

MINUTES
YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
July 12, 1995

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Pollock called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Heringer, Lea, Pollock, Walker, Gray, and Webster.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Lang

STAFF PRESENT: Stephen L. Jenkins, Director
David Flores, Senior Planner
David Morrison, Associate Planner
Laxmi Srinivas, Associate Planner
Mark Hamblin, Associate Planner
Linda Caruso, Commission Secretary

STAFF ABSENT: Paul Kramer, County Counsel

2. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Commission Action:

The Minutes of the June 14, 1995, Planning Commission Meeting were approved with no corrections.

MOTION: Gray SECOND: Walker
AYES: Gray, Heringer, Lea, Pollock, Walker, and Webster
NOES: None
ABSENT: Lang
ABSTAIN: None

◆ ◆ ◆

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 Chairman. The Planning Commission reserves the right to impose a reasonable limit on time afforded to any individual speaker.

No one came forward to address the Commission.



4. CORRESPONDENCE

The Commission acknowledged receipt of a memo from Roy Pederson, CAO, regarding some changes in the processing of short-term gravel permits.

Don Hoff, Principal Analyst for the County, said that Roy Pederson wanted to expedite the short-term applications to minimize the potential impact of putting the gravel industries out of business.

David Morrison, Resource Management Coordinator for the Community Development Agency, assured the Commission that although the process was being expedited, all the steps will still be gone through as they are for any other application.



5. CONSENT AGENDA

Items on the Consent Agenda are believed by staff to be non-controversial and consistent with the Commission's previous instructions to staff. All items on the Consent Agenda may be adopted by a single motion. If any commissioner or member of the public questions an item, it should be removed from the Consent Agenda and be placed in the Regular Agenda.

There were no items on the Consent Agenda.



6. REGULAR AGENDA

- 6.1 95-013 - Consideration of an Approval of Access to create two homesites in the A-1 (Agricultural General) Zone. Subject property is located .8 miles west of Interstate 5 and a quarter of a mile south of CR 2 in Dunnigan. A Categorical Exemption has been prepared. Applicant: Ned and Betty Euliss (L. Srinivas)

Commissioner Pollock acknowledged receipt of a revised Condition #3 for this application. It was noted that the revised language was in bold font.

Laxmi Srinivas gave the Staff Report.

Director Jenkins added that this revision of Condition of Approval #3 would not relate in any way to the agricultural operations of the property.

Commissioner Webster asked if the Blue Oak trees were an endangered species and it was answered no by Staff.

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

Lee Humes, representing Ned Euliss, agreed with the Conditions of Approval.

Commissioners Walker and Gray commended the applicant for working together with Staff to protect our natural resources whether or not they are threatened.

The Public Hearing was closed at this time.

Commissioner Pollock was concerned about the affect of the language on the" land use" issues. She did not want anyone to construe that agriculture could not do normal, acceptable farming practices, which might include cutting down trees.

Commission Action:

- 1) **CERTIFIED** the Categorical Exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as the appropriate level of environmental review for this project.
- (2) **ADOPTED** the Findings as presented in the staff report.
- (3) **APPROVED** an Approval of Access (ZF 95-013) to convert the subject lots to buildable lots (home sites), subject to the proposed Conditions of Approval as modified.

MOTION: Gray SECOND: Lea
AYES: Gray, Lea, Heringer, Pollock, Walker, and Webster
NOES: None
ABSENT: Lang
ABSTAIN: None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The applicant and/or the new owners shall agree and consent to participation in, and waive objection to enter into a joint maintenance agreement for the perpetual maintenance and upkeep of the subject Private Vehicular Access Road from County Road 2 to serve Lot 28 (APN 051-140-470) and Lot 29 (APN 051-140-460). Said private road shall be an all weather Private Vehicular Access Road, to the specifications set forth by California Public Resources Code §4290 (CDF Firesafe Regulations). The applicant and/or the new owners would be responsible for the total cost of said private road, maintenance agreement and any permits to construct said private road. The applicant and/or the new owners shall name the access road and the name of the access road shall be reflected in the maintenance agreement and other documents.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the homesites, the applicant shall obtain plan check approval and permits for on-site sewage disposal systems and water wells from the County Environmental Health Department.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the homesites, the applicant shall submit detailed site plans that show the location of the subject houses in relation to the existing oak trees and the setbacks of the proposed structures from the existing oak trees.

