

MINUTES

YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

October 30, 1996

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Gray called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: John Bencomo, Interim Director
David Flores, Senior Planner
Mark Hamblin, Associate Planner
Mike Luken, Senior Planner

Linda Caruso, Planning Commission
Secretary
Jim Curtis, representing County
Counsel's Office

◆ ◆ ◆

2. SPECIAL ITEMS

2.1 Tony Bernhard, the County Recorder, administered the Oath of Office to the new Yolo County Planning Commissioners, Meredith Stephens and Seth Merewitz.

2.2 Commissioner Gray presented a Resolution to former Planning Commissioner Nancy Lea.

3. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Commission Action:

Commissioner Rodegerdts made the correction to page 24 of the Minutes, paragraph eleven, to strike the word would and replace with should.

MOTION: Walker SECOND: Lang

AYES: Lang, Gray, Walker and Rodegerdts
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: Heringer

4. PUBLIC REQUESTS

The opportunity for members of the public to address the Planning Commission on any subjects relating to the Planning Commission, but not relative to items on the present Agenda, was opened by the Chairman. The Planning Commission reserves the right to impose a reasonable limit on time afforded to any individual speaker.

Bill Traylor, resident of Esparto, commented on the Esparto General Plan and the proposed zoning designations for his property.

◆ ◆ ◆

5. CORRESPONDENCE

Commissioner Gray acknowledged receipt of all correspondence distributed at the beginning of the meeting.

◆ ◆ ◆

6. 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.

Item 6.1 was pulled from the Consent Agenda and placed on the Regular Agenda.



7. REGULAR AGENDA

6.1 96-056 - A request for an Agricultural Preserve Contract Amendment and a Lot Line Adjustment/ Elimination of underlying parcels resulting in three parcels that reflect the actual configuration of the parcels ownership and farming operations. The Agricultural Contract Amendment results in three contracts consisting of 26, 60, and 100 acre parcels. Property is located on the south side of Shadow Valley Road along the east and west sides of State Highway 16 near Guinda in the Agricultural Preserve (A-P) zone. A Negative Declaration has been prepared. APN# 060-050-03 Applicant/Owner: Gretler/Karstad (M. Hamblin)

Commissioner Stephens abstained from this item due to a possible conflict of interest since her brother is one of the applicants.

Mark Hamblin gave the Staff Report.

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

Bob Wirth, the applicant, said the improvement is supported by the Yolo County General Plan.

Charlie Rominger, of the Yolo County Farm Bureau, said that land under contract with the Williamson Act should follow the criteria of parcel sizes set forth by the Blue Ribbon Committee.

A discussion about the number of buildable sites and the rescinding of the non-renewal status took place.

Commission Action:

- (1) **CERTIFIED** that the proposed Negative Declaration was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and Guidelines (CEQA);
- (2) **ADOPTED** the "FINDINGS" for this project as presented in the staff report;
- (3) **APPROVED** the Lot Line Adjustment/Merger map resulting in 3 parcels (Parcel 1 - 26 ac., Parcel 2 - 60 ac., Parcel 3 - 100 ac.) as shown in **Exhibit "B"** subject to the "CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL" presented in the staff report as modified;
- (4) **APPROVED** the agricultural preserve contract division of Land Use Contract 70-114/AP 8 into 3 new individual contracts consisting of 26, 60, and 100 acres to reflect the parcels shown in **Exhibit "B"** subject to the "CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL" presented in the staff report as modified.

MOTION: Walker SECOND: Lang
AYES: Rodegerdts, Merewitz, Heringer, Gray, Walker, and Lang
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Stephens
ABSENT: None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Community Development Agency:

(1) The applicant(s) shall merge any and all underlying parcels for all purposes including the State Subdivision Map Act and the applicable provisions of the County of Yolo's ordinances by filing a revised grant deed(s) with the Certificate of Compliance, excepting therefrom the three parcels created by Lot Line Adjustment and shown on the Lot Line Adjustment/Merger Map labeled Exhibit "B".

