CITY OF MERCED
Planning Commission

Resolution #4152

WHEREAS, the Merced City Planning Commission at its regular meeting of May 7, 2025, held a public hearing and considered **General Plan Amendment #24-02 and Site Utilization Plan Revision #3 to Planned Development #20,** initiated by Eric Gonsalves, on behalf of Yosemite 1380 LLC, property owner for the property located at 1380 E Yosemite Avenue and 3595 Parsons Avenue. The General Plan Amendment proposed changing the General Plan land use designation from Commercial Office (CO) to Business Park (BP) for 2.72 acres and from Commercial Office (CO) to High Medium Density (HMD) residential for the remaining 4.48 acres. The Site Utilization Plan Revision proposed changing the land use designation within P-D #20 from Commercial Office to Self-Storage for 2.72 acres and to Residential for the remaining 4.48 acres. The approximate 8.05-acre subject site is generally located on the southwest corner of E. Yosemite Ave and Parsons Ave. The property being more particularly described as Lots "A" and "B", as shown on that certain map entitled "Oakmount Village Unit No. 5," recorded in Volume 46, Page 38 of Merced County Records; also known as Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 006-050-068 and 006-050-072; and,

WHEREAS, the Merced City Planning Commission held a public hearing regarding this matter on March 19th 2025. At this meeting the commission voted to continue this matter to the Planning Commission meeting of April 9, 2025, to allow for additional time to review the project and documents. At their meeting on April 9, 2025, the Merced City Planning Commission adopted a motion of intent to recommend denial of General Plan Amendment #24-02 and Site Utilization Plan Revision #3 to Planned Development #20, and directed staff to prepare Findings for Denial; and,

WHEREAS, the Merced City Planning Commission based its decision to recommend denial of General Plan Amendment #24-02 and Site Utilization Plan Revision #3 to Planned Development #20 on the following Findings:

General Plan Amendment – Findings

Chapter 20.82 (General Plan Amendments) outlines procedures for considering General Plan Amendments but does not require any specific findings to be made for approval. However, Planning practice would be to provide objective reasons for approval or denial. These findings can take whatever form deemed appropriate by the Planning Commission and City Council.

1. *The proposed amendment is deemed to be in the public interest.*

   The Planning Commission finds that the proposed amendment is not in the public interest because public storage facilities provide limited employment and may attract

blight to the area. Additionally, the Planning Commission found that the proposed change in land use designation from Commercial Office (C-O) to High Medium Density Residential was not in the public interest due to the incompatibility of the project to the surrounding uses (namely the single-family residential to the south) and the access of the project from Parsons Avenue.

2. *The proposed amendment is consistent and compatible with the rest of the General Plan and any implementation programs that may be affected.*

   The Planning Commission finds the proposed amendment inconsistent and incompatible with the General Plan and any implementation programs. The Planning Commission found the proposed General Plan Amendment land use designation change from Commercial Office (CO) to Business Park (BP) and the proposed change from Commercial Office (CO) to High Medium Density (HMD) to be inconsistent with the General Plan for the area.

NOW THEREFORE, after reviewing the project and fully discussing all the issues, the Merced City Planning Commission does resolve to hereby recommend that City Council deny General Plan Amendment #24-02 and Site Utilization Plan Revision #3 to Planned Development #20.

Upon motion by Commissioner Ochoa, seconded by Commissioner Swiggart, and carried by the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Ochoa, Smith, Swiggart, Delgadillo, Thao, and Greggains
NOES: None
ABSENT: Chairperson Gonzalez
ABSTAIN: None

Adopted this 7th of May 2025

Chairperson, Planning Commission of
the City of Merced, California

ATTEST:

