CITY OF PATTERSON PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 2026, AT 7:00 P.M.
City Council Chambers
1 Plaza, Patterson, California

PUBLIC MEETING GUIDELINES

City of Patterson Planning Commission meetings are conducted in person at City Hall Council Chambers. As a courtesy, and technology permitting, members of the public may continue to participate virtually. However, the City cannot guarantee that the public's access to teleconferencing technology will be uninterrupted, and technical difficulties may occur from time to time.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE IN THE MEETING IN PERSON OR VIA TELECONFERENCE BY CALLING 1-669-900-6833, MEETING ID: 701 906 1477 PASSWORD: 20995363 AND WILL BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE PUBLIC COMMENT. JOIN FROM A PC, MAC, IPAD, IPHONE, OR ANDROID DEVICE BY USING THIS URL:

https://us06web.zoom.us/j/7019061477?pwd=VEIrMTIYdmNZTk53ZitzZUdSZUQxZz09

Planning Commission meetings will be available for public viewing daily on Comcast cable channel 7, or online via the following link: https://vimeo.com/channels/patterson/

Regular Planning Commission meetings are scheduled on the 2nd and 4th Thursday of each month at 7:00 p.m. January-October and on the 3rd Thursday only in November and December. The agenda/packet is usually posted by 5:00 p.m. the Thursday before a scheduled Thursday Planning Commission meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Planning Department at (209) 895-8020. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28 CFR 35.102-35.104 ADA Title II].

The Planning Commission agenda and supporting public documents are available for viewing in City Hall, Planning Department, 1 Plaza, 2nd Floor, Patterson, California, during normal business hours. The Planning Commission agenda and supporting public documents are also available online on the City web site www.pattersonca.gov listed under Agenda Center "Planning Commission" or please call or email the Planning Department at (209) 895-8020 or planning@pattersonca.gov

If you wish to be notified of future Planning Commission meetings, please visit our website www.pattersonca.gov go to Popular Links "Planning Commission Agendas" and Subscribe to "RSS"

CALL TO ORDER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC The public wishing to address the Planning Commission on items that do not appear on the agenda may do so; however, the Planning Commission will take no action other than referring the item to Staff for study and analysis and may place the item on a future agenda [Resolution 92-25].

Any member of the audience desiring to address the Planning Commission regarding a matter on the agenda, please raise your hand or step to the podium at the time the item is announced by the Chairperson. In order

that all interested parties have an opportunity to speak, any person addressing the Planning Commission will be limited to a maximum of three (3) minutes unless the Chairperson grants a longer period of time.

STATEMENT OF CONFLICT BY COMMISSIONERS

RIGHT TO APPEAL Any person who is dissatisfied with the decision of the Planning Commission may appeal such action to the City Council within ten (10) business days after action.

CORRESPONDENCE None

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes of December 18, 2025.
2. Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes of February 12, 2026.

AGENDA ITEMS

Public Hearing: **Architectural & Site Plan Review #24-06, Conditional Use Permit #24-03, 111 E. Las Palmas Avenue, APN #047-033-011 - J's Food Court**
A public hearing to consider Architectural and Site Plan Review and Conditional Use Permit (CUP) approval of a proposed mobile vehicle food court, including up to 13 mobile vehicle spaces, gazebo structures, trash enclosure, parking spaces, and related facilities, at 111 E. Las Palmas Ave (APN 047-033-011), east of 1st St. The southwest portion of the site is developed with an existing auto sales building and car lot. The remainder of the site is undeveloped with two mobile food truck vendors.**(Staff Report To Come)**

- **ITEMS FROM STAFF**
- **ITEMS FROM COMMISSION**
- **ADJOURNMENT**

CITY OF PATTERSON
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
DECEMBER 18, 2025

The Planning Commission regular meeting of December 18, 2025, was called to order by Chairperson West at 7:01 p.m.

SHOWN PRESENT (HYBRID MEETING): Shown present: Chairperson West, Vice Chairperson Bendix, Commissioner Apland, Commissioner Sidhu and Commissioner Alexander. Also shown present were: Community Development Director Stice, City Planner Andrews, IT Support Technician II Lane Valenzuela, Videographer Justin Danner and Planning Commission Secretary Melo. Shown excused: Associate Planner Rodriguez.

