>NOT PARTICIPATING:</b>	None

**MOTION:** Commissioner Dias moved, Commissioner Hackler seconded, that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve Rezone 2009-01 and General Plan Amendment 2009-01, having determined that the appropriate findings can be made, subject to the conditions contained in Draft Planning Commission Resolutions 2009-05 and 2009-06, and amending Condition No. 22 of Draft Resolution 2009-05 to read Live entertainment shall only be allowed with a catering license on the premises at any time.

<b>AYES:</b>	Hackler, Williams, Hillberg, Bean, Fregosi, Dias and Brem
--------------	---

**NOES:** None  
**ABSTAIN:** None  
**ABSENT:** None  
**NOT PARTICIPATING:** None

**MOTION:** Commissioner Dias moved, Commissioner Hackler seconded, to amend the previous motion made in error concerning Conditional Use Permit 2003-13. This motion does not include a change to condition no. 22. Motion carried unanimously.

*Chairman Brem called for a 5 minute recess at 9:20 p.m.  
Chairman Brem re-convened the meeting at 9:25 p.m.*

*To avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest Commissioner Dias steps down.*

- 3. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 2009-01 (SIGN DESIGNS – HAROLD BROWN)** To authorize a double sided (43.3 square feet per side), twenty (20) foot tall monument sign for Turlock Memorial Park & Funeral Home. The subject parcel is located within the "Public-Semi Public" zoning district which has no set sign criteria, however the proposed height of this sign is significantly taller than the recommended monument sign height as set forth by the City of Turlock Design Guidelines. The project is located at 575 N. Soderquist Rd., more particularly described as Stanislaus County APN 061-001-009, the applicants are seeking authorization for the sign to be located on the West Main frontage of this parcel. The proposed project is "EXEMPT" from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Section 15311(a) [Accessory Structures] of the CEQA Guidelines and the City of Turlock CEQA Implementing Procedures Part IV (b).

**Staff Report:**

Sean Scully presented the staff report and said the project is a request for a 20' monument sign to be located on the West Main side of the property. He said the applicant is asking for the sign size and location to assist the public in finding the entrance to the park. He noted that staff is recommending denial as the sign does not meet the intent of the design guidelines. He cautioned that approving this project may increase the requests for similar signs along the West Main corridor. Sean advised that one of the specific findings that must be made in order to grant a Conditional Use Permit is "That the site for the proposed use is in conformance with the General Plan" staff does not believe that this finding can be made.

Sean advised that staff has included an option for an alternative motion that would continue the item to allow the applicant time to submit a revised sign plan that would conform to the design guidelines and General Plan policies. He offered to answer any questions.

Harold Brown, representing Sign Designs, spoke against staff's proposal for an alternate sign.

Ed Anderson, also representing Sign Designs, spoke about the need for the 20' sign, the design and content of the sign, and asked for the Commission's approval.

Scott Atherton, General Manager of Turlock Memorial Park and Funeral Home, said the fence that surrounds the memorial park was built at ten feet tall to prevent vandalism, and felt that a sign shorter than 20' tall would not be seen over this fence. He provided information about why the park entrance had been moved from West Main Street to Soderquist Road.

**Public Hearing:**

Chairman Brem opened the public hearing. No one spoke. Chairman Brem closed the public hearing.

The Commission discussed the other options as suggested by staff as well as illumination and content of the sign. The consensus was that they would prefer less advertising and more directional information on the new sign, and to have the sign height reduced but be taller than the fence.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Fregosi moved, Commissioner Bean seconded, that the Planning Commission continue Conditional Use Permit No. 2009-01 (Turlock Memorial Park & Funeral Home Monument Sign), to June 4, 2009, in order to allow the applicant time to submit a revised directional sign to lower the height, address illumination, and emphasize directionality.

<b>AYES:</b>	Hackler, Williams, Hillberg, Bean, Fregosi, and Brem
<b>NOES:</b>	None
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None
<b>NOT PARTICIPATING:</b>	Dias

*Commissioner Dias is re-seated.*

4. **PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO LOCAL REGULATIONS REGARDING LARGE FAMILY DAY CARE FACILITIES DEFINITIONS, STANDARDS AND RESTRICTIONS CONTAINED IN TITLE 9 OF THE TURLOCK MUNICIPAL CODE (ZONING ORDINANCE), INCLUDING TMC 9-1-202 (DEFINITIONS), TMC 9-2-110 (FAMILY DAY CARE HOME), AND CHAPTER 9-3 (BASE DISTRICT REGULATIONS)** The City of Turlock proposes to change certain provisions of the Zoning Ordinance regulating large family day care facilities. The purpose of the amendments is to bring the City's ordinance into compliance with the California Child Day Care Act by aligning the City's definitions with State Law, specifying the standards, restrictions, requirements, and conditions for the nondiscretionary permit to permit large family day care homes, and clarifying the requirement for a nondiscretionary permit (i.e., a Minor Administrative Approval) in the Agricultural and Residential zoning districts. In addition, the City will be considering a change to its current policy which exempts large family day care facilities from paying business license fees. The proposed amendments are "Exempt" from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Section 15061(b)(3) [No Environmental Impact] of the CEQA Guidelines.

**Staff Report:**

Debbie Whitmore asked the Commission to continue the decision on this item to a future date in order to allow the day care providers time to comment as they were not notified of the March workshop. Debbie provided information on the California Child Day Care Act; the definition of large and small family day cares and their regulations, the definition of a nondiscretionary permit and the criteria that must be spelled out to bring to bring the ordinance in to compliance with State law. Debbie advised that small family day cares cannot be regulated by the City.

