

MINUTES

YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

August 12, 1998

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Walker, Woo, Stephens, Heringer, Lang, and Rodegerdts
MEMBERS ABSENT: None
STAFF PRESENT: John Bencomo, Assistant Director
David Flores, Senior Planner
Mark Hamblin, Associate Planner
Steven Basha, County Counsel

◆ ◆ ◆

2. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES FOR THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Commission Action

The Minutes of the July 1, 1998 meeting were approved with no corrections.

MOTION: Woo SECOND: Walker
AYES: Walker, Woo, Stephens, Heringer, Lang, and Rodegerdts
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: 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 Heringer acknowledged receipt of all correspondence sent with the packet and distributed 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.

Item 5.3 was removed and placed on the Regular Agenda.

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



5.1 **98-020** - A follow up report on the Planning Commission's direction regarding a survey of the Madison Market, which is on the County's Historic Resources Inventory, prior to its demolition. (M. Hamblin)

Commission Action

Directed Staff to update at the next meeting.

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



5.2 **97-072** - A continuation of a request for a Conditional Use Permit for an elderly unit on a 24 acre property already occupied by another dwelling unit. The property is located at 23705 County Road 96, northwest of Davis in the Agricultural Preserve zone. A Categorical Exemption has been prepared. **Staff will be requesting a continuance of this item to an undetermined date.** APN: 040-170-04. Applicant/Owner: Roberto Cardenas (D. Flores)

Commission Action

- (1) **CONTINUED** the project to a time uncertain to allow staff sufficient time to work with the applicant in determining the appropriate direction in addressing the applicant's revised request for additional housing on the property.

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



- 5.4 **95-093** - Consideration to establish new Financial Assurances for Subphase B of Phase 2 for the Solano Concrete Long-Term, Off-Channel Mining Operation, to ensure reclamation of 25 acres to row crop agriculture. The subject property is located south of Cache Creek, between Interstate 505 and County Road 92D, northeast of the Town of Madison in the General Agriculture/Sand and Gravel (A-1/S-G) zone. A Categorical Exemption has been prepared. APN: 049-070-13. Applicant: Solano Concrete (D. Morrison).

Commission Action

- (1) **CERTIFIED** that the proposed Categorical Exemption (see Exhibit 1) was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and Guidelines (CEQA);
- (2) **ESTABLISHED** financial assurances in the amount of \$207,690 for the Solano Concrete reclamation plan regarding the second subphase of Phase 2 for the long-term, off-channel mining site (ZF# 95-093), to ensure the reclamation of approximately 25 acres to row crop agriculture.

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



6. REGULAR AGENDA

The following item was taken off the Consent Agenda, and placed on the Regular Agenda:

- 5.3 **95-095(G-4)** - A modification to existing Financial Assurances for the Teichert Aggregates- Woodland surface mining operation to release approximately 50 acres of In-Channel land as having been reclaimed. The property is located

within and south of Cache Creek, between County Roads 94B and 96, northwest of Woodland. A Categorical Exemption has been prepared. APNs: 025-350-18, 19, and 20. Applicant/Owner: Teichert Aggregates (D. Morrison)

Commission Action

- (1) **CERTIFIED** that the proposed Categorical Exemption (see Exhibit 1) was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and Guidelines (CEQA);
- (2) **DETERMINED** that reclamation of approximately 50 acres of in-stream land associated with the Woodland aggregate processing plant has been completed (see Exhibit 2). The existing \$85,000 in financial assurances will remain in place for the off-channel processing plant and conveyor crossing.

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



- 6.1 **98-028** - A request for a Tentative Parcel Map to allow division of a 167 acre parcel into 20 and 147 acre parcels. Subject property is located on Howald Drive, between County Road 100B and 102 near Woodland in the Agricultural Preserve (A-P) zone. APN: 027-220-01. Owner/Applicant: Rudy and Faye Howald/Richard Hoppin (D. Flores)

Verbatim Notes

Chairman Heringer read the above 6.1 agenda item description.

David Flores, Staff Member:

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, Good Morning. As indicated the applicant is requesting to divide a 167 acre parcel into two separate parcels, consisting of a 20 acre and 147 acre parcels.