The location of the houses, accessory structures and the surrounding landscaping shall avoid damage to the roots of the existing oak trees or the maintenance of the existing oak trees. If any of the existing oak trees with a diameter at breast height greater than two inches are to be removed, the applicant shall agree and consent to replacing any trees that are to be removed with Blue Oak trees. The location, number and species of the replacement trees shall be shown on the site plans. The replacement trees shall be planted prior to the final inspections for the subject houses. If the Planning Division determines that the removal of the trees shown on the site plan is not required or the location of the proposed structures have the potential to damage the existing oak trees, the applicant shall **either** revise the site plan to meet the requirements of the Planning Division **or replace the trees that are to be damaged and in no case shall a maximum of ten (10) trees be impacted.**

4. In accordance with Yolo County Code §8-2.2415, the applicant 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. The County 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 if 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 that 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.

Fire Department Requirements

5. The applicant shall meet all the fire protection, on-site water storage and access requirements of the Dunnigan Fire District.
6. Landscaping shall be of non-flammable vegetation within 30 feet of buildings.
7. Addressing for the proposed structures shall be posted using 3.5" reflective numbers prior to the final inspection for the proposed structures.
8. Prior to issuance of a building permit and in order to provide adequate access to the subject property, the applicants, their successor's or assignees, shall construct an all weather Private Vehicular Access Road, to the specifications set forth by California Public Resources Code §4290 (CDF Firesafe Regulations) over the existing easements as shown in the attached site plan (Exhibit C).

Public Works Requirements

9. The applicant shall obtain a permit for the construction of the access roads and install an 18" diameter culvert under the driveway.

FINDINGS

(A summary of the evidence to support each FINDING is shown in italics.)

In accordance with Yolo County Code §8-2.260 the Planning Commission Finds that:

The Private Vehicular Access Easement (PAVE) is adequate to serve the subject property, emergency vehicles and will not adversely effect the health, safety or general welfare of Yolo County.

The Private Vehicular Access Easement will be constructed to California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection (CDF) Fire Safe Standards which will ensure safe usage for normal and emergency vehicular use. The constructions of the single-family homesites are consistent with the Yolo County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and will not adversely affect the health, safety or general welfare of Yolo County.



- 6.2 95-016 - A request for a General Plan Amendment to the Clarksburg General Plan enlarging the existing Clarksburg Urban Area Boundary to include Lot 26 of the Holland Land Co., Subdivision No. 9A and the redesignation of said lot from AG (Agricultural) to RL (low

density residential) and a Change of Zone on Lot 26 from A-1 (Agricultural General) to RS-B43/PD (Residential Suburban). A Reversion to Acreage Map on Lots 21-25 of the Holland Land Co. Subdivision No. 9A to create a single 60 acre parcel within the A-1 Zone. A Negative Declaration has been prepared. Applicant: Delta Sugar (M. Hamblin)

Mark Hamblin gave the Staff Report.

Director Jenkins added that this application was in accordance with the Delta Protection Act.

It was noted that the size of the parcel on Exhibit "C" was incorrect.

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

Al Sandberg, President of Delta Sugar Corporation, said that this proposal would insure that the easement property would be used for agricultural purposes only.

Commissioner Lea said she was pleased that the applicant was agreeable to a Conservation Easement on the property because that would stop future development.

Al Sandberg also added he did not want any kind of "sign" restrictions on the property.

Ted Smith, Chairman of the Clarksburg General Plan Committee, said the Committee voted to support the proposal.

Commissioner Heringer said that the "conservancy issue" was a private right.

Jeff Merwin, Vice Chair of the Clarksburg General Plan Committee, felt that the clustering of homes against the urban line was favorable in an attempt to limit growth in the area.

Winifred Frasier, resident of Clarksburg, said that because her property, located along Clarksburg Road was in a "horseshoe" shape (surrounded by developed land), it is the most logical place to start growth for Clarksburg.

Russ van Loben Sels, Member of the Board of Directors of Delta Sugar and a member of the Clarksburg General Plan Committee, felt that this action needed to move forward because they would lose the opportunity for future planning.

