

MINUTES

YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

June 12, 1996

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Gray called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Heringer, Rodegerdts, Walker,  
Lang, and Gray

MEMBERS ABSENT: Lea and Webster

STAFF PRESENT: Stephen L. Jenkins, Director  
David Flores, Senior Planner  
Jim Curtis, representing County  
Counsel's Office  
Linda Caruso, Planning Commission  
Secretary

◆ ◆ ◆

2. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS

MINUTES YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION JUNE 12,  
1996

**Commission Action:**

The Minutes of the May 1, 1996 Planning Commission Meeting were approved with no corrections.

MOTION: Walker SECOND: Lang

AYES: Gray, Heringer, Rodegerdts, Lang and Walker

NOES: None

ABSENT: Lea and Webster

ABSTAIN: None

◆ ◆ ◆

**3. 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 from the public came forward.

◆ ◆ ◆

**4. CORRESPONDENCE**

Chairman Gray acknowledged receipt of the correspondence in the packet as well as the following items distributed at the beginning of the meeting.

- (1) The Draft South Fork Preserve Comprehensive Management Plan
- (2) The Notice of Availability for the Negative Declaration for the South Fork Preserve Comprehensive Management Plan.
- (3) A section of the Zoning Code Regulations regarding burrow pits.
- (4) A copy of a letter from Darryl Ekelund, Chair of the Yolo County Historical Advisory Committee to Tom Stallard, Chair of the Board of Supervisors regarding Dunnigan.

A brief discussion regarding the Dubach Pit took place. All work at the pit has ceased.



#### 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.

- 5.1 96-024 - A request for a Variance to increase a highway commercial sign height requirement of 40 feet to 80 feet in the Highway Commercial (C-H) zone. Subject property is located on Interstate I-5 at County Road 13 and Highway 99W near Zamora. A Categorical Exemption has been prepared for this item. APN: 55-130-12 Applicant: Alex Long (D. Flores)

Commission Action:

MINUTES YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION JUNE 12,  
1996

1. **CERTIFIED** a Class 1 Categorical Exemption as the appropriate level of environmental review for this project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and Guidelines (CEQA); and
2. **ADOPTED** the Findings as presented in the staff report.
3. **APPROVED** the Sign Variance from the height requirement of 40 feet to 80 feet subject to the conditions listed under "CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL".

**Commission Action:**

MOTION: Walker SECOND: Lang

AYES: Walker, Lang, Heringer, Gray and Rodegerdts

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Webster and Lea

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

**Yolo County Community Development Agency:**

1. The sign variance is approved from the height requirement of 40 feet to 80 feet, with a face area of the sign at 200 square feet. A signboard indicating prices and services shall remain the same as indicated in the Yolo County Code. This sign shall extend no more than seven

**MINUTES YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION JUNE 12, 1996**

(7') feet above the surface of the ground, and the sign shall not exceed a face area of twenty (20') feet.

2. The applicant shall obtain the necessary permit approvals from the Yolo County Environmental Health Department, Zamora Fire District, Yolo County Building Department, and the Yolo-Solano Air Pollution Control District prior to construction of below and above ground fuel facilities.
3. Applicant shall contact Underground Service Alert (USA) prior to movement of dirt on-site for location of underground utilities.

**County Counsel:**

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 shall promptly notify the applicant of any claim, action or proceeding and that the County cooperates 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.

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

- \* legal action;
- \* non-issuance of future building permits.

#### FINDINGS

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

#### California Environmental Quality Act & Guidelines (CEQA)

In certifying the proposed Categorical Exemption for this project as the appropriate level of environmental review under CEQA, the Yolo County Planning Commission finds:

That on the basis of the Initial Study and comments received, that there is no evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment.

MINUTES YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION JUNE 12,  
1996

## Variance

In accordance with Section 65906 of the State Government Code and Section 8-3211, Article 32 of Title 8, the Yolo County Planning Commission has determined the following:

- (1) That any modification granted shall be subject to such conditions as will assure that any adjustment thereby authorized shall not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations upon the properties in the vicinity and zone in which the subject property is situated:

*Other fuel facilities along I-5 have been granted variances for sign height modification from the Ramos Oil Card Lock Facility (50 ft) in Woodland and to the Beacon Fuel Facility (60 ft) in Dunnigan which were approved by the Planning Commission.*

- (2) 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 is found to deprive the subject property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity and under the identical zone classification; and

*As discussed in the staff report, other parcels throughout the County have been granted variances due to the height of the existing overpass crossings*

*along the Interstate which block the view of essential services to the traveling public.*

- (3) 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 Plan.