Their desire to split the parcels to allow their son to own the residence by fee title. This will allow for either parcel to be financed separately, if needed. The applicants further stated that if the parcel map is approved, that both parcels will continue to be farmed as one unit. The applicant has also indicated that part of their application, their willingness to establish a condition that no additional residence be constructed on either parcel. As indicated in the Staff Report, it's Staff's position that the proposed division does not conform with the Yolo County General Plan. Staff, during the early stages, discouraged the applicant with proceeding with the application because of the nature of the request. The parcels to be created are strictly for the purpose of creating a home site in an agricultural setting, and the 20 acre parcel is not an appropriate size to be considered a sustainable, viable farming unit. In addition, the creation of the 20 acre parcel is inconsistent with the minimum parcels as were established under the Blue Ribbon Committee, back in 1992.

As indicated by the applicants, they have farmed this parcel for the last 30 years in various row crops. They have also leased properties, approximately 2,700 acres throughout Yolo and Sutter Counties. The issue of splitting the agricultural land for the purpose of establishing a family estate planning has been ongoing, as many of the commissioners are aware. This issue has been discussed numerous times before the Commission and also previous Commissions. As indicated in 1990, during the initial hearings of the Blue Ribbon Committee, many farmers came forward speaking to the issue of establishing family estates as part of their family estate planning, creating smaller parcels for their children in keeping the family at home, and the Planning Commission and also the Board of Supervisors took this into consideration. At the Board, although there was much discussion regarding this issue, the Board went ahead and adopted the minimum acreages which are now 80 acres if it's cultivated and irrigated, 160 acres if it's cultivated and non-irrigated, and 320 acres for ranch land. And, so, at this point, Staff as part of our report under our Findings, also our General Plan policies as they are now established, recommends that this application be denied, as stated in the Staff Report. Are there any questions that Staff can answer at this time?

Harry Walker: For clarification, apparently there is one existing residential unit on the proposed 20 acre piece at this time. Dave Flores: That's correct. Harry: Thank you.

Henry Rodegerdts: No comment.

Chairman Heringer: We close the Staff Report and open the Public Hearing. Are there people here that speak for this? Your name please:

My name is Dick Hoppin. I'm here on behalf of the applicant. I would like to indicate to the Commission that it is our position that this application is not in opposition to the General Plan, and is not opposed to the policy of the County to maintain and preserve agricultural land. In fact, if you do what we ask you to do, you are going to, in fact, improve your position in regards to preserving agricultural land. I think that you have to understand, in this particular situation, it has to be analyzed as these facts exist. Now there have been other people, I have been here before, wanting to split ag. land. This is a different situation because we are not going to do anything that is not already done. What you have here right now is 147 acres with a house on it, and shop buildings. If you grant what we want you to grant, you're going to end up with 147 acres, divided in two parcels, with a house and shop buildings. You're going to have exactly the same thing, after you start, than you did before you started. We're not asking to go and build a home. We already asked to build a home in 1982. We filed an application, and you people approved it. We have one house on this piece of property and we're entitled to that and that's all we're asking for. The difference between this case and most of the cases you come across is we are agreeing to restrict, not the parcel with the 20 acres, and not the parcel remaining, which is 127, we are agreeing to restrict both parcels to any future residential development. That means that no future Planning Commission that thinks differently than you do, or no policy changes by the Board of Supervisors, can alter that situation. If you deny this petition, we wait six months, six years, we might have a different Commission, we might have different policies, in which case then we maybe can

do it. If you agree what we are agreeing to, we're stuck with it, and you're going to end up with something that is not at all different than you have right now. If you look at the purpose of a Planning Commission, the purpose of a Planning Commission, as I see it, is to do two things: One is to make plans to develop a General Plan and to make plans. The other proposition for a