ROLL CALL: Chairperson West, Vice Chairperson Bendix, Commissioner Apland, Commissioner Sidhu, Commissioner Alexander

ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Hi there. I am unable to attend the meeting due to work and was hoping you could read my comments under public comment time. My name is Yolanda Magaña resident of Patterson, CA. I wanted to bring up that I hope planning commissioners are abstaining from voting when it comes to decisions that could be financially beneficial to them. Such as if a commissioner is a realtor, broker, developer, contractor, land owner, architect, engineer, land use consultant, Attorneys specializing in Land Use or Property Law, or other professions or other areas of personal interest that they could have a financial benefit that could foreseeably be impacted by their voting decision. With Patterson growing as it is, I want to make sure our public leaders aren't having any conflicts of interests with voting on any new developments. Thank you for your time.

STATEMENT OF CONFLICT BY COMMISSIONERS: Chairperson West will excuse himself from item #4 630 N. 4th St. Four-plex

CORRESPONDENCE: Received a comment letter from Department of Housing & Community Development (HCD) regarding City of Patterson 6th Cycle 2023-2031 Housing Element

Chairperson West asked staff to explain the correspondence received from HCD regarding the Housing Element. Community Development Director Stice and City Planner Andrews explained the Housing Element process.

CONSENT AGENDA: None

AGENDA ITEMS:

Public Hearings related to recommendation to City Council for three development agreements for the Zacharias and Baldwin Ranch South Master Plan as follows:

1. **Development Agreement for Zacharias Project with developers Zacharias Ranch, TPF Development, and Lakeside Hills for residential parcels.**

The Planning Commission will consider a recommendation to the City Council related to an ordinance for a Development Agreement between the City of Patterson and Zacharias Ranch, TPF Development and Lakeside Hills. This agreement would apply to residential parcels of real property located in the Zacharias Area of the Master Plan. The project covers approximately 618.2 acres and would add approximately 3,941 new residential units to the City of Patterson. The proposed agreement is a Master Development Agreement intended to memorialize shared benefits, representations, warrants and obligations of the parties related to the Zacharias Project Area. This agreement provides vested rights to the Developers, establishes certain financial and infrastructure obligations for the development of the Project and reduces the economic risk of the Project for both the City and the Developers. Subsequent project-level development agreement may be required for each Developer.

Community Development Director Stice stated that legal staff recommended to continue the Development Agreement to the Planning Commission meeting on January 22nd.

Open Public Hearing: 7:10 p.m.

No public testimony

Close Public Hearing: 7:11 p.m.

Motion to continue Development Agreement for Zacharias Residential to January 22nd Planning Commission meeting:

By: Vice Chairperson Bendix
Second: Commissioner Apland
Motion passed: 5-0 Vote

ROLL CALL: Chairperson West, Vice Chairperson Bendix, Commissioner Apland, Commissioner Sidhu, Commissioner Alexander

Ayes: Chairperson West, Vice Chairperson Bendix, Commissioner Apland, Commissioner Sidhu, Commissioner Alexander
Noes: None
Excused: None

2. **Development Agreement for Zacharias Commercial and Industrial Project with developers Zacharias Ranch and Lakeside Hills.**

The Planning Commission will consider a recommendation to the City Council related to an ordinance for a Development Agreement between the City of Patterson and Zacharias Ranch and Lakeside Hills. This agreement would apply to commercial and industrial parcels of real property located in the Zacharias Area of the Master Plan. The project covers approximately 367.9 acres and would add approximately 7,765,000 sq. feet of commercial, light industrial, and mixed-use buildings to the City. The proposed agreement is a Master Development Agreement intended to memorialize shared benefits, representations, warrants and obligations of the parties related to the Zacharias Commercial and Industrial Project Area. This agreement provides vested rights to the Developers, establishes certain financial and infrastructure obligations for the development of the Project and reduces the economic risk of the Project for both the City and the Developers. Subsequent project-level development agreement may be required for each Developer's development area.

Community Development Director Stice stated that legal staff recommended to continue the Development Agreement to the Planning Commission meeting on January 22nd.