Commissioner Heringer questioned whether or not the Clarksburg General Plan Committee was being fair. Other applications have come before them and they have been rejected.

Mr. van Loben Sels answered that this proposal is different from other proposal. Each proposal is has to be considered on its merits. He added that because of its difference, it was approved by the Clarksburg Committee.

Commissioner Gray said that voluntary easements should be used as a good example for the rest of the community.

Bill Frasier, resident of Clarksburg, stated his concerns for the Commission and the unfairness of the application process.

The Public Hearing was closed at this time.

Commission Action:

Commissioner Heringer made the motion that this item be postponed until all the issues could be set forth before the Commission.

There was no second to this motion.

Commission Action:

The Planning Commission recommended that the Board of Supervisors take the following actions:

- (1) **CERTIFY** the Negative Declaration prepared for the project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and Guidelines (CEQA);
- (2) **ADOPT** the "FINDINGS" for this project as presented in the staff report;
- (3) **ADOPT** the General Plan Amendment to the Clarksburg Area General Plan to enlarge the Clarksburg Urban Area boundary to include Parcel B (Lot 26) of the Holland Land Co. Subdivision No. 9A (6.5 acres) **Exhibit "A"** - General Plan Resolution Amending Clarksburg General Plan;
- (4) **ADOPT** the General Plan Amendment to the Clarksburg General Plan to redesignate the land use of Parcel B from AG (Agricultural) to RL (Low Density Residential - minimum of 1 residential unit per acre) (Exhibit "A" - General Plan Amendment);
- (5) **ADOPT** a Change of Zone on Lot 26 from A-1 (Agricultural General) to RS-B43/PD (Residential Suburban-minimum buildable parcel size of 43,000 sq. ft./planned development) (**Exhibit "B"** - Change of Zone);
- (6) **APPROVE** the Reversion to Acreage Map on Lots 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 of the Holland Land Co. Subdivision No. 9A in order to create one 60 acre parcel in the A-1 Zone (**Exhibit "C"** - Reversion To Acreage Map).

MOTION: Walker SECOND: Webster
AYES: Gray, Pollock, Walker, Webster, and Lea
NOES: Heringer
ABSENT: Lang
ABSTAIN: None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

(1) Prior to granting of an entitlement to initiate grading on the subject property, issuance of a building permit or recording of final subdivision map for Parcel B (Lot 26), the project proponent shall pay the appropriate fee per acre in conjunction with a formal consultation pursuant to California Fish and Game Code Section 2081 which may involve securing a management agreement for the conversion of habitat for threatened and endangered species.

(2) Prior to recordation of a Reversion To Acreage Map, the transfer of development potential to Parcel B from the approximately 60 acre Parcel A property consisting of Lots 21-25 shall be memorialized by the recordation of an agricultural conservation easement or other suitable device satisfactory to the Board of Supervisors over the properties. The conservation easement or other device shall ensure that no development occurs on the 60 acre Parcel A.

(3) The Basis of Bearings for the Reversion To Acreage Map shall be the California Coordinate System NAD 27 or NAD 83.

(4) The Reversion To Acreage Map shall be filed with the Yolo County Department of Public Works and Transportation within two (2) years from the date of the approval decision by the Yolo County Planning Commission, unless appealed to the Board of Supervisors, or the map shall be deemed null and void without any further action.

FINDINGS

(Evidence to support the required findings is shown in italics)

General Plan Amendment

The Yolo County Planning Commission has determined that it is in the public interest to amend the Clarksburg General Plan of the Yolo County General Plan and finds:

The site is currently in agricultural production (row crop) and contains no residences. The project will eliminate 5 of the 6 existing underlying parcels on the 60 acres of the property zoned A-1 with the approval of the Reversion to Acreage Map.

Currently, each of these underline parcels have the potential of having a residence constructed or placed on them including Lot No. 26. The applicant wishes to eliminate the potential of 6 scattered residences across agricultural land and proposes to execute an agricultural conservation easement on 60 acres of the site and focus the future potential of the 6 residences on to the 6.5 acre Lot 26 of Parcel B which abuts the Clarksburg Urban Area line and a Low Density Residential designated area.

