



# County of Yolo

## PLANNING AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

John Bencomo  
DIRECTOR

292 West Beamer Street  
Woodland, CA 95695-2598  
(530) 666-8775 FAX (530) 666-8728  
www.yolocounty.org

---

---

## YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

CHAIR: Mary Kimball  
VICE-CHAIR: Jeb Burton  
MEMBERS: Leroy Bertolero; Jeff Merwin; Richard Reed; Keith Williams; Don Winters

---

---

### MINUTES

July 9, 2009

#### ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

1. Chair Kimball called the meeting to order at 8:31 a.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Bertolero.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bertolero, Burton, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, Williams, and Winters  
MEMBERS ABSENT: None  
STAFF PRESENT: David Morrison, Assistant Director of Planning  
Eric Parfrey, Principal Planner  
Stephanie Berg, Associate Planner  
Craig Baracco, Associate Planner  
Philip Pogledich, Senior Deputy County Counsel  
Aurea Hardy, Office Support Specialist

\*\*\*

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE **May 14, 2009** MEETING.

#### Commission Action

The Minutes of the **May 14, 2009** meeting were approved with no corrections.

MOTION: Burton SECOND: Merwin  
AYES: Burton, Kimball, Merwin, Reed and Winters  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: Bertolero and Williams  
ABSENT: None

ADOPTION OF THE REVISED SUMMARY NOTES OF THE **June 10, 2009** MEETING

**Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department**

July 9, 2009

Page 2 of 23

The Revised Summary Notes of the **June 10, 2009** meeting were approved with the following corrections.

Page 9, Mr. Morrison's comment to include the word industrial prior to the acronym IN.

Mr. Morrison explained his understanding that Clark Pacific is asking to move 20 acres of *industrial* (IN) from the southeast area of the property to the northwest – basically an equal exchange.

MOTION: Bertolero      SECOND: Reed  
AYES: Bertolero, Kimball, Merwin, and Reed  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: Burton, Williams, and Winters  
ABSENT: None

\*\*\*

4. PUBLIC REQUESTS

The opportunity for members of the public to address the Planning Commission on any subjects relating to the Planning Commission, but not relative to items on the present agenda, was opened by the Chair. The Planning Commission reserves the right to impose a reasonable limit on time afforded to any individual speaker.

No one from the public came forward.

\*\*\*

5. CORRESPONDENCE

5.1 Letter regarding the Yolo County Draft General Plan EIR from Erich Linse

5.2 California Country Magazine.

5.3 Yolo County Landowners Association Press Release

Chair Kimball acknowledged receipt of all correspondence sent with the packet and distributed at the beginning of the meeting.

\*\*\*

Agenda Item 7.2, Presentation from Len Monaco from Farm Credit bureau regarding agricultural financing was heard by the commission prior to other agenda items.

Mr. Monaco offered information on various financing requirements, and answered clarifying questions from the commission.

TIME SET AGENDA

6.1 **2009-012:** Lot Line Adjustment, Zone Boundary Change, and Williamson Act Successor Agreements for agriculturally zoned property located in the upper Yolo Bypass. The project would adjust boundary lines along the centerlines of the bypass levee and conform to existing field boundaries (APNs: 057-090-06 (portion of), 057-090-10, 057-100-12, 057-130-09, 057-150-01, 057-150-02, 057-160-01, and

**Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department**

July 9, 2009

Page 3 of 23

057-160-02). A Categorical Exemption will be prepared for this project. Owners/Applicants: Knaggs Farming Company, Neal Dow, Sacramento Valley Conservancy/Scott Daly

Chair Kimball recused herself for this item due to an association with a neighboring property.

Stephanie Berg, Associate Planner, presented the project and answered questions from the commission.

Vice-Chair Burton opened and closed the public hearing.

No one from the public came forward.

Commissioner Bertolero said that he does not have a problem with the applicant's request.

Commissioner Reed stated that he was comfortable moving forward on this request.

Commissioner Winters concurred with his fellow commissioners.

Commission Merwin said that he is all for cleaning up lines and have it correspond with what is actually there.

Commissioner Williams said that he is in agreement, and would clean up the lines as well if he were the property owner.

Vice-Chair Burton stated that he does not personally have an issue with it, and that it makes sense.

**Commission Action**

1. **HELD** a public hearing and received comments;
2. **DETERMINED** that a Categorical Exemption is the appropriate level of environmental documentation in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines (**Attachment C**);
3. **ADOPTED** the Findings (**Attachment D**) for approval of the Lot Line Adjustment and Zone Boundary Change;
4. **APPROVED** the Conditions of Approval (**Attachment E**) for the Lot Line Adjustment and Williamson Act Successor Agreements;
5. **APPROVED** the Resolution for the Lot Line Adjustment and Williamson Act Successor Agreements (**Attachment F**);
6. **ADOPTED** an Ordinance approving the Zone Boundary Change (**Attachment G**); and
7. **APPROVED** the Williamson Act Successor Agreements to divide the existing contract into two contracts (**Attachment H**).

MOTION: Merwin                      SECOND: Bertolero  
AYES: Bertolero, Burton, Merwin, Reed, Williams and Winters  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: Kimball  
ABSENT: None

\*\*\*

6.2 **2009-013:** Use Permit to develop a temporary parking lot and construction staging area in the A-1 zone during the expansion of the University Retirement Community in Davis. The project proposes a 97 space parking lot, a soil stock pile area of 55,000 square feet, and a construction area containing 2-3 office trailers and storage of construction equipment at 39660 W. Covell Blvd. A Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project. (APN: 036-060-05). Owner/Applicant: Binning Ranch Holding Co/University Retirement Communities

Commissioner Kimball resumed the Chair.

Craig Baracco presented the project, and answered questions from the commission.

Chair Kimball opened the public hearing.

Amy Stevenson, Development Manager for Pacific Retirement Services, representative for the applicant, explained that they had reviewed the staff report and were in agreement with the recommendation and all of the conditions of approval. In addition, she said that they were open to coming up with some language to address the final clean up issue, and recommended that they tie it to the final Certificate of Occupancy with six months subsequent to completion for clean up. She further explained that they wanted to get started on the project, as they estimate that two years will be needed to complete the project.