(2) The applicant shall merge Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the Craig-Stitt Subdivision of the T.E. Haven Property (M.B. Bk. 3, Pg. 30) into one parcel by filing a grant deed for the subject property that clearly states the intent to merge said separate lots prior to the recording of the Certificate of Compliance prepared for this Lot Line Adjustment.

(3) The property owner(s) shall record the Certificate of Compliance prepared for this Lot Line Adjustment and Merger at the property owners expense in the Office of the Yolo County Clerk/Recorder within one year from the date of the Yolo County Planning Commission's approval or said Lot Line Adjustment shall be deemed null and void without any further action.

(4) Within sixty 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 into the revised Land Use Contracts for the subject properties.

(5) 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 three new Williamson Act Contracts as reflected in this report.

(6) Prior to the recording of the Certificate of Compliance for this project, the property owners shall rescind their letter of non-renewal of Land Use Contract 70-114/AP-8) filed with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in November, 1989. The rescinding of the filed non-renewal letter will continue the property in the Land Use Contract. A copy of the rescinding letter filed with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors shall be submitted to the Community Development Agency.

County Counsel:

(7) 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.

FINDINGS

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

California Environmental Quality Act & Guidelines
(CEQA)

In certifying the proposed Negative Declaration for this project as the appropriate level of environmental review under CEQA, the Planning Commission finds:

The written and verbal information received on this project and presented during the public hearing concludes that the project does not present a "significant effect on the environment" as defined by CEQA.

Lot Line Adjustment

In accordance with Yolo County Code §8-1.452 [Ordinance 939, effective November 18, 1982] 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 have consented to the proposed Lot Line Adjustment and Merger, and the Public Works Department has approved the proposal as complying with said Act;

The applicant(s) are the owners of the parcels to be adjusted and merged and have consented to the project.

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

The legal descriptions submitted with the application appear to accurately describe the proposed parcels to be created by the project.

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 street or utility easements will be abandoned by the adjustment and merger.

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; and

The Lot Line Adjustment and Merger will not result in the elimination or reduction in size of an access way to any resulting parcel. Parcel 1 and 2 will have public road frontage to Shadow Valley Road, Parcel 3 has access to State Highway 16.

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.

After review of the application, State and County regulations, the responses to the Request For Comments and Negative Declaration, etc. by the Community Development Agency, it was determined 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.

Agricultural Preserve Contract Division

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/Merger is consistent with the minimum acreage requirement as established in the Blue Ribbon Ordinance No.1157.

Parcel 1, the 26 acre homesite contains a 2 acre pond and Koi farm operation (fish farm). Fish farms (aqua culture) have been determined to be an agricultural operation. The remainder of the site is planted in row crops (hay). Parcel 2 consists of 60 acres contains no residences and

historically has been planted in row crop (barley, wheat) and has a livestock well and pole barn. Parcel 3 (100 ac.) consists of orchard (walnuts) and alfalfa. This parcel has irrigation improvements including a sprinkler irrigation system, a 50 horse power agricultural well (950-1100 g.p.m.) and water rights to Cache Creek.

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

Parcel 1, the 26 acre homesite contains a 2 acre pond and an experimental Koi farm operation (fish farm). Fish farms have been determine to be an agricultural operation. The remainder of the site is planted in row crops (hay). Parcel 2 consists of 60 acres contains no residences and historically has been planted in row crop (barley, wheat) and has a livestock well and pole barn. Parcel 3 (100 ac.) consists of orchard (walnuts) and alfalfa. This parcel has irrigation improvements including a sprinkler irrigation system, a 50 horse power agricultural well (950-1100 g.p.m.) and water access rights to Cache Creek.

The soil types for the property range from Class 1 to Class 8 (Cache Creek river bed) as shown on the Soil Survey of Yolo County, California prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service, issued June 1972.

