

MINUTES

YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 10, 1995

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Lea, Pollock, Walker, Heringer, Webster and Lang

MEMBERS ABSENT: Gray

STAFF PRESENT: Stephen L. Jenkins, Director
Paul A. Kramer, Jr., County Counsel
Heidi Tschudin, Contract Planner
Linda Peirce, Contract Planner
Linda Caruso, Commission Secretary

2. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Commission Action:

The Minutes of the April 19, 1995, Planning Commission Meeting were approved with corrections to page 11, item 13, should read Any well water used for human consumption... and a correction on page 25, under Director's Report, item 2, should be added, The Board of Supervisors upheld the "no build" restriction and denied the parcel split.

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

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

Chair Pollock acknowledged receipt of the items of correspondence received in the packet and at the beginning of the meeting.

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 94-075 - Consideration of the following: Certification of the EIR, Approval of General Plan Amendments, Approval of Rezonings, Action Regarding Redevelopment Pass Through Agreements, Amendment of Growth Management Map, Vesting of Tentative Subdivision Map, Modification of PD-2, and Establishment of PD-47 for the Davis Community Golf Course Expansion Project and 39-Unit Residential Subdivision. Subject property is located on 149+ acres in the Southwest corner of County Road 99 and 29, plus 147+ acres immediately north of the Binning Tract and south of the existing City of Davis Golf Course near Davis in an Agricultural General/Agricultural Preserve Zone. A supplemental EIR has been prepared. Applicants: Northwest Partners II, Attn: Heather Muir, 2224 Glacier Drive, Davis, CA 95616 and the City of Davis, Attn: Jeff Loux, Planning Director, 23 Russell Blvd., Davis, CA 95616. (H. Tschudin)

Heidi Tschudin gave the Staff Report. She asked that the EIR be certified and gave the reasons why staff was recommending denial including that the project is at odds with the County General Plan policies. The County Staff is in support of the Golf component of the project, but with the

residential component added to it, there is a great deal of inconsistency. Some examples are loss of agricultural productivity, conversion of agricultural land, and cumulative air quality impacts.

Commissioner Pollock asked whether or not a Golf Course on A-1 zoned land would require a Conditional Use Permit through the County. It was answered by Director Jenkins that a public golf course is permitted by right. The City of Davis could go forward without any County approval.

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

Lois Wolk, Vice Mayor of Davis, said she would like to provide public, affordable golf to the residents of Yolo County. She explained the benefits of the project going west instead of south. The golf course would be larger, more environmentally sensitive and better designed. The buffers would be limited if the project went south. She also added that if the project went towards the south, the Commission would lose their ability to condition the project.

Jeff Loux, Planning Director of the City of Davis, discussed affordability and the environmental aspects of the project.

Commissioner Pollock asked Mr. Loux if a 2081 Permit by Fish and Game and mitigation for Swainson Hawk would still be required even if the project were to go south. It was answered yes.

Ray Krone, Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering at the University of California, representing the Friends of Yolo County Airport, was concerned with safety issues concerning aircraft.

Robert Wiswell, Manager of the Yolo County Airport, said that most accidents occur during takeoff. He added that the approach and departure area should be kept as clear as possible. He indicated that he would like some kind of protection for the land immediately north of the Airport.

Commissioner Lea asked if under current law, does someone have a right to apply for a building permit for a house on the land north of the airport.

Paul Kramer, County Counsel, said that a site plan review would be required first and that General Plan and CLUP policies may only permit two houses on the four parcels.

John Hiliss, resident of North Davis Meadows, was concerned with the amount of traffic on Fairway Drive. He was in favor of the project because a second access to the Golf Course would be provided and bike path would be created.

George Slocum, a resident of North Davis Meadows and the chairman of the Yolo County Aviation Advisory Committee, is in favor of any attempt which will protect the approach corridors for the airport and is in favor of the transferring of development rights for the Swanston property because he feels it is in the best interest of the Yolo County Airport. He further feels that the proposed access road be made the primary access road to the golf course.

Judge Waldon, a member of The Davis Seniors Golf Club, gave his reasons for wanting this project approved as affordability, easy access, within walking distance, enjoyment of the game and the "action" on the golf course.

Ron Whitehead, retired Sheriff of Yolo County, supported the golf project because of the family activity provided by the Golf Course.

Sheila Howitt, a resident of the Binning Tract, was not in support of the proposed residential project but was in favor of the golf course going south.

Vigfus Asmundson, Davis resident, said there was no justification for violating the Davis and the County General Plan and the airport issue was an imaginary threat. He added that this was leap frog development.

A ten minute recess was called at 10:25.

Mike Ducker, an adjoining property owner, was in favor of the golf course but disagreed that the proposed access road should become a primary access road.

Earl Balch, former County Park and Recreation Director and retired Airport Manager, was in support of the project as proposed. He added that the Swanston transfer of development rights is a very important portion of the project.

Becky Robinson, representing the Davis Women's Golf Club, said the club was in support of the project.

Barbara Muller, member of the Davis Golf Club, said she was in favor of the project because there are not too many recreational activities for seniors.

Ed Agan, the Tournament Director of the Davis Senior Golf Club, said that players come from all over the County and there is a need for more golf holes for people to play.

Lois Wolk, discussed and passed out copies of other policies of the recreation element of the Davis and the County General Plan to the Planning Commission.

Bill Streng, the applicant, spoke about loss of agricultural land, financial feasibility, and the Swanston property transfer of Development Rights. He also added that they could not afford approval of any less than 39 units or it would be the same as denial of the project. On the subject of affordable housing, he said the solution was to expand an apartment site that is already planned as mitigation for Davis development by four units.

Commissioner Heringer asked who owned the south parcel and it was answered that the City of Davis did.