Planning Commission, seems to me, is to grant variances, use permits, lot splits, all the things that are provided in the Code. This situation we're before you, was anticipated, the Blue Ribbon Commission, that established this, has established that the minimum lot size is 20 acres. They didn't say 20 acres is a minimum lot size on special provisions, it they didn't anticipate it was going to be used, so that is before you. I agree the Staff has recommend you don't do it, they didn't say you can't do it, they just say, don't do it. My feeling would be, and I don't understand why you wouldn't frankly, because you're going to end up better off afterwards than you are before. If you look at the blue Ribbon Commission Report, they say the minimum size requirements if the owner demonstrates annually that, except for a home site no larger than a single acre, the remainder of the acreages is being used for commercial production or agricultural products, or is planted with bearing or maturing fruit or nut trees, vines, or other perennial or agricultural crops, or is used partly for the storage of commodities obtained from owners leased or land elsewhere, for equipment used, the farm owners, owner, or leased elsewhere. In no case, shall these excepted parcels fall below 20 acres in size for irrigated land and 40 acres for non-irrigated land. What they're saying to you is, if you want to it, if you want to do these things, don't do it for less than 20 acres, if it's irrigated. This ground is irrigated, it's Class 1 soil, we could go out there and plant grapes on that 20 acres and have an economical unit. We could have an economic viable unit for 20 acres of grapes if we planted it on there. That's not the issue, it seems to me. The issue is are we violating the policy of the County regarding lot splits. The answer is obviously no. We have it already done, we're there. They're saying, and you read the Staff Report, and they are concerned about the Swainson Hawk, they are concerned about the environmental impact, the Swainson Hawk, if it's there, it's there, if it isn't, it isn't, we have a house there. We're not going to go put a house there. If there's an environmental problem, it's there already. All we're trying to do before you today is conform our factual situation to your requirements in the zoning ordinance. Most of the situations you get before you are ones where someone comes in and says, we want to build, we want to build a house, and I dare say that very few of them, if any, come and say we will restrict both the parcel that we're building on and the attached parcel from future residential development. That's what we're doing, that's why, in light of fact that the Staff is not recommending this, we are pursuing it, because frankly we think it makes sense for you to do this because you're so much better off, because we can't do anything else ever after that. For example, they're saying that the property's surrounded by active agricultural use on four sides, agreed, and would conflict with agricultural operations, aerial or ground spring adjacent properties, early morning evening farming activities. My goodness, these people have lived there since 1982, they farm it themselves, that is not going to change if you grant this. The same thing is true with, a, by approving this application would be inconsistent with the General Plan Policy, which states the County vigorously conserve and protect agricultural lands and not establish rural home sites. You've already got a rural home site, we're not establishing one, you've got one, and you are also saying here that you want to vigorously conserve and protect agricultural land. I couldn't agree more. That's what we're doing, we're saying we are not going to want

any circumstance change the situation as it exists now. You start out with the Staff Report and I want to point out to you on Page 2 at the very top, it says the approval of this map to create a home site for a family, says to create a home site for a family. We are not creating a home site for a family, we've already got a home site for a family. OK. Each one of these requests, and I know what you're concerned about, you're concerned that if we give this to the Howald's, then the Jones' and the Smith's and everybody else are going to come in and want to do the same thing. The trouble is, and the facts are, that the Jones' and the Smith's don't have this factual situation that we have. I understand it's there you shouldn't do lot splits, but when the practical result of doing the lot split doesn't change one thing, and actually preserves the agricultural

environment, then I think that's the reason you have permits available, use permits, conditional permits, lot splits, that's the reason you people are in business, because it's not changing anything and that's why you should use your discretion to carry out what in fact you're obligated to do.

Chairman Heringer: Mr. Hoppin, you are repeating what you said previously, please get to the point. Mr. Hoppin: I'm sorry, OK. The report indicates that the adjacent lands are subject to spraying and that the family members will inhale the chemicals from the spraying. That's in Item F. That's why they don't want to do it. That's again, every one one of these, every one of these objections they have doesn't apply because that's why the situation, if you deny it, if you deny this application, they're going to still stay there, legally. One other thing I would like to indicate to the Commission, that we are not taking any land out of production. That's one of the major objections to the lot split that we're not taking, and if you want us to, we will fence the 20 acres off. I don't think that makes sense and we don't want to, but if you want us to, we will do it. I don't know if you want to just make it an economical unit, we could do it by planting grapes to it, if you require us to do that, we haven't discussed it, but I don't think, that's not going to change anything anyway, but if you required that, I would discuss that with my clients. I have, I have no other comments and I'm willing to answer any questions you might have in regard to this situation..