The applicant through use of the Lot Line Adjustment and Merger is removing and adjusting underlying lots (11 lots) created by the Heine

Tract map and the Craig-Stitt Subdivision in order to create 3 parcels and Agricultural Preserve Contracts.

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

The soil types for the property range from Class 1 to Class 8 (Cache Creek river bed) as shown on the Soil Survey of Yolo County, California prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service, issued June 1972. The proposed Parcel 1 configuration will contain the prime soils for the subject property.

Currently there are 11 underlying parcels of which approximately 5 have the potential for a residence being constructed on them, subject to approval of Use Permits. The request will removed and merge the underlying parcels created by the Heine Tract and the Craig-Stitt Subdivision Map in order to have 3 parcels. Parcel 1 involves a 26 acre parcel with a residence, fish farm, and row crops. Parcel 2 involves 60 acres and row crops. Parcel 3 consists of 100 acres and contains the prime class soils. This parcel has alfalfa and an orchard on it.

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

Agricultural land is considered a principal component of open space. The applicant will be preserving open space by reducing 11 existing and underlying lots to 3 parcels.

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

It is the policy of Yolo County to vigorously conserve and preserve the agricultural lands in Yolo County. Yolo County shall protect and conserve agricultural land use especially in areas presently farmed or having prime agricultural soils and outside of existing planned urban communities and outside of city limits.

The project will eliminate 11 underlying parcels. Five of the underlying parcels have the potential for a residence being constructed on them subject to approval of Use Permits. The applicants request will create 3 parcels. The request will create a 100 acre parcel with all of the prime class soils on it with irrigation improvements and water rights to Cache Creek.

(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 Yolo County Community Development Agency staff have reviewed the application for conformance with the Subdivision Map Act. The project will lot line adjust and merge 11 underlying lots created by the Heine tract

subdivision map on July 13, 1892 and 4 underlying lots created originally by the Craig-Stitt Subdivision of the T.E. Haven Property into 3 parcels consisting of Parcel 1 - 26 ac., Parcel 2 - 60 ac., and Parcel 3 - 100 ac.

- (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).

Parcel 1, the 26 acre parcel contains a residence, 2 acre pond and Koi farm operation (fish farm). The parcel also has a 5,000 gallon irrigation water storage tank. The remainder of the site is planted in row crops (hay). Parcel 2 consists of 60 acres contains no residences and historically has been planted in row crop (barley, wheat). It also has a livestock well and pole barn. Parcel 3 (100 ac.) consists of orchard (walnuts) and alfalfa. This parcel has irrigation improvements including a sprinkler irrigation system, a 50 horse power agricultural well (950-110 g.p.m.) and water rights to Cache Creek.

Under the County's Agricultural Preserve

Regulations

*where
there
are
existing
legal
lots of
record
that are
less
than the
minimum
ag.
contract
acreages
stated
under
the
County's
regulati
ons, the
State's
minimum
sizes
specifie
d are 20
acres
for
irrigate
d land
or 40
acres
for non-*

*irrigate
d land,
provided
that the
owner
annually
demonstr
ates
that,
except
for a
homesite
no
larger
than a
single
acre,
the
remainde
r of the
acreage
is being
used for
the
commerci
al
producti
on of
agricult
ural
products
or is*

*planted
with
immature
fruit or
nut
trees,
or
vines,
or is
used
partly
for
storage
of
commodit
ies
obtained
from the
owner's
owned or
leased
land
elsewher
e or for
equipmen
t used
to farm
the
owner's
other
owned or
leased*

land,
which
demonstr
ation
shall be
made by
filing a
declarat
ion or a
Williams
on Act
question
naire
with the
County
Assessor
not
later
than
April 1
of each
year.
Failure
to file
the
declarat
ion or
question
naire by
April 1
or
failure

*to meet
the
above
criteria
shall
cause
the
property
to be
valued
pursuant
to
Section
423*



7.1 96-017 - A continued hearing for a Conditional Use Permit to allow the installation of a 158' monopole and a 10'x20' unmanned equipment shelter. Property is located on the Westside of South River Road, one mile north of the Freeport Bridge near Clarksburg in the Agricultural General (A-1) Zone. A Negative Declaration has been prepared. APN# 044-060-14 Applicant/Owner: Nextel/Smart SMR of California/Correa (M. Hamblin)

Commissioner Rodegerdts abstained from this item due to possible conflict of interest.