Chair Kimball closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Winters said that the project is near and dear to his heart due to the fact that he lives in close proximity to it. He said that the University of Retirement Center is an excellent housing and social development in Davis, and the expansion seems worthwhile and necessary. He expresses his support of it.

Commissioner Merwin said that he is comfortable with it, especially if they tighten up the language a bit in regards to the final clean up.

Commissioner Williams concurred, particularly if the language is added.

Commissioner Bertolero acknowledged that there is only a temporary loss of ag land, and all of the environmental analysis shows that there is no, or less than, significant impact. He does not have any mitigation concerns, and overall it will be a great asset to the community.

Commissioner Reed expressed his support if the modification discussed regarding final clean up is added.

Vice-Chair Burton was in agreement, and expressed his support of the project. He encouraged staff to think about an expedited process for this type of project in the future. He also supported using building permits as a means to enforce conditions of approval. He explained that in his experience, the loose wording of conditions can turn into a pretty big loophole.

Chair Kimball concurred with all of her fellow commissioners, and said that it seems like a great project that will be an asset to the City of Davis. She added that the location makes sense, but her concerns are with this particular site being utilized longer than the building process requires, so she would like to see the discussed condition that would require clean up of the site tied to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy.

### **Commission Action**

**Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department**

July 9, 2009

Page 5 of 23

Vice-Chair Burton made a motion to accept the proposal, with the caveat that staff and the applicant work out some language that ties both Certificate of Occupancy, and the Zoning Permits to a six month clean up schedule after issuance.

1. **HELD** a public hearing and received comments;
2. **ADOPTED** the Negative Declaration as the appropriate level of environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Guidelines (**Attachment C**);
3. **ADOPTED** the Findings (**Attachment D**); and
4. **APPROVED** a Use Permit subject to the Conditions of Approval (**Attachment E**).

MOTION: Burton                      SECOND: Winters  
AYES: Bertolero, Burton, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, Williams, and Winters  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: None

**FINDINGS**

Upon due consideration of the facts presented in this staff report and at the public hearing for Zone File #2009-013, the Yolo County Planning Commission finds the following:

*(A summary of evidence to support each FINDING is shown in Italics.)*

**California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Guidelines**

1. That the recommended Initial Study/Negative Declaration was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and is the appropriate environmental document and level of review for this project.

*The environmental document for the project, prepared pursuant to Section 15000 et. seq. of the CEQA Guidelines, provides the necessary proportionate level of analysis for the proposed project, and sufficient information to reasonably ascertain the project's potential environmental effects. The environmental review process has concluded that there will not be a significant effect on the environment as a result of the proposed project.*

**General Plan**

2. That the proposal and requested land use is in conformity with the General Plan.

*The General Plan Land Use designation for the property is Agricultural. The project is consistent with the following General Plan Land Use policy:*

*LU-18 Agricultural Area Uses: Yolo County shall consider the placement of certain agricultural related land uses in agricultural areas, by means of Conditional Use Permits, which uses may be incompatible with urban sites by reason of hazard or nuisance to concentrations of people. Findings for approval shall include, but are not limited to:*

- The use is directly related to agricultural land use (cultivation of agricultural plants or the raising of animals); and

*This project will facilitate the construction of a Quasi-public facility, and a senior citizen recreational facility. This facility serves a vital community need and is a use that is conditionally allowed in the Agriculture Zone.*

- Will not diminish nor prevent agricultural use on site or on adjoining agricultural lands; and

*The processing facility will not diminish, nor prevent agricultural use on this site, or on adjoining agricultural lands. The subject site is currently fallow. This project is temporary and will not result in the loss of productive agriculture land.*

- The use has some hazard or nuisance aspect which precludes it from being placed in an urban area; and

*The surrounding urban area is build-up and developed, and lacks the available land to permit the temporary parking and staging of construction operations that this project entail. This project will reduce the nuisance and hazard of reduced parking capacity while the construction project is ongoing.*

- The use can be developed in the area without significant reduction of cultivation, growth, and harvesting of the indigenous agricultural products.

*The project will not reduce the cultivation of surrounding products, in this case alfalfa production. A condition of approval will ensure that the project will not affect aerial spraying operations.*

### **Zoning Code**

In accordance with Section 8-2.404.5 of the Yolo County Code, the Planning Commission finds the following:

3. The requested land use is listed as a conditional use in the zoning regulations and is allowed under the following authorization:

*In the A-1 zone, "Building and structures, public and quasi-public" are allowed with a major conditional use permit. "Quasi-public" uses are defined in the County Code as "such use having the purpose primarily of serving the general public including such uses as...senior citizen recreational facilities" The expansion of the University Retirement Community that this application serves is primarily the construction of a senior "wellness center" which offers increased recreational facilities for senior citizens such a bocce courts and swimming and therapeutic pools. This application is considered a part of that quasi-public use and is allowed with the approval of a Use Permit.*

### **Use Permit**

In accordance with Section 8-2.2804 of the Yolo County Code, the Planning Commission finds the following:

4. The requested use is essential or desirable to the public comfort and convenience.

*The proposed project will enable the construction of recreational facility for senior citizens, and thus provide a valuable public convenience.*

5. The requested land uses will not impair the integrity or character of a neighborhood or be detrimental to public health, safety, or general welfare.

*The requested use is a temporary construction staging area and parking lot. Any change to the existing neighborhood will be temporary in nature and consistent with construction activity found throughout the region. The proposed use will slightly increase traffic on existing City streets. Proposed buildings are consistent with structures found in the construction zones.*

*Based upon conditions set forth by Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department, and the City of Davis, the proposed uses will not be detrimental to public health, safety, or general welfare. Continued compliance will be required with all agencies.*

6. The requested use will be in conformity with the General Plan.

*See above under (2).*

7. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, sanitation, and/or other necessary facilities will be provided.