The proposed amendments include:

- Spacing and concentration allowed by State law
- Minimum parking requirements
- Advertising signs
- Play yard size
- Restrictions on interior and exterior modifications of the residence

- Building code compliance – minimum requirement of State law
- Allow City inspection for compliance
- Automatic permit expiration/revocation upon discontinuance of State license
- Business License Requirements

Debbie said that optional elements to the ordinance amendment include restrictions on the hours of operations and limitations on the use of the front yard as a child play area.

**Public Hearing:**

Chairman Brem opened the public hearing.

Pam Clark, a large family child care provider for 24 years, said she has not been subject to these restrictions in the past. She suggested the Local Child Care Planning Council be invited to participate in the next public workshop on the Large Family Day Care Ordinance.

Eunice Mendoza-Moncur spoke saying she has been operating in Turlock for four years and expressed concern with the parking and building code requirements.

Joy Johnson expressed concern about how the new restrictions would affect day cares and asked the Commission to consider the impacts of their decision.

Debbie Whitmore advised that this ordinance would not affect existing large family day cares. The City is in the process of setting up a new permitting process which she explained in detail.

Celia Fuentes-Sanchez spoke of the need for child care and said her business is full and she turns down two to three calls per week.

Kim Ford, a licensed day care provider for 20 years, spoke of her experience in obtaining her day care license in Turlock. She stated day care providers are already very regulated and she is concerned with unannounced visits by the City.

Chairman Brem closed the public hearing.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Fregosi moved, Commissioner Bean seconded, to continue the Large Family Day Care Ordinance item to a future date for a workshop prior to formal action. Motion carried unanimously.

*Due to the lateness of the hour, Chairman Brem asked that the Commission hear the report on Item I.1, Turlock Unified School District, at this time.*

**I. COMMISSIONER'S CONSIDERATION:**

**1. Turlock Unified School District "School Facilities Needs Analysis"**

Roger Smith, TUSD, provided information on Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3 school fees that can be charged for new residential construction.

**G. 5. NOTICE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO LOCAL REGULATIONS REGARDING HOUSE AND BUILDING NUMBERING STANDARDS CONTAINED IN TITLE 8 AND TITLE 11 OF THE TURLOCK MUNICIPAL CODE, INCLUDING CHAPTER 8-4 (HOUSE AND BUILDING**

**NUMBERING), CHAPTER 11-5 SUBDIVISION MAPS (SUBDIVISION MAPS: FIVE OR MORE PARCELS), AND CHAPTER 11-6 PARCEL MAPS (PARCEL MAPS: FOUR OR LESS PARCELS)**

The City of Turlock purposes to change certain provisions of the Turlock Municipal Code relating to street names and house and building numbering. The purpose of the amendment is to clearly identify the criteria and standards for designating street names of new subdivisions and assigning house and building numbers. The proposed amendments are "Exempt" from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Section 15061(b)(3) [No Environmental Impact] of the CEQA Guidelines.

**Staff Report:**

Debbie Whitmore presented the staff report explained the changes to the City's addressing process that would happen with this ordinance amendment. Staff recommends approval.

**Public Hearing:**

Chairman Brem opened the public hearing. No one spoke. Chairman Brem closed the public hearing.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Bean moved, Commissioner Fregosi seconded, that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council amend Title 8, Chapter 4 and Title 11, Chapter 5 and 6 of the Turlock Municipal Code having determined that the amendments are exempt from CEQA and having determined that the appropriate findings can be made, subject to the conditions contained in draft Planning Commission Resolution No. 2009-07.

<b>AYES:</b>	Hackler, Williams, Hillberg, Bean, Fregosi, Dias and Brem
<b>NOES:</b>	None
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None
<b>NOT PARTICIPATING:</b>	None

**H. OTHER MATTERS**

- 1. Continued to June 4, 2009 by previous motion.** Planning Commission consideration of the final design and rendering of the Public Safety Building Communications Tower.
2. Planning Commission consideration of a request to initiate an amendment to Title 9 of the Turlock Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance) to address design and development standards for cargo containers.

**Staff Report:**

Debbie Whitmore said in order to make a change to the zoning ordinance the Commission needs to take formal action to provide intention.

**Public Hearing:**

Chairman Brem asked for public comment. No one spoke.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Bean moved, Commissioner Hackler seconded, that the Planning Commission declare their intention to initiate a Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to

address Design and Development Standards for Cargo Containers.

**AYES:** Hackler, Williams, Hillberg, Bean, Fregosi, Dias and Brem  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSTAIN:** None  
**ABSENT:** None  
**NOT PARTICIPATING:** None

**I. COMMISSIONER'S CONSIDERATION:** *See notes above*

**J. STANISLAUS COUNTY PLANNING REFERRAL ITEMS:** None

**K. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS**

None

**L. STAFF UPDATES**

Debbie Whitmore updated the Commission on the following items:

- The appeal of the Turlock Golf Center project on Taylor Road will be heard by the Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors on May 19.

**M. ADJOURNMENT:** Having no further business Chairman Brem adjourned the meeting at 11:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

MIKE BREM  
Chair

DEBRA A. WHITMORE  
Deputy Director of Development Services,  
Secretary of the Turlock Planning Commission