

**PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 2025-**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HOLLISTER DENYING SITE AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW 2025-6 TO DEVELOP AN AGRICULTURAL FEED AND SUPPLY RETAILER TO INCLUDE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE EXISTING THREE BUILDINGS, CONSTRUCTION OF A CANOPY STRUCTURE, THE INSTALLATION OF LIGHTING, FENCE SURROUND, LANDSCAPING, DEVELOPMENT OF A PEDESTRIAN PATHWAY, PARKING LOT SURFACE REGRADING, STRIPING AND THE INSTALLATION OF ACCESSIBLE PARKING, EV PARKING AND THE AVAILABILITY OF CHARGING STATIONS. THE PARCEL IS LOCATED AT 89 THIRD STREET WITHIN THE NEIGHBORHOOD MIXED-USE (NMU) ZONING DISTRICT (APN 054-162-001)**

**WHEREAS**, the Applicants, Zaira & Cesar Basanez, have submitted an application for Site and Architectural Review (S&A 2025-6) to develop an agricultural feed and supply retailer which will improve the existing buildings through the refinishing of paint and the installation of lighting while developing a new construction canopy to function as feed supply storage. Additional improvements include a fence surround, landscaping, the development of an internal pedestrian pathway, parking lot surface regrading and striping. The parking lot will include accessible and EV parking with the availability of EV charging stations. The parcel is located at 89 Third Street further identified as San Benito County Assessor Parcel Number 054-162-001; and

**WHEREAS**, the Applicant has submitted an incomplete application for the requested entitlements prepared by MH Engineering Co. and Symmetry Design+Build, received by the Planning Division on August 8, 2025; and

**WHEREAS**, under the provisions of Section 17.24.060 of the City of Hollister, the City Planning Division received the Applicant's plans and forwarded the request to the Development Review Committee (DRC) to assess the proposal for compliance with all relevant regulations; and

**WHEREAS**, in response to comments provided by the DRC, particularly related to stormwater post-construction requirements for surfacing of the lot, the applicant has failed to adequately respond and address the City's comments and requested that the item be brought forward for consideration of denial by the Planning Commission; and

**WHEREAS**, under the provisions of Section 17.24.190 of the Hollister Municipal Code, the Planning Commission is charged with receiving, investigating and taking action on Site and Architectural Review applications; and

**WHEREAS**, the Development Review Committee considerations were presented to the Planning Commission as part of the staff report and the findings for denial of the project; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on September 25, 2025 to consider Site and Architectural Review 2025-6, review the City staff report, and receive written and oral testimony for and against the proposal; and

**WHEREAS**, after closing the Public Hearing, the Planning Commission determined that the proposed project qualifies for a Notice of Exemption (NOE) pursuant to Section 15301, Existing Facilities. The proposed project has been evaluated and has been determined to be consistent with projects characterized under Class 1 as the project consists of the operation, repair, maintenance, permitting of existing private structures, facilities, mechanical equipment and topographical features involving negligible expansion of the existing use. The proposed project is consistent with a Class 1 project as it will involve the restoration of deteriorated structures and facilities to meet current standards of public health and safety. Further, the project is statutorily exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15270, Projects which are Disapproved, of the CEQA Guidelines.

**NOW THEREFORE IT IS RESOLVED** that the Planning Commission of the City of Hollister does hereby make the following findings and determinations regarding the proposed Site and Architectural Review:

- A. The proposed Project, as conditioned, is not consistent with the provisions of Title 17, Neighborhood Mixed-Use Zoning District, of Hollister Municipal Code including the requirements of the Zoning District in which the property is located because:
1. The project proposes to surface the project site with an unspecified thickness of Class II AB material which does not comply with the requirements stipulated under Hollister Municipal Code (HMC) Section 17.18.110 mandating all off-street parking lots be surfaced with four inches of Portland Cement Concrete or two inches of asphaltic concrete, or oil surfacing, placed on four inches of suitable base and built to a thickness which meets city street standards, subject to the approval of the Director/City Engineer. Additionally, the proposed project does not comply with the requirements under HMC 17.16.140 mandating that all new development and redevelopment post-construction drainage improvements be designed in accordance with the requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast Region, Resolution R3-2013-0032(B)(c).
  2. Section 17.16.140(A)(1) of the Municipal Code requires that "All new development and redevelopment post-construction drainage improvements shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast Region, Resolution R3-2013-0032 or subsequent amendments thereto, as applicable." The applicant was provided the comments and necessary plan amendments required in order to meet this requirement of the Zoning Ordinance. However, they did not amend their plans in response to the

comments provided, and instead requested the Planning Commission to hear the project as proposed, understanding staff would recommend denial.

- B. The proposed project is inconsistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan, any applicable Specific Plans and any applicable design guidelines because:
1. The project does not meet the City of Hollister's zoning ordinance and standards regarding the surfacing of the parking lots and drive aisles and is inconsistent with the post-construction stormwater requirements as described above, meaning that the project is inconsistent with the General Plan. The Zoning Ordinance and adopted regulations implement the City's General Plan policies. Goal CSF2 of the General Plan indicates that the City should "provide adequate drainage facilities, limit erosion and maintain clean water". The plans as demonstrated do not comply with stormwater requirements and therefore cannot be determined to be consistent with the General Plan.
  2. The project is not consistent with the performance standards (CSF1.3) as implemented by Section 17.16.140(A)(1) of the Municipal Code, which indicates that the project must be consistent with the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast Region requirements.
- C. The proposed development will be detrimental to public health, safety or welfare of persons residing in or working in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City because:
1. The project as proposed does not meet post-construction stormwater requirements as regulated by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board. Unless amended in accordance with the comments as provided to the Applicant during the project review, the project will have negative impacts to the City's stormwater system. Additionally, were the property to be developed as proposed, any findings of improper stormwater management on the site by the Regional Water Board would result in fines against the City of Hollister as the holder of the permit, they would not be passed to the property owner, and would be at the expense of the taxpayers.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED**, at a regular meeting of the City of Hollister Planning Commission held on this 25<sup>th</sup> day of September 2025, by the following vote:

**AYES:**  
**NOES:**  
**ABSTAIN:**  
**ABSENT:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson of the Planning Commission  
of the City of Hollister

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Eva Kelly, Secretary

***Please Note***

*It is the sole responsibility of the project applicant to comply with the conditions as approved, modified, or added by the Planning Commission. It is recommended that the applicant review these conditions carefully and if any questions arise as to compliance with the conditions, please do not hesitate to contact the staff planner. Also, if you do not agree with the proposed conditions, you have an opportunity to present your case to the Planning Commission at their meeting. In addition, the City provides for a 15-day appeal period.*