The proposal will provide for a more efficient farming of the 60 acre site because it will have no residences on it. The proposal will also limit residential development along Willow Ave and directly in front of the former Delta Sugar Corporation Plant. This site is currently designated for heavy industrial uses.

Change of Zone

In accordance with Section 8-2.3005, Article 30, Chapter 2, the Yolo County Planning Commission finds:

(a) That the public health, safety, and general welfare warrant the change of zones or regulations, and such change in the zones or regulations is in conformity with the Master Plan (General Plan);

The request limits sprawl onto agricultural lands adjacent to the Clarksburg. Currently, each of the 6 underlying parcels have the potential of having a residence constructed or placed on them including Parcel B (Lot No. 26). The applicant wishes to eliminate the potential of 6 scattered residences across agricultural land and to volunteer an agricultural conservation easement on 60 acres of the site and focus the future potential of the 6 residences on to the 6.5 acre Lot 26 which abuts the Clarksburg Urban Area line and a Low Density Residential designated area.

The proposal will provide for a more efficient farming of the 60 acre site because it will have no residences on it. The proposal will also prevent residential development along Willow Ave directly in front of the former Delta Sugar Corporation Plant. This site is currently designated for heavy industrial uses.

Delta Protection Zone

In accordance with "Primary Zone" of the Delta as established by the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Protection Act of 1992 (Senate Bill 1866) the Yolo County Planning Commission finds:

1. The development will not result in wetland or riparian loss;

The proposal (general plan amendment and zone change) will not result in the loss of wetland or riparian habitat. The 65 acre property is currently and has been historically farmed. The site does not contain wetland habitat.

2. The development will not result in the degradation of water quality;

The proposal does not involve any changes to the quality of ground water. However, the potential construction of 6 single family residences on the 6.5 acre site, and the installation of domestic water wells since a community service system is not available in Clarksburg will result in a withdrawal from groundwater to service the homes. The groundwater table is currently at a high level in the community. This is not expected to degrade the water quality.

Thomas To, Director of the Yolo County Environmental Health Services has presented a concern pertaining to the installation of septic tanks in a high ground water area to service the potential new residences on the site and the possibility of ground water contamination due to them. The Director of Environmental Health

Services indicates that special designed sewage disposal systems are going to be required for homes constructed on the property

3. The development will not result in increased nonpoint source pollution or soil erosion, including subsidence or sedimentation;

The proposal will not result in an increased nonpoint source pollution or soil erosion, including subsidence or sedimentation. The potential submittal of a subdivision map and the construction of 6 single family residences on the 6.5 acre site is not expected to result in an increase nonpoint source pollution or soil erosion. The Seismic Hazard Element of the Yolo County General Plan does not identify the area being within an subsidence or sedimentation area. The potential 6 houses will introduce a slight increase in surface runoff could be contained on the 1 acre site if necessary. Surface runoff and pollution generated from the potential houses is considered not to present a not significant effect on the environment.

4. The development will not result in degradation or reduction of Pacific Flyway habitat;

The proposal will not result in degradation or reduction of Pacific Flyway habitat. The proposal could allow with the submittal of a subdivision map the potential construction of 6 single family residences on the 6.5 acre site.

The subject property is located within the foraging range of the Swainson's hawk which is a state listed endangered species. The subject property currently consist of alfalfa which provides foraging area for the hawk. While the proposal does not present a significant effect on the environment. The potential construction of 6 single family residences on the 6.5 acre parcel represents the removal of the alfalfa or row crop production from the site. The potential development of the 6.5 acres represents a more people-intensive use of the existing property and has the potential of diminishing the foraging habitat for the Swainson's hawk.

The Swainson's hawk requires suitable nest trees adjacent to or in close proximity to large open agricultural fields, grasslands and pastures which have an abundant prey base, and therefore constitute foraging habitat. Native grasslands are the preferred foraging habitat for Swainson's hawks, but they also find suitable prey resources in alfalfa and other hay crops, certain grain and row crops, and lightly grazed pastures and fallow fields.

Prior to granting of an entitlement to initiate grading on the subject property, issuance of a building permit or recording of final subdivision map, the project proponent shall pay the appropriate fee per acre in conjunction with a formal consultation pursuant to California Fish and Game Code Section 2081 which may involve securing a management agreement for the conversion of habitat for threatened and endangered species.