Mark Hamblin gave the Staff Report and included an additional Condition of Approval as follows:

- The applicant shall install mature landscaping including upper canopy trees to help visually screen the facility from the neighbors.

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

John DeHart, the applicant, said he has met with the neighbors in hopes of trying to establish alternatives sites for the monopole.

Jay Stewart, of Sacramento, who was here for another matter, asked if there were any environmental concerns that Sacramento County needed to be concerned with at this time.

Commissioner Gray indicated that a Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated for this project.

Barbara Borges, a nearby property owner, was concerned with the project due to health reasons.

Cathy Baker, a nearby property owner, was concerned with health, aesthetics, areal traffic, and lighting.

Joe Borges, a nearby property owner, submitted a petition in protest against the project.

The Public Hearing was closed at this time.

A discussion of alternatives sites took place.

Commissioner Heringer said he didn't think the applicant (Nextel) was searching hard enough for an alternative site.

Commissioner Walker questioned the applicant about the service area for the cell tower and the notification of property owners beyond the 300 feet radius.

Commissioner Stephens asked that since there is such opposition to this project, that perhaps a higher level of environmental review would have been more appropriate.

Commissioner Merewitz asked for clarification of the approval of this project by the Clarksburg Advisory Committee. It was answered by Mark Hamblin that there was not a quorum present when this was approved.

Commissioner Heringer made the motion to deny the application based on the site being inappropriate, the public not being notified by the Clarksburg Advisory Committee and the applicant, health concerns of some of the surrounding property owners, and aesthetic reasons.

Jim Curtis said a formal listing of the findings for denial were needed. Staff later submitted formal findings to the Commission for their approval and are included in the Minutes.

Commission Action:

(1) D I D N O T C E R T I F Y t h a t t h e p r o p o s e d N e g a t i v e
D e c l a r a t i o n w a s p r e p a r e d i n a c c o r d a n c e w i t h t h e
C a l i f o r n i a E n v i r o n m e n t a l Q u a l i t y A c t a n d
G u i d e l i n e s (C E Q A) ;

(2) **ADOPTED** the "FINDINGS" for DENIAL for this project as presented in the staff report AS MODIFIED;

(3) **DENIED** ~~APPROVE~~ the Conditional Use Permit subject to the conditions listed under "Conditions Of Approval" presented in the staff report.

MOTION: Heringer SECOND: Walker

AYES: Heringer, Merewitz, Lang, Gray, Walker,
 and Stephens

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Rodegerdts

ABSENT: None

FINDINGS

[Supporting evidence has been indented and italicized]

Planning Commission Policy of Siting of
Communication\Transmission Facilities

On August 3, 1993, the Yolo County Planning Commission adopted the following policies for assessing communication and transmission facilities permits. In review of the adopted policies the Yolo County Planning Commission determined the project **not** consistent with the following stated policies.

- a. The project **did not** encourage the use of monopoles (non-lattice towers) along existing transmission line rights-of-way, and the joint

use of existing structures and\or sites to minimize impacts.

The applicant proposed to install a 158' monopole and a 200 sq. ft. equipment building on a 3,600 square foot leasehold of an approximate 17.5 acre site. There are several existing wireless communication sites within 1 □ miles of the proposed Nextel site. Airtouch Cellular has a site south of the Clarksburg-Borges Airport. Airtouch also has a site across the Sacramento River near State Highway 160 and Mack Road. Sprint Spectrum has a site approximately 1 mile north of the proposed Nextel site. Another potential site noted during the public hearing exists in Sacramento County at the Sacramento Manufacturing Company. The Planning Commission determined that the applicant did not aggressively pursue the joint use of existing sites in the surrounding area.

