

## **FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF APRIL 24, 2014**

**6. (14-0470)** Hearing to consider request for a design review revision to the existing Valero fuel station to allow placement of an 8 foot x 10.5 foot metal storage container for the collection of aluminum cans and plastic/glass bottles, an attendant on site during the hours of operation, and one unlit wall sign [Design Review Revision DR90-0034-R/Recycling Center]\*\* on property identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 083-340-07, consisting of 0.492 acre, in the Cameron Park area, submitted by Joshua Alexander; and staff recommending the Planning Commission take the following actions:

- 1) Determine the project is Categorically Exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15303 of the CEQA Guidelines; and
- 2) Approve Design Review Revision DR90-0034-R based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval. (Supervisory District 4) (Cont. 04-10-14, Item 4)

Lillian MacLeod presented the item to the Commission with a recommendation for approval.

David Anderson, applicant's agent, made the following comments:

- Appreciates the larger recycling center that is located on the adjacent property;
- Recycling is the core issue as 50% of public doesn't reuse;
- Facility would make recycling convenient to the public;
- Anticipating using El Dorado Waste Management; and
- Applicant is committed to business.

Dyana Anderly made the following comments:

- Very familiar with recycling facilities;
- Significant space around the shed would be used when it was open for business;
- Cameron Park Design Review Committee recommended against approving project;
- Location is within 50 feet of Highway 50 and is visible from Cameron Park Drive which is the entry point into Cameron Park, across from the Cameron Park welcome sign, and is at the main entry point to a shopping center;
- Disagreed with staff's conclusion that project was consistent with the General Plan;
- There are alternate locations;
- Disagreed with staff's conclusion that the project was in compliance with the Design Review Guidelines;
- If project is approved, it should be reviewed within 6 months; and
- Site currently has too many signs.

Terry Rogers, President of the Shingle Springs-Cameron Park Chamber of Commerce, made the following comments:

- Opposed to project;
- Already a recycling center in shopping center which would be within 150 feet of the proposed project site; and
- Unightly mess for main entrance into shopping center.

Albert Jimenez, El Dorado Disposal, made the following comments:

- Existing recycling center has been in the location behind CVS for 10 years, averages 70-90 customers a day and parking is an issue;
- If project is approved, existing facility may need to be closed;
- Explained that the existing facility recycles much more than just bottles and cans, but still has the public dropping unacceptable items (i.e., mattresses, large appliances, etc.) after hours; and
- Has an employee that specifically cleans up the recycling center's outside area each day in order to remove items dropped off after hours.

Kris Payne made the following comments:

- Does his shopping at that shopping center;
- Staff is following County rules but this project may still not be community acceptable;
- A new use is being added to an existing project;
- Ingress/egress is very important and how is this going to work while still being consistent with location;
- Community viewshed is important; and
- A lot is at stake besides just another business coming into the area.

Paul Ryan, Cameron Park CSD, made the following comments:

- Opposed to project;
- Supports the Chamber of Commerce's stance on this;
- Existing recycling center has a contract with Waste Connections; and
- Recycling centers are the greatest thing as long as they are hidden.

Linda Hopkins, Cameron Park resident and Chamber of Commerce employee, made the following comments:

- Has used the existing recycling center and there are usually several customers there at one time;
- Public leaves unsightly items after hours;
- Animals will be attracted to the bags that are left unattended;
- Existing business is adequately handling the community's recycling needs; and
- As a resident, opposed to the project.

Mr. Anderson made the following rebuttal comments:

- Staff would be on site 7 days a week;
- Only recycling bottles and cans;
- Would be monitored daily;
- Public testimony heard today are common complaints regarding recycling centers;
- Intent is to encourage recycling;
- Area would be kept clean and orderly by the leasing agent and property owner;
- Business would be in a box with a sign outside listing times, contacts, and acceptable items;

- The proposed location is an unused corner of the lot and 3 existing parking spaces would be utilized;
- Applicant is complying with County's rules;
- No screening is being provided as the business would be conducted within the box;
- Open to adding planters for aesthetics;
- Does not want to see the existing recycling center close; and
- Welcomes visibility to encourage recycling and would use signage.

Chair Mathews closed public comment.

Mrs. MacLeod stated that the gas station is required to have 5 parking spaces and they currently have 9 spaces. In addition, the Fire Department and Transportation had no issues with the project.

Commissioner Stewart made the following comments:

- Preference is to move it behind the gas station;
- 24/7 on-site operation (gas station) alleviates some concerns; and
- Allow temporary 90 day signage.

Commissioner Shinault made the following comments:

- Will start seeing more of these due to new codes;
- Should require fully enclosed shed with fence and that all activity occurs inside enclosure;
- Have gates positioned so public can't see inside and box should be screened by a fence that can cover it; and
- Opposed to project as it is currently presented; needs to be redesigned.

Chair Mathews made the following comments:

- Fan of recycling;
- Agreed with Cameron Park Design Review Committee's comments;
- Not opposed to competition;
- Agreed with Commissioner Stewart's comment to hide the facility behind the gas station; and
- If not moved behind the gas station, building needs to be aesthetically pleasing and not a metal box.

Commissioner Pratt made the following comments:

- Visibility neutral;
- Have to consider the activity area;
- Good idea to move behind the gas station;
- Accountability to traffic;
- Suburban area and needs to have suburban niceties; and
- Not a fan of storage containers.

Mr. Anderson welcomed the opportunity to go back to the applicant to relay the Commission's comments. As a designer, he supported everything the Commission had said.

There was no further discussion.

**Motion: Commissioner Stewart moved, seconded by Commissioner Shinault, and carried (4-0), to continue the item off-calendar.**

**AYES: Pratt, Shinault, Stewart, Mathews**

**NOES: None**

**ABSENT: Heflin**