

Hearing no comments, Chair Acosta closed the public hearing.

2) Appropriate Motion(s)

MAIN MOTION: It was moved by Commissioner Sencion, seconded by Chair Acosta, and carried by the following vote to continue the item to December 3, 2024:

3) Chair Calls for a Vote on Motion(s)

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Acosta, Senci3n, Meldahl, Veitch-Olson
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: Dodge, Radin, Rojas

C. DENIAL OF SPECIAL USE PERMIT AND DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT WITH ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW (PP2023-6377) AND RECOMMENDING TO CITY COUNCIL DENIAL OF A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT FOR A NEW 7,670-SQUARE-FOOT DRIVE-THROUGH CAR WASH FACILITY ON A 1.18± ACRE SITE LOCATED AT 632 EAST LAKE AVENUE (APN: 017-321-02), FILED BY VANCE SHANNON WITH QUICK QUACK CAR WASH, APPLICANT, ON BEHALF OF BILL HANSEN, PROPERTY OWNER

1) Staff Report

Associate Planner Ivan Carmona gave the presentation.

2) Planning Commission Clarifying & Technical Questions

None.

3) Applicant Presentation

Quick Quack Carwash Representative Vans Shannon gave a Presentation.

Meeting Break called by Chair to address audio difficulties. Break time started at 6:52pm, meeting resumed at 6:54pm.

William Hansen gave a presentation.

4) Planning Commission Clarifying & Technical Questions

None.

5) Public Hearing

Chair Acosta opened the public hearing.

ADOPTED MINUTES 4.A.

Resident Leean Jones spoke in favor of the decision to deny the project, commenting that the project would be detrimental to public health, safety, convenience and welfare. She further shared examples of noise-generating businesses, including car washes, that create noise impacts for nearby residents.

Local business owner Raeid Farhat raised concerns regarding the consistency of approval and denial of projects. He referenced a gas station project at 676 East Lake Avenue that was allowed to convert the former handwash facility into an automated car wash facility.

Resident Steven McGee spoke in favor of the decision to deny the project. He commented on the potential impacts of noise to residents' ability to sleep and rest.

Resident Martha Vega spoke against the decision to deny the proposed project. She referenced previous approved projects and supported businesses wanting to develop within the city. She encouraged Commissioners to also think of the youth that will get to vote and live in the city.

Resident Joan Garrett spoke in favor of the decision to deny the project. She shared her concerns about noise and children walking in areas with high traffic volumes.

Hearing no further comment, Chair Acosta closed the public hearing.

In response to an inquiry on making a motion, Assistant City Attorney Bazzano noted that in the absence of a motion at this time the Planning Commission could consider and discuss the item to see if the Planning Commission could get to an appropriate motion.

Commissioner Veitch-Olson requested to reopen the Planning Commission clarifying and technical questions. Chair Acosta accepted the request. Assistant City Attorney Bazzano also clarified that to ask questions of staff or the applicant, the Planning Commission could do so without having to reopen the Public Hearing.

2) Planning Commission Clarifying & Technical Questions

Chair Acosta reopened the Planning Commission Clarifying & Technical Questions as a request by Commissioner Veitch-Olson.

Commissioner Veitch-Olson inquired about the project's timing and noted there was a study session in October to receive direction from the City Council on whether or not to amend the Drive-Through Facility Restrictions Ordinance. In answering, Interim Assistant Community Development Director Orbach clarified that the project was brought before the Planning Commission tonight at the request of the applicant and property owner. He explained that the project was deemed complete in September and this was the first meeting date that the item could be brought for review by the Planning Commission.

ADOPTED MINUTES 4.A.

Chair Acosta commented on the time Commissioners had to review the agenda packet. The Chair also shared comments regarding his support for business and the proposed project.

In response to Chair Acosta's question concerning making a motion to approve or deny the appeal, Assistant City Attorney Bazzano clarified the two recommendations and potential actions by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Veitch-Olson inquired whether the Planning Commission could table the item to a future date to allow Council an opportunity to consider making changes to the Drive-Through Facility Restrictions Ordinance before the item returned to the Commission. She shared her concerns that approval of the project would set a precedent of not applying the 150-foot-setback requirement in the Ordinance.

Chair Acosta commented that the Planning Commission conducts their review on a project-by-project basis, questioned the application of the setback requirement, and noted his approval of the project.

Assistant City Attorney Bazzano clarified that in order to approve the project, the Commission would need to find that it meets standards, including the 150-foot-setback requirement set forth in the WMC section 14-41.100(a)(1).

In response to Chair Acosta's question about whether the Commission could or could not make a motion to approve the project, Assistant City Attorney Bazzano confirmed that it could not because the project does not meet all drive-through facility standards.