Chairman Heringer: Clarification, Mr. Hoppin: Sure, Chairman Heringer: Why do you want to split it in the first place? Mr. Hoppin: Because they have five, they have a number of children, and this is all on one piece of property, and for estate planning purposes we want to do it, and for financing purposes we want to do it, and it makes sense that because of the value of the property, of the location of the property, and the size of the property, it doesn't make sense to have undivided interests in all those people, and he's already spent the money on the home. We put the cart before the horse. He spent the money to construct this home on what it amounts to is his parent's property, and so what do we do now? Chairman Heringer: And it's the only home there? Mr. Hoppin: It's the only home there, it's the only home that will ever be there, exactly, and so that's why we want to do it, so that we can work out a situation where he ends up owning property that his home's on that he paid for. Chairman Heringer: Any other questions? Henry Rodegerdts: I do have one. Mr. Hoppin, are all the current structural improvements on the proposed Parcel One? Mr. Hoppin: No, No, there's a house that's on Parcel One, then on Parcel Two it's a shop buildings. That's the reason we did it the

way we did it. You see this little jog there. Henry Rodegerdts: Yes, Mr. Hoppin: That's to include the shop buildings on the larger parcel, and just put the, just the residence on the small parcel. Henry Rodegerdts: It's my understanding that your clients are prepared to agree, as a condition of approval of this lot split, that there will be no additional residences built on either the proposed Parcel One, or the Proposed Parcel Two? Mr. Hoppin: That's true. John Bencomo: My Chairman, if I may interject, just a Point of Clarification: The gentleman cited a provision of our regulations that discuss a 20 acre and 40 acre minimum, and I think that the interpretation was accurate, however the prefacing language to that section also makes it very clear that it for the purpose of preexisting parcels, not for the splitting or establishment of new parcels, so in a case, as an example, it there were two parcels that were already in existence and one might have been 100 acres and one 60 acres, then we wanted to, the Commission was desirous of reducing one of those parcels to 20 acre minimum, and it met that criteria, that would be fully within your purview, however in this case, it is the establishment or the creation of the whole new parcel, so that particular provision does not apply. Mr. Hoppin: Well, I disagree, but you and I disagree. I think they could do this if they wanted to. Do you agree they

could do this if they wanted? Chairman Heringer: What section is that, John, do you know off hand the number? John Bencomo: No I can find it though, that's up to the Commission to decide. Mr. Hoppin: That's what I mean, if they want to do this, they can do it, it's not illegal for them to do this.

John Bencomo: My only purpose was to cite the whole section of the Code. Chairman Heringer: Any other questions? Betty Woo: I guess our Council isn't here so I'll ask John. If there was a no build put on it, is there any way that could be changed? If hypothetically it was approved with no build on both parcels? John Bencomo: As was stated by the gentleman, that in a subsequent Planning Commission, Body could remove that such a condition. Betty Woo: So, even if we agreed to put it on, like he said, who knows next year, another Commission might be here that might change it. John Bencomo: Yes Chairman Heringer: Harry? Harry Walker: I have no questions. Chairman Heringer: I'm still really confused about this, to have a number of children for estate planning to cut off 20 acres and they're going to give it to one child. Mr. Hoppin: Yes, we're going to give this 20 acres to the one child who built the home.

Chairman Heringer: What happens to the others, are they going to get 20 acres too? Mr. Hoppin: We're going to work out, we're going to work it out so that it comes out equitably among the other siblings so that everybody, well, see, he's paid for this, so the only difference is there actually is the agricultural part of the land part of it. So, so the other children are going to get equal value of other assets in other places to equalize out. But the real purpose here is he's already paid the money for the house. Chairman Heringer: Don't get me wrong, I approve of estate planning, I think it's a wise thing to do. Mr. Hoppin: Thank you, and we're just trying to work this out and stay within the guidelines. Harry Walker: Mr. Chairman, there are some other agricultural properties involved, and I'm sure that this is not the only division of where the estate planning is coming into play, there will be other actions beyond this, so, the other four kids are not going to left out in the cold. Chairman Heringer: Do you have any questions? Henry Rodegerdts: I have a question of John, I don't know whether Dick has to remain up there, but, Chairman Heringer: Go ahead Henry: John, if we were to approve this split, with a future no build restriction on both parcels, what's to prevent a subsequent Planning Commission 15 years from now in deciding that that wasn't such a good idea and will let