Dave Taormino, of Northwest Partners, addressed concerns that the project would induce new growth. He added that just because a project is approved doesn't mean that a domino affect occurs around it.

David Jones, of Legal Services of Northern California, said that although there were previous objections to the project due to compliance with the County's affordable housing policies, a resolution has been reached. He directed the Commission to the Alternative Actions for Davis Golf Course Expansion and Residential Subdivision Project document, in "attachment 7", page 2, item 4,

under the second bullet should include after the first sentence to include or dedicate approximately 4/10 an acre of improved land within the City of Davis for the construction of four such units of permanently affordable housing. He said with the inclusion of this sentence, they would remove their objection.

Marianne Nix, a resident of Knights Landing, said that although she did not have anything against Davis or the project, it was unfair that Knights Landing has all their affordable houses crammed together and the Davis home sites are on a half an acre or more.

The Public Hearing was closed at this time.

The Planning Commissioners gave their reasons for their decisions on this project.

Commission Action:

1. Certified the Final EIR as adequate, complete, and in compliance with State law for the purposes of denying the project, based on independent review and analysis of the Final EIR, and based on findings of fact to be provided reflecting the independent judgement of the Commission.
2. Denied the necessary County approvals requested for the project.

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



A recess was called at this time.

6.2 94-061 - Public Hearing on the Draft EIR for the Short-Term Mining and Reclamation Project for the Reiff Site. Subject property is located north of Cache Creek, South of Road 19 and West of I-505 near Esparto in an Agricultural General Zone. Applicant: Teichert Aggregates, 3500 American River Dr. Sacramento, CA 95851. (L. Peirce)

Linda Peirce gave the Staff Report. She reminded everyone that this was only a public hearing on the adequacy of the Draft EIR. All questions and issues raised would receive written response in the Final EIR document. The public review period will end May 30, 1995.

Randy Sater, Manager of Aggregate Resource Development for Teichert Aggregates, gave an overview of the Reiff Site Short Term Mining and Reclamation Project. He explained the mining and reclamation plan and the location of the project.

Commissioner Webster asked how the land would be irrigated. It was answered that it would be sloped from northeast to southwest. A detention basin would be used during the mining phase. It keeps the water off the site and collects it in one central area and during the reclamation phase there will be recovering ag tailwater on site.

Commissioner Walker asked how there would be a net gain of 29 acres.

Brian Rahn, of Dellavalle Laboratory, said the 29 acre gain comes in improved soil conditions, not a gain in prime agricultural land. The majority of the site is class four soils. It wouldn't be a gain of property, but better, farmable ground.

Commissioner Heringer asked how much overburden is on the site. It was answered that it varies, but usually four to five feet.

Brian Rahn, said that during the soils analysis, the levels of Boron were higher than desired for Boron sensitive crops such as walnuts and almonds.

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

No one came forward to address the Commission on the Draft EIR.

Randy Sater said he would be submitting his comments in writing.

Commissioner Pollock commented regarding page 4.4-22 and asked who would be doing the monitoring of the pumps. She also asked for clarification of what the role of the Planning Commission on mitigation of the plant itself. She said there wasn't enough information in the DEIR on the plant.

Director Jenkins explained that Staff's position is that the existing Teichert Reiff Plant sunsets with the completion of mining of the existing operation. If they want to move into another area, they will have to re-permit that plant.

Commissioner Pollock also wanted clarification about the current in-channel versus the off-channel permit. She asked if the in-channel permit were ended, would there a reclamation plan along with it. It was answered yes.

Commissioner Webster said there was skepticism by the Farm Bureau on whether the land could be reclaimed and be as productive as it was before.

Commissioner Heringer asked questions regarding flooding.

Commissioner Walker asked what the approximate difference in elevation was between pit floor in its reconstituted form and the main stream flow adjacent to it.

It was answered that it would average five feet less than the surface elevation.

Joe Scalmanini, Consulting Engineer, answered questions asked by the Commission.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the reclamation.

The Public Hearing was closed at this time.

It was decided that a workshop for the Final EIR would be helpful.

Commission Action:

The Planning Commission:

1. Conducted a public hearing to receive oral and /or written comments from the public and the Commissioners regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
2. Informed the public that the comment period for the Draft EIR closes on May 30, 1995 at 5:00 p.m.
3. Directed the consultant to prepare responses to all comments received and submit the Final EIR to the Commission and the public.



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.

Director Jenkins brought the Commission up to date on the following items:

- (1) The Warren, Hope, and County of Yolo projects will go before the Board of Supervisors at one time and as one General Plan Amendment.
- (2) The first meeting in July will involve more General Plan Amendments. The Delta Plan will have to be adopted by the Board by August 22, 1995.
- (3) The purpose of the May 24, 1995, meeting is to conduct a hearing on the EIR for the Solano Short Term Gravel application.
- (4) The first meeting in June will involve another hearing on the on the EIR for Teichert- Woodland Short Term Gravel application.
- (5) Discussed Wallace Edson's concern of additional flow of drainage onto their property in Knights Landing.

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) Commissioner Pollock wanted to clarify that the General Plan Amendment of the County of Yolo/Curtis King application that was going before the Board of Supervisors was erroneously noticed in the newspaper as medium-density when it was approved as low-density.

(2) Commissioner Pollock updated the Commission on her attendance at the Habitat Management Plan on April 27, 1995, in Winters and gave a description of the plan for the new Commissioners.

(3) Commissioners Lea and Pollock both met with Dave Taormino and Bill Streng on the Golf Course Expansion Project.

(4) Commissioners Lea, Walker and Pollock also met with Randy Sater and Mr. Taylor, concerning the Teichert application.

(5) Commissioner Pollock asked that the Rules of Order be placed on the next Agenda.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m. and the next meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission is scheduled for May 24, 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\may10.95