*The existing facility will be served by portable toilets and an existing on-site well. Stormwater runoff will be addressed though on-site drainage improvements and an existing stormwater drainage system within*

*the City of Davis. The project will connect to existing city streets through an encroachment permit. All necessary facilities will be provided.*

**Quasi-public Use**

In accordance with Section 8-2.604.5 of the Yolo County Code, the Planning Commission finds the following:

8. That the site shall have been previously utilized by non-farm production uses;  
*The proposed site was previously the location of a residence and outbuildings, and is currently fallow.*
9. That the proposed use requires or will benefit from an agricultural setting;  
*The site consists of a portion of a property that is currently fallow and immediately adjacent to an urbanized area and a previously approved quasi-public use. The availability of the site for a temporary staging area and parking lot will allow the quasi-public use to proceed.*
10. That a condition of use permit shall be the recordation of a “right to farm easement” with regard to the site, approved by the county as to form and content.

*A Condition of Approval is included, requiring the recordation of a “right to farm easement.”*

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

**Planning**

1. The applicant shall be responsible for all costs associated with implementing the Conditions of Approval contained herein. The applicant shall comply with both the spirit and the intent of all applicable requirements of the Yolo County General Plan, the County Code, and these Conditions of Approval.
2. This Use Permit shall commence within one year from the date of the Planning Commission’s approval or said permit shall be null and void. The Director of Planning and Public Works may grant an extension of time; however, such an extension shall not exceed a maximum of one year.
3. The applicant shall keep the site area free from flammable brush, grass, and weeds. All structures on the site shall be adequately maintained and free from graffiti.
4. The applicant shall pay fees in the amount of \$2,043 (\$1,993 for state filing fee, plus \$50 county processing fee), under Public Resources Code Section 21089, and as defined by Fish and Game Code Section 711.4, at the time of the filing of the Notice of Determination, to cover the cost of review of the environmental document by the California Department of Fish and Game.
5. Any lighting used to illuminate the site shall be so arranged as to minimize glare and direct light away from adjoining lots, passing traffic, and the night sky. Prior to issuance of any building permits, a lighting plan shall be approved by the Director of Planning and Public Works.
6. The applicant shall record a “right-to farm” easement on the site, approved by the county as to form and content.
7. The following action shall be taken during construction to minimize temporary air quality impacts (dust) and shall be included as notes on all construction documents:

- a. An effective dust control program should be implemented whenever earth-moving activities occur on the project site. In addition, all dirt loads exiting a construction site within the project area should be well watered and/or covered after loading.
  - b. Apply water or dust palliatives on exposed earth surfaces as necessary to control dust emissions. Construction contracts shall include dust control treatment in late morning and at the end of the day, of all earth surfaces during clearing, grading, earth moving, and other site preparation activities. Non-potable water shall be used, where feasible. Existing wells shall be used for all construction purposes where feasible. Excessive watering will be avoided to minimize track of mud from the project onto street.
  - c. Grading operations on the site shall be suspended during periods of high winds (wind higher than 15 miles per hour).
  - d. Outdoor storage of fine particulate matter on construction sites shall be prohibited. Contractors shall cover any stockpiles of soil, sand and similar materials. No storage of uncovered construction debris will occur for more than one week.
  - e. Construction-related trucks shall be covered and installed with liners, and on the project site shall be swept at the end of the day.
  - f. Revegetation or stabilization of exposed earth surfaces shall be required in all inactive areas of the project.
  - g. Vehicle speeds shall not exceed 15 miles per hour on unpaved surfaces.
8. Within six months of the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the University Retirement Community project, the site shall be restored to its previous natural state. All buildings and vehicles will be removed and the site shall be kept free of trash and debris. The compacted gravel used in the parking area shall be removed. The site will either be seeded with native plants and grasses or placed in active agricultural production.

### **Resources**

9. Prior to any grading or construction on site, a preconstruction survey for burrowing owls shall be conducted in areas of suitable habitat on and within 250 feet of the project site. A minimum of one survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and shall be completed no less than 14 days, and no more than 30 days before grading or construction begins. Surveys shall be conducted by walking transects no more than 100 feet apart to achieve 100% visual coverage.
- a. If no occupied burrows are found during preconstruction surveys, a letter report documenting survey methods and findings should be submitted to Yolo County Planning and Public Works and the City of Davis for review and approval, and no further mitigation is required for potential impacts to burrowing owls.
  - b. If an occupied burrow is found on or within 250 feet of the project site, potential disturbance shall be minimized by establishing a 160 foot radius buffer during non-breeding season (September 1 through January 31) or a 250 foot radius buffer around the burrow during breeding season (February 1 through August 31), until the breeding season ends, if it is confirmed by a qualified biologist that the burrow is no longer occupied.



- c. If destruction of an occupied burrow in the project area is unavoidable, passive relocation techniques shall be used during the non-breeding season (September 1 through January 31) to exclude the owls from the burrow in accordance with Department of Fish and Game (DFG) guidelines (DFG 1995). Following relocation, the project site shall be monitored for five consecutive days to ensure that owls are no longer present. If site grading does not occur within three days after the five consecutive days of monitoring is completed, a biologist shall resurvey the site to determine if owls have reoccupied the site. If owls have reoccupied the site, passive relocation and monitoring procedures must be repeated. Following completion of the passive relocation, a letter shall be submitted to DFG, Yolo County, and the City of Davis, documenting the methods and results of passive relocation on the project site. If there are no occupied nests or if nesting owls have been relocated as described above, the site may be maintained per city requirements to prevent occupation by any burrowing owls.
  - d. In addition to passive relocation, DFG guidelines suggest mitigating for the loss of burrowing owl nesting habitat on protected lands at a ratio of 6.5 acres per pair or individual displaced by development. If occupied nests are detected on-site during breeding season, the applicant shall mitigate for the loss of nesting habitat consistent with DFG guidelines. The acquisition of Swainson's hawk mitigation lands may be used as credit for burrowing owl habitat.
10. Prior to any grading or construction activities on-site, a qualified biologist shall conduct preconstruction surveys for Swainson's Hawk, according to the CDFG and Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory committee guidelines (200) immediately prior to the projects initiation and shall encompass the area within one half mile of the project site. If Swainson's Hawk nests are identified in the vicinity of the project site, potential adverse affects to this species shall be avoided by establishment of CDFG approved buffers around any active nests. No construction activities shall take place within 0.25 miles of the nest until the young have fledged, or summarizing nest activities shall be submitted to Yolo County, the City of Davis and CDFG until the young have fledged and the nest is determined to be inactive.