*The granting of the Variance for the subject lot (3.9 acres) will be consistent with the requirements of the Zoning regulations and the Master Plan in that the parcel will not be a distraction to the area, due to it's close proximity to Interstate 5.*



## 6. REGULAR AGENDA

- 6.1 96-009 - A request for a Lot Line Adjustment to increase a 3.7 acre parcel to 4.5 acres and decrease a 111.70 acre parcel to 110.88 acres. In addition, a Variance request to adjust a 3.7 acre A-P contract and a 4.52 acre A-P contract in the Agricultural Preserve (A-P) zone. Subject property is located on County Road 31 approximately 2100 feet east of County Road 96 near Davis. A Categorical Exemption has been prepared for this item. APN: 37-080-21, 23. Applicant: Loretta Lamont (D. Flores)

David Flores gave the Staff Report.

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

Loretta Lamont, the applicant, said she wanted more area for pasture and a garden.

The Public Hearing was closed at this time.

**Commission Action:**

**MINUTES YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION JUNE 12, 1996**



1. **CERTIFIED** that the attached Categorical Exemption is the appropriate level of environmental review for this project.
2. **ADOPTED** the proposed FINDINGS for this project as presented in the staff report;
3. **APPROVED** a Lot line adjustment request to increase a 3.7 acre parcel to 4.52 acres and reduce a 111.70 acre parcel to a 110.88 acre parcel.
4. **APPROVED** a Variance to create a 4.52 acre Williamson Act Contract, subject to the conditions listed under "CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL".

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

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

**Community Development Agency:**

1. Within sixty (60) days of the approval of the recommended action, the applicant shall submit, for review and approval to the Community Development Agency, the revised agricultural preserve legal descriptions to be incorporated

**MINUTES YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION JUNE 12,  
1996**

into the revised Land Use Contracts for the subject properties.

2. After approval of the legal descriptions by the Community Development Agency, the applicant shall transmit the above information to the Yolo County Counsel's Office and shall execute two (2) new contracts as reflected in this report.
  
3. As stated in the Conditions of Approval established by the Yolo County Planning Commission on May 10, 1990 for Y.C. Permit No.262, no homesite will be established on the 110.88 acre A-P contracted parcel (APN# 37-080-21) for a period of ten years. (May 2000).

**County Counsel:**

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 shall promptly notify the applicant of any claim, action or proceeding and that the County cooperates 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.

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

- \* legal action;
- \* non-issuance of future building permits.

#### FINDINGS

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

#### California Environmental Quality Act & Guidelines (CEQA)

In certifying the proposed Categorical Exemption for this project as the appropriate level of environmental review under CEQA, the Yolo County Planning Commission finds:

That on the basis of the Initial Study and comments received, that there is no evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment.

**MINUTES YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION JUNE 12,  
1996**

In accordance with Section 8-2.408. of Article 4 of Title 8 and provisions of the Blue Ribbon Ordinance No.1157, the Yolo County Planning Commission finds:

- (1) That the parcels created are consistent with the zone by preserving the agricultural use from the encroachment of nonagricultural uses;

*The proposed lot line adjustment and variance request are consistent with the minimum acreage requirement as established in the Blue Ribbon Ordinance No.1157.*

*The applicants have indicated their intent is to continue farming practices on the parcels (currently row crop and pasture farming). This statement and the fact that surrounding lands are currently under contract, prevents the encroachment of nonagricultural uses other than the possibility of construction of one (1) single family home within the Williamson Act contracted parcels, which will be allowed for the 110 acre A-P contracted parcel in the year 2000.*

- (2) That the parcels tend to maintain the agricultural economy;

*The applicants have stated that the parcels will continue in agricultural production, which are in row crop and pasture farming. This statement, and the fact that surrounding lands are currently under contract, supports the finding that the parcels tend to maintain the agricultural economy.*

- (3) That the parcels tend to assist in the preservation of prime agricultural lands;

*The proposed re-adjusted contracts will continue the preservation of agricultural lands as classified by the Soil Survey of Yolo County by continuing the agricultural activities on the 110 acre parcel in the Williamson Act. Although the 4.5 acre A-P contracted parcel does not meet the criteria established under the Blue Ribbon Ordinance, it is utilized in an agricultural nature (pasture and small orchard operation).*

- (4) That the parcels preserve lands with public value as open space;

*The separate legal properties are being utilized for open space and agricultural purposes.*

- (5) That the proposed use is consistent with the General Plan;

*The applicant has stated that continued farming will continue on the parcels. This statement, and the fact that surrounding lands are currently under contract, supports the finding that the proposed split is consistent with the preservation of agriculture as mandated by the Yolo County General Plan.*

- (6) That the proposed contracts in question were created in conformity with and complies with all the requirements of the Subdivision Map Act of the State.