- b. The project **did not** incorporate design elements and environmental mitigation measures that will minimize impacts and were appropriate to the context of the site for the proposed project.

The subject site is located within a designated county scenic corridor, specifically a river bank corridor area. The general environmental setting for the area is rural agricultural with scattered single family residential. The Planning Commission found that the project did not

incorporate appropriate design elements to address the scenic river bank corridor designation of the area or that would minimize impacts to the environmental setting.

c. The project was determined to not be consistent with the following siting and design guidelines by the Commission:

1. The project **did not** involve locating new facilities within existing utility\railroad rights-of-way, planned commercial\industrial zones; siting with a demonstrated sensitivity to the preservation of open space, rural\historic character, surrounding agricultural operations, landing strips and aerial traffic; and avoidance of significant habitats, or along scenic highways, waterways and prominent vistas.

The new facility did not utilize the existing PG&E power line transmission towers or the right-of-way easement. The PG&E easement is located approximately 3/4 mile south the proposed Nextel location.

The propose project was to occur in an area of historical resource significance. The site is near an ancient Indian burial mound and to the rear of a century old Portuguese meeting hall which is still used.

The proposed site location is within a county designated scenic corridor that follows along the Sacramento River.

Agriculture is an important element of open space. It was determined that locating the project at this site presented a negative visual affect to open space.

2. Require underground facilities and\or procurement of easements for future use, whenever feasible; in residential areas adequate setbacks shall be imposed with due consideration of potential impacts to health, safety, noise and aesthetics.

The property is within an agricultural designated area. The site is also located within a designated county scenic corridor area. The property is currently being farmed (corn field). Surrounding the site are agricultural operations and scattered single family residences and the Sacramento River .

County Zone Regulations

In accordance with Section 8-2.2804 of Article 27 of the Yolo County Zoning Regulations the Planning Commission (acting as the Board of Zoning Adjustment) finds:

- a. The requested use is listed as a conditional use in the zone regulations or elsewhere in this chapter;

The proposed wireless communication facility is allowed within the A-1 Zone with the approval of a conditional use permit, pursuant to Section 8-2.2405 of Article 24 of the Yolo County Zoning Regulations.

- b. The requested use is **not** essential or desirable to the public comfort and convenience;

Though wireless communications is widely used as an efficient communication device for business and personal use and is recognized by the California Public Utilities Commission as a necessary public service that provides an additional notification service for emergency communications.

The impacts that this wireless communication facility presents makes the project less than desirable to the public comfort and convenience. Alternative sites exists potentially involving co-locations. There are several existing wireless communication sites within 1 □ miles of the proposed Nextel site. Airtouch Cellular has a site south of the Clarksburg-Borges Airport. Airtouch also has a site across the Sacramento River near State Highway 160 and Mack Road. Sprint Spectrum has a site approximately 1 mile

north of the proposed Nextel site. Another potential site noted during the public hearing exists in Sacramento County at the Sacramento Manufacturing Company.

The propose project is to occur in an area of historical resource significance. The site is near an ancient Indian burial mound and to the rear of a century old Portuguese meeting hall that is still in use.

The proposed site location is within a county designated scenic corridor (river bank corridor) that follows the Sacramento River.

Agricultural is an important element of open space. It was determined that locating the project at this site presented a negative visual affect to open space.

- c. The requested use **will** impair the integrity or character of the neighborhood nor be detrimental to the public health, safety or general welfare;

The proposed project will impair the integrity and character of the designated county scenic corridor and the rural agricultural and historical setting of the area.

- d. The requested use **will not** be in conformity with the General Plan;

*The project was determined **not** to be consistent with the following applicable General Plan elements and policies: Land Use (LU-76 Compatibility/New Development); Open Space (OS-9 Scenic Areas); Conservation (CON 7 Design and Site Development Standards); and Scenic Highways (SH-9 Towers and Lines).*

- e. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, sanitation, and/or other necessary facilities will be provided.