### **Public Works**

11. The applicant shall submit a grading and drainage plan for the site, for review and approval of County Public Works, and submit and meet all the requirements of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan including stormwater BMP's.

### **Building**

12. All building permit plans shall be submitted to the Planning and Public Works Department for review and approval in accordance with County Building Standards prior to the commencement of any construction.
13. Prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits, the applicant shall obtain final approval on the demolition permits currently active on the property.
14. The applicant shall pay the appropriate fees prior to the issuance of Building Permits, including, but not limited to, School and Fire District fees, County Facilities Fees and Environmental Health Fees.
15. All buildings shall have their ground flood elevated one foot above base flood elevation and a certification of elevation shall be submitted for each building.

**City of Davis**

16. The applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit from the City of Davis Public Works Department for the two interim driveways. Prior to applying for the Encroachment Permit, the applicant shall provide detailed plans, showing existing right-of-way, and street improvements, including, but not necessarily limited to: existing edge of pavement; roadside drainage swales; roadside signage, if any; and existing driveway approach.
17. Interim driveway improvements shall provide for stormwater BMP's to prevent the migration of sediments and possible pollutants (oils, greases, etc) from entering the right-of-way, subject to the review and approval of the City of Davis.
18. The permit will be conditioned on maintaining the interim driveways, including drainage pipes and BMP's during use of the site. In addition, all interim driveway improvements within the city's street right-of-way shall be removed, and existing improvements restored, unless otherwise approved by the City of Davis engineer.
19. The applicant shall provide a minimum 20-foot wide fire access lane through the site.
20. If any lane or road closures, or traffic impacts to the Covell/Risling intersection, are anticipated during the course of the project, the applicant shall provide a traffic control plan(s) for city review and approval one week prior to beginning mobilization in the staging area

**Agricultural Commissioner**

21. The applicant shall maintain a "no structure" buffer on the property of 100 feet from all active agricultural fields, in which no buildings inhabited by humans will be placed, specifically the proposed construction office trailers.

**Environmental Health**

22. The existing permit for the removal of a septic system shall be finalized prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits

**County Counsel**

23. In accordance with Yolo County Code Section 8-2.2415, the applicants, owners, their successors or assignees shall agree to indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the County or its agents, officers and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding (including damage, attorney fees, and court cost awards) against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of the County, advisory agency, appeal board, or legislative body concerning the permit or entitlement when such action is brought within the applicable statute of limitations.
24. The County shall promptly notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding and that the County cooperate fully in the defense. If the County fails to promptly notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding, or the County fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify, or hold the County harmless as to the action. The County may require that the applicant post a bond in an amount determined to be sufficient to satisfy the above indemnification and defense obligation.

Failure to comply with the **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL** as approved by the Planning Commission may result in the following:

Non-issuance of future building permits;  
Legal action.

\*\*\*

6.3 **2009-020:** Variance to reduce the rear setback for a proposed single family home in the R-1 zone. Proposed reduction of the rear setback to 12 feet from the 25 feet required. The property is located at 52844 Clarksburg Ave in the Town of Clarksburg. A Categorical Exemption has been prepared for this project. (APN: 043-240-21)

Craig Baracco gave the staff report and answered questions from the commission.

There was a discussion regarding setbacks, and how they would affect neighboring properties.

Chair Kimball opened the public hearing.

Dan Dorkin, speaking for the applicant, answered questions from the commission and provided further explanation regarding the necessity for the setback and the well location.

Chair Kimball closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Bertolero said that he attended the Clarksburg Advisory Committee meeting the day that the applicant discussed the project, and it sounded as if they had done everything possible to make it work. He added that they have been very creative and as long as it does not affect the lot to the west, he is in support of the variance.

Commissioner Reed explained that his concern was also with the adjoining lot, but since it does not appear as if it will have an affect on it, than he is in support of the project.

Vice-Chair Burton concurred with his fellow commissioners, and stated that he does not see any issues.

Commissioner Williams agreed with the other commissioners.

Commissioner Merwin explained that requests like this are exactly why variances exist, and he supports it.

Commissioner Winters expressed his support of the variance.

Chair Kimball concurred and said that she appreciates the applicant's creativity and feels that it is good to fill in lots within the town.

### **Commission Action**

1. **DETERMINED** that a Categorical Exemption under Section 15305(a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines is the appropriate environmental documentation for the project (**Attachment D**);
2. **ADOPTED** the **FINDINGS (Attachment B)** for the project; and
3. **APPROVED** the Variance described in the Findings attached hereto, subject to the Conditions of

Approval (**Attachment C**).

MOTION: Merwin           SECOND: Reed  
AYES: Bertolero, Burton, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, Williams and Winters  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: None

**FINDINGS**

Upon due consideration of the facts presented in this staff report, testimony at the public hearing for Zone File #2009-020, and all other documents in the record, and in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Yolo County General Plan, the Clarksburg Area General Plan, Yolo County Zoning Code Section 8-2.2904 (variance requirements), the Yolo County Planning Commission approves a Variance allowing the building of a home with rear yard setbacks of 12 feet and finds the following concerning the project:

*(A summary of evidence to support each FINDING is shown in Italics)*

**California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines**

In determining that the proposed Categorical Exemption for this project is the appropriate level of environmental review under CEQA, the Planning Commission finds:

*Under Section 15305(a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, minor setback variances not resulting in the creation of any new parcels are exempt from CEQA review. The variance at issue in this application meets these criteria.*

**Variance Findings:**

In accordance with Section 8-2.2904 of Article 27 of the Yolo County Code, the Planning Commission finds:

- a. Any variance granted shall be subject to such conditions as will assure that the adjustment thereby authorized shall not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which the subject property is situated;