Open Public Hearing: 7:12 p.m.

No public testimony

Close Public Hearing: 7:13 p.m.

Motion to continue Development Agreement Zacharias Commercial/Industrial to January 22nd Planning Commission meeting:

By: Vice Chairperson Bendix
Second: Commissioner Sidhu
Motion passed: 5-0 Vote

ROLL CALL: Chairperson West, Vice Chairperson Bendix, Commissioner Apland, Commissioner Sidhu, Commissioner Alexander

Ayes: Chairperson West, Vice Chairperson Bendix, Commissioner Apland, Commissioner Sidhu, Commissioner Alexander
Noes: None
Excused: None

3. **Development Agreement for Baldwin Ranch South Project with developer Baldwin Ranch South.**

The Planning Commission will consider a recommendation to the City Council related to an ordinance for a Development Agreement between the City of Patterson and Baldwin Ranch South. This agreement would apply to residential parcels of real property located in the Baldwin Ranch South area of the Master Plan. The project covers approximately 66 acres and would add approximately 305 new residential units to the City. The proposed agreement is intended to memorialize shared benefits, representations, warrants and obligations of the parties related to the Baldwin Ranch South Project Area. This agreement provides vested rights to the Developer, establishes certain financial and infrastructure obligations for the development of the Project and reduces the economic risk of the Project for both the City and the Developer.

Community Development Director Stice stated that legal staff recommended to continue the Development Agreement to the Planning Commission meeting on January 22nd.

Open Public Hearing: 7:14 p.m.

No public testimony

Close Public Hearing: 7:15 p.m.

Motion to continue Development Agreement for Baldwin Ranch South to January 22nd Planning Commission meeting:

By: Vice Chairperson Bendix
Second: Commissioner Apland
Motion passed: 5-0 Vote

ROLL CALL: Chairperson West, Vice Chairperson Bendix, Commissioner Apland, Commissioner Sidhu, Commissioner Alexander

Ayes: Chairperson West, Vice Chairperson Bendix, Commissioner Apland, Commissioner Sidhu, Commissioner Alexander
Noes: None
Excused: None

Chairperson West excused himself and wished everyone a wonderful holiday. Vice Chairperson Bendix took over the meeting as chairperson.

4. **Public Hearing:** **Architectural & Site Plan Review #25-06, Conditional Use Permit #25-09 – 630 N. 4th Street Four-plex, APN # 047-021-010**
An application to allow a residential building with four units at 630 N. 4th Street with two units of 1,561 square feet and two units of 1,583 square feet. All units would be part of a single two-story building, oriented to face North 4th Street. Multiple-family units housing projects, such as the proposed project, are subject to the approval of a conditional use permit in the Downtown Residential zone, where the project is proposed. The project site measures 18,295 square feet and is currently vacant.

Community Development Director Stice introduced City Planner Andrews to present the PowerPoint presentation for the project. City Planner Andrews stated that the Planning Commission received a petition from neighbors regarding the concerns about the project's potential impacts regarding parking, traffic, infrastructure and consistency with the character of the surrounding neighborhood. The signees requested that the Planning Commission deny the project. He answered questions from the Commission.

Carl Thompson, applicant for the project, 1919 Grand Canal Blvd, Stockton, CA
Mr. Thompson spoke in favor of the project and described it to the Commission. He noted the petition that was circulated and he became aware of it on Monday but wanted more time to address concerns with petitioners. He's aware of concerns but stated that this project helps with the housing element, and he has addressed concerns with mitigating second story windows and privacy for neighbors. He stated that petitioner's concerns would be addressed the best he could. He answered questions from the Commission.

Open Public Hearing: 7:31 p.m.

Dominic Farinha, past member of City Council and resident of Patterson
Mr. Farinha stated that he's not opposed to housing in general but he made comments on how the project is designed. He is concerned with parking, traffic impacts and trash pickup, and is concerned this project would set a precedent for future multi-family projects in the area. He asked the commissioners to consider other conditions to reduce impacts while allowing the project to move forward.