The applicants were going to be providing all necessary infrastructure and utilities for the proposed project.

A five minute recess was taken at 10:10 a.m. and reconvened at 10:20 a.m.



The following item was taken out of sequence.

- 7.3 94-115 - A certification of the Final EIR and a request for a Conditional Use Permit, a General Plan Amendment and a Zoning Code Amendment 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 gave the Staff Report. He also requested that the Staff Report be considered in two separate parts (the adequacy of the EIR and the Use Permit).

Bob Berman, of Nichols-Berman, said the applicant has made several revisions to the project in response to concerns brought about by the public. They are reflected in the EIR. These include the construction of the bike path, sewage, drainage and the proposed Woodland General Plan.

A discussion among the Commissioners and Mr. Berman regarding Woodland's Sphere of Influence and the Urban Limit Line.

Commissioner Rodegerdts said it would be advisable for the applicant to wait until the November election to see whether the proposed site would be in Woodland's Sphere of Influence.

Director Bencomo said that Staff did make the recommendation to the applicant that they wait for Election Day.

Brian Benson, nearby property owner, asked questions regarding rainfall data.

The Public Hearing for the EIR was opened at this time.

Mike Beeman had concerns about the drainage patterns of the parcel to the West.

A discussion regarding the drainage issue resulted. The suggestion of adding a mitigation measure to the Conditions of Approval was made.

Robert Milsap, attorney for the applicant, asked whether this should be addressed in the Staff Report instead of the EIR, but added that the drainage issue is a legitimate concern.

Commissioner Lang was concerned about nearby farms not being able to spray their farms because of the close proximity to the proposed school.

Brian Benson spoke about restriction of spraying on his property because a five hundred foot buffer would be required should the project be approved.

The Public Hearing was closed.

The motion was made to certify the EIR. Commissioner Gray added that an amendment be made to the Mitigation Monitoring Plan that properly address the issue of drainage of water from the West.

Commission Action:

- (1) **CERTIFIED** the Final EIR as adequate, complete, and in compliance with CEQA for the purposes of analyzing 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.

MOTION: Merewitz SECOND: Lang
AYES: Rodegerdts, Merewitz, Heringer, Gray, Walker, Stephens, and Lang
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The entitlement portion of the project was opened.

Jack Hamlin, the administrator of the Woodland Christian School, requested a continuance to the next available Planning Commission Meeting date after the November election.

C o m m i s s i o n A c t i o n :

(2) CONTINUED the Hearing until the next available
Planning Commission Meeting.

MOTION: Heringer SECOND: Rodegerdts
AYES: Rodegerdts, Merewitz, Heringer, Gray, Walker, Stephens, and Lang
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

◆ ◆ ◆

7.2 An update of the status of the Yolo County
Habitat Plan. (M. Hamblin)

A long discussion among the Commissioners and Staff
about the schedule of upcoming meetings regarding the
Habitat Conservation Plan and the exclusion of the
Yolo County Planning Commission's participation took
place.

Director Bencomo said there has been an effort to
work in concert with the other jurisdictions.

Commission Action:

Commissioner Gray recommended that the Commission place on the November 13th Agenda, a time specific item, for the purposes of discussing any questions, concerns or comments regarding the implementation of the HCP.

◆ ◆ ◆

The Commission recessed for lunch at 12:00 p.m.

◆ ◆ ◆

THE FOLLOWING ITEM WAS TIME SET FOR 1:00 p.m.

7.4 A continuation of a public hearing to consider the Dunnigan General Plan/Specific Development Project, Final Environmental Impact Report and Zoning Changes associated with the update of the Dunnigan General Plan. (M. Luken)

Mike Luken gave the history of the meetings that led to the present. During the October 14, 1996 meeting of the Dunnigan Advisory Committee, the members voted to take all residential growth components out of the proposed plan. However, Staff suggested an alternative plan which would achieve the eventual need for housing in Dunnigan, and at the same time slowing down growth, and giving the Planning Commission and the County, an opportunity to determine whether there is a jobs-housing balance as

the Plan develops. For every 80 new employees expected to be generated from new commercial or industrial development, 50 units (up to 200) may be approved.

