



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
Minutes**

**December 10, 2024 5:30 PM
Council Chambers
400 N. Douty St.**

ROLL CALL:

Present:	Absent:
Planning Commissioner Dennis Ham Planning Commissioner Richard Douglas Planning Commissioner Garry Curtis Planning Commissioner - Alternate Bernie Marez Planning Commissioner Jim Nelson	Planning Commissioner Gunther Norris

INVOCATION:

There was no invocation.

FLAG SALUTE:

Vice-Chair Ham led the flag salute.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

This is the time for citizens to comment on subject matters not on the agenda and that are within the jurisdiction of the Commission. This is also the public's opportunity to request an item from the Consent Calendar be pulled for discussion purposes or to comment on any item on the agenda. Comments related to Public Hearing items will be heard at the time the item is discussed. A maximum of three minutes is allowed for each speaker. Please begin your comments by stating your name and providing your city of residence.

Hanford resident Mark Pratter, of The Greater Hidden Valley Association, was allowed to speak at this time, as he had another meeting to attend and could not stay for the public hearing. He spoke in favor of 18 acres being converted to park land and approval of the General Plan Amendment and rezone. He requested that the block wall requirement be removed, due to the additional cost involved.

Hanford resident Rose Schapley stated that she had contacted Parks & Community Services, Police, and Public Works, to share her concern about toxic castor plants being planted throughout Hanford, and has not received a response. Vice-Chair Ham deferred to Director Waters, who recommended that she reach out to Kings County Health Department and Parks & Recreation Commission.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Consent Calendar items are considered routine and will be enacted in one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these matters unless a request is made and then the item will be removed from the Consent Calendar to be discussed and voted upon by a separate motion.

Motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

RESULT: (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER:	Planning Commissioner Garry Curtis
SECONDER:	Planning Commissioner Jim Nelson
AYES:	Planning Commissioners Garry Curtis, Jim Nelson, Bernie Marez, Richard Douglas, Dennis Ham
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Planning Commissioner Gunther Norris

- A. Community Development: Approval of the Minutes of the November 12, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting.
- B. Community Development: Approval of the Minutes of November 21, 2024 Planning Commission Special Meeting

PUBLIC HEARING:

- A. Community Development: Conditional Use Permit No. 0041-24: a request to establish signage with electronic changeable copy for a car wash in the C-S Service Commercial zone district. Variance No. 0022-24: a request to deviate from the standards of the Hanford Municipal Code Section 17.56.090 to allow a freestanding sign to exceed the maximum height and square footage allowed within the C-S Service Commercial zone district. The project is located at 1726 Glendale Ave. (APN 011-030-012).

Vice-chair Ham opened the public hearing and called for the staff report.

Associate Planner Manha presented the staff report. He recommended approval of the CUP and denial of the Variance and invited questions of staff.

Commissioner Curtis asked if the sign would be turned off after business hours. Associate Planner Manha replied that it will be on only during business hours, per requirements.

Vice-chair Ham requested clarification of Resolution No. 2024-28 denying the Variance. Associate Planner Manha replied that the Variance was for the size of the sign, and the CUP was for the electronic changeable copy. The resolution would require compliance with the size requirements of the current Municipal Code.

There being no further questions, Vice-chair Ham opened Public Comment.

In Favor:

Applicant Aaron Hamilton stated that the site location is sunk in and further from the street than some other signage in the area. The extra elevation would allow the signage to be more visible from the street and potentially from the highway.

Opposed:

Hanford resident Rose Schapley did not feel that an electronic sign should be visible from Highway 198.

Vice-chair Ham closed Public Comment and invited questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Marez requested additional clarification of Resolution No. 2024-28. Associate Planner Manha stated that the adoption of Resolution No. 2024-28 would deny them from exceeding the height standards of that zoning district. Deputy City Manager Waters added that staff recommended compliance with the current Zoning Ordinance. Vice-chair Ham noted that adjacent signs are in different zone districts.

Vice-chair Ham closed the public hearing and called for a motion.

Motion to adopt Resolution No. 2024-27, approving Conditional Use Permit No. 0041-24.

