



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

November 12, 2009

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

1. Chair Kimball called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Reed.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bertolero, Burton, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, and Williams
MEMBERS ABSENT: Winters
STAFF PRESENT: David Morrison, Assistant Director of Planning
Eric Parfrey, Principal Planner
Donald Rust, Principal Planner
Stephanie Berg, Associate Planner
Jeff Anderson, Assistant Planner
Philip Pogledich, Senior Deputy County Counsel
Heidi Tschudin, Project Manager
Aundrea Hardy, Office Support Specialist

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE **OCTOBER 8, 2009** MEETING.

Commission Action

The Minutes of the **October 8, 2009** meeting were approved with no corrections.

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

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 Brochure from American Planning Association offering the guide, "The Commissioner."

5.2 Save the Date – Sonoma State University's 26th Annual Planning Commissioners Conference. (email)

5.3 California Dairy Quality Assurance Newsletter

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

CONSENT AGENDA

6.1 **2009-027:** Findings for Planning Commission approval of the Clark Certificate of Compliance to recognize a 12.19-acre parcel and an 8.01-acre parcel in the A-1 (Agricultural General) zone, located at 33750 Russell Boulevard in Winters (APNs: 038-130-08 and 038-130-09). Applicant/Owner: Clark

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

Commission Action

1. **DETERMINED** that the Statutory Exemption prepared for the approval of the Certificate of Compliance is the appropriate level of environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines (**Attachment B**); and

2. **ADOPTED** the Findings (**Attachment C**) of approval for the Clark Certificate of Compliance.

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

TIME SET AGENDA

- 7.1 Consideration of a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors on a proposed “Compensatory Mitigation Ordinance.” The Ordinance would be added to Title 10 of the Yolo County Code (Environment). If adopted, the Ordinance would provide for limited County regulation of certain habitat creation, restoration, and enhancement projects, as well as the preservation of existing habitat in certain circumstances. Most projects covered by the Ordinance would be subject only to its notice and opportunity to comment provisions. Those provisions create a non-binding local review process that is intended to give County departments and the Yolo Natural Heritage Program an opportunity to comment on proposed habitat projects, including but not limited to the compatibility of such projects with neighboring agricultural and other uses. However, certain projects covered by the Ordinance—those undertaken as compensatory mitigation for out-of-county impacts or to otherwise satisfy legal obligations of the project proponent—will also be subject to a conditional use permit requirement. For these projects, the Ordinance specifies the contents of permit applications, sets forth certain criteria to guide decision making, and establishes public notice and hearing requirements. The proposed Ordinance is of general application throughout the unincorporated area of the County Applicant: Yolo County (Pogledich).

Philip Pogledich, Senior Deputy County Counsel, presented background information on the subject, explained the changes made since the previous workshop and answered questions from the commission.

There was discussion about the review process and the Planning Commission’s role in the process.

Chair Kimball opened the public hearing.

Chad Roberts, Yolo Audubon Society, informed the Planning Commission that they generally support the ordinance, although they do have concerns about general politicization of habitat restoration and enhancement projects.

Chair Kimball closed the public hearing

Commissioner Bertolero pointed out a couple of grammatical errors. He wondered if now is the time to form an advisory committee in No Man’s Land, which could be used to provide recommendations on pending wetlands conversion applications. He said that there isn’t much of a population in No Man’s Land, but there are issues that need to be addressed within the area. He understands that funds are temporarily a problem, but he still feels that this is an opportunity to dovetail several issues together.

Commissioner Reed asked if an advisory committee was being developed in the bypass.

David Morrison, Assistant Director of Planning Services, explained that the Yolo County 2030 General Plan calls for the creation of the Yolo Bypass area plan, and there would be an advisory committee formed as a part of that plan that would largely parallel, or include, the existing group that has been in operation for about a decade, the Yolo Bypass Working Group. The Yolo Bypass Working Group has been under the facilitation of the Yolo Basin Foundation. Until an advisory committee is formed, there may not be an official county presence; however, that does not mean that there hasn’t been an active discussion going on in the bypass amongst landowners and other stakeholders for many years. The preparation of the Yolo Bypass Plan is expected to start in approximately two years, depending on staffing and resources. He also pointed out that the noticing ordinance, as it is currently written, does not include noticing of advisory committees, it includes noticing of departments, and is something that is not anticipated in the ordinance as it is currently drafted.

Commissioner Reed expressed his concern regarding the MOU process, and wanted to ensure they were allowing the public to have an opportunity to review and comment on the projects covered by the

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

November 12, 2009

Page 4 of 12

Compensatory Mitigation Ordinance. He asked if there was some way to tighten up the use permit process.