Secretary

CITY OF MERCED
Planning Commission

Resolution #4170

WHEREAS, On September 17, 2025, the Merced City Planning Commission at its regular meeting, held a public hearing to consider **General Plan Amendment #24-02 and Site Utilization Plan Revision #3 to Planned Development (P-D) #20,** initiated by Eric Gonsalves, on behalf of Yosemite 1380 LLC, property owner for the property located at 1380 E Yosemite Avenue and 3595 Parsons Avenue. The General Plan Amendment proposed changing the General Plan land use designation from Commercial Office (CO) to Business Park (BP) for 3.19 acres and from Commercial Office (CO) to Low-Medium Density Residential (LMD) for the remaining 4.86 acres. The Site Utilization Plan Revision proposed changing the land use designation within Planned Development (P-D) #20 from Commercial Office to Self-Storage for 3.19 acres and to Residential for the remaining 4.86 acres. The approximate 8.05-acre subject site is generally located on the southwest corner of E. Yosemite Ave and Parsons Ave. The property being more particularly described as Lots "A" and "B", as shown on that certain map entitled "Oakmount Village Unit No. 5," recorded in Volume 46, Page 38 of Merced County Records; also known as Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 006-050-068 and 006-050-072; and,

WHEREAS, at this meeting the Merced City Planning Commission voted 3-2 in favor of a motion to recommend denial of General Plan Amendment #24-02, Site Utilization Plan Revision #3 to Planned Development #20, and Environmental Review #24-25 (Negative Declaration) ; and,

WHEREAS, the motion failed to obtain the required four (4) affirmative votes and therefore was deemed denied pursuant to Municipal Code section 20.82.040(B).

WHEREAS, a resolution of denial was prepared for the Planning Commission and brought back to the Planning Commission for their meeting of November 5, 2025; and,

NOW THEREFORE, after reviewing the project and fully discussing all the issues, the Merced City Planning Commission does resolve to hereby recommend that City Council deny General Plan Amendment #24-02, Site Utilization Plan Revision #3 to Planned Development (P-D) #20.

Upon motion by Vice Chair Greggains, seconded by Chairperson Gonzalez, and carried by the following vote:

AYES:	Commissioners Ochoa, Greggains, Thao, Smith, Vue, and Chairperson Gonzalez
NOES:	None
ABSENT:	Commissioner Swiggart
ABSTAIN:	None

Adopted this 5th of November 2025

Chairperson, Planning Commission of
the City of Merced, California

ATTEST:

Secretary

CITY OF MERCED
Planning Commission

Resolution #4171

WHEREAS, on September 17, 2025, the Merced City Planning Commission at its regular meeting held a public hearing and considered **Site Plan Review Permit #551 and Minor Use Permit #24-13,** initiated by Eric Gonsalves, on behalf of Yosemite 1380 LLC, property owner for the property located at 1380 E Yosemite Avenue and 3595 Parsons Avenue. The Minor Use Permit would be for interface review to allow commercial development adjacent to or across from a Low Density Residential (R-1-6) Zone. The Site Plan Review Permit would allow the development a self-storage facility (approximately 500 storage units). The approximate 8.05-acre subject site is generally located on the southwest corner of E. Yosemite Ave and Parsons Ave. The property being more particularly described as Lots "A" and "B", as shown on that certain map entitled "Oakmount Village Unit No. 5," recorded in Volume 46, Page 38 of Merced County Records; also known as Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 006-050-068 and 006-050-072; and,

WHEREAS, at this meeting, the Merced City Planning Commission voted 3-2 in favor of a motion to approve the Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, Site Plan Review Permit, and Minor Use Permit; and,

WHEREAS, Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map #1332 and Environmental Review #24-25 (Negative Declaration) were deemed approved as these items required a simple majority vote by the Planning Commission and a separate resolution was prepared for this entitlement; and

WHEREAS, Site Plan Review Permit #558 and Minor Use Permit #24-13 failed to obtain the required four (4) affirmative votes and therefore was deemed denied pursuant to Municipal Code section 20.64.040(e); and

WHEREAS, this resolution of denial for Site Plan Review Permit #551 and Minor Use Permit #24-13 was brought to the Planning Commission for their consideration at their meeting of November 5, 2025; and,

NOW THEREFORE, after reviewing the project and fully discussing all the issues, the Merced City Planning Commission does resolve to hereby deny Site Plan Review Permit #551, Minor Use Permit #24-13.

Upon motion by Vice Chair Greggains, seconded by Chairperson Gonzalez, and carried by the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Ochoa, Greggains, Thao, Smith, Vue, and Chairperson Gonzalez
NOES: None
ABSENT: Commissioners Swiggart
ABSTAIN: None

Adopted this 5th of November 2025

Chairperson, Planning Commission of
the City of Merced, California

ATTEST:

Secretary