

## RESOLUTION NO. PC 2024-06

### A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CAMARILLO, RECOMMENDING DENIAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF A REQUEST FOR A ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT FROM IVY LAWN MEMORIAL PARK FOR THE AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 19.22 OF THE CAMARILLO MUNICIPAL CODE TO ALLOW FOR PET CEMETERY USE IN THE PROFESSIONAL OFFICE (P-O) ZONE.

The Planning Commission of the City of Camarillo resolves as follows:

#### **SECTION 1. General Findings.** The Planning Commission finds as follows:

- A. Jeanne Clark of Ivy Lawn Memorial Park has submitted an application requesting approval of a Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment (ZOA), to amend Chapter 19.22 of the Camarillo Municipal Code ("CMC") to allow for pet cemetery use in the Professional Office (P-O) Zone.
- B. The Planning Commission is authorized by Chapter 19.72 of the CMC to review and make recommendations on any proposed zoning-related ordinance that seeks to amend Title 19 of the CMC; and
- C. On August 26, 2023, the Community Development Director presented the findings of his investigation concerning the proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to the Economic Development and Land Use Committee ("EDLUC") which requested additional information to be presented at a future EDLUC meeting; and
- D. On October 24, 2023, the Community Development Director presented the findings of his investigation concerning the proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to the EDLUC which was split in its recommendation; and
- E. A Notice of Public Hearing before the Planning Commission was duly given and published in the time, form, and manner as required by law;
- F. The Planning Commission considered the information provided by City staff, public testimony, and the Applicants. This Resolution, and its findings, are made based upon the evidence presented to the Planning Commission at its April 30, 2024, hearing including, without limitation, the staff report submitted by the Director of the Community Development Department.

#### **SECTION 2. General Plan, Camarillo Municipal Code and Economic Development Strategic Plan Inconsistencies Findings.**

- A. That the proposed use resulting from the Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment will be incompatible with the underlying General Plan designation of public or office because the General Plan Land Use element defines public uses as intended to facilitate uses such as but not limited to parks, schools, libraries, police, and fire facilities and because the General Plan Land Use element defines office uses as intended to

facilitate uses such as but not limited to the grouping of the medical and dental professions, lawyers, engineers, architects and other similar services. Medical clinics, banks, savings and loans, real estate, insurance, utility offices and facilities for other administrative functions related to the operation of both private and public corporations are also included in this classification.

B. That the proposed use resulting from the Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment will be inconsistent with the intent of the P-O Zone because the Zone is intended to provide a method whereby land may be designed and developed as a unit for professional administrative offices, and to produce an environment of stable desirable character which will be in harmony with the existing or potential development of the surrounding neighborhoods and which may be located in or adjacent to residential areas, and in order to produce professional administrative office developments which meet modern standards of open space, concentration of buildings, common parking facilities, light, air, pedestrian and vehicular circulation, the P-O Zone is established to provide suitable locations for offices and services of a professional, clerical, or administrative nature.

C. That the proposed use resulting from the Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment will be inconsistent with the intent of the Economic Development Strategic Plan (EDSP) because the EDPS considers office and business parks as a Strategy Group Action Item and seeks to maximize options for future office/business park development including reuse/redevelopment of existing properties.

**SECTION 3. Environmental Review.** The Planning Commission finds and determines that the proposed Ordinance is not subject to further review under the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §§ 21000, et seq.; “CEQA”) for the following reasons: (1) it will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15060(c)(2); (2) the proposed action, by itself, does not constitute a “project” as defined in the CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15378); and (3) the project will be rejected or disapproved. Therefore, no further environmental review is necessary.

**SECTION 4. Recommendation.** Based on the above findings, and after receiving evidence and testimony at a public hearing, the Planning Commission recommends denial of the proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment, to the City Council.

**SECTION 5. Office of Record.** The record of proceedings upon which this decision is based is located in the Community Development Department, which is the office of record for the matter.

**SECTION 6. Construction.** This Resolution must be broadly construed in order to achieve the purposes stated in this Resolution. It is the Planning Commission’s intent that the provisions of this Resolution be interpreted or implemented by the City and others in a manner that facilitates the purposes set forth in this Resolution.

**SECTION 7. Reliance On Record.** Each and every one of the determinations in this Resolution are based on the competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire record relating to the matter. The determinations constitute the independent findings and determinations of the Planning Commission in all respects and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.

**SECTION 8. Limitations.** The Planning Commission's analysis and evaluation of this matter is based on the best information currently available. It is inevitable that, in evaluating the matter, absolute and perfect knowledge of all possible aspects of the matter will not exist. One of the major limitations on analysis of the matter is the Planning Commission's lack of knowledge of future events. In all instances, best efforts have been made to form accurate assumptions. Somewhat related to this are the limitations on the City's ability to solve what are in effect regional, state, and national problems and issues. The City must work within the political framework within which it exists and with the limitations inherent in that framework.

**SECTION 9. Preservation.** This Resolution does not affect any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred before, or preclude prosecution and imposition of penalties for any violation occurring before this Resolution's effective date. Any such amended part will remain in full force and effect for sustaining action or prosecuting violations occurring before the effective date of this Resolution.

**SECTION 10. Severability.** If any part of this Resolution or its application is deemed invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the Planning Commission intends that such invalidity will not affect the effectiveness of the remaining provisions or applications and, to this end, the provisions of this Resolution are severable.

**SECTION 11.** This Resolution is the Planning Commission's final decision and will become effective immediately upon adoption and will remain effective unless the action is appealed within ten days pursuant to CMC § 19.62.090 or CMC § 19.25.250.

**SECTION 12. Electronic Signatures.** This Resolution may be executed with electronic signatures in accordance with Government Code §16.5. Such electronic signatures will be treated in all respects as having the same effect as an original signature.

**SECTION 13.** The Planning Commission Chair, or presiding officer, is hereby authorized to affix their signature to this Resolution signifying its adoption by the Planning Commission of the City of Camarillo, and the Planning Commission Secretary is directed to attest thereto.

ADOPTED on April 30, 2024, by members of the Planning Commission of the City of Camarillo, voting as follows:

AYES: Vice-Chair Limon, Commissioner Davidson and Murphy

NOES:

ABSENT: Chair Edsall, Commissioner Vandermeulen

ABSTAIN:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Vice-Chair

ATTEST:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

cc: Community Development Department  
General Services (Information Systems Division)  
Jeanne Clark

Title	Resolution 2024-06 ZOA for Pet Cemetery Use in the P-O Zone
File name	Attachment_1_-_Resolution.pdf
Document ID	096d409dc43e9ed8bacb027bf0e05dcb64457017
Audit trail date format	MM / DD / YYYY
Status	● Signed

## Document History



**05 / 02 / 2024**  
17:21:01 UTC

Sent for signature to David Moe (dmoe@cityofcamarillo.org) and Gladys Limon (glimon@gmail.com) from mloera@cityofcamarillo.org  
IP: 47.176.217.204



**05 / 02 / 2024**  
18:45:41 UTC

Viewed by David Moe (dmoe@cityofcamarillo.org)  
IP: 47.176.217.204



**05 / 02 / 2024**  
18:46:23 UTC

Signed by David Moe (dmoe@cityofcamarillo.org)  
IP: 47.176.217.204



**05 / 02 / 2024**  
19:27:08 UTC

Viewed by Gladys Limon (glimon@gmail.com)  
IP: 172.56.121.64



**05 / 02 / 2024**  
19:31:35 UTC

Signed by Gladys Limon (glimon@gmail.com)  
IP: 172.56.121.64



**05 / 02 / 2024**  
19:31:35 UTC

The document has been completed.