Assistant City Attorney Bazzano further clarified that if the Planning Commission could provide evidence in support of making the required findings, then City staff could bring back the item with an alternative resolution to approve the project.

5) Public Hearing

Chair Acosta reopened the Public Hearing at the request of property owner Bill Hansen.

Property owner Bill Hansen commented on the short timeframe and amount of material for review in the agenda packet by the Planning Commission. Mr. Hansen noted that he has been working on this project for two and a half years and described the sequence of events regarding project design and entitlements to bring it for consideration by the Planning Commission. Mr. Hansen commented on other developments he has worked on and expressed frustration with this project.

Chair Acosta thanked the applicant and closed the public hearing without inquiring about whether any additional members of the public wished to speak.

ADOPTED MINUTES 4.A.

Requests were made by multiple members of the public to speak. In response, Chair Acosta reopened the public hearing.

Resident Steven McGee addressed Chair Acosta and shared concerns regarding living near a carwash. He further added that he supports businesses and addressed concerns regarding the noise surrounding the residents.

Resident Leeann Jones spoke in support of local businesses and asked the Commission to consider if this business is needed. Resident Jones also shared concerns that the community was not involved in the project and requested for residents to be involved in decisions of new development. She stated she took the time to read and understand the packet.

Resident Ilia Buliach shared he is neither in opposition or in support of the project, but shared concerns regarding procedures. Resident Buliach commented on the short amount of time available for reviewing the agenda packet and making decisions.

Assistant City Attorney Bazzano requested to be able to respond regarding comments to the agenda notice. Chair Acosta postponed the comment.

Chair Acosta thanked the community for being involved and speaking. Chair Acosta further shared concerns regarding the timing of when the agenda was received and the amount of time available to read all the material.

Chair Acosta asked other Planning Commissioners whether they read all the material in the packet. In response, the other Commissioners present confirmed they had read the agenda packet materials.

Chair Acosta shared concerning comments towards City Staff.

Assistant City Attorney Bazzano responded to the comments regarding the noticing of the agenda. Attorney Bazzano clarified that there are two types of meetings under the Brown Act: regular meetings and special meetings. A special meeting requires the agenda to be published 24 hours ahead of the meeting. Assistant City Attorney Bazzano noted for the record that the agenda for this meeting was published at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

Assistant City Attorney Bazzano also shared that the Planning Commission can decide to continue the item to a future regular meeting date or a date uncertain.

Chair Acosta inquired about the different possible dates to move the item to since it would also require availability from the Commissioners. Assistant City Attorney Bazzano suggested moving the item to a date uncertain.

In addition, Interim Community Development Director Meek stated that, if the Planning Commission decides to move the item to a date uncertain, the Department will make its best efforts to schedule a Special Meeting where everyone is available.

Chair Acosta confirmed that there will be a regular meeting on December 3, 2024, and requested Staff send out an email to Commissioners to decide on a Special Meeting date in December.

6) Appropriate Motion(s)

MAIN MOTION: It was moved by Chair Acosta, seconded by Commissioner Veitch-Olson, and carried by the following vote to continue the item to a date uncertain with direction to staff to coordinate a Special Meeting in December:

RESOLUTION NO. xx-24 (PC)

RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA, DENYING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT AND DESIGN REVIEW WITH ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW (PP2023-6377) FOR A NEW 7,670-SQUARE-FOOT DRIVE-THROUGH CAR WASH FACILITY ON A 1.18± ACRE SITE LOCATED AT 632 EAST LAKE AVENUE (APN: 017-321-02), FILED BY VANCE SHANNON WITH QUICK QUACK CAR WASH, APPLICANT, ON BEHALF OF BILL HANSEN, PROPERTY OWNER

RESOLUTION NO. xx-24 (PC)

RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING TO CITY COUNCIL DENIAL OF A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE ZONING DESIGNATION OF THE SUBJECT PARCEL LOCATED AT 632 EAST LAKE AVENUE (APN: 017-321-02) FROM NEIGHBORHOOD SHOPPING CENTER (CNS) TO THOROUGHFARE COMMERCIAL (CT) TO ALLOW CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW DRIVE-THROUGH CAR WASH FACILITY, FILED BY VANCE SHANNON WITH QUICK QUACK CAR WASH, APPLICANT, ON BEHALF OF BILL HANSEN, PROPERTY OWNER

7) Deliberation

None

8) Chair Calls for a Vote on Motion(s)

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Acosta, Sencion, Meldahl, Veitch-Olson
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: Dodge, Radin, Rojas

6. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

No report at this time from Secretary Meek.

7. ADJOURNMENT