RESULT:	Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER:	Planning Commissioner Garry Curtis
SECONDER:	Planning Commissioner - Alternate Bernie Marez

AYES:	Garry Curtis, Bernie Marez, Dennis Ham, Richard Douglas, Jim Nelson
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Gunther Norris

Motion to adopt Resolution No. 2024-28, as amended, denying Variance No. 0022-24.

RESULT:	Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER:	Planning Commissioner - Alternate Bernie Marez
SECONDER:	Planning Commissioner Jim Nelson
AYES:	Bernie Marez, Jim Nelson, Dennis Ham, Richard Douglas, Garry Curtis
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Gunther Norris

- B. Community Development: Annexation No. 163 Parts 9, 12, 13 and 14: A proposal to annex four separate substantially surrounded county islands with a combined total of 197.15 acres into the City of Hanford from the Kings County jurisdiction. Prezone No. 0001-24, Parts 9, 12, 13, and 14: A proposal to prezone the proposed territory to be annexed consistent with the 2035 Hanford General Plan Land Use Map. CEQA Determination: The project has been determined to be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Categorical Exemption Class 19 (Annexation of areas containing existing public or private structures developed to the density allowed by the current rezoning) per CEQA Guidelines Section 15319(a), and because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment per CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3). A Notice of Exemption has been prepared for the project in accordance with CEQA. Island 9 is generally located East Lacey Boulevard, South of Southern Pacific Railroad Tracks. Island 12 is generally located west of 10 ½ Avenue, north of Houston Avenue. Island 13 is generally located west of 10th Avenue, between Idaho and Iona Avenues. Island 14 is generally located west of 11th Avenue, south of Flint Avenue.

Vice-chair Ham opened the public hearing and called for the staff report.

Director Waters presented the staff report and recommended approval. He acknowledged staff's receipt of one letter of opposition from Tom Buford (Buford Oil), copies of which were distributed to the Commissioners, at the dais. He then invited questions of staff.

City Attorney Mizote provided the following legal points:

1. The Commission's primary responsibility in considering this project was to confirm whether the proposed annexation is consistent with the General Plan:
 - a. Is the land proposed for annexation within the City's Sphere of Influence?
 - b. Does the rezoning match the land-use designation set forth in the General Plan?
2. The proposed annexation satisfies agencies of higher authority.
 - a. LAFCO has final decision authority over annexations.
 - i. Planning Commission does not make the final decision on annexation, neither does City Council. LAFCO makes the final decision.
 - ii. LAFCO policies: eliminates islands
 - iii. LAFCO could condition future annexations on the City moving forward with annexations of islands, stemming from the aforementioned MOU.
 - b. State of California: annexations of undeveloped land is needed to accommodate housing

- i. Housing objectives are to meet the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) goals.
- ii. Through zoning and annexations, local agencies must accommodate their share of new housing. The State is aggressive in enforcement efforts as to local agencies achieving housing goals, through zoning and annexations, through fines and lawsuits.

3. This is not a case of the City wanting to annex land for development purposes.

4. Annexations are part of larger, inter-connected issues controlled by outside agencies, including LAFCO and the State of California.

Vice-chair Ham asked Director Waters to show page 66 of the staff report, showing all islands to be annexed, and proposed four separate discussions--one for each island.

There being no further questions, Vice-chair Ham opened public comment.

Island 9 - East Lacey Boulevard:

In Favor

None.

Opposed

Tom Buford (Buford Oil), Public Comment submitted (Letter of opposition provided to Commissioners)

Island 12 - West of 10 1/2 Avenue, north of Houston:

In Favor

None.

Opposed

Hanford Residents:

1. Bob Ramos: The City has encroached on this strip of land from Thompson, moving south. He expressed concern that, when annexed, businesses will be taken away (their livelihood). He mentioned that some of their fences are above the required height and asked that these residents be given time to make adjustments to conform with City regulations.

2. Tony Cotta did not see how there would be adequate space to accommodate the City and future businesses, and he prefers the country way of living in this area.

3. Alexander Moreno wanted to remain in the County and maintain his current lifestyle. He understands that this is a directive from Sacramento, because of the mandate and Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) between Kings County and City of Hanford.

4. David Guzman: This is the third time this has been proposed to be annexed into the City. He bought in this area because it is County. Per Government Code 5637, this it is a recommendation, not a law. He signed a petition stating opposition to annexation.