them build a residence on Parcel Two? John Bencomo: As I indicated, there's nothing to preclude that and, in fact, it has been done. Mr. Hoppin: Just like, if you don't do it we could go and see that same Planning Commission and they'd let us do it anyway. Chairman Heringer: Any other questions? Mr. Hoppin, please make yourself available, but please sit down. Mr. Hoppin: Thank you. Chairman Heringer: Are there any other people, persons to speak for this project? Faye Howald: I'm Faye Howald, the mother of the son that built the house on my property, and for a wedding present he asked to have the one acres his house set on. We were slow in getting that job done, we wanted to give him one acre, then we wanted to give him five acres and we were told it could not be done, so we applied for the twenty, and if you don't approve this, my only question would be: why have you done it to my neighbors around the corner, why have you split off five acres for them, three acres for another farmer right around the corner out of 20 acres, so we just want to give our son the ground his house sets on, and you don't have to worry about the other kids, I'll do something for them. Than you.

Chairman Heringer: Just a moment Faye. You struck a very big nerve, precedent setting is what we try to avoid, we try to be even handed in our actions and we do take each circumstance, the circumstances involved in each project under consideration, and that's the reason for that, and you are getting the same consideration, what falls out of this is what will fall out of it. Faye Howald: Thank you. Chairman Heringer: Any other persons speaking for this?

Any oppositions? Any other questions to the spokespeople? If not we'll close the Public Hearing. Chairman Heringer: What do we have here? Who wants to comment? Meredith Stephens: Mr. Hoppin, unfortunately, many of the requests that we get here are not to build

houses on parcel splits, they're to get parcel splits, and we hear the same thing over and over again. We're willing to do no builds, we don't want to change farming, we just want a house site or we want to do some estate planning and living on a farm myself and having children, I understand the need for estate planning, but that is not the purpose of this Commission. We are specifically prohibited from doing estate planning under the Blue Ribbon Act, and I do not see how this will in any way benefit agriculture. The whole history of conversion of ag. land in California is chipping away with smaller parcels, so I am opposed. Chairman Heringer: Kent,

Kent Walker: All that I see with it is that every parcel of farm ground we have we could split off a 20 acres for estate planning, and whether it has a home or not a home, that's what I would give into. It's also on an A-P Preserve, they're taking the Williamson Act on it and make it ag. ground. Going into it, before they put the home in, they knew we'd probably have problems with it, and the Blue Ribbon Committee worked quite diligently coming up with 80 acres, not 20, but 80 acres. I think I have to go long with the Blue Ribbon Committee that 80 acres is acceptable.

Chairman Heringer: Betty?, Betty Woo: I think I have to disagree a little bit with Dick when he said that our job is to make plans and to give variances and that sort of thing, and do lot splits, I think we see our job as a little bit more beyond that in that we are trying to preserve the ag. land and we are trying to do something here besides just the legal splits and that sort of thing, and I don't see anything that's going to benefit ag. land in this split, in fact, if Faye's son decides to sell that 20 acres down the line, we don't know that it's ever going to be in the future connected with the farming land, it might be some gentleman from the city who just likes to have 20 acres around him, doesn't want the spraying around him, there's nothing that we would be doing that would be ensuring that this is going to stay