*The Community Development Agency staff and the Yolo County Public Works and Transportation Department has reviewed the application for conformance with the Subdivision Map Act.*

- (7) That the parcels are at least 80 gross acres where the soils are capable of cultivation and are irrigated, 160 gross acres where the soils are capable of cultivation but are not irrigated and 320 gross acres where the soils are not capable of cultivation (including rangeland and lands which are not income producing).

*Assessor's Parcel No. 37-080-21 (110-acre parcel) is cultivated and irrigated and utilized for irrigated row crop. The remaining 4.5 acre A-P contracted parcel will continue in farming and horse grazing. As indicated, the Williamson Act Contracts to be created will be one 110.88 acre, and one 4.5 acre contract respectively.*

### Variance

In accordance with Section 65906 of the State Government Code and Section 8-3211, Article 32 of Title 8, the Yolo County Planning Commission has determined the following:

- (1) That any modification granted shall be subject to such conditions as will assure that any adjustment thereby authorized shall not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations upon the

properties in the vicinity and zone in which the subject property is situated:

*Minimum parcel size requirements to enter into a Williamson Act Contract prior to the adoption of the Blue Ribbon Ordinance was 20 acres. There were provisions in the Yolo County Code at the time which allowed acreage with no minimum parcel size to be included into an A-P Contract if it abutted property that was already classified in the A-P Zone. When this 5 acre parcel along with the adjacent parcel (110 acres) entered into an A-P Contract, the 5 acres was allowed because of it's abutment to an existing A-P contracted land. Staff does not believe that the granting of a Variance for the subject lot will constitute a grant of a special privilege in that other parcels throughout the County are below the minimum acreage size under the original A-P contract requirements. As indicated in the staff report, on May 16, 1990, the Planning Commission approved a 5 acre A-P contract based on a hardship finding. The owner of the 5 acre parcel filed for non-renewal of their contract in 1990 and will expire in the year 2000.*

- (2) 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 is found to deprive the subject property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity and under the identical zone classification; and

*As discussed earlier, other parcels throughout the County were established under A-P contracts. The lot line adjustment will not be significant as only .82 acres is being added to the smaller A-P contracted parcel.*

- (3) 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 Plan.

*The granting of the Variance for the subject lot (4.5 acres) will be consistent with the requirements of the Zoning regulations and the Master Plan in that the parcels will remain in agriculture.*

#### Lot Line Adjustment

In accordance with Yolo County Code §8-1.457, Article 4.5, Chapter 1 of Title 8 the Yolo County Planning Commission finds:

1. That the application is complete;

*The application was deemed complete by the Community Development Agency.*

2. That all record title holders who are required by the Subdivision Map Act of the State to have consented to the proposed Lot Line Adjustment, and the Public Works Department has approved the proposal as complying with said Act;



*The owner of the parcels to be adjusted has consented by signature found on the application submitted.*

3. That the deed to be utilized in the transaction accurately describes the resulting parcels;

*The Yolo County Public Works and Transportation Department has analyzed and approved the application packet for correctness of the deed utilized.*

4. That the Lot Line Adjustment will not result in the abandonment of any street or utility easement of record, and that, if the Lot Line Adjustment will result in the transfer of property from one owner to another owner, the deed of the subsequent owner expressly reserves any street or utility easement of record;

*No abandonment of existing Right of Ways or easements will occur. Both property owners will have adequate access from County Road 31.*

5. That the Lot Line Adjustment will not result in the elimination or reduction in size of the access way to any resulting parcel, or that the application is accompanied by new easements to provide access to parcels in the location and of the size as those proposed to be created.

*The parcels to be adjusted will take access off County Road 31.*

6. That the design of the resulting parcels will comply with existing requirements as to the

area, improvements and design, flood and water drainage control, appropriate improved public roads, sanitary disposal facilities, water supply availability, environmental protection, and all other requirements of State laws and this Code and is in conformity with the purpose and intent of the General Plan and zoning provisions.

