

Inter Office Memo

ATTENTION: FOR FINAL ACTION OR MODIFICATION TO OR ADDITION OF CONDITIONS, SEE FINAL BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' ACTION SUMMARY **MINUTES**

DATE:

August 11, 2022

TO:

Board of Supervisors

FROM:

Planning Commission

SUBJECT:

RESOLUTION NO. 12960 - UNCLASSIFIED CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

NO. 3692 INITIAL STUDY NO. 7948

APPLICANT/

OWNER:

SCI Fresno Memorial Gardens

REQUEST:

Amend Special Use Permit (Conditional Use Permit) No. 270 to allow the construction and operation of a new funeral chapel consisting of a 13,939 square-foot building with related offices to be located westerly and adjacent to the existing cemetery, on an approximately 7.5-acre portion of a 38.55-acre parcel in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.

LOCATION:

The project site is located on the southeast corner of the intersection of W. Whitesbridge Ave. (State Route 180) and S. Polk Ave. approximately one mile west of the City of Fresno (APN: 326-030-81S, 07S, & 10) (175 S. Cornelia

Avenue) (Sup. Dist. 1).

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

At its hearing of August 11, 2022, the Commission considered the Staff Report and testimony (summarized in Exhibit A).

A motion was made by Chairman Abrahamian and seconded by Commissioner Arabian to deny Unclassified Conditional Use Permit (UCUP) No. 3692, citing that Finding No. 2 could not be made due to the potential for traffic impacts to surrounding properties, Finding 3 could not be made, in that the project would have adverse impact on the surrounding agricultural operations, and Finding 4 could not be made in that the proposed facility is not necessary to the operation of the cemetery and such a facility would be more appropriately situated in an urban area.

RESOLUTION NO. 12960

This motion passed on the following vote:

VOTING:

Yes:

Commissioners Abrahamian, Arabian, Carver, Ewell, Hill, and

Zante

No:

None

Absent:

Commissioners Chatha and Woolf

Recused:

None

STEVEN E. WHITE, DIRECTOR

Department of Public Works and Planning

Secretary-Fresno County Planning Commission

William M. Kettler, Manager

Development Services and Capital Projects Division

 $\label{localization} WMK: js: jp \\ G: \4360 Devs \& Pln\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\CUP\3600-3699\3692\RESOLUTION\CUP\3692\ Reso. doc$

NOTE:

Attachments

EXHIBIT A

Initial Study No. 7948 and Unclassified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3692

Staff:

The Fresno County Planning Commission considered the Staff Report dated August 11, 2022, and heard a summary presentation by staff.

Applicant:

The Applicant's representative concurred with the Staff Report and the recommended Conditions. He described the project and offered the following information to clarify the intended use:

- The cemetery was originally approved by the County in 1957 and began operation in 1958, and the applicant feels that a new modern facility is appropriate given the cemetery has been in operation for many years.
- This current request involves the addition of a new building for expanded accommodation of funeral services and ceremonies.
- There are improvements to Polk Avenue proposed, including dedication to the County of additional right-of-way, and the improvement of approximately 250 feet of Polk Avenue to required County standards, Polk Avenue is intended to be used as an exit only for the Public.
- Dedication of an additional 33 feet of right-of-way on Cornelia Avenue on the east side of the property will also be required.
- A traffic analysis was prepared which determined that the project did not meet the criteria or thresholds for a more comprehensive traffic impact study, due to the limited increase in traffic anticipated as a result of the proposed facility.
- With regard to traffic, the traffic analysis included a queuing analysis, which concluded that the existing Cornelia Avenue ingress/egress was adequate.
- In consultation with the County and the State Water Resources
 Control Board Division of Drinking Water, a new well will be installed
 on the property to replace an existing well that had been
 contaminated.
- The cemetery has been in operation adjacent to farming operations for decades and we have not had any complaints; the existing undeveloped portion of the property is farmed by a third party. Farming operations are sometimes limited or ceased during outdoor funeral/memorial services by agreement; additionally, the cemetery has coexisted with the surrounding agricultural operations for many years.

- The average attendance of a typical funeral service is 50 people, and there are approximately 450-500 burials per year at the existing cemetery; and rarely are any complaints expressed by visitors.
- Landscaping would be provided to provide a buffer between the proposed facility and surrounding property, however some of the existing oleanders along Whitesbridge Avenue will be removed during development.

Others:

No other individuals spoke in favor of the application. Two individuals presented information in opposition to the application, stating concerns with the width and condition of Polk Avenue being inadequate for the additional traffic; and that the proposed facility may create conflicts with regular agricultural operations such as chemical applications.

Correspondence:

No letters were presented to the Planning Commission in support of or in opposition to the application.

WMK:js:jp

G:\4360Devs&PIn\ADMIN\BOARD\Board Items\2020-2029\2022\10-25-22\PC Appeal CUP 3692 Memorial Gardens\CUP 3692 PC Reso.doc

EXHIBIT "B"

ATTACHMENT TO AGENDA ITEM

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Unclassified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3692

Listed below are the fees collected for the land use applications involved in this Agenda Item:

Unclassified Conditional Use Permit Application (amendment): \$4,569.50\\
Initial Study: 5,151.00\\
Health Department Review: 992.00\\
Agricultural Commissioner 93.00\\

Total Fees Collected \$ 10,558.50

¹ Includes project routing, coordination with reviewing agencies, preparation and incorporation of analysis into Staff Report.

² Review proposal to provide appropriate California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) evaluation.

³ Review of proposal by the Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division to provide comments.

^{4.} Review of proposal by the County Department of Agriculture.