Monica Della Maggiore, 431 N. 4th Street, Patterson
Mrs. Della Maggiore asked how many feet the project was noticed because she lives close by. Staff stated that the legal requirement is a 300' notification. She spoke about the history of the area and stated that the proposed project would change the area. She also stated that she was surprised that a project of that size would be allowed on N. 4th Street. She asked if the units would be for sale or rent. City Planner Andrews stated that they were proposed for rentals.

Cassondra Powers, lives next door to 630 N. 4th Street
Mrs. Powers stated that she's opposed to the project because most families lived there for decades and the character of the block reflects the area. She stated that she purchased her home because it was single-family. She stated that the street already brings traffic from Hwy 33 and the schools and multi-housing would increase traffic, congestion and safety for surrounding homes. She was also concerned about future property value. She asked the Commission to deny the project as proposed.

Sand Keller-Borba, Patterson resident
Mrs. Keller-Borba stated that she is a 47-year resident of N. 4th Street and her parents are the original owners. She spoke about the history of N. 4th Street. She urged the Commission to consider the issues that this project would bring and not approve the conditional use permit.

Monica Della Maggiore, 431 N. 4th Street, Patterson
Mrs. Della Maggiore stated that she bought in the neighborhood because of the character of it. She stated that it would take years for full grown trees to grow or landscaping around the 4-plex and it would feel sterile.

Elisa Medina, 700 N. 3rd Street, Patterson
Mrs. Medina stated that she bought 6 years ago because of the architecture of single-story homes that have been there for years and for the quiet, wide streets. She stated that she would be able to see the four-plex from her kitchen and 12 garbage totes. She asked if there would be monitoring for the garbage cans to be put away, and wondered if people would even park in their garage. She was also concerned about who would be moving into the area. She stated that she opposes the conditional use permit.

John Christopherson, corner of Northmead and N 4th Street
Mr. Christopherson stated that he would have to look at a giant building and it would wreck the whole neighborhood. He stated that he lives there because it's single-family and private and the four-plex is not a good fit for the neighborhood. He also was concerned with excessive parking in the neighborhood if the project goes through.

Adrian Goss, 615 N. 4th Street, Patterson
Mr. Goss filed the petition and stated that he doesn't agree with the conformity of the proposed project because it doesn't look like anything on the street. He also stated that it would have a negative impact on the values in the neighborhood. He was concerned that the back half of the lot would get built out as well and add to the concerns already stated. Mr. Goss stated that they didn't have enough time to address all concerns in the petition because they got the notice about the meeting last Tuesday.

Kandace Weyhrauch, Patterson resident
Mrs. Weyhrauch stated that she doesn't live in the neighborhood, but she wanted to speak on behalf of her friends that live in the neighborhood. She stated that changing the dynamic of the neighborhood is wrong. She noted that the traffic is horrible on M Street and 4th Street and it's not right to add 4 more units on one lot. She urged the Commission to not approve the conditional use permit.

Marco, Patterson resident
He stated that he doesn't live in the area but had questions and concerns about the proposed project including the garbage cans and car placement in front of the 4-plex. He asked if the soil had been checked due to the fire and whether there is contamination. City Planner Andrews stated that soil testing would take place if the project was approved. He stated that street is in a flood zone. He also stated that the building is nice and he likes houses that are more affordable, but he stated that apartment complexes aren't the answer.

Dominic Farinha
Mr. Farinha asked if any consideration had been given for a large single-family home and ADU to allow for other housing opportunities instead of the massive 4-plex He felt there could be a happy medium to provide a different housing style but not the proposed housing project.

Hugo Gonzalez, neighbor
Mr. Gonzalez doesn't think the project is a good idea and he's against it.

Chad Hubin, 620 N. 4th Street
Mr. Hubin bought property because it was a single-family home. The easement is there because he gave the previous owner the easement so he could get into his backyard not for multiple people using his driveway. He stated that he opposes the project.

John Powers
Mr. Powers stated that his wife voiced her concerns previously, but he was concerned about the amount of trash cans that will be out front on Wednesdays, and everyone has at least two cars so lots of cars in the area and it's in front of his house. He is strongly opposed and hopes the Commission makes the right decision.

Close Public Hearing: 8:06 p.m.

Commissioners spoke about the project and voiced their concerns. They asked staff questions.

