



M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: 06/04/2025

TO: Planning Department

FROM: Engineering

RE: S&A 2025-6, 89 Third Street, Ganado Feed & Pet Supplies

The City of Hollister Engineering Division has reviewed the plans received by Cesar Basanez (89 Third Street – Ganado Feed & Pet Supplies). Engineering staff have the following comments on the project.

RESPONSES IN BLUE BELOW

NO RESPONSES FROM SYMMENTRY DESIGN AND BUILD

General Comments

1. The provided City's stormwater management post-construction requirement form is incomplete; The project site details and square footages need to be inputted. Compacted class II AB is classified as an impervious surface, hence the site will need to comply with post-construction stormwater regulations based on the impervious classification.

SEE RESPONSE LETTER FROM MH ENGINEERING SECTION ii ENGINEERING REVIEW

Sheet 1 – Existing Site Plan

2. What items do 50, 51, 52, 54 represent? They are not classified by the legend. Items need to be identified.

MH Comment: Points numbered 50, 51, 52 & 54 are survey control points, and the survey control point table will be added to this sheet to identify these as requested.

3. The trash enclosure floor shall be designed to slope to an interior P-trapped area floor drain and connected to a grease, oil and sand interceptor before plumbing to the sanitary sewer system.

MH Comment: Yes the trash enclosure floor is graded to drain to the floor drain connected to the sewer lateral as called out on this sheet with the floor slopes shown on sheet C3. The P-trap and drain details will be provided with the construction plans yet a note to this effect will

be added to this entitlement plan set. Per HMC 13.04.120 “Grease, oil and sand interceptors shall be provided when, in the opinion of the director, they are necessary for the proper handling of liquid wastes containing grease, flammable waste, sand or other harmful ingredients...” It is our understanding that this site and proposed use shall not introduce any harmful ingredients to the trash enclosure location and as such we are not proposing the interceptor – yet we’d reconsider if city engineering can clarify why one is required in this circumstance.

4. Thermo striping on class II AB? How is this feasible?

MH Comment: We are not proposing any striping on the AB, we will clarify the plan to show that the pedestrian path leading to the trash enclosure location is not necessarily being striped – yet if it is necessary to define that path in some manner we would do it with bricks set flush in the AB.

5. Compacted Class II AB is classified as an impervious surface. The proposed impervious surface needs to be shown the storm water management calculations. Class II AB will track onto Third Street which was recently paved, Class II AB will not be allowed. Section 17.16.140 of the City’s Municipal Code requires businesses to comply with the City’s Storm Water Management program which does not allow for sediment tracking onto city streets.

MH Comment: Class II AB can be treated with a binder to ensure that the potential for tracking is eliminated. The proposed AB is only a resurfacing of the existing AB and other impervious areas such that we deem it to be not a regulated project according to CCRWQCB R3-2013-0032 (1) (b) (i) (2).

6. Please be aware the irrigation use for the site will be billed using the regular domestic water rate which is significantly higher than the irrigation rate. If a separate irrigation

Mailing Address: 375 Fifth Street, Hollister, CA 95023 ☎ *Physical Address:* 339 Fifth Street Hollister, CA 95023 *Telephone* (831) 636-4340 ☎ *Fax* (831) 636-4349

meter is placed, the landscaping will be charged using the irrigation rate. The irrigation system will also need to have a backflow to prevent any cross contamination with the domestic water line.

MH Comment: Yes – we do propose just using the existing domestic water service and are foregoing installation of a separate irrigation meter because the amount of landscaping is minimal and the amount of irrigation water to be used does not justify the expense of a separate landscape meter. The required backflow for the irrigation is provided and shown on the plans.

7. Parking Stall 11 presents unreasonable parking maneuverability. This item will need to be revised.

MH Comment: Parking stall 11 is of the size, shape and orientation consistent with the HMC 17.18 (G) (3). “Parallel Parking Spaces. Parallel parking spaces shall have a minimum width of nine feet and a minimum length of 24 feet; “ – Please clarify why the comment deems this “unreasonable parking maneuverability”.

8. There is an existing curb and light/pole onsite at the S/E corner of the property. The vertical obstructions will prevent ingress/egress through the secondary gate. This area needs to be identified as to be removed.