Mr. Pogledich recommended a language addition under the MOU that reads, "Any MOU has to provide for a public review process on individual projects that are undertaken pursuant to the MOU that is identical to the process for a Use Permit under this ordinance."

Commissioner Reed recommended that they should include some type of trigger to notify the public of pending applications, so that something does not just show up at the Board of Supervisors without the public being aware of it. He said that he could see how applicants would like the proposed process as a way to fast track the application, which might be attractive from their point of view, but there should be a parallel public process that is not bypassed.

Mr. Pogledich reiterated that his expectation is that any project covered by a MOU is still going to have to go through CEQA compliance, which provides another occasion for public comment. However, he did not have any objection to including a sentence along the lines of what he mentioned to compliment the CEQA process to make sure there is adequate room for public involvement.

Commissioner Reed agreed and said that he thinks the exemption for the oak woodlands, vernal pools, and native grasslands is probably good, he just doesn't know if there are any gotchas there, but the logic seems solid on it. He added that there are plenty of exemptions in the proposed ordinance to protect local agricultural practices, as well as a public review process.

Vice-Chair Burton said he was conflicted on the whole statute in general. On one part, he agrees with Mr. Roberts in that he does not like the idea of politicizing wetlands projects, but at the same time, he can see major potential problems of hemming in the towns in the current areas and not allowing for planned growth in the community. Adding the out of county issue made it much easier for him to vote on.

Commissioner Williams had no comment.

Commissioner Merwin said that he is generally not in favor of increasing the government's role in people's daily lives. However, given that habitat restoration, creation, and/or enhancement, can have significant potential downsides to neighboring uses, he feels that this is the best way to proceed. This is especially true, considering what is being proposed by the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP). He agreed with Mr. Pogledich that it is unlikely the state will be the lead agency on many of the BDCP projects. More likely, it will be Westland's Water District or Metropolitan Water District, both of which would require a Use Permit. He believes that the public review process is very important and prudent in this situation, and is generally pleased with the ordinance.

Chair Kimball said she is pleased to see the proposal evolve into two separate ordinances, and whoever had that idea should be commended. She is also especially pleased to see the second ordinance for "in county" projects. As Mr. Roberts and others have said, it is important not to politicize these important projects, but there does need to be communication so that people know what is going on and can positively impact the projects. She added that she is also pleased to see that they are finally dealing with out of county mitigation, and is happy that there is a two-year review period for the ordinances. Finally, she is glad that they are integrating Commissioner Reed's request to include some additional opportunity for public comment. She thanked Mr. Pogledich for his hard work and requested a motion.

Commission Action

1. **RECEIVE** a staff presentation regarding the draft ordinances attached hereto, which establish a use permit requirement for certain habitat projects undertaken as compensatory mitigation (**Attachment A**), and require the proponents of certain other habitat restoration, creation, and enhancement projects to

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

November 12, 2009

Page 5 of 12

participate in a non-binding County review process (**Attachment B**);

2. **HOLD** a public hearing to receive comments from the public regarding the draft ordinances and any related issues; and
3. **RECOMMEND** that the Board of Supervisors (a) adopt each ordinance with any changes recommended by the Planning Commission, and (b) find that adoption of each 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: Reed SECOND: Burton
AYES: Bertolero, Burton, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, Williams, and Winters
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

WORKSHOP

- 7.2 **2009-022:** Review of the preliminary Dunnigan Specific Plan, which will provide a policy and regulatory framework for land development with a viable program for building and financing the infrastructure necessary to support existing and planned land uses and will be required to satisfy the prescriptive requirements of the County’s new General Plan. The Specific Plan area consists of approximately 3,089 acres, located at the interchange of I-5 and I-505 including and including the existing town of Dunnigan. Applicant/Owner: Dunnigan Landowners Group (Tschudin).

Heidi Tschudin, Project Manager, led the workshop and answered questions from the commission.

Keith Fichtner, representative for Dunnigan Landowners Development Group, provided information on members of the Dunnigan Landowners Development Group, and was available to answer questions from the commission. He expressed his interest in working with the community and its residents to obtain their comments and input.

Chair Kimball expressed her dissatisfaction with the map presented, due to its lack of overlays. She explained that it is difficult for her to picture different aspects of the proposed community without more detail

Ms. Tschudin responded to Chair Kimball’s comment by clarifying that the purpose of the workshop at this time, was to provide a check in point and obtain direction, comments, and feedback from the Planning Commission and the public. She said that in the future, they would be sure to provide clearer graphics and maps for both the Commission and the public.