Motion to deny Architectural & Site Plan Review 25-06 and Conditional Use Permit 25-09:

By:	Commissioner Apland
Second:	Commissioner Alexander
Motion passed:	4-0 Vote

ROLL CALL: Vice Chairperson Bendix, Commissioner Apland, Commissioner Sidhu, Commissioner Alexander

Ayes:	Vice Chairperson Bendix, Commissioner Apland, Commissioner Sidhu, Commissioner Alexander
Noes:	None
Excused:	None
Abstained:	Chairperson West

ITEMS FROM STAFF:

Community Development Director Stice stated that city hall will be closed starting on Monday and will reopen on January 5th.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION:

Vice Chairperson Bendix asked about letter going to Save Mart and Community Development Director Stice said it hadn't been sent out yet.

ADJOURNMENT: The Planning Commission regular meeting of December 18, 2025, was adjourned by Vice Chairperson Bendix at 8:13 p.m.

_____
Prepared by Denise Melo, Secretary of City of Patterson Planning Commission

CITY OF PATTERSON
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
FEBRUARY 12, 2026

The Planning Commission regular meeting of February 12, 2026, was called to order by Chairperson West at 7:01 p.m.

SHOWN PRESENT (HYBRID MEETING): Shown present: Chairperson West, Vice Chairperson Bendix, Commissioner Apland, Commissioner Sidhu and Commissioner Alexander. Also shown present were: Community Development Director Stice, IT Support Technician II Lane Valenzuela, Videographer Justin Danner and Planning Commission Secretary Melo. Shown excused: City Planner Andrews and Associate Planner Rodriguez.

ROLL CALL: Chairperson West, Vice Chairperson Bendix, Commissioner Apland, Commissioner Sidhu, Commissioner Alexander

ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

STATEMENT OF CONFLICT BY COMMISSIONERS: None

CORRESPONDENCE: None

CONSENT AGENDA:

Motion to approve Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of November 20, 2025

By: Vice Chairperson Bendix
Second: Commissioner Apland
Motion passed: 5-0 Vote

ROLL CALL: Chairperson West, Vice Chairperson Bendix, Commissioner Apland, Commissioner Sidhu, Commissioner Alexander

Ayes: Chairperson West, Vice Chairperson Bendix, Commissioner Apland, Commissioner Sidhu, Commissioner Alexander
Noes: None
Excused: None
Abstained: None

Motion to approve special Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of December 1, 2025

By: Vice Chairperson Bendix
Second: Commissioner Sidhu
Motion passed: 5-0 Vote

ROLL CALL: Chairperson West, Vice Chairperson Bendix, Commissioner

Apland, Commissioner Sidhu, Commissioner Alexander

Ayes: Chairperson West, Vice Chairperson Bendix, Commissioner Apland, Commissioner Sidhu, Commissioner Alexander
Noes: None
Excused: None
Abstained: None

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. **Public Hearing:** **Tentative Parcel Map #26-01 – Eagle Valley Investments, S. Rogers Road, APN #'s 021-093-004, 021-093-006, 021-093-007**
The project consists of a Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide three existing parcels (Assessor's Parcel Numbers 021-093-004, 021-093-006, and 021-093-007), totaling approximately 16 acres, located along Sperry Avenue and Rogers Road, into eleven (11) parcels. The proposed parcels would range in size from approximately one (1) to two (2) acres and are intended for future commercial development. The parcels are zoned General Commercial District. The project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15315 (Minor Land Divisions), as the proposal involves the subdivision of property in an urbanized area and does not include any construction or expansion of use at this time. Any future development of the subdivided parcels will be subject to separate discretionary review and environmental analysis, as required.

Community Development Director Stice presented the PowerPoint presentation. He answered questions from the Commission.

Open Public Hearing: 7:20 p.m.

Larry Buehner, Eagle Valley Investments
Mr. Buehner stated that staff did a great job explaining the tentative parcel map. He stated that the old tentative map expired during the pandemic and then changes were made to bring this new tentative parcel map back to the Commission.

Close Public Hearing: 7:22 p.m.