MH Comment: The existing light and raised island in the southern portion of the property is proposed to remain as is because it has no impact on the proposed project nor the circulation through the secondary access gate that is proposed.

9. Please provide a delivery and circulation plan for the site. Are deliveries instructed to enter from Third street and exit out of McCray, or vice versa? The circulation plan shall

indicate the design vehicle(s) and turning radii to ensure proper maneuverability through the site.

MH Comment: Small delivery vehicles like fed-ex and UPS and ambulances will use the Third Street driveway and have the capacity to enter the site and turn around on-site without the need for the secondary access gate. Large delivery vehicles and fire trucks that cannot turn around on-site are the reason we've provided the secondary access gate and labeled it as such on the plans – these large vehicles could enter or leave the site in either direction (from Mc Cray to Third or from Third to Mc Cray) when coordinated with the site manager and when necessary with a call prior to arrival at the site or by asking the manager to unlock and open the gate when leaving. This site has been historically served by vehicles much larger than will be necessary for this proposed use and we feel this explanation along with the notes included on the plan are sufficient to ensure that the project will not result in any large vehicle obstructing the public sidewalk or streets.

10. In accordance with the Federal ADA Regulations the commercial driveway approach and sidewalk are out of conformance as shown by sheet C3. The sidewalk and driveway at the S/E corner of the property exceeds a 2% cross cross-slope therefore shall be removed and replaced per City Standard Plan A-11, A-6. This requirement is set forth by Federal ADA Regulations.

MH Comment: We understand that by this comment the city is demanding that this user replace the existing driveway at the southern end of the property on Mc Cray Street. The applicant is not proposing any changes to the southern end of the property and as such considers the project extents to terminate where the southerly fence is – yet we understand where you are coming from with this comment and the situation where the existing driveway is not in conformance. We ask why if this was a known issue that the recently city constructed sidewalk immediately adjacent and on this same property and street frontage did not remedy this – and would like the planning commission to ultimately decide if this is a burden that should be placed on this small business in this circumstance.

11. A PCC Apron is not approved at this location. The area North of the existing 1,154 SF warehouse will need to be revised and designed so that no vehicles are deterred from parking north of the warehouse. The city recently installed new sidewalk along the frontage of this property and this proposal encourages parking in this area. The City wants to reduce the likelihood of vehicle traffic driving on the sidewalk. The area can be landscaped and/or can provide perhaps a pedestrian walkway to enter the warehouse.

MH Comment: The pcc apron provided is solely for access to those existing doors on that warehouse. In essence, I believe as proposed it is just a walkway to those doors. We don't understand why the city placed the new curb and sidewalk so remotely from the right of way line and are unclear on how to satisfy this comment, such that we expect further discussion to clarify what would be needed here.

Sheet C5 – Pre-liminary Landscape Plan


12. California Street's & Highway's Code Division 7 Part 3 Chapter 22 Section 5610 indicates the owners of lots or portions of lots fronting on any portion of a public street or place when that street or place is improved or if and when the area between the property line of the adjacent property and the street line is maintained as a park or parking strip, shall maintain any sidewalk in such condition that the sidewalk will not endanger persons or property and maintain it in a condition which will not interfere with the public convenience. As a result some landscaping on the parkway strip along Mc Cray Street needs to be provided. Unmaintained, overgrown weeds is not an option. The current small

landscaping area proposed along the edge of the property along McCray is likely not feasible. There is a likelihood the proposed plants will die off given the restricted landscape area.

MH Comment: The applicant has conceded to landscape the strip between the sidewalk and curb – and takes your point that the area between the back of walk and the buildings is problematic with regard to sustainable landscaping with shrubs such that we've called for cobbles to be placed in the area between the walk and buildings with the planter strip trees and shrubs added to provide the required aesthetic to screen the large existing walls along the frontage.

Sincerely,

Marco Martinez

 Digitally signed by Marco Martinez
DN: C=US, E=marco.martinez@hollister.ca.gov, O=City of Hollister, OU=PW - Engineering,
CN=Marco Martinez

Marco Martinez
Associate Engineer

Mailing Address: 375 Fifth Street, Hollister, CA 95023 ☎ *Physical Address:* 339 Fifth Street Hollister, CA 95023 *Telephone*
(831) 636-4340 ☎ *Fax* (831) 636-4349