*The R-1 Zone requires a rear yard requirement of 25 feet. The applicant shall be allowed to build the home with rear yard setbacks of 12 feet. The variance does not constitute a grant of a special privilege with respect to this parcel. Residences of a similar (or even larger) size may be constructed on other parcels in this vicinity that are zoned R-1. By granting this variance, the Planning Commission finds that it is simply ensuring that the subject parcel enjoys the same residential development rights as other surrounding parcels. If the Planning Commission were to instead deny the requested variance, the subject parcel would be unable to build a residence and would not enjoy the same privileges as other parcels in the same vicinity and zone.*

*Conditions of Approval have been prepared for this project, which limit this waiver specifically to the construction of a single-family home at this specific parcel. The variance will not apply generally.*

- b. That, because of special circumstances applicable to the subject property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict application of the provisions of this chapter would deprive the subject property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity and under the identical zone classification; and

*The subject parcel is approximately 7,600 square feet in area, with a building footprint severely restricted due to the requirement to provide a septic system and leach field, as well as a turning area for emergency vehicles. While having to fit homes with septic systems on small lots is a situation common in the community of Clarksburg, the additional requirement to provide a turning area for emergency vehicles is unique for this property.*

*Given the unique combination of size and multiple lot restrictions found on this parcel, the rear setback normally found in this zones appropriate. Therefore, a rear yard setback of 12 feet is appropriate for this property alone.*

- c. That the granting of such variance will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this chapter, and will be in conformity with the Master (General) Plan.

*The property is designated Low Density Residential in the Clarksburg Area General Plan. The construction of a single-family home is consistent with the provisions of this land use designation. Further, this lot is located within the already developed area of town and this Variance would further Policy L5: Growth should be directed toward infill or replacement development within the Clarksburg town area.*

## **II. Planning**

1. The applicant shall be responsible for all costs associated with implementing the following Conditions of Approval, which the Planning Commission finds are necessary and appropriate:
2. This variance shall apply solely to the building of a single-family home located at 52844 Clarksburg Avenue, Clarksburg (APN 043-240-21).
3. The rear yard shall be a minimum of 12-feet as measured from base of wall to property line.
4. All other requirements of the Yolo County Zoning Code for the R-1 zone shall be followed, including side and front yards, parking, height of building, and any accessory structures built on the site.

## **III. Building**

5. The applicant shall apply for a building permit for the construction of the single-family home, shall follow all applicable building codes and regulations, and pay all appropriate fees.

## **IV. Public Works**

6. The Applicant shall install frontage improvements (curb, gutter, and sidewalk) for access from Clarksburg Avenue, prior to final occupancy. If the applicant's associated projects on the neighboring properties (APNs: 043-240-17, 18); that utilize the same access off of Clarksburg Avenue, have not been completed at that time, then the applicant shall contact the Public Works Division (ph 666-8838) and shall post a \$10,000 bond/check to secure Temporary Occupancy Permit only, for a period not to exceed five months.

## **V. County Counsel**

7. In accordance with Yolo County Code Section 8-2.2415, the applicants, owners, their successors or assignees shall agree to indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the County or its agents, officers and

employees from any claim, action, or proceeding (including damage, attorney fees, and court cost awards) against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of the County, advisory agency, appeal board, or legislative body concerning the permit or entitlement when such action is brought within the applicable statute of limitations.

8. The County shall promptly notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding and that the County cooperate fully in the defense. If the County fails to promptly notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding, or the County fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify, or hold the County harmless as to the action. The County may require that the applicant post a bond in an amount determined to be sufficient to satisfy the above indemnification and defense obligation.

Failure to comply with the **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL** as approved by the Planning Commission may result in the following:

- Non-issuance of future building permits;
- Legal action.

\*\*\*

A request was made to hear agenda item 6.5 and 6.6, prior to hearing agenda item 6.4.

#### **Commission Action**

Commissioner Bertolero made a motion to hear agenda items 6.5 prior to item 6.4

Vice-Chair Burton seconded the motion.

Vote: Yes 7; No 0; Abstain 0; Motion Carried.

#### **Commission Action**

Commissioner Bertolero amended his prior motion to include hearing item 6.6 in addition to item 6.5, prior to item 6.4

Vice-Chair Burton seconded the motion.

Vote: Yes 7; No 0; Abstain 0; Motion Carried.

\*\*\*

- 6.5 Recommendations for adoption of the proposed "Wetland Habitat Creation and Restoration Ordinance," to be added to Title 10 of the Yolo County Code. The ordinance would provide for limited County regulation of certain wetland habitat creation and restoration projects. Projects subject to the ordinance would have to receive a discretionary County permit before they could proceed. Among other things, the Ordinance provides that such projects would be subject to the California Environmental Quality Act, specifies the contents of permit applications, sets forth certain criteria to guide decision making, and establishes public notice and hearing requirements, for projects located throughout the unincorporated area. A Categorical Exemption has been prepared for this project.  
Owner/Applicant: Yolo County

Phil Pogledich, Senior Deputy County Counsel, presented the proposed ordinance, and answered questions from the commission. In addition, he provided a memorandum with proposed language changes to the ordinance.

There was a discussion regarding the intent of creating a wetland project versus unintentionally creating a wetland habitat.

In response to the discussion, Mr. Morrison clarified that the ordinance only applied to intentional projects and referred to section 10.301 in the proposed ordinance, that reads, "No person shall engage in grading, clearing, or other land disturbance activities relating to a wetland habitat creation, restoration, or enhancement project without first applying for and receiving a use permit under this Chapter, together with any other approvals required by federal, state, or local law."

Further discussion ensued, and language recommendations were shared.

Mr. Pogledich advised the commission that he would look into it to ensure that the intent was clear.

Chair Kimball referred to page 3, saying that she liked that everything was positive, except for item D, that begins with, "to avoid." She suggested modifying that specific language to be more positive in order to maintain consistency throughout the document.

Mr. Pogledich agreed.

Chair Kimball opened and closed the public hearing.

No one from the public came forward.