Motion to approve Tentative Parcel Map #26-01 with eleven findings and 18 conditions of approval:
By: Vice Chairperson Bendix

Conditions of Approval

1. That the project shall be subject to the mitigation measures outlined in the West Patterson Business Park EIR and Addendum.

2. That the final map submitted for checking and recordation shall be prepared by a licensed civil engineer or land surveyor, each licensed to practice in the state of California, and shall meet all of the specifications of the state Subdivision Map Act.

3. That the parcels shall comply with the requirements of the General Commercial zoning classification.

4. That, prior to final map submittal, the applicant/developer shall submit to the City Engineer a driveway access plan that utilizes the necessary number of shared, City-commercial-standard driveways to mitigate potential impacts to S. Rogers Road that could occur otherwise because of the proposed increased number of lots.

5. That the approval shall comply with all applicable state and municipal codes and meet the requirements of the City Engineer.

6. That easements of record shall remain in effect and shall be recorded on the final map.

7. That an access easement and agreement shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and recorded for any lots/parcels that either share driveways as per the required driveway access plan (above) or that do not have direct access to the public right-of-way.

8. Public utility easements shall be granted as required by the appropriate companies and to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director and City Engineer.

9. The applicant shall file one copy of the Tentative Parcel Map to be used for assigning addresses.

10. That no non-conforming condition of zoning may be created by this approval.

11. Cost of all inspections related to on-site and off-site improvements shall be paid by the subdivider/developer.

12. In addition to payment of required development impact fees, developers of each parcel shall be responsible for their fair share of costs, as determined by the City Engineer, related to the improvement of Rogers Road and Sperry Avenue.

13. The subdivider shall set all monuments required by the Subdivision Map Act before project acceptance for off-site improvements are approved.

14. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority (SLDMWA) as set forth in their comment letter dated February 2, 2026, which is incorporated herein by reference, and shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals prior to issuance of grading or building permits for any work adjacent to or affecting the Delta-Mendota Canal right-of-way.

15. That the applicant shall coordinate with the local electrical service provider (TID) to ensure adequate electrical service is available to all parcels. Additional Public Utility Easements (PUEs) and/or electrical easements shall be granted as required where existing or proposed electrical facilities extend beyond established easement areas or cross parcel boundaries. All required easements shall be shown on the final map or recorded prior to issuance of improvement or building permits.

16. That future development of the subdivided parcels shall comply with the City of Patterson General Plan, zoning regulations, and all applicable development standards. Specific land uses allowed within the boundaries of this subdivision shall be limited to retail, visitor services, lodging, recreation, amusement/entertainment, restaurants, auto sales (with ancillary services), and other related uses

determined through subsequent development applications and any required discretionary permits in accordance with the Patterson Municipal Code.

17. That, per Patterson Municipal Code Section 16.20.010, failure to record a final map within twenty-four months of the date of approval or conditional approval of the tentative map shall terminate all proceedings, unless otherwise provided for under the Subdivision Map Act; provided, however, that upon application of the subdivider in writing, an extension not exceeding one year may be granted by the planning commission, except as provided under subsections (B) and (C) of this section. In the event the commission denies the subdivider's application for extension, the subdivider may appeal to the city council. Where proceedings have terminated because of failure to file a final map or failure to receive extension by the planning commission or city council, a new tentative map shall be filed in accordance with the provisions of this chapter before a final map may thereafter be recorded or any lot sold.

18. That the applicant shall indemnify, defend and hold harmless the City of Patterson, its agents, officers and employees from any and all claims, actions, or proceedings against the City of Patterson, its agents, officers and employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul any approval by the City of Patterson and its advisory agency, appeal board or legislative body concerning the project, which action is brought within the time period provided for by the Government Code of the State of California. The City of Patterson shall promptly notify the applicant of any claim, action or proceeding and shall cooperate fully in the defense. If the City fails to do so, the applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify or hold the City harmless.