5. Al Casem has a business on his property. He stated that the advantage of being in the County is that they do not have to be concerned about Code Enforcement. He feels that the annexation will have a detrimental impact on him and his neighbors and claimed that property owners were denied due process.

6. Alejandro Santillan echoed the sentiments of previous speakers regarding Code Enforcement concerns and maintaining the county lifestyle.

7. Anthony Perez agreed with the other speakers and was opposed to annexation.

8. Luis Ramirez, Jr. stated that the main reason for the annexation is monetary, and he enjoys freedom in the County.

Vice-chair Ham asked Director Waters to clarify "grandfathering." Director Waters referred to p. 118 of the packet, which includes information relating to grandfathering of non-conforming uses. If a use is legally allowed in the County, it may continue to operate within the City limits. As long as the use continues to operate, the grandfathering statutes still apply.

Vice-chair Ham asked if there were limitations to grandfathering.

Director Waters replied that as long as the approved use is continued, it would continue to be legal. If the use stops for a period longer than six months, the use may require additional approvals from the City. City Attorney Mizote added that, under the County zoning ordinance, if a use permit is required in the County, the use permit must be obtained for that use to be considered legal and continued after annexation.

Island 13 - West of 10th Avenue, between Idaho and Iona Avenue:

There were no comments.

Annexation 14 - West of 11th Avenue, south of Flint Avenue:

There were no comments.

Vice-chair Ham closed the public hearing.

City Attorney clarifications of comments raised:

1. California Government Code requires that if the City provides utility services, the City obligates itself to move forward with the annexation where utility services are provided.

2. The role Kings County played in executing the MOU: The first MOU was drafted by County staff and county Counsel. The second MOU was based on the first MOU, which was prepared jointly by City and County. County Counsel did the review on behalf of the County. It is accurate to state that the County has been involved in the MOUs. It was the County's intent that the islands be annexed into the City. Through the annexation process, some of the property tax money will shift from County to City. County has full understanding of the ramifications of annexation.

3. Properties are being developed and properties cannot be constructed without all annexations intertwined. LAFCO is looking to the City to annex these islands. When the City moves forward with annexation of undeveloped properties, LAFCO will look at the islands and will have an expectation. When the City annexes the undeveloped land, the City will have to address the remaining island annexations.

Director Waters stated that 10 1/2 Avenue is designated as Rural Residential by the County. The City is applying Low-Density Residential zoning, which is consistent with the County's designation.

Commissioner Marez asked if an MX designation could be applied to the Island 12 area. Mr. Waters replied that the City would grandfather in whatever was legally permitted by the County in this area. Commissioner Marez asked what the timeline is for the annexation. Director Waters: It will go to City Council in January, then the recommendation is taken to LAFCO, with noticing requirements. The annexation may occur sometime in early spring, dependent on the outside agency.

Vice-chair Ham closed Public Comment and called for a motion:

Motion to adopt Notice of Exemption, in accordance with CEQA.

RESULT:	Passed
MOVER:	Planning Commissioner Bernie Marez
SECONDER:	Alternate Planning Commissioner Richard Douglas
AYES:	Dennis Ham, Richard Douglas, Bernie Marez
NAYS:	Garry Curtis, Jim Nelson
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Gunther Norris

Motion to adopt Resolution No. 2024-20 (A-D), recommending approval of Prezone No. 0001-24, Parts 9, 12, 13, and 14 to the City Council.

RESULT:	Failed
MOVER:	Planning Commissioner Douglas
SECONDER:	Planning Commissioner Ham
AYES:	Dennis Ham, Richard Douglas
NAYS:	Garry Curtis, Jim Nelson
ABSTAIN:	Marez
ABSENT:	Gunther

City Attorney Mizote commented that resolutions are only approved by a majority vote of the entire Commission. So with the one abstain, it is equivalent to a failure. Based upon the evidence presented and the agenda packet, he did not see any substantial evidence which would justify a rejection of the resolution. He highly recommended that the Commission reconsider this vote; and, if the vote is to deny the resolution, he would strongly suggest that the Commission identify the evidence on which it is relying. Commissioner MAREZ changed his vote to yes, and Mr. Mizote suggested a second voice vote. He confirmed that the Commissioners who made the motion and the second will allow that to stand.

