

# MINUTES

## GRIDLEY PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING  
6:00 P.M., TUESDAY  
NOVEMBER 18, 2014



GRIDLEY CITY HALL  
685 KENTUCKY STREET  
GRIDLEY, CA 95948

---

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:  
ROLL CALL

CHAIR O'BRIEN  
RECORDING SECRETARY

---

**CALL TO ORDER:** At 6:15 p.m. the meeting was called to order by Chair O'Brien.

### ROLL CALL

**Planning Commissioners Present:**

Shirley O'Brien  
Robert Thomas  
Robert Wise  
David Talley

**Absent:**

Herman Sunderman

**Staff Present:**

Donna Decker, City Planner/Consultant

### 1. CONSENT AGENDA

#### 1.1 Approval of Planning Commission minutes for October 21, 2014.

**MOTION BY WISE, SECOND BY TALLEY,** for approval of Planning Commission minutes dated October 21, 2014.

Ayes: Wise, Talley, O'Brien    Noes: None    Abstain: None

**Motion passes 3-0**

### 2. PUBLIC HEARINGS –

2.1 **Zoning Text Amendment No. 2-14; An ordinance to amend Title 17, Chapter 17.52, “Nonconformities”, of the Gridley Municipal Code related to the nonconforming uses, buildings, and development standards. (Citywide)**

A. **Receive staff report-** Donna Decker, City Planner, provided a brief staff report defining nonconformity providing various examples of what staff typically encounters. She noted that section 17.52.030 “Exceptions”, seemed to negate nonconformity in general and staff wished to amend the code to provide consistency in its interpretation.

Ms. Decker reviewed the text amendments consisting of eliminating Section 17.52.030, renumbering the sections, adding language to clarify section 17.52.040, types of

nonconformities, requirements to change from one type of nonconformity to another in section 17.52.080, and the addition of a conditional use entitlement to repair structural components of a nonconforming structure to section 17.52.090.

Ms. Decker recommended that if the text amendment were acceptable after review and discussion, to have the code amendment forwarded to the City Council for action.

**B. Open public hearing** – The public hearing was opened for public comment. Chair O’Brien requested comments from the public.

**C. Hear public testimony** - None

**D. Close public hearing** –With no public comments, Chair O’Brien closed the public hearing.

**E. Commission discussion** – The planning commissioners considered the text amendments and reviewed the specific language reflecting types of nonconformities, the definitions of nonconformities as well as questioning whether a definition for development standards should be considered. Commissioner Thomas suggested that providing as much breadth as possible would be conducive to meeting future nonconforming considerations. Planning commissioners discussed adding a definition for “development standards”.

Ms. Decker noted that staff could return with additional modifications and provide a definition for consideration. The commissioners determined they would like to continue the item for further review.

**MOTION BY TALLEY, SECOND BY WISE**, to continue the item to the next Planning Commission meeting date.

Ayes: Wise, Talley, Thomas, O’Brien Noes: None Abstain: None **Motion passes 3-1**

**3. INFORMATIONAL - None**

**4. COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION FORUM - None**

**5. REGULAR AGENDA - None**

**6. REPORTS & COMMUNICATIONS –**

Commissioner Wise reported to the Planning Commission related to the Daddow Park redevelopment. He described his research into the project, investigated the site, and believes, after talking with various community residents that there is strong feeling related to the gazebo and that he believes that much can be done to renovate the park and that restoring the gazebo’s structural members would be more cost effective than initially thought. He noted that he believes that it is a structure that is integral to the park and should be saved and with that, perhaps, there could be significant cost savings for the implementation of improvements and use of the grant funds.

Commissioner Wise presented an alternative plan that considers replacing the rotted members of the existing gazebo with heavy timbers or with steel members, re-roofing, and then reorienting the park from the east-west axis from the Virginia Street towards the rail corridor to a north-south focal point from Hazel Street looking at the gazebo south to Sycamore Street. He also suggests the removal of the sidewalk access points from the rail area to discourage much pedestrian access so close to the rail corridor. He noted that the renovation of the gazebo would not only maintain a structure of importance in the community, but it could also be refit to be a better stage for performances too. He presented issues related to ADA concerns in terms of the proposed concept plan and presented various alternatives to solve such concerns. Commissioner Wise suggested that the park be cleared of some trees and vegetation to open it up, and to provide a clear pedestrian pathway on the east side.

He noted that restrooms may be needed but that it will be a significant maintenance and operation issue for the City. He expressed concern due to staffing reductions the City has experienced. He believed that portable restrooms could be used for specific events that are held and made a condition for holding the event, then, the City would not be required to have an obligation and cost of restroom maintenance. He also thought that tables could be provided on the Hazel Street area.

Commissioner O'Brien noted that there are restrooms located at Railroad Park adjacent to the Skate Park—located across Hazel Street and across the RR tracks to the north.

Commissioner Talley noted that reliance on the existing restroom facilities for Daddow Park could result in excessive pedestrian traffic between the two areas and across the RR tracks which is a significant concern.

Commissioner Thomas requested clarification regarding the process, how the comments and concerns related in this discussion could be presented to the Council for consideration and what the next steps were.

Ms. Decker responded that the Planning Commission had requested a report back from the City Council Study Session. She noted that at the study session the concerns related to the gazebo and the potential for the community to not support renovations that were not inclusive of the restoration of the gazebo may illicit displeasure from the community. Ms. Decker described the next steps of the park design is to develop the plan to construction level drawings. She responded to the clarification of the role of the Planning Commission related to the design of the park and believed that as the plan moves forward that modifications may be made and based upon future feedback from the commission as well as the community. Commissioner Thomas responded with concerns of spending a great deal of the commission's time without benefit of moving forward, that the park design is hopeful to bring more activity and pedestrians where he believes that the location is not conducive to intensification due to the RR corridor and that there are conflicts between park use and the RR corridor. He noted that he does not believe the plan would be an improvement and best use due to the location to the RR corridor. He noted that the redesign and construction of any improvements should be cost effective and have the best use of funds as possible.

Commissioner Wise noted that it appeared that the City Council was not considering the direction the community would like the project to go in—that is to save the gazebo. Commissioner Wise observed that the issue of the gazebo has not been made public, or that the community has not been made aware of it, and potentially that the City Council is may be unaware of the importance of the gazebo to the community. He also noted that he supports outreach to the public to find out if the community is supportive of the park improvements.

Ms. Decker responded that the conversations with the City Council during the study session have been related to the best use and economic use of the funds to get as much of the park constructed because there may not be future funding opportunities to complete work if it is started. She noted that the City Council supported the previous approval of the project and had an interest in supporting a functional plan that would enhance the downtown.

Commissioner Thomas noted that the Planning Commission appears to be united in desiring that the park design be revisited and that the issue of the gazebo and the retention of it be seriously considered as the design moves forward into construction plans.

Commissioner Thomas noted that the park will look much different when trees that are removed open up the park and that the feel of the space will change.

Ms. Decker responded that she will be pursuing public outreach and that as the design moves forward and costs are considered that there will be future opportunities to consider the best alternative. She also noted that she will forward the information provided by Commissioner Wise to the City Council for consideration and confirmed that future plans will be available for review and that they [the plans] will come back to the Planning Commission for continued review.

7. **ADJOURNMENT** – At 7:40 p.m. the Planning Commission adjourned to the next regularly scheduled meeting to be held on Tuesday, December 16, 2014 at 6:00 p.m.

**Approval:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Donna Decker, City Planner/Consultant, DES LLC**