Second: Commissioner Apland
Motion passed: 5-0 Vote

ROLL CALL: Chairperson West, Vice Chairperson Bendix, Commissioner Apland, Commissioner Sidhu, Commissioner Alexander

Ayes: Chairperson West, Vice Chairperson Bendix, Commissioner Apland, Commissioner Sidhu, Commissioner Alexander
Noes: None
Excused: None

2. Public Hearing: **Conditional Use Permit #26-01 – Gold Coast Sales, Inc., Pylon Sign, S. Rogers Road, APN # 021-093-001**
To consider plans for a new pylon and electronic billboard sign and Conditional Use Permit application on property located at the southwest corner of Sperry Avenue and S. Rogers Road, zoned General Commercial District. Project plans illustrate a new 90-foot-high, freeway-oriented sign to be constructed on undeveloped 1.9-acre site (APN 021-093-001) to benefit multiple businesses and properties. The Planning Commission may approve signs over 30 feet high with consideration and potential approval of a Conditional Use Permit.

Community Development Director Stice presented the PowerPoint presentation. He answered questions from the Commission.

Open Public Hearing: 7:43 p.m.

An email was sent by Dominic Speno and he asked that it be read into the record. It reads as follows:

“I am concerned about possible line of sight blockage as it relates to the Villa Del Lago sign that has been in place since the early 1990’s. One exhibit in particular that raised my concern was exhibit “love tc” it appears as though the proposed sign is directly blocking the line of sight for the Villa Del Lago sign. This is my main concern that I would like addressed before any approval is granted. I am not opposed to a sign generally as long as the line of site in relation to the Villa Del Lago sign is not infringed upon. Please enter this response into the record for commissioners to consider”

Steven Martinez from Caltrans emailed the following comment:

“Pursuant to the California Outdoor Advertising Act (Business and Professions Code 5200 et. seq.), any proposed off-premises outdoor advertising display visible from the State Highway System must obtain an ODA Permit from the Caltrans Outdoor Advertising Program prior to placement. For questions regarding permitting requirements or how to apply for an ODA Permit, please e-mail ODA@dot.ca.gov or call (916) 654-6473.”

Frank Orosco, consultant for Project
Mr. Orosco answered questions from the Commission regarding adding community events on the electronic board. Mr. Orosco stated that it would be possible to add information about events. He also stated that originally the sign was supposed to be between Oak Harbor and Love’s and now that the sign location has moved, they’re not opposed to putting the flagstone on the legs of the sign. The sign will only block Villa Del Lago if you’re standing in parking lot looking at Villa del Lago sign but doesn’t block from the freeway. He also stated that McDonald’s won’t close escrow until sign is in place. He stated businesses are waiting for McDonald’s to break ground before other businesses purchase lots. He spoke in favor of the project and answered questions from the Commission.

Larry Buehner
Mr. Buehner stated that of the 90-foot sign 12 feet or so is the M arches. The height from the freeway is elevated and the sign is at a lower elevation. It looks taller from the Love’s parking lot than the freeway.

Sarah Kumar, she and her husband own Grocery Outlet in town
They live here and do business in Patterson. She stated they have struggled with signage and visibility off the freeway. She is in favor of the signage and hopes to be put on the sign for more economic growth in the community.

Sarah Hernandez, Patterson
Miss Hernandez asked when proposed sign images are approved, what process does that lot of land get approved for signage? Community Development Director Stice stated corner lots get more signage front and side like Grocery Outlet. She asked questions about the process when buildings get built. Community Development Director Stice stated that each development is different and financing and environmental issues may play a role in how fast the development starts. Miss Hernandez stated that Grocery Outlet reminds her of the word family because they’re a local family business and although they didn’t need a sign to open, they’ve given a lot back to the community. She said they need an additional sign because she can’t tell what their building is from the freeway.

Close Public Hearing: 8:05 p.m.

Reopen Public Hearing: 8:08 p.m.

Larry Buehner stated that when they put the stone on the sign, they'll match it in the future when the businesses come in. Community Development Director Stice stated that the base would require its own building permit.

Reclose Public Hearing: 8:09 p.m.

Motion to adopt Resolution #2026-01, approving Conditional Use Permit #26-01 with four findings and 20 conditions of approval with addition of condition #21 to state "The applicant shall include a 6-foot-high flagstone base structure located at the base of the sign columns and consistent with designs of the surrounding commercial businesses, subject to review and approval by the city Community Development Director. Additionally, a building permit will be required for such sign base structure if proposed outside of the original sign plans."
By: Vice Chairperson Bendix

Conditions of Approval

1. The project shall comply with all applicable State and Municipal Codes, including the California Building Codes and meet the requirements of the Public Works Department, City Engineer, Building Inspector, Planning Department and Fire Chief.