Commissioner Winters complimented the ordinances thoroughness, and said that with the potential of more wetland projects coming into the county, there has to be a way to keep a handle on them; therefore, he is in support of the project.

Commissioner Merwin concurred with Commissioner Winters, and expressed his support of Chair Kimball's comment to change negative language to be more positive.

Commissioner Williams concurred with his fellow commissioners.

Vice-Chair Burton expressed concern about the ordinance hurting the wetlands projects, but said he understands that it has been addressed at length. In addition, he is not really sure why they are holding wetlands projects to a different level than they hold agricultural projects, but understands the need from the county's perspective. However, he wanted to ensure that the county did not subject applicants that were unintentionally creating wetlands to the ordinance requirements, and recommended a minor adjustment concerning the exemption for creating a habitat for hunting and so forth to deal with the flooding. He would also like to have the decision making/consultation process criteria for the Ag Commissioner spelled out a little more, in regards to whether the project impacts agricultural land or not.

Commissioner Reed said that his biggest concern was the out-of-county mitigation and the large-scale projects that can overwhelm local control. He stated that he understands the frustration at times when the state and feds come in and do whatever they want. He believes that the primary driver for this ordinance is as a tool primarily for the county to be able to deal with out-of-county mitigation; as a result, they have to create a definition for all of the small-scale activities to which it would not apply. He explained that there may be some challenges when the ordinance rolls out, but he is comfortable with the fact that Mr. Pogledich recognizes the need for some tweaking of the ordinance in the future, and has built a process for future amendments into the ordinance; therefore, he is comfortable with it.

Commissioner Bertolero said that it is good to have a more defined process for reviewing these types of

projects, and it gives the county a chance to see how they might affect neighboring ag uses and/or endangered species. He feels that the permit process is a good way to deal with it, to ensure that it comes before someone for review. He added that he has mixed emotions about an increase in the amount of wetlands, as seen in what has happened already in the Yolo Bypass. Wetlands are great in many ways, but they have extended almost down to Rio Linda now, and there has been a tremendous amount of agricultural acreage taken out of production. He reiterated that it is good that they are going to have a process in place, as he hates to see the county continually lose its ag base.

Chair Kimball expressed her appreciation to Mr. Pogledich for all of his work and for his process, and she hopes that they are able to use this process for future ordinances. She said that she is in favor of a technical advisory committee or something similar when they begin to see applications for wetlands. Because there tends to be a fear about the unknown, she would like to see point organizations, or agencies that have all of the right information about the ordinance, and possible a checklist or table to provide to applicants so they know whether or not they need to obtain a permit. She added that she is comfortable with the revisions that were discussed.

Commissioner Bertolero made a motion to accept the recommended actions, including the additional edits suggested by Mr. Pogledich and reviewed in the handout, as well as the proposed edits from Vice-Chair Burton and Chair Kimball.

**Commission Action**

1. **RECEIVED** a staff presentation regarding the draft ordinance (**Attachment A**) regarding wetland restoration, creation, and enhancement projects;
2. **HELD** a public hearing to receive comments from the public regarding the draft ordinance and any related issues; and
3. **FOUND** that adoption of the ordinance is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §§ 15307 (actions by regulatory agencies for protection of natural resources), 15308 (actions by regulatory agencies for protection of the environment), and Public Resources Code § 15061(b) (3) (the “common sense” exemption); and
4. **ADOPTED** the ordinance with changes recommended by the Planning Commission in addition to the changes recommended by the hand out provided.

MOTION: Bertolero      SECOND: Reed  
AYES: Bertolero, Burton, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, Williams, and Winters  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: None

\*\*\*

6.6 Recommendations for adoption of a proposed ordinance regarding electrical transmission lines and related facilities. The proposed ordinance would establish a permitting process for such facilities. The permitting process would require such facilities to be consistent with the General Plan and zoning. It would also require consideration of feasible alternatives, and the ordinance will identify various public health, safety, and welfare considerations to be evaluated in deciding permit applications. A Categorical Exemption has been prepared for this project. Owner/Applicant: Yolo County

Mr. Pogledich presented the proposed ordinance, and answered questions from the commission.



Chair Kimball opened the public hearing.

Arnold Sargent addressed the commission and shared his thoughts regarding the electrical transmission line ordinance. He shared his frustrations regarding the lack of noticing for this type of project, and the lack of feedback he had received from a letter that he had written to PG&E. He said that he thinks the scope of the proposed ordinance is too narrow, and they need to cast the net to not only capture the oversight of transmission lines, but distribution lines as well. He provided some ideas, including a tiered permitting system based on the scope of the project, and gave additional views and experiences that he experienced with this type of project.

Chair Kimball asked clarifying questions.

Mr. Sargent responded that he would like to see the ordinance broadened to include more oversight so that it doesn't exempt small projects, such as distribution projects. He said that they could provide some regulatory process to ensure that public interests are considered in the citing of new distribution facilities.

In response to Mr. Sargent's comment, Mr. Pogledich said that he could include the comments about expanding the regulation to include other types of distribution transmission facilities in his staff report to the Board of Supervisors, and ask them if it is something they would like County Counsel and Planning staff to look into.

After further discussion, Mr. Pogledich confirmed that he would include this discussion in his board letter for the August 4, 2009 Board of Supervisors' meeting.

Don Saylor, Mayor of the City of Davis, applauded the county for considering the Transmission Ordinance. He talked about the timing and the importance of such an ordinance. He said that he and Supervisor Provenza have been working with a group including many people from throughout Yolo County to respond to the proposed power lines. He said they were able to conduct meetings for the public to come and discuss their thoughts and opinions, instead of being limited to a single presentation from the TANC representative before the Board of Supervisors' meeting. The additional meetings were not part of the process and came about only because people in the county stood up and asked for them. Many questioned why the routes would come through Yolo County, and the only answer they received was because it looks like a big empty place. However, Yolo County is not a big empty place; there are people, homes, and schools in Yolo County, and TANC did not consider any of those.