Mr. Morrison pinpointed locations on the map to assist the commission in visualizing the proposed locations of lakes, civic and commercial areas, schools, etc.

Commissioner Merwin recommended that they consider combining the middle school and high school on the same campus to minimize trips across town, and combine it with open space rather than placing it on the edge of town.

Mr. Morrison explained that the location and organization of campuses is the decision of the school district. In other communities, there has been some concern about having younger children on the same campus with

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

November 12, 2009

Page 6 of 12

the older children.

There was further discussion about the school locations and the pros and cons of combining the campuses.

Commissioner Merwin asked where the parade route would be.

Commissioner Williams requested that Mr. Morrison review the process from the planning department's standpoint on how they originally began to discuss growth, and how they went from a relatively small number of homes to a build out of nine thousand residences.

Mr. Morrison explained the process, from the suggestions and ideas provided in the public workshops, through the development of the alternatives and the Planning Commission recommendation in 2005, through the Board of Supervisors hearings in 2007 to approve the Preferred Land Use Alternative, and the need to comply with both the SACOG Smart Growth principles and new climate change legislation.

Commissioner Williams said that going back five or six years, he doesn't think anybody was envisioning the kinds of projects they have now. He said they are essentially building a new town from scratch, and asked if any prototypes were available to see judge the potential success of this proposed project.

Mr. Morrison explained that new towns are successfully built all the time. The question is how you build a new town that is a full functional community, with jobs and housing that work together. Unfortunately, there are no prototypes for creating a new balanced community.

Commissioner Williams asked about the phases. Will the County be able to stop future phases, if sufficient jobs are not provided in the first phase?

Mr. Morrison replied that halting construction is one option, among others, that would be available to the Board of Supervisors at the beginning of each phase if the jobs/housing balance and match are not being met.

Commissioner Williams stated that he has a concern that the policy is calling for a 1.2 jobs/housing balance, which is higher than the existing jobs/housing balance in Dunnigan. There are people who currently live in the community that do not have a job. While the intent is wonderful, he is concerned that the community will end up with all the houses and without any jobs.

Mr. Morrison explained that staff and the applicant also share that concern, which is why they are all working so hard to figure it out. Although they cannot base the future on what is going on in the present.

There was further discussion regarding the jobs/housing balance.

There was discussion regarding placing the first school as close to Interstate 5 as possible, and whether or not there should be a footbridge over the highway.

Commissioner Williams provided some historical information on the water situation in Dunnigan and expressed concern over the lack of water to supply the new growth.

Mr. Morrison explained that the water yield modeling and capacity studies would be done as part of the analysis for the specific plan.

There was further discussion on the water supply, joint use facilities, and wastewater.

Chair Kimball called a five-minute recess.

Chair Kimball opened the public hearing.

Jack Rexroad, Zamora resident, expressed his concern over development that worsens flooding in his neighborhood. He said if they put up seven thousand new homes, it cannot help but increase the amount of runoff in the region. Runoff already has great difficulty in getting under Interstate 99, where it naturally wants to flow. He added that he doesn't know if the idea for the proposed lakes was to take care of the runoff water, but if so, their storage capacity is no nowhere near large enough.

Rachael Long, Zamora resident, expressed her concerns regarding wildlife habitat, particularly the creeks which serve as major corridors for the movement of animals from the foothills into the valley. Development where it occurs on both sides of a creek is of special concern to her. She also commented about the light pollution in the industrial area along Bird Creek, and the lack of open space for wildlife habitat. She shared other concerns about the agricultural mitigation process, the location of any new cemetery, the I-5 and I-505 connection location (especially the connector from northbound I-5 to southbound I-505), and if there are plans to connect Road 8 to Road 12A.

Mel Smith, Dunnigan Advisory Committee member, and resident of Dunnigan, commented on the proposed Levels of Service (LOS) on certain roads, and his concerns about the potential traffic impacts resulting from this policy.

Willard Ingraham, Dunnigan resident and member of the citizen's advisory committee, shared his concerns with the commission about the impact on the welfare of residents in the Hardwood area, if the Dunnigan Specific Plan moves forward. In addition, he explained his concerns regarding the lack of water in the Dunnigan area.

Charla Parker, Zamora resident, asked about the vision for inclusion of health care services, or medical and dental clinics, and which locations would be zoned for those uses.

Mr. Morrison took a moment to share where on the map health care businesses, clinics, and offices could be located.

Vice-Chair Burton asked if there was any intent to provide emergency medical facilities.

Mr. Morrison replied that at built-out there would be sufficient population to support a clinic; otherwise, emergency services would be served by Woodland, as they are currently.

Erich Linse, Yolo County resident, shared his concerns regarding the amount of water available to serve the Dunnigan residents, the jobs/ housing balance, and climate change. He hoped that with help from the community, they can focus on what they can produce, such as avocado and citrus trees, along with other fruits and vegetables.

Mary Jo Hoes, Yolo-Zamora Citizens Advisory Committee Chair, asked which county road serves as the southern border for the Specific Plan. She also shared her concern about the small St. Mary's cemetery and the need for a new cemetery. She said that she was happy to see the schools spread out so that there are multiple uses; for example, the fire department is currently used as a meeting center, so hopefully this will take care of a meeting area for over 200 residents, because it is important to have a community meeting location.

Mr. Morrison responded to Ms. Hoes' question and identified County Road 9 as the southern border of the Specific Plan, where the existing Richie Brothers facility is located.

Deanna Kirkland, expressed her concerns about placing a retail/commercial area between Interstate 5 and

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

November 12, 2009

Page 8 of 12

County Road 99W. She said there has been no indication in the past that either County Road 6 or County Road 8 overpasses were going to be expanded to both accommodate the new growth and provide access to regional shopping. The majority of these trips will be in cars. In addition, although County Road 99W is going to be widened, it is a well-traveled road, so putting a retail area or a big box store there might not be a good idea. She shared her idea to place the retail area more towards County Road 2, where it is accessible to regional traffic, but away from the rest of the community. She said that there is still some more tweaking that needs to be done to the plan. She didn't know whether she likes the idea of being a prototype. She added that she agrees with what her neighbors said today and feels that everyone needs to get together as a team and work together.

Chair Kimball closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Bertolero said that he thinks everything is great, including the map. However, he had concerns that are more fundamental, such as water, sewer, and storm drainage. The Commission has to be sure that they look at the main issues. He spoke of the number of wells needed for adequate water, and the lack of success in recently drilled wells in Dunnigan. He shared difficulties that he had encountered in the past when there was a drought, and stated that they have to be realistic. How will the storm drain system handle excess runoff and where would overflow go. He also shared concerns about the location of the waste-treatment plan and recommended putting it further out of town.

Commissioner Reed concurred with Commissioner Bertolero's comments and added that another subject that they should consider is how to integrate the existing community into the new town, so that current residents avoiding feeling overwhelmed. The process needs to create a bridge between the existing community and the planned community. He suggested a series of meetings where there can be an exchange of ideas.

Commissioner Reed commented on the Level of Service, sound walls, and traffic impacts.

Vice-Chair Burton said he was pleased with the map since he was using his laptop to view it, and was able to zoom in on specific areas. He expressed his concerns over the water issue, and felt that Commissioner Bertolero's ideas had merit, and that the County's highest priority should be water. His secondary concern involved plans for the location of an urgent care facility and to ensure they are going to create a community that it is self-contained, including the full-range of needed facilities. He complimented the abundance of office space, and acknowledged that the Environmental Impact Report will resolve many of these issues and concerns.

Commissioner Williams reiterated the concerns that he brought up at the beginning of the workshop, such as water, the number of new homes, expanding the water and sewer out to homes that are already there, etc. He said that no one has mentioned the jobs/housing balance, and shared some history on past attempts to bring jobs to Dunnigan. He said he has no problem with the plan, but if the jobs are not developed concurrent with housing, then they need to stop new construction.

Commissioner Merwin said that he realizes that it is early in the process, and he enjoys visuals, so he was able to grasp the overall concept presented in the map. He referred to Commissioner Williams' comments regarding the jobs/housing balance, and said that the applicants are largely homebuilders. He stated that it is not the desire of the county to create a bedroom community, although he suspects that certain people involved in the project feel that it will ultimately go that way due to access to major interstates. He stated that they should start the process, and as they build out, if the jobs aren't being created, then future phases should be stopped, and he would very much like to pass that on to the Board of Supervisors.

Chair Kimball concurred with all the comments made by the commissioners, and added that for her, the greenways are important, and although they are not revenue building, they are what help in creating the community atmosphere, and encourage residents to get out and walk in the beautiful areas. She said she

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

November 12, 2009

Page 9 of 12

would like the plan to include creating the greenways as long, as big, and as wide as they can be. She explained that it would assist in the absorption of floodwater and assist in containing that water. She expressed further concern about the small size of the greenway next to Bird Creek, the availability of water, and the desire to address food production and community gardens in the plan.

Ms. Tschudin, reviewed issues that were raised during the public workshop, including :

- What do neighborhoods look like?
- Can the middle school and high school be combined?
- Where are the north/south greenways? Greenway plan
- Use greenways for drainage and recharge
- Size of the lakes adequate for retention/detention?
- Will the levels of the lakes fluctuate? How much?
- Overflow for lakes.
- What is the “parade” route?
- Will the town have everything it really needs to serve the residents? Sustainability.
- What will the phasing look like? How to ensure job development? Job/housing relationships.
- Stop housing if jobs aren’t developed.
- Economic development program.
- Water supply. Reliable water supply during drought conditions? Water storage.
- Aquifer studies.
- Joint use of public facilities.
- Wastewater facility – off-site vs. on-site.
- Easterly easement off-site for water, wastewater, and drainage
- Flooding and run-off
- Integrated wildlife habitat. Wildlife movement corridors.
- Park and open space landscaping as habitat
- Light pollution
- Land use adjoining Bird Creek? Greenway by Bird Creek too small.
- Location for mitigation land
- Cemetery
- Freeway access – west to I-505 via CR 12A?
- No sound walls along freeway
- Freeway crossings
- Allowable roadway Level of Service (LOS)
- Infrastructure requirements for Hardwoods?
- Dislocation of existing residents? Hardships on existing residents?
- Health care and medical services. Urgent care
- Community meeting centers
- Does big box retail belong along County Road 99W?
- Involve community and advisory council in planning
- Too much office space
- Places for community food production

Ms. Tschudin, explained the ongoing process, and requested that the commission take an action.

Commission Action

1. **HELD** a public workshop to receive public comments; and

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

November 12, 2009

Page 10 of 12

- 3. ACCEPTED** the preliminary Dunnigan Specific Plan land use plan, subject to direction provided by the Planning Commission.

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

REGULAR AGENDA

8. DISCUSSION ITEMS

8.1 None

9. 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:

9.1 Budget and Personnel:

- a. Due to reductions in staffing and to reduce costs, the front counter will be open from 10:00 a.m. to noon, and from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. In addition, the office will be closed November 23, 2009, through November 27, 2009, due to furlough. The office will also be closed the last two weeks of December 2009, due to furlough.
- b. In the community, there is a lack of construction and development activity at this time. An average year will see approximately eighty projects come in; however, this year the Yolo County Community Development Department has received around forty projects.

9.2 Board of Supervisors:

- a. The Board of Supervisors has adopted a number of items, including the Esparto Downtown Mixed Use, the Design Guidelines, the Wind Energy Ordinance, and the Yolo County 2030 General Plan.
- b. The Willow Creek Stable appeal was remanded back to the Planning Commission and will be heard at the December meeting.

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

November 12, 2009

Page 11 of 12

10. 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 Merwin said that he attended the Yolo County Farm Bureau meeting and communicated with the Bogle Family and their neighbors.
- B. Commissioner Williams reported that he attended advisory committee meetings in Dunnigan, Madison, and Yolo-Zamora. He also went to a SACOG Planning Commissioner training, and attended the CCCPA planning conference in Sacramento, which was largely devoted to water issues.
- C. Vice-Chair Burton said that he had a number of conversations with growers and residents of Clarksburg, as well as the Wine Growers Association, regarding the Bogle Winery project.
- D. Vice-Chair Burton Commissioner Reed reported that he, Stephanie Berg, the employees of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation toured County Road 41, and discussed issues pertaining to the proposed abandonment. He also attended an event at the Barsotti's Capay Organic Farm. In addition, he extended his condolences to the family of Che Barnes, a member of the Coast Guard who recently died on duty.
- E. Commissioner Bertolero reported that he attended the Board of Supervisors meeting on October 13, 2009, where they adopted the new advisory committee bylaws, as well as the Design Guidelines. He attended the Dunnigan Citizens Advisory Committee, the Planning Commissioner's Workshop put on by SACOG, the Commissioner's State Conference, the Knights Landing Citizens Advisory Committee meeting, and the Board of Supervisors meeting on November 10, 2009, where they approved the Yolo County 2030 General Plan.
- F. Chair Kimball thanked all of the commissioners that do so much good work, and asked staff if they had any insight into future projects.

Mr. Morrison provided a list of future area plans, and community plans, and thanked the Planning Commission for their leadership.

11. 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. Willow Creek Stable Appeal
- B. Use Permit for a radio tower south of Davis
- C. Tentatively, a Use Permit for a cell tower in El Macero.
- D. Castle Homes Appeal.
- E. Granite EIR Workshop

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

November 12, 2009

Page 12 of 12

- F. Recommendation regarding the abandonment of County Road 41.
- G. February 2010 - Election of Officers for 2010.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The Regular Meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission was adjourned at 11:59 p.m. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission is December 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