RESULT: Passed
MOVER: Planning Commissioner Richard Douglas
SECONDER: Planning Commissioner Dennis Ham
AYES: Richard Douglas, Dennis Ham, Bernie Marez,
NAYS: Jim Nelson
ABSTAIN: Garry Curtis
ABSENT: Gunther Norris

Motion to adopt Resolution No. 2024-21, finding the proposed Annexation No. 163, Parts 9, 12, 13, and 14 consistent with the Hanford General Plan Policies L15, L16, and L17 and forward Annexation No. 163, Parts 9, 12, 13, and 14 to the City Council, with a recommendation that an application be made to the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) of Kings County.

RESULT: Passed
MOVER: Planning Commissioner Richard Douglas
SECONDER: Alternate Planning Commissioner Bernie Marez
AYES: Richard Douglas, Bernie Marez, Dennis Ham,
NAYS: Garry Curtis, Jim Nelson
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Gunther Norris

- C. Community Development: **General Plan Amendment No. 2024-01 (GPA0011-24):** a request, by the City of Hanford, to change the General Plan designation from Low-Density Residential to Open Space for an 18-acre portion of a 38.48-acre parcel. **Rezone No. 2024-01 (RZ0002-24),** a request, by the City of Hanford, to change the zoning from R-L-5 Low-Density Residential to PF Public Facility for an 18-acre portion of a 38.48-acre parcel. **CEQA Determination:** This project is categorically exempt from further environmental review, as per § 15061 (b) (3) Common Sense Exemption, § 15305 Minor Alterations in Land Use Limitations, §15319 (a) Annexations of Existing Facilities and Lots for Exempt Facilities of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. **LOCATION:** The project is located on an 18-acre portion of the overall 38.48-acre parcel, west of the existing Hidden Valley Park. The project is located at on the southwest corner of West Cortner Street and North 11th Avenue (APN 008-360-006).

Vice-chair Ham opened the public hearing and called for the staff report.

Director Waters presented the staff report, recommended approval, and invited questions of staff.

Commissioner Nelson expressed his approval of the item.

IN FAVOR

Hanford resident Mickey Stoddard referred to the 2019 Parks and Recreation Master Plan's survey of public response: 64% ranked walking and biking trails #1, 56% ranked walking and hiking trails #2, 51% ranked having new restrooms built #3. There have been no trails or restrooms built since 2019. He was on Park and Recreation Commission when the Master Plan was put together. Worked within that Department and would like to see that these items are prioritized. He stated that the 2019 Plan has been overlooked, prioritizing Heroes Park. He asked why it has taken so long for the Hidden Valley expansion to take place and implored commissioners to grant city residents the trails and restrooms they

have requested.

Hanford resident William Harlin: Multiple efforts have been made to expand the park. He brought up a concern about the road being considered to extend through the park [Rodgers Road]. Crime in the neighborhood has increased. The park should have space and be maintained as park space. Heroes Park is a long way off. The City does not have money to take care of its roads. He stated that the City should repair what we have. He appreciates rezoning of Hidden Valley.

Hanford resident Marisol Corazon and Daycare Center owner: The extension of the park will benefit her business and would allow them a safe place to walk; noise is not a concern.

Hanford resident Bob Ramos: The land was always designated as parkland. He mentioned the City Council decision, under a previous Mayor, allowing redesignation of the land, against the wishes of Hanford residents. The park is crucial as the center of the City. He agreed that improvement should be done in phases.

Hanford resident Rose Schapley appreciated the earlier statements that were made. Opposed to Rodgers Road going through the park. She thought it would only be for emergency/maintenance vehicles. Highly encourages completion of Hidden Valley Park expansion and ground covering prior to Heroes Park completion. Expansion was planned decades ago.

Hanford resident Nathan Odom: Parks Master Plan was not the first to be designed per residents' wishes. He mentioned the 1972 General Plan Update, created by locals, with five years of interviews. It was decided that Hidden Valley Park would be a regional park, as a central component, with Hanford to expand around the parkland, connected throughout the City by corridors.

OPPOSED
None.

Vice-chair Ham closed Public Comment and offered Commission discussion.

Commissioner Curtis requested a copy of the original agreement of when the property was donated.