*Analysis of the application by the Community Development Agency, Yolo County Public Works and Transportation Department has indicated that the design of the resulting parcels will comply with existing requirements as to the area, (via variance) improvements and design, flood and water drainage control, appropriate improved public roads, sanitary disposal facilities, water supply availability, environmental protection, and all other requirements of State laws and this Code and is in conformity with the purpose and intent of the General Plan and zoning provisions.*



- 6.2 94-115 - A Public Hearing to accept comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Woodland Christian School and the First Baptist Church to allow the construction of a church facility and a non-sectarian private school for grades K-12 in the Agricultural General (A-1) zone. This project will include the following ancillary structures: An administration building, classroom facilities, senior housing residences, playgrounds, athletic fields and parking facilities. Subject property is located at 40271/40403 County Road 24C near Woodland. APN: 042-080-05 Applicant: First Baptist Church/Woodland Christian School. (D. Flores)

David Flores described the project and clarified the major EIR issues. The project as proposed would conflict with a number of policies in the General

Plan, primarily those that are designed to conserve and preserve agricultural lands in the County.

Bob Berman, of Nichols-Berman, described the Master Plan of the project. The project would require an Amendment to the Yolo County and the Woodland Area General Plan to change the urban limit line to coincide with the City of Woodland's 1988 urban limit line, a Zoning Code Amendment and a Use Permit. He also defined the physical impacts of the project as being the necessary reconstruction of Road 24C, the loss of AG land, the increase in urban land, and sewage, water supply and drainage issues.

Commissioner Rodegerdts said although the Draft EIR was well done, the urban limit lines were not very clear.

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

Jim Wilson, the Project Manager for the First Baptist Church, said he was pleased with the quality of the Draft EIR and its thoroughness. He acknowledged that there are issues to be dealt with and items that will need to be mitigated. There has been a great deal of cooperation with both the City and County in their efforts to identify the issues to be dealt with and to put them behind them.

Dan Kinnoin, of the Planning Collaborative, said that while there are several project components which allow some flexibility in their placement and

design, the overall requirements must be met in order for this development to succeed.

Commissioner Gray had concerns about pedestrian and bicycle safety and accessibility.

Mike Beaman, former farmer of the parcel, asked why the east and west side buffers were not addressed in the Draft EIR.

The Public Hearing was closed at this time.

Commissioner Walker said he shared the concerns of Commissioner Gray regarding pedestrian and bicycle safety. He also asked for clarification concerning fire protection.

Jim Wilson answered that there would be a on site well with a tank built that would hold 200,000 gallon of water and will be powered by a pump.

Director Jenkins said the Woodland General Plan includes this property in its growth area.

Commissioner Heringer commented that he did not know how the project could proceed without knowing where the boundary is.

Commissioner Gray asked what was the site selection criteria.

Jack Hamblin, the Administrator of the Woodland Christian Schools, said there were no sites available in the City of Woodland, and the land for

the proposed project was gifted to them for that particular purpose.

Director Jenkins complimented the applicants for their cooperative efforts regarding this project.

John Bencomo, Principal Planner, indicated that the City of Woodland could not make any commitments until November, but they are very supportive of this project.

**Commission Action:**

1. **CONDUCTED A PUBLIC HEARING** to receive comments from the public on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the First Baptist Church and Woodland Christian School.
2. **INFORMED THE PUBLIC** that the comment period of the Draft EIR will close on July 12, 1996 at 4:00 pm.
3. **DIRECTED THE CONSULTANT** to make any necessary revisions to the Draft EIR recommended by the Planning Commission and as a result of comments received from the Public and Responsible Agencies.
4. **DIRECTED STAFF** to prepare a Final Report for consideration by the Planning Commission on the Final Environmental Impact Report with revisions and comments which were received during the public comment period.

**MINUTES YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION JUNE 12, 1996**



A five minute recess was taken at this time and the Meeting reconvened at 10:05 a.m.

### 6.3 A Status Report regarding the Esparto General Plan Update. (D. Flores)

Dave Flores, Senior Planner, gave the Commission an update on the status of the Esparto General Plan and the Fiscal Impact Analysis. He also addressed the Community's concerns regarding land use changes and recommended that the Planning Commission schedule an evening meeting in the Esparto Community which would allow residents to participate and voice their concerns.

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

Tammy Fullerton and Meredith Stephens, the Chair and the Vice Chair of the Esparto Advisory Committee, presented and outlined their issues and concerns. They illustrated using tables, the changes made to the Plan since it was prepared in 1993. The Community is opposed to these changes. They feel it will destroy the rural character of Esparto.