Mr. Saylor added that just because Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) has withdrawn from the project, it does not mean that the project will be halted. At this point, they are watching the TANC process very closely. In addition, TANC is comprised of fifteen member agencies and a joint powers authority, all of whom are municipal power companies. That means that they are not subject to the Public Utilities Commission authority. He shared the details of how TANC is comprised and shared further information on some of the TANC's activities. He said that it is extremely important that Yolo County step up with the Transmission Ordinance and with every other avenue they can to ensure an equitable resolution. He said that their Ad Hoc Coalition is pursuing state, press, and public action, in addition to staying in contact with other groups that are similarly situated up and down the Central Valley.

Mr. Saylor referred to a list of documents and analysis on page 4 of the staff report, and recommended adding an additional item that would require "An analysis of the economic impact of the proposed project on land uses and property owners effected by the project." He also recommended a more specific explanation regarding the reference to General Plan areas on page 5. As an example it could say, "This public outreach would require consultation and action by cities when the proposed project traverses their planning area." He explained that the reason he recommended the language is because they would like to be directly involved in

## Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

July 9, 2009

Page 18 of 23

the process.

Bob Schneider, Senior Policy Director for Tuleyome, thanked Supervisor Jim Provenza for bringing the matter forward, as well as Don Saylor for his hard work. He said that the two of them really lead the Ad Hoc Coalition, and that it has been very effective in addressing the issue. In addition, he thanked Mr. Pogledich for all his work in developing and presenting the ordinance. He said that it is a bit pioneering and certainly necessary.

Mr. Schneider apprised the commission on the current status of the project by saying SMUD has pulled out, although no one is quite sure why. He said that it he believes it has a lot to do from their perspective of the uncertainty of what role the federal government might play in overseeing interstate in these other transmission systems within the whole regulatory oversight.

Mr. Schneider commented that after SMUD pulled out, the TANC went dark, appearing as if they were going to withdrawal from all public involvement and continue under the radar. At the same time, however, the comment period of July 30, 2009 for the scoping session remains in affect. Therefore, it is important for everyone to ensure that they send their comments or concerns, in writing, by email or fax, over to David Young at Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) by that date.

Mr. Schneider said that another thing that has come out of this is Lois Wolk's bill SB 460, which would help provide some regulatory oversight, and certainly lead to some legislative hearings to look at what is going on with this project. He said that TANC has no screening criteria, and they had none when they drew the lines on the map. One of the big problems is that everyone's land that has a line over the house is heavily impacted. The affected landowners have to disclose the TANC proposal if they sell the property, and until the lines can be erased from the map, the landowners will be under a lot of pressure. In addition, TANC never looked at existing rights-of-way, or the reconfiguration of existing transmission towers, both of which he thinks were alarming to SMUD. Mr. Schneider closed his comment by saying that he feels that this ordinance will help provide some supervision to the process.

Chair Kimball closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Winters expressed his belief that it is difficult for all to believe that an outside entity could come into their area without any oversight or local control, so an ordinance such as this is important to be able to control the process. He said that he is in support of the proposed ordinance.

Commissioner Merwin said that he sees the ordinance as closing a gaping loophole, or at least, the local jurisdiction's attempt at doing everything they can to close it. In regards to the location of distribution lines that Mr. Sargent spoke of, he said that is a different animal entirely than what the electrical transmission line ordinance is trying to do, and it should probably be looked at in a different venue. Commissioner Merwin wasn't fully prepared to comment on Mr. Sargent's letter because he would have to study the issue more. He stated that he is supportive of the ordinance with some of the modifications that were proposed today.

Commissioner Williams stated that he is in support of the ordinance, and said that he attended several of the TANC meetings. One of the biggest concerns expressed at the meetings was the process, and TANC's lack of communication with the right people at the right time. If the ordinance can require that an entity maintain communication and notify Yolo County residents at the earlier possible date, then it is needed.

Vice-Chair Burton reiterated his surprise the Yolo County did not already have an ordinance in place on the matter, so he was glad that they were doing it now. He said as far as the local issue, he sees it as an issue and that it does need to be addressed, but he wasn't sure that this was the right time or place to do so. He said, something was brought up that he thinks they may want to look at. Specifically, that they cannot control PG&E and other groups that are controlled by outside agencies, but if they have to use county right-of-ways

for their improvements, can Yolo County hold them to the proposed transmission ordinance?

Mr. Pogledich replied to Vice-Chair Burton's question. He said that he believes the Public Utilities Code may actually regulate smaller, local transmission/distribution lines differently than larger transmission facilities, and they may have more authority over smaller local lines than they would over the local projects, but he would research that. He advised the commission that Yolo County has a franchise agreement with PG&E to use local rights-of-way for certain purposes, and that would include erecting utility poles and running lines, but he would look at the franchise agreement for additional information.

Vice-Chair Burton said that they may want to look at that to see if it is something that they can adjust.

Mr. Pogledich said that he would look into that when preparing the report for the Board of Supervisors.

Commissioner Reed asked Mr. Pogledich what his thoughts were on adding an item about economic impact.

Mr. Pogledich said that there are some concerns, but at the same time, there is some merit to it, so he needs to put more thought and research into it, as well as hear what the Planning Commission's position is on the issue.

Commissioner Reed said that he thinks it is a good idea, but also has concerns about what he doesn't know; therefore, he will trust Mr. Pogledich's further analysis.

The commission took a moment to discuss their feelings on it, and ultimately decided to allow Mr. Pogledich to look into it, and make the decision rather than directing staff to include it in the ordinance.

Commissioner Reed thanked Supervisor Provenza and Don Saylor for their leadership in bringing the issue to the forefront, and providing the impacted communities with an opportunity to comment.

Commissioner Bertolero thanked the members of the public that addressed the commission and provided very informative information. He said that it is extremely beneficial to the Planning Commission to have background information as well as up-to-date information. He said that the state definitely needs the energy, but so far the TANC project does not seem justified.