in ag. land or not. I'm opposed. Chairman Heringer: Harry? Harry Walker: Well, I appreciate the opportunity to express my thoughts. I'm in disagreement with the colleagues I've heard of so far, and these kinds of questions always bother me because foremost in my mind, and even though I admire the Blue Ribbon Committee, and I understand the goals of the Supervisors in maintaining the viability of agriculture, even they jump the traces occasionally and make some exceptions which make no sense to me, but this is about individual rights for me as it's superior position to planning. You've been assured repeatedly that the acreage involved is not going to change, it's not going to come out of agriculture and they've agreed to pride this and written statements to this effect. As far as what some Planning Commission in the future could do, I'm not at all certain it would be wise for us to try to say to anyone that forever this is its use. You look at the planned population in California by 2030, it's supposed to double, and there's no doubt in mind that this parcel of this property up north of town some day is probably going to be residential, whether we like it or not. I won't be here to see that, but nonetheless, and so to try to tie the hands of owners, I think it entirely unwise and unjust. So I have no problem at all with the request. I think its been well thought out and Mr. Hoppin has done his homework well, he usually does, from my observation of him in these kinds of situations. A little repetitive at times, Richard, but anyway, I'm supportive of the request.

Chairman Heringer: Henry? Henry Rodegerdts: These decisions are always very difficult when personalities are involved, we're just looking at these rules and regulations and policies and the abstract, it's easy to promulgate how it's going to be, then our friends get in between the policy and the decision. Later on in this agenda we're going to consider an 8 unit development on the outskirts of Clarksburg, and one of the letters opposing that development without some added conditions is before each of the Commissioners this morning. The letter is written by Mr. Gregory Merwin, a farmer in the Clarksburg area, and one of the points he makes in the letter is as follows: We are located in probably the most enlightened county in the Central Valley when it comes to development and growth. What is happening all around us is one of the major tragedies of our time, but Yolo County has for the most part stayed off the bandwagon. And of

course he's talking about the stated goal which remains foremost in this county to preserve its agricultural lands and its agricultural economy. To date, we have not marched in line with so many of the other counties in the Central Valley. I'm sure, Harry, that if trends continue you're absolutely right, this land will be swallowed up in residential development or some similar use, maybe even in the lifetimes of some of the Planning Commissioners here, but that does not mean that just because this might happen if this property were located in another county, that it need necessarily happen in Yolo County. Agribusiness tourism report that the Board of Supervisors approved several years ago has a very interesting statement in it, something to the effect that at least then, and I think today so far, it is the goal and maybe even possible that Yolo County will remain an agricultural oasis in an urban desert. As Commissioner Stephens has said, we chip away at this. You know, one parcel split at a time. I call it the balkinization of Yolo County. I have no further comments. Chairman Heringer: Thank you. My position is that I agree with Harry in his analysis, we shouldn't try to control our destiny from the grave. Other people in the future should have the opportunity and the circumstances involved to make decisions that are right for that time. Estate planning is essential, and even though the Blue Ribbon Committee might have mentioned that they weren't concerned with estate planning, I think it is vital in our discussions to look at estate planning. Each one of us

has a family. I come from a rather large family and we had much difficulty, much difficulty, and I don't like to tie the hands of private property owners to do the things that they want to do. It's guaranteed by the constitution that that is a just and legal way to do things. Private property is sacred, so I agree with Harry on this analysis of this.

The Chair will entertain a motion to either deny or accept this petition. Harry Walker: Mr. Chairman, by being bashful as I am I will go for the recommended actions, adopt the findings for approval without balkinization, as presented in the report, without going through all those I guess my motion is to approve the request for a tentative parcel map split. Chairman Heringer: Is there a second to that motion? Heringer: I will second it. Chairman Heringer: All those in favor, is there any discussion? All those in favor, signify by saying Aye. 4-2. We'll move on to Item. Thank you for coming this morning.

The motion was made to approve this item.

MOTION: Walker SECOND: Heringer
AYES: Walker, Heringer
NOES: Rodegerdts, Stephens, Woo, Lang
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion did not pass; therefore this subsequent motion was made.

Commission Action

- (1) **ADOPTED** the Findings for Denial of this project as presented in the staff report;
- (2) **FOUND** that the proposed project is not consistent with the Yolo County General Plan land Use and Open Space Policies as described in this staff report;
- (3) **DENIED** the request for a Tentative Parcel Map creating a 20 acre and 147 acre

parcel from an existing 167 acre parcel for the purpose of creating a separate homesite for a family member;

- (4) **CERTIFIED** staff's determination of a Statutory Exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for Denial of Projects as the appropriate level of environmental review for this project.