2. The applicant shall comply with all conditions of approval and adopted mitigation measures.

3. Development shall occur in substantial conformance with the plans as approved by the Planning Commission.

4. All signage shall be submitted for a sign permit and shall be in accordance with relevant provisions of the Patterson Zoning Ordinance and that any proposed monument sign shall be constructed with design elements and materials reflective of those of the main building.

5. The applicant shall include a 6-foot-high flagstone base structure located at the base of the sign columns and consistent with designs of the surrounding commercial businesses, subject to review and approval by the city Community Development Director. Additionally, a building permit will be required for such sign base structure if proposed outside of the original sign plans. (new condition)

Additional Approvals

6. A Caltrans Outdoor Advertising Permit is required where applicable.

7. Approval by the City does not authorize installation or operation of an electronic billboard without all required state permits.

8. Applicants must acknowledge that final approval is contingent upon Caltrans authorization.

Brightness (Luminance) Standards

9. Electronic billboards shall not exceed a maximum brightness of 500 nits from sunset to sunrise.

10. Daytime brightness must be automatically adjusted based on ambient light conditions. Automatic dimming technology is required at all times.

Glare and Safety

11. Electronic billboards shall not produce glare, light spill, or brightness that impairs driver visibility or interferes with traffic control devices.

12. Sign orientation and illumination must be compatible with surrounding land uses.

13. The City retains authority to require modification or temporary shutdown if a sign is deemed unsafe by the Community Development Director or Caltrans.

Message Display and Operation

14. Only static images are permitted.

15. Each message must be displayed for a minimum of eight (8) seconds, with a transition time not exceeding one (1) second.

16. Flashing, scrolling, video, animation, or simulated motion effects are prohibited.

Measurement and Compliance

17. Brightness must be measurable using industry-standard testing methods.

18. Applicants must agree to post-installation testing upon request by the City or Caltrans.

19. Noncompliance may require immediate adjustment or temporary shut-off until corrective actions are implemented.

Regulatory Hierarchy

20. Where local, state, or federal regulations differ, the more restrictive standard shall apply. Compliance with City requirements does not guarantee issuance of a Caltrans Outdoor Advertising Permit. These standards are intended to provide clear expectations for applicants, streamline interagency coordination, and reduce the risk of post-approval conflicts with state and federal highway regulations.

Indemnity

21. The applicant shall agree to defend at his/her sole expense any action brought against the City, its present or former agents, officers, or employees because of the issuance of said approval, or in any way relating to the implementation thereof, or in the alternative, to relinquish such approval. The applicant shall reimburse the City, its agents, officers, or employees, for any court costs and attorney's fees which the City, its agents, officers or employees may be required by a court to pay as a result of such action. The City may, at its sole discretion, participate at its own expense in the defense of any such action but such participation shall not relieve applicant of his/her obligations under this condition.

Second: Commissioner Alexander
Motion passed: 5-0 Vote

ROLL CALL: Chairperson West, Vice Chairperson Bendix, Commissioner Apland, Commissioner Sidhu, Commissioner Alexander

Ayes: Chairperson West, Vice Chairperson Bendix, Commissioner Apland, Commissioner Sidhu, Commissioner Alexander
Noes: None
Excused: None

ITEMS FROM STAFF:

Community Development Director Stice stated that there are lots of different projects going on currently like the development agreements for Zacharias and Del Puerto Health Care District master plan we expect an application from them next month.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION:

Vice Chairperson Bendix asked if Rogers Road will ever get fixed and if we're still waiting for PG&E. Community Development Director Stice said eventually but that would be questions for the Public Works and Engineering departments. He also asked when Save Mart would get the letter regarding the handicapped parking spaces and Community Development Director Stice said that it was done.

ADJOURNMENT: The Planning Commission regular meeting of February 12, 2026, was adjourned by Chairperson West at 8:12 p.m.

_____
Prepared by Denise Melo, Secretary of City of Patterson Planning Commission