City Attorney interjected, stating that the property was not donated, but purchased, by the City, noting that he had a copy of the minutes with a motion to purchase a 40-acre parcel from Mrs.Dutra, originally wanting it for storm drainage purposes. Mrs.Dutra stated that she would only sell the 40 acres as a whole. In the 60's, the City had intended to sell what was not being used for storm drainage, but noted that Mr.Odom was correct and plans changed. Regarding the extended road, the City would have to do an environmental study, and CEQA would ultimately dictate a ruling on that issue.

There being no further questions, Vice-chair Ham called for a motion.

Motion to recommend certification of the Categorical Exemption for the project.

RESULT:	Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER:	Planning Commissioner Garry Curtis
SECONDER:	Planning Commissioner Jim Nelson
AYES:	Dennis Ham, Richard Douglas, Garry Curtis, Bernie Marez, Jim Nelson
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Gunther Norris

Motion to adopt Resolution No. 2024-22, recommending approval of General Plan Amendment No.2024-01 to the City Council.

RESULT:	Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER:	Planning Commissioner Richard Douglas
SECONDER:	Planning Commissioner Jim Nelson
AYES:	Dennis Ham, Richard Douglas, Garry Curtis, Bernie Marez, Jim Nelson
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Gunther Norris

Motion to adopt Resolution No. 2024-23, recommending approval of Rezone No. 0001-24 to the City Council.

RESULT:	Passed (UNANIMOUS)
----------------	---------------------------

MOVER: Planning Commissioner Garry Curtis
SECONDER: Planning Commissioner Jim Nelson
AYES: Dennis Ham, Richard Douglas, Garry Curtis, Bernie Marez, Jim Nelson
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Gunther Norris

Chair HAM called for a five-minute break. The meeting resumed at 7:40 p.m.

- D. Community Development: **Annexation No. 164 (ANX0006-24)**: a request, by the City of Hanford, to annex approximately 230 acres into the City of Hanford from the Kings County Jurisdiction for development of Heroes Park, and surrounding parcels, in accordance with the Kings County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo)'s policy, so as not to create islands. **General Plan Amendment No. 2024-02 (GPA0012-24)**: a request, by the City of Hanford, to change the land use designation on APN 014-230-030-000 from Low-Density Residential to Open Space, by designating the General Plan's floating open space circles in the location of the future Heroes Park (40 acres) and relocating the 20-acre Neighborhood Mixed Use designation from the northern portion of the parcel to the south. **Pre-Zone No. 2024-14 (PRZ0014-24)**: a request, by the City of Hanford, to prezone the annexation area a combination of R-L-5 Low-Density Residential, R-M Medium-Density Residential, PF Public Facilities, and MX-N Neighborhood Mixed Use, as designated by the General Plan and as proposed to be amended through General Plan Amendment No. 2024-02 (described above). **CEQA Determination**: This project is categorically exempt from further environmental review, as per § 15061 (b) (3) Common Sense Exemption, § 15305 Minor Alterations in Land Use Limitations, §15319 (a) Annexations of Existing Facilities and Lots for Exempt Facilities of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. The project is located between Grangeville Boulevard and Lacey Boulevard, east of 9 ¼ Avenue, west of 8 ¾ Avenue (APN 014-230-030, - 033, -034, -035, 014-230-089, 014-230-092, -093, 014-230-020, and -021).

Vice-chair Ham opened the public hearing and called for the staff report.

Deputy City Manager Waters presented the staff report, recommended approval of the project, and invited questions of staff.

Commissioner Nelson

- What is the size of the mixed zone? Director Waters: 20 acres.
- Will it be zoned as low-density and medium-density housing? Director Waters: No, it would more likely be for higher density housing and commercial zone, since it is mixed-use.

Commissioner Douglas: Is the budget already covered? Director Waters: The City received approximately 10 million dollars Proposition 68 funding. Eight million was received, and the City applied for approximately one million dollars in additional funding. Funding from Proposition 68 had specific requirements, which is why this area was selected.

Commissioner Curtis stated that he understood that the park would be located off of 9 1/4 and Grangeville, but the park now looks to be off of Grangeville. Director Waters confirmed that the project would be off of Grangeville completely, due to road development, at this time.