MOTION: Rodegerdts SECOND: Stephens
AYES: Rodegerdts, Stephens, Woo, Lang
NOES: Walker, Heringer
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

FINDINGS

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

In accordance with California Government Code Section 66474 (Subdivision Map Act) the Planning Commission finds that:

- (a) That the proposed map is not consistent with the applicable general and specific plans as specified in Section 65451.

The proposed map is inconsistent with Land Use Policies 6, 14, 20 and Open Space Policy 4 of the Yolo County General Plan which prohibits the division of agricultural lands solely for the purpose of creating a homesite.

- (b) That the design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans.

The design of the proposed map is inconsistent with Land Use Policies 6, 14, 20 and Open Space Policy 4 of the Yolo County General Plan prohibiting the division of agricultural lands solely for the purpose of creating a homesite.

- (c) That the site is not physically suitable for the type of development.

The property is surrounded by active agricultural usage on four sides, and would be conflict with agricultural operations (aerial or ground spraying of adjacent properties, early morning-evening farming activities, etc..).

- (d) That the site is not physically suitable for the proposed density of development.

The property is surrounded by agricultural farming activities. By approving this application would be inconsistent with the County's General Plan Policies which states that the County shall vigorously conserve and protect agricultural lands, and not establish rural homesites in the County.

- (e) That the design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements are likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably insure fish or wildlife or their habitat.

Staff believes that this proposal may cause substantial environmental detriment as this area of the County is within the Swainson Hawk habitat areas, and removal of this property as a productive agricultural unit would affect the foraging potential for the hawk.

- (f) That the design of the subdivision or type of improvements is likely to cause serious health problems.

As indicated earlier, with the spraying application to the adjacent parcels (which are in agricultural usage), the mist or over spraying could affect the property owners and their family members with inhaling these chemicals.

- (g) That the design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of, property within the proposed division. In this connection, the governing body may approve the map if it finds that alternate easements, for access or for use, will be provided, and that these will be substantially equivalent to ones previously acquired by the public. This subsection shall apply only to those easements of record or to easements established by judgement of the court of competent jurisdiction and no authority is hereby granted to a legislative body to determine that the public at large has acquired easements for access through or use of the property within the proposed subdivision.

The proposal will not conflict with existing easements dedications currently in place.



- 6.2 **98-012** - A request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a secondary school for grades K-8 on church property. Grace Valley. Subject property is located at 27173 County Road 98, southeast of the intersection of County Road 98 and County Road 32, Russell Blvd west of Davis in the Agricultural General (A-1) zone. A Negative Declaration has been prepared for this item. APN: 036-160-08. Applicant/Owner: Robert Black/Grace Valley Christian Center (D. Flores)

Commission Action

MITIGATION MEASURES

THE ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE CUMULATIVE AND/OR PROJECT SPECIFIC IMPACTS CULMINATING FROM THE POTENTIAL LAND USE DISCUSSED IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT ARE AS FOLLOVED IN THIS REPORT AND MADE A PART OF THE APPROVAL PROCESS OF THIS PROJECT.

AS SUCH, ANY MODIFICATION TO THE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL OR MITIGATION MEASURES CAN ONLY BE MADE IF: (1) IT DOES NOT REDUCE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THIS CONDITION AS AN ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION MEASURE, OR (2) A NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT IS PREPARED TO REFLECT THE CHANGED PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND/OR CONDITIONS.

Compliance Conformance

4. In order to comply with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, a detailed monitoring program must be developed by the applicant for all required mitigation conditions. The monitoring program should include the following:
 - a. Specific criteria to measure the effectiveness of the mitigation;
 - b. Annual monitoring of mitigation measure for a minimum of five years and report submitted to the Planning and Public Works Department for review;
 - c. Annual monitoring report (submitted to the Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department), which include corrective recommendations that shall be implemented in order to ensure the mitigation efforts are successful.
5. A bicycle lane shall be provided along the eastern edge of CR 98 in the right-of-way between CR 32 and the **primary driveway access of the