

MINUTES

YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

July 16, 1996

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Gray called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Webster

STAFF PRESENT: David Flores, Senior Planner  
Linda Caruso, Planning Commission  
Secretary



2. 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

MINUTES YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION JULY 16,  
1996

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.



3. CORRESPONDENCE

The following items of interest and correspondence have been submitted to the Yolo County Planning Commissioners for their consideration, response and/or discussion, if desired.

There was no correspondence.

4. 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 The Yolo County Planning Commission in conjunction with the Esparto General Plan Advisory Committee shall conduct a workshop which will allow the Community to participate and voice their concerns regarding criteria to be established for future developments in the Community of Esparto.

David Flores gave the Staff Report. He addressed the main concerns of the Community.

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

Tammy Fullerton, the Chairperson of the Esparto General Plan Advisory Committee, went over the key issues of concern as follows:

- 1) Increase in housing units from 500 units to 1286 units.
- 2) Maximum of four units acre density.

- 3) Inconsistencies in gross versus net units per acre.
- 4) Impacts on the School District Master Plan
- 5) Developers acting as spokesmen for the Community.
- 6) The lack of contact during the Draft Infrastructure Study from Psomas.
- 7) Affordable Housing Issues.
- 8) Revised Land Use Maps.
- 9) Draft Infrastructure Study has validity problems.
- 10) Ag buffer zones omitted or reduced in Infrastructure Study.
- 11) Keeping the "character" of the Town of Esparto.

Meredith Stephens, member of the Esparto General Plan Advisory Committee, presented the changes discussed during the meeting of July 2, 1996.

Commissioner Gray explained why the Commission was in the Community of Esparto and clarified the Affordable Housing requirement.

Jane Baretto, resident of Esparto, was concerned with the parcel on the south side of town, near the mobile home park. Ms. Baretto recommended that this parcel not be rezoned to allow single family residential.

Dave Langhow, a member of the Esparto Advisory Committee, commented that the only one or two acre lots available will be located near the sewage ponds on the east side of town.

Barry Burns, resident of Esparto, said that since the County has spent a lot of money on hiring the

Consultant, he hopes the 1993 Plan will not be ignored.

Bob Warren, of Brown Construction Company, requested that the Senior Housing project continue to be part of the Plan.

Bill Traylor, resident of Esparto, suggested that the most recent Plan be utilized and that the sewage ponds be relocated. He also had concerns about the buffer zones.

Fred Manas, owner of the Manas Ranch, requested a five hundred-foot buffer be implemented, so he could utilize aerial spraying.

Tony Lopes, of the Madison Service District, had concerns of where the sewage ponds would be located.

Matt Carpenter, speaking for Syar Industries, submitted a new plan for the buffer zones to separate mining areas from Esparto.

Stan Rooney, resident of Esparto, said he is in favor of the old plan because there is not enough law enforcement or services to accommodate the increase in people.

Alice Manas said that the cost structure of the Infrastructure Study is not accurate because it is based on 1200 residences, which Esparto does not want.

Robert Hallsman, a member of the Esparto General Plan Committee, requested that the zoning of the Herbst property be changed back from mixed use to light industrial.

Betty Dirkman, a member of the Esparto General Plan Committee, said 1200 residences are too many. Esparto needs to take care of the people already living in Esparto.

Kathy Wicks, speaking on behalf of Jerry Elmore, the Superintendent of the Esparto School District, said that a lot of thought went into the choosing of the three proposed school sites.

The Public Hearing was closed at this time.

The Commissioners made the following comments:

Nancy Lea said she understood the Community's concern, the quality of life that is enjoyed and the desire to improve rather than to replace what exists.

Commissioner Walker spoke about the Affordable Housing Issue. Some of these mandates, we don't have a lot of options for, but maybe we can minimize the impacts of it.

Commissioner Lang said that all the problems and issues can be worked on together.

Commissioner Rodegerdts said that if the Town of Esparto grows from 500 to 1200, it will not preserve the character of the town and he would not support the increase.

Commissioner Heringer said that Esparto has the some of the same problems that Clarksburg has. He added this was the Community's General Plan and that they should work with the County to resolve some of the issues of concern.

Commissioner Gray addressed the issues brought up at the meeting including the need to scale back on density, the senior project, the buffers, the money needed to help pay for the Infrastructure, and the school site options.

Commissioner Gray directed Staff to submit to the Esparto General Plan Advisory Committee, a brief narrative with changes from the original plan for their review and recommendation.



## 7 . D I R E C T O R ' S R E P O R T

A r e p o r t b y t h e D i r e c t o r o n t h e r e c e n t B o a r d o f  
S u p e r v i s o r ' s m e e t i n g s o n i t e m s r e l e v a n t t o t h e  
P l a n n i n g C o m m i s s i o n . A n u p d a t e o f t h e C o m m u n i t y  
D e v e l o p m e n t A g e n c y a c t i v i t y f o r t h e m o n t h . N o

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.

There were no reports by the Director.



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.

There were no reports by the Commissioners.



9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission is scheduled for July 24, 1996 at 8:30 a.m. at the Planning Commission Chambers 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