5. The development will not result in reduced public access, provided that access does not infringe upon private property rights;

A parcel or subdivision map to create the potential of up to six 1 acre lots and a specific road delineation has not been filed. The 6.5 acre site currently has 300 feet of public road frontage along Willow Avenue which contains no sharp curves or dangerous intersections within the immediate vicinity. Farm equipment from the adjoining agricultural operations travel on Willow Avenue but this activity does not

present a significant effect on the environment, to this proposal, or infringe upon private property rights.

6. The development will not expose the public to increased flood hazards;

The subject property is shown to be within a Flood Zone B (an area between 100 and 500 year flooding), as shown on the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), community panel number 060423 0670D, effective date March 5, 1990, produced in accordance with the National Flood Insurance Program by the U.S Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Federal Insurance Administration. Development within Flood Zone B does not require flood proofing in the construction of buildings as required by the Yolo County Flood Prevention Regulations.

7. The development will not adversely impact agricultural lands or increase the potential for vandalism, trespass, or the creation of public or private nuisances on private or public land;

The proposal will be protecting agricultural with the granting of an agricultural conservation easement on 60 acres of the 66 acre property. The proposal will also remove 5 underlying parcels from being used as individual homesite parcels.

Currently, each of these 6 underlying parcels have the potential for a residence being constructed on each of them subject to approval of Use Permits on those parcels less than 20 acres by the County. The applicant wishes to eliminate the potential of 6 scattered residences across agricultural land and is proposing an agricultural conservation easement on a 60 acre portion of the property.

The applicant is attempting to focus the future construction/placement potential of the 6 residences on 6.5 acres of Parcel B (Lot 26) which currently abuts the Clarksburg Urban Area line and a Low Density Residential designated area

8. The development will not result in the degradation or impairment of levee integrity;

The proposal involves a general plan amendment and change of zone, a subdivision map for the site has not been submitted at this time. Degradation or impairment of levee integrity will not result from this proposal. The subject property is approximately 3/4 of a mile from the levee along the Sacramento River.

9. The development will not adversely impact navigation;

The proposal involves a general plan amendment and change of zone, a subdivision map for the site has not been submitted at this time. Degradation or impairment of levee integrity will not result from this proposal. The subject property is approximately 3/4 of a mile from the levee along the Sacramento River.

10. The development will not result in any increased requirements or restrictions upon agricultural practices in the primary zone.

The proposal involves protecting agricultural by a conservation easement on 60 acres of it. The proposal will also remove 5 underlying parcels from being used as individual homesite parcels.

The applicant is attempting to focus the future construction/placement potential of the 6 residences on 6.5 acres of Parcel B (Lot 26) which currently abuts the Clarksburg Urban Area line and a Low Density Residential designated area.

The proposal will not result in any increased requirements or restrictions upon agricultural practices in the primary zone other than the implementation of the conservation easement which focuses on preserving the existing agricultural operation.



6.3 95-046 - General Plan Consistency Review for the County's Capital Improvement Plan Update. A Categorical Exemption has been prepared. Applicant: Yolo County (L. Srinivas)

Laxmi Srinivas gave the Staff Report.

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

Keith Ott, Director of General Services for Yolo County, reviewed the processes that have evolved over the past five years in facilities planning and programming as well as new requests.

Commissioner Webster asked for clarification on Regional Parks.

Commissioner Gray had questions concerning the status of former County Hospitals. He also asked about the morgue's need to be updated.

Keith Ott added that the County has adopted a "pay as you go plan".

Captain Tom Musgrove, Detention Commander at Monroe Detention Center, answered questions regarding the morgue. He indicated that when a body is taken into custody, due to evidentiary reasons, contracting out for cold storage would not be feasible.

Commissioner Lea said the Capital Improvement Plan showed a real effort in cost containment.

The Public Hearing was closed at this time.

Commission Action:

1. **CERTIFIED** a Categorical Exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as the appropriate level of environmental review for this project.
2. **ADOPTED** the FINDINGS for the consistency of this project with the General Plan as presented in the staff report.