Director Jenkins said there was a misunderstanding that he wanted to clarify. He explained that the Commission had directed him in June of 1994 to address affordable housing issues brought about by David Jones, of Legal Services of Northern California. Between June and September of 1994, he

met on several occasions with representatives of the Community, members of the Advisory Committee, developers, and with David Jones to address these issues. He later included these issues in the Staff Report dated September 7, 1994, along with recommendations that would reduce the amount of growth to a level more in line with the wishes of the Community. During the Planning Commission meeting on September 7, 1994, he presented the proposed changes to the Plan. The Commission then made further changes to Plan, which are reflected in the Minutes, and which resulted in an increase in the amount of growth. This has been and will continue to be a very open and public process.

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

Alice Manus, resident of Esparto and member of the Esparto Advisory Committee, said that she was unaware that the area east of her peach orchard might be considered for a possible school site.

Ray Perkins, the Agricultural Commissioner of Yolo County, clarified that the peach orchard would be impacted if a school were to be located there. He recommended that there be a buffer between AG land and urban development.

Commissioner Lang added that spraying of the orchard would be restricted if a school was located there.

Jerry Elmore, the Superintendent of the Esparto School District, said the amount of growth would adversely impact the schools.

**MINUTES YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION JUNE 12 ,  
1996**

Vicky Murphy, of Brooks, said she supports the original Plan.

Lance Linville, resident of Esparto, said there was a positive response from the Community to the original plan. It more specifically addressed commercial designations.

Ellen George, property owner, said that although she contributed to the cost of the Draft Esparto Infrastructure Study, she had never received a copy of it. She was very concerned about the time frame involved and if more money would be required.

Dave Flores apologized to the citizens of Esparto for not getting a copy of the Draft Esparto Infrastructure Study. Since this was handled through a title company and a designated person who was collecting money for the Study, a list was not provided to Staff.

Bill Traylor, property owner, asked for consideration that a portion of his property be designated mixed use and a portion be designated as 4 units per acre.

David Herbst, of Herbst Manufacturing, hopes that his property will be left with an industrial designation. He said there are errors in the General Plan Land Use Map.

Michael Goodin, resident of Esparto, also questioned the accuracy of the map. He wants his property to be designated mixed use.

**MINUTES YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION JUNE 12, 1996**



The Public Hearing was closed at this time.

Commissioner Rodegerdts commented that what he had heard today was off track of what he knows the Community wants.

Commissioner Heringer suggested that the Esparto General Plan Committee should "stick to their guns".

Commissioner Lang said that we can expect to hear the same kinds of objections and concerns from all of the small communities in the County regarding the affordable housing issues.

Commissioner Gray apologized for any delay in communication. The intention of the Commission and Staff is to help the Community go forward with their Plan and to help them adopt their Plan.

**Commission Action:**

The Planning Commission recommended that Staff and the Esparto General Plan Committee schedule an evening meeting in the Esparto Community which would allow residents of the Community to participate and voice their concerns.

After some discussion, it was agreed that the Workshop on the Esparto General Plan would be scheduled for Tuesday, July 16, 1996 at 6:30 p.m. at the Alice Marsh Social Hall in the Esparto High School.

MOTION: Rodegerdts SECOND: Lang

AYES: Rodegerdts, Lang, Gray, Heringer, and Walker

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Lea and Webster

◆ ◆ ◆

#### 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 informed the Commission on the following items.

- 1) Introduced Jim Curtis as a contract assistant County Counsel.
- 2) County wide evaluations of all programs and procedures.

**MINUTES YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION JUNE 12, 1996**

- 3) Budget submittal.
- 4) Targeted Industry Study.



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) Questions concerning Farm Workers Housing Needs Study and the Spreckels Sugar Appeal.
- 2) The status of the Cell Tower Applications.
- 3) Questions regarding the monitoring of Pheasant Glen Vineyards.
- 4) Commissioner Walker met with Wayne Stoops regarding water and sewage issues for the Dunnigan General Plan. Commissioner Rodegerdts, Gray, and Heringer will be meeting with Wayne Stoops.
- 5) Commissioner Rodegerdts attended the California Association of Water Agencies in Monterey and a conference in Arkansas concerning agricultural policies.
- 6) Commissioner Gray attended a meeting regarding regional problem solving.



9 . ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission is scheduled for June 26, 1996 at 8:30 a.m. at the Yolo County Planning Commission Chamber at 292 W. Beamer Street, Woodland, CA. 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