Chair Kimball expressed her appreciation to those that have stepped up to the plate on the issue and took a head-on approach. She agreed that there needs to be a larger look at the economical analysis, even if it results in some fairly vague terms, and she will trust Mr. Pogledich and Mr. Morrison to work out the details of that wording when going forward to the Board of Supervisors. It seems like that particular subject repeatedly came up, so she feels that they need to have some type of criteria included that is related to economics. She addressed the other condition that was requested by Don Saylor regarding the public outreach that would require consultation and action by cities when the proposed project traverses their planning area. She said it makes sense to add that.

Vice-Chair Burton made a motion to recommend adoption of the ordinance with the discussed potential adjustments after review by Mr. Pogledich, including the addition of some level of reference to distribution lines.

### **Commission Action**

1. **RECEIVED** a staff presentation regarding the draft ordinance (**Attachment A**) regarding major electrical transmission and distribution projects;
2. **HELD** a public hearing to receive comments from the public regarding the draft ordinance and any

related issues; and

3. **RECOMMENDED** that the Board of Supervisors (a) adopt the ordinance with any changes recommended by the Planning Commission, and (b) find that adoption of the ordinance is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §§ 15307 (actions by regulatory agencies for protection of natural resources), 15308 (actions by regulatory agencies for protection of the environment), and Public Resources Code § 15061(b)(3) (the “common sense” exemption).

MOTION:       Burton               SECOND: Merwin  
AYES:         Bertolero, Burton, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, Williams and Winters  
NOES:         None  
ABSTAIN:      None  
ABSENT:       None

\*\*\*

- 6.4 **2007-080:** Recommendations for adoption of the proposed Wind Energy Systems ordinance to be added to Article 24 of Title 8, Chapter 2 of the Yolo County Code. The ordinance would set criteria for the issuance of building and use permits for the placement and construction of small and large wind energy systems in the unincorporated area. A Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project. Owner/Applicant: Yolo County

Eric Parfrey, Principal Planner, provided a memo, reviewed the proposed ordinance, and answered questions from the commission.

Chair Kimball opened the public hearing.

Chair Kimball read a speaker card from Rachel Long of Zamora, which was left at the beginning of the meeting for the commission regarding the impact of wind turbines on wildlife in Yolo County.

John Mattice of Energy Management Solutions, shared his knowledge of wind energy systems with the commission, and provided details and pricing on a small wind energy product that his company sells.

Chair Kimball closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Bertolero spoke of the concern about the state adopting their own ordinance in about a year. He said that he did not perceive any environmental issues, and he felt that Mr. Parfrey had done an excellent job at drafting the ordinance and in routing the ordinance through the advisory committees, so he felt that it was a good ordinance.

Commissioner Reed agreed, and said that if they could just provide the flexibility for future changes in dealing with trade-offs and setbacks and pole designs it would be fine.

Vice-Chair said he is in favor of the project and the proposal makes sense. He thanked Mr. Parfrey for his hard work.

Commissioner Williams concurred and said that he was not aware of how large a small wind energy system really was until he looked at the ordinance. He also conveyed his appreciation of the fact that there wouldn't be a lot of signage on the systems and for the use of monopoles to cut down on bird strikes.



\*\*\*

8. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

A report by the Assistant Director on the recent Board of Supervisor's meetings on items relevant to the Planning Commission and an update of the Planning and Public Works Department activities for the month. No discussion by other commission members will occur except for clarifying questions. The commission or an individual commissioner can request that an item be placed on a future agenda for discussion.

David Morrison brought the commission up to date on the following:

8.1 Planning Commission Subcommittee:

- a. The final meeting for the Planning Commission Subcommittee will be on July 15, 2009. A lot of progress has been made on the bylaws and other documents. He said the major outstanding issue is the comment areas, but they hope to resolve that at the next meeting. The results will be presented at the September Planning Commission meeting.

8.2 Board of Supervisors:

- a. The Board of Supervisors recently took action on the following items:
  - Approval of the ABC permit for the Road Trip Deli in Capay.
  - Authorization of contracts for the Dunnigan Specific Plan.
  - Heard a presentation by TANC.
  - Approval of a comment letter on a PG&E line.
  - Denied a request to extend the comment period for the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan.

8.3 Current Projects

- a. They expect to cancel the August Planning Commission meeting.
- b. At the September Planning Commission meeting they expect to bring the Parking Ordinance for final consideration, and have a workshop on an Environmental Impact Report for new mining permits.

\*\*\*

9. COMMISSION REPORTS

Reports by commission members on information they have received and meetings they have attended which would be of interest to the commission or the public. No discussion by other commission members will occur except for clarifying questions.

- A. Commissioner Winters said that he had a busy last month personally, which didn't leave much time for his commissioner duties. He retired from teaching and had to get all the loose ends tied together.
- B. Commissioner Merwin stated that he attended the Yolo County Farm Bureau meeting, and spoke to the applicant via telephone regarding the Roth variance.

- C. Commissioner Williams reported that he attended the advisory committee meetings in Esparto and Dunnigan.
- D. Vice-Chair Burton apologized for missing the June Subcommittee and Planning Commission meetings.
- E. Commissioner Reed said that he attended the Yolo County RCD dinner on June 10, 2009.
- F. Commissioner Bertolero stated that he attended two advisory committee meetings, one in Dunnigan and the other in Clarksburg. He also conducted a third Planning Commission Subcommittee meeting in June and managed to complete about 95% of the new guidelines.
- G. Chair Kimball reported that she attended the Yolo County RCD annual dinner.

\*\*\*

10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

The opportunity for commission members to request that an item be placed on a future agenda for discussion. No discussion by other commission members will occur except for clarifying questions.

- A. Workshop on an EIR for mining permits.
- B. Parking Ordinance

\*\*\*

11. ADJOURNMENT

The Regular Meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission was adjourned at 12:21 p.m. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission is September 10, 2009, in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers.

Any person who is dissatisfied with the decisions of this Planning Commission may appeal to the Board of Supervisors by filing with the Clerk of the Board within fifteen days from the date of the action. A written notice of appeal specifying the grounds and an appeal fee immediately payable to the Clerk of the Board must be submitted at the time of filing. The Board of Supervisors may sustain, modify, or overrule this decision.

Respectfully submitted by,

David Morrison, Assistant Director  
Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department