MOTION: Lea SECOND: Webster
AYES: Gray, Lea, Heringer, Pollock, Walker and Webster

NOES: None
ABSENT: Lang
ABSTAIN: None

FINDINGS

(A summary of the evidence to support each FINDING is shown in italics.)

In accordance with Article 7, Section 65403.c of the Planning and Zoning Law, the Planning Commission finds:

That the proposed project conforms with the provisions of the Yolo County General Plan.

Staff has reviewed the proposal and has determined that the Capital Improvements Plan is consistent with the Yolo County General Plan Policies listed in this report. The proposal includes various improvements, retrofits and expansions of the existing County facilities. The project will provide for the increasing demand for County services and improve the overall efficiency of the existing County Facilities with respect to space planning, safety, circulation, energy, maintenance and operation costs and mitigation of noise impacts.



6.4 95-048 - Consideration of a General Plan Amendment and Zone Code Amendment to permit hazardous waste facilities to locate within the agricultural and heavy industrial land use designated areas of the County. A Final EIR has been certified. Applicants: Department of Public Works (M. Hamblin)

Mark Hamblin gave the Staff Report.

Commissioner Lea was concerned about a hazardous waste facility being placed on A-1 ground that may be surrounded by A-P ground. What would the effect be on immediate neighbors.

Commissioner Pollock asked what the guidelines would be for the sites.

It was answered by Director Jenkins that each site would be subject to conditional use permit approval.

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

Tamara Bowcutt, the Assistant Director of Public Works, Integrated Waste Management Division, said that Yolo County has decided to be more conservative than the State requires. She also added that a General Plan Amendment is wanted before a site is needed.

The Public Hearing was closed at this time.

Commission Action:

The Planning Commission recommended that the Board of Supervisors take the following actions:

- (1) **RECERTIFY** the Final Environmental Impact Report prepared for the project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and Guidelines (CEQA);
- (2) **ADOPT** the "FINDINGS" for this project as presented in the staff report;
- (3) **ADOPT** the General Plan Amendment to the Yolo County General Plan to permit *Hazardous Waste Facilities* within the agricultural and industrial land-use designations as shown in **Exhibit "A"** - General Amendment;
- (4) **ADOPT** the General Plan Amendment to the Yolo County General Plan to re-instate a policy relating to *Design/Handicapped* as shown in Exhibit "A" which was inadvertently deleted in 1991.
- (5) **ADOPT** the Zone Code Amendment to permit hazardous waste facilities on lands that are zoned A-1 (Agricultural General), A-E (Agricultural Exclusive), and lands designated M-2 (Heavy Industrial) as a conditional use permit (**Exhibit "B"** - Zone Code Amendment) in accordance with the adopted Yolo County Hazardous Waste Management Plan, and its "Sating Restrictions For Hazardous Waste Facilities (Exhibit "C" - Yolo County Hazardous Waste Management Plan."

MOTION: Gray SECOND: Walker
AYES: Gray, Lea, Heringer, Pollock, Walker and Webster
NOES: None
ABSENT: Lang
ABSTAIN: None

FINDINGS

(Evidence to support the required findings is shown in italics)

General Plan Amendment

The Yolo County Planning Commission has determined that it is in the public interest to amend the Yolo County General Plan and finds:

To implement policies of the Yolo County Hazardous Waste Management Plan (YCHWMP) into the General Plan and Zoning Regulations in order to provide a more structured framework under which the new hazardous waste facilities could be sited, constructed and operated.

In conformance with AB 2948, the purpose of this Plan is to ensure safe, effective, and economical facilities for management of hazardous waste in Yolo County. In 1990 land disposal of untreated hazardous waste was prohibited. By implementing the programs detailed in the plan, Yolo County will be able to use alternative methods of handling waste and abide by the 1990 ban on land disposal.

The re-instatement of the County's General Plan policy supporting disabled access regulations referenced under the California Code of Regulations providing that a reasonable portion of all facilities and accommodations normally sought and used by the public in such a building be accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities.