Bob Berman, of Nichols-Berman, agreed that the EIR meets all the guidelines of CEQA.

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

Steve Thinglum, representing Lakemont Homes, said the housing component must be in place. If commercial development does occur, where will the employees live?

Suellen Coast, resident of Dunnigan, said she was in favor of the proposed development because it will bring much needed services such as schools, police and fire protection.

Willard Ingraham, resident of Dunnigan, said he does not want a "bedroom" community. He would like to see the commercial phase of the project first.

Patrick MacAvery, resident of Dunnigan, said the jobs-housing balance analysis is pure fiction.

Shirley Gooch, a member of the Dunnigan Advisory Committee, said that people earning minimum wage would not be able to afford the new homes.

Don Peart was concerned about the wells and water issues.

Gary Shaad spoke about what the groundwater conditions would be like if development were to occur where proposed. The groundwater could go dry.

Commissioner Gray asked for Mr. Shaad's opinion about Dunnigan Park (commercial part of plan). Mr. Shaad said he did not think it was credible.

Commissioner Rodegerdts asked for comments from the citizens of the community present regarding whether they wanted a decision from the Commission at this time or if they want it to revert back for discussion by the Dunnigan Advisory Committee.

Commissioner Stephens said in the original plan, the houses were not tied to the creation of new jobs (commercial/industrial component). Will the citizens of Dunnigan find the 200 houses more acceptable now?

Marlene Shaad, resident of Dunnigan, said she would like to see the area developed with agriculturally oriented industries.

Eric Linse, resident of Dunnigan, said he believes that people working in highway services would not be able to afford the new homes.

Mike Luken explained the different expansion plans. He then addressed concerns brought up during the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Rodegerdts said he was not prepared to vote for a plan which has a residential component.

Commissioner Lang said he would like to send the proposal back to the Community.

Commissioner Merewitz said he would also like to see the Community vote on the plan and come back with more suggestions.

Commissioner Stephens said it seemed that the issue of the jobs being tied to the housing issue had been addressed. However, she also suggested that the developers state specifically to the Community what public services they would pay and how much money would be required from the residents.

Commissioner Heringer said it was Dunnigan's General Plan and the people of Dunnigan should decide on it.

Commissioner Walker said his primary concern was with water availability and quality.

Commission Gray agreed that it was Dunnigan's plan, but also suggested that the Community return to the Planning Commission with a plan within a specified time period.

Commission Action:

That the Dunnigan General Plan and the Development Projects be reconsidered, amended, eliminated, etc. and that the Dunnigan Advisory Committee return to the Planning Commission within 30 days with a specific time frame so it may be placed on a Planning Commission Agenda.

MOTION: Rodegerdts SECOND: Merewitz

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None



7. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

A report by the Director on the recent Board of Supervisor's meetings or 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.

John Bencomo updated the Commission on the following:

- 1) Scheduling of upcoming Planning Commission Meetings.
- 2) The Groundwater Ordinance will be heard by the Board of Supervisors on November 5, 1996.
- 3) Odor problems from industries in the County.



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 of the charge of the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission.
- 2) Commissioner Merewitz visited gravel sites.
- 3) Commissioner Lang discussed the scheduling of Planning Commission Meetings during the winter months.
- 4) Commissioners Rodegerdts and Stephens attended the Dunnigan Advisory Committee meeting on October 14, 1996.



9 . ADJOURNMENT

The Regular Meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission was adjourned at 3:35 p.m. The next meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission is scheduled November 13 and 14, 1996 at 8:30 a.m. in the Planning Commission Chamber. 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,

John Bencomo, Interim Director
Yolo County Community Development Agency

LAC