Commissioner Marez asked about lighting requirements, noting that the area is a bit dark. Director Waters: City standards require adequate lighting for any new development.

There being no further questions, Vice-chair Ham opened Public Comment.

IN FAVOR

Hanford resident Jim Lugman asked if there will be a buffer area, being that he has a well. He also asked about spraying at a walnut farm near park. Director Waters: The Buffer indicates to whom the notices are mailed. Notices were sent to

residents within a 300-ft buffer. Right-to-Farm policies are in place. He is unsure of the specifics, but he can find out.

OPPOSED

None. Hanford resident Bob Ramos, was neither for nor against the project, but commented on the domino effect, stating that if this is not approved, Hidden Valley Park cannot be approved. The eastern edge of Heroes Park will be at 9th Ave when it gets completed.

Vice-chair Ham closed Public Comment and called for a motion.

Motion to adopt the Notice of Exemption, in accordance with CEQA.

RESULT:	Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER:	Planning Commissioner Garry Curtis
SECONDER:	Alternate Planning Commissioner Bernie Marez
AYES:	Dennis Ham, Richard Douglas, Garry Curtis, Bernie Marez, Jim Nelson
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Gunther Norris

Motion to adopt Resolution No. 2024-24, recommending approval of General Plan Amendment No. 2024-02 to the City Council.

RESULT:	Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER:	Alternate Planning Commissioner Bernie Marez
SECONDER:	Planning Commissioner Jim Nelson
AYES:	Dennis Ham, Richard Douglas, Garry Curtis, Bernie Marez, Jim Nelson
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Gunther Norris

Motion to adopt Resolution No. 2024-25, recommending approval of Prezone No. 2024-14 to the City Council.

RESULT:	Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER:	Planning Commissioner Richard Douglas
SECONDER:	Planning Commissioner Jim Nelson
AYES:	Dennis Ham, Richard Douglas, Garry Curtis, Bernie Marez, Jim Nelson
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Gunther Norris

Motion to adopt Resolution No.2024-26, finding the proposed Annexation No. 164 consistent with the Hanford General Plan Policies L15 and L17 and forward Annexation No.164 to the City Council, with a recommendation that an application be made to the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) of Kings County.

RESULT:	Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER:	Planning Commissioner Garry Curtis
SECONDER:	Planning Commissioner Richard Douglas
AYES:	Dennis Ham, Richard Douglas, Garry Curtis, Bernie Marez, Jim Nelson
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Gunther Norris

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS:

No comments.

COMMISSIONERS' ITEMS OF INTEREST:

At this time, any Commissioner may ask a question for clarification of matters within the Planning Commission’s jurisdiction, make an announcement, or report briefly on activities in their role as a Planning Commissioner. In addition, subject to the Planning Commissioner’s Handbook, Commissioners may request staff to report back to the Planning Commission at a subsequent meeting concerning any matter within the Commissioner’s jurisdiction (GC 54954.2).

Commissioner Curtis asked if there would be a meeting on Christmas Eve. Director Waters: No.

Vice-chair Ham asked if there are any requirements for the use of parking lots for various events, noting that a lot

adjacent to the Carnegie Museum had been used for a swap meet. Director Waters: An encroachment permit is required.

Vice-chair Ham stated that events had encroached on an event happening at the Carnegie Musuem. Director Waters made note of the concerns.

ADJOURNMENT:

Materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted to the Planning Commission after distribution of the agenda packet are available to public inspection in the Planning Division Office located at 317 N. Douty Street, Hanford, California 93230, during normal business hours. Such documents are also available at the city's website, www.cityofhanfordca.com subject to staff's ability to post documents before the meeting. If you need a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in this meeting, please contact the Planning Division's office, 559-585-2580, 317 N. Douty Street, Hanford, California 93230, at least 2 days prior to the meeting {28 CFR 35.102.35.104 ADA Title II} APPEALS: Any action of the Planning Commission, which is a final project decision, may be appealed to the City Council by the applicant or any adversely affected person. To file an appeal, an appeal application and filing fee of \$1,100.00 must be submitted to the Community Development Department, 317 N. Douty Street, Hanford, California, within ten (10) days following the date of the final decision of the Planning Commission.

Vice-chair Ham adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Chrystina Arms, Development Services Technician