Change of Zone

In accordance with Section 8-2.3005, Article 30, Chapter 2, the Yolo County Planning Commission finds:

(a) That the public health, safety, and general welfare warrant the change of zones or regulations, and such change in the zones or regulations is in conformity with the Master Plan (General Plan);

The Yolo County General Plan does not include any policies specific to hazardous waste management. However, it does contain land use, safety and seismic safety, conservation, scenic highways, historic conservation, and administration policies that indirectly relate to the purposes of a county hazardous waste management plan. These policies coincided with the siting criteria set forth by the State for the preparation of a County hazardous waste management plan.

The proposed LU 82 would allow hazardous waste facilities in the A-1, A-E, and M-2 zones through a conditional use permit process.

In conformance with AB 2948, the purpose of this Plan is to ensure safe, effective, and economical facilities for management of hazardous waste in Yolo County. In 1990 land disposal of untreated hazardous waste was prohibited. By implementing the programs detailed in the plan, Yolo County will be able to use alternative methods of handling waste and abide by the 1990 ban on land disposal.

To implement policies of the Yolo County Hazardous Waste Management Plan (YCHWMP) into the General Plan and Zoning Regulations in order to provide a more structured framework under which the new hazardous waste facilities could be sited, constructed and operated.



- 6.5 95-037 - Consideration of a Draft General Plan Amendment to integrate the "Land Use and Resource Management Plan for the Primary Zone of the Delta" (Delta Protection Plan) within the Yolo County General Plan. Applicant: Yolo County Community Development Agency (D. Flores)

The Staff Report was given by Dave Flores.

Commissioner Gray asked if the residents of Clarksburg could appeal actions to the Delta Protection Commission. It was answered yes by Director Jenkins.

The Public Hearing was opened and no one came forward.

Commission Action:

The Planning Commission recommended that the Board of Supervisors take the following actions:

1. **CERTIFY** the Categorical Exemption prepared for this proposal in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and Guidelines (CEQA);
2. **RECOMMEND SUBMISSION OF** the Draft General Plan Amendment to the Delta Protection Commission for approval which integrates the "Land Use and Resource Management Plan for the Primary Zone of the Delta" into the Yolo County General Plan.

MOTION: Walker SECOND: Gray
AYES: Gray, Lea, Heringer, Pollock, Walker, and Webster
NOES: None
ABSENT: Lang
ABSTAIN: None



6.6 A Report on the status of Knights Landing Community Development Issues.

Director Jenkins read a memo from Marianne Nix, regarding the Knights Landing Service District not providing water to Mark Hope's new houses until the check issue is resolved.

He also brought the Commission up to date on the three Knights Landing projects that went before the Board of Supervisors on June 27, 1995. All three projects were approved with no changes except for an additional Condition of Approval on the three projects dealing with drainage.

He also added that the Community Development Agency had not received anything from the Community regarding the General Plan Update or violations occurring in the Community of Knights Landing.

Commissioner Webster left the meeting at 12:00 p.m.



7. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

A report by the Director on the recent Board of Supervisor's meetings on items relevant to the Planning Commission. An update of the Community Development Agency activity 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.

- (1) A report and follow up on the Lancaster application (dog kennel) regarding the use of helicopters for police dog training.
- (2) The PreStar application was approved by the Board of Supervisors.
- (3) The North Davis Golf Course Expansion appeal was approved by the Board of Supervisors on June 20, 1995.

8. 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. The Commission or an individual Commissioner can request that an item be placed on a future agenda for discussion.

- (1) A discussion on availability on upcoming Agendas.
- (2) Commissioner Pollock and Lea both received telephone calls regarding the Muller application.
- (3) Commissioner Gray met with Joe Scalmanini for a workshop.
- (4) Commissioner Walker advised the Commission of the overturning of the \$850.00 Fish and Game Fee. It would no longer be collected.
- (5) Commissioners Walker and Pollock attended the Board of Supervisors Meeting on the North Davis Golf Course Expansion Appeal.
- (6) Commissioner Gray reported that the Avigation Easement has been remanded back to the Board of Supervisors.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m. and the next meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission is scheduled for July 26, 1995 at 8:30 a.m. 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 that Board within fifteen days a written notice of appeal specifying the grounds. The Board of Supervisors may sustain, modify, reject or overrule this decision. There will be an appeal fee payable to the Community Development Agency and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

Respectfully submitted by,

Stephen L. Jenkins, Director
Yolo County Community Development Agency

C:\mnts\July12