



Board Agenda Item 11

DATE: June 24, 2025

TO: Board of Supervisors

SUBMITTED BY: Steven E. White, Director
Department of Public Works and Planning

SUBJECT: Amendment Application No. 3869 (Applicant: Kanwarjits Bath)

RECOMMENDED ACTION(S):

1. Find that the proposed rezone of the subject 54.02-acre site from the existing AL-20 (Limited Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District to the RR-5 (Rural Residential, 5-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District is consistent with the County's General Plan;
2. Adopt an ordinance pertaining to Amendment Application (AA) No. 3869 thereby rezoning the subject 54.02-acre site from the existing AL-20 (Limited Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District to the RR-5 (Rural Residential, 5-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District; and
3. Designate County Counsel to prepare a fair and adequate summary of the proposed Ordinance and direct the Clerk of the Board to post and publish the required summary in accordance with Government Code, Section 25124(b)(1).

The subject parcels are located on the south side of Reno Avenue, approximately one-half mile north of the nearest city limits of the City of Fresno (APNs: 580-010-53s & 580-010-54s) (12523 Auberry Rd. and 3007 Reno Rd.) (Sup. Dist. 5).

This item comes before your Board with a recommendation for approval from the Planning Commission at its October 24, 2024, meeting (8 to 1). As a legislative action, this application requires final action from your Board. A summary of the Planning Commission's action is included in Attachment A. The Planning Commission Staff Report is included as Attachment B. This item pertains to a location in District 5.

ALTERNATIVE ACTION(S):

If your Board determines that the proposed AA No. 3869 to rezone the subject 54.02-acre site from the AL-20 (Limited Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District to the RR-5 (Rural Residential, 5-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District is not consistent with the County's General Plan Vision Statement, Goals and Policies, a motion to deny the Application would be appropriate.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no Net County Cost associated with the recommended actions. Pursuant to the County's Master Schedule of Fees, the Applicant has paid land use processing fees in the amount of \$4,696.00.

DISCUSSION:

On October 24, 2024, the Planning Commission considered AA No. 3869. After receiving the Department of Public Works and Planning Staff's presentation and considering public testimony from the Applicant in support of the proposal, and with no one speaking in opposition to the rezoning, the Commission voted (8 to 1) in favor of forwarding to your Board a recommendation for approval of the proposed rezoning. Staff notes that 73 property owners within a quarter mile of the subject property were provided notice of both the Planning Commission hearing and the hearing before your Board. There were no written or verbal comments submitted from the public.

By way of background on February 20, 2024, the Board adopted an update to the Fresno County General Plan (GPA 526 and AA 3862) that included the addition of Policy LU-E.24 that changed the Land Use Designation of parcels identified in Figure LU-2 to Rural Residential (Five-acre minimum parcel size) and rezoned the parcels to AL-20 (Limited Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size).

This application AA No. 3869, utilized the Environmental Impact Report that was certified for the General Plan Update and was also utilized for the previous GPA 526 and AA 3862. In the case of this request, Staff determined per California Environmental Quality Act Section 15162 that no revised or additional environmental document is necessary.

If your Board determines that the proposed rezoning is consistent with the County's General Plan and desires to approve AA No. 3869, it would be appropriate to make a motion finding the Amendment consistent with the General Plan, adopt the attached proposed Ordinance, and direct County Staff to prepare and publish a summary of the proposed Ordinance.

If your Board determines that the proposed rezoning is not consistent with the County's General Plan, then denial of the rezoning would be appropriate, citing the reasons for denial and the proposal's inconsistency with the General Plan.

REFERENCE MATERIAL:

BAI # 6, February 20, 2024

ATTACHMENTS INCLUDED AND/OR ON FILE:

Attachments A - B
Ordinance
On file with Clerk - Ordinance Summary

CAO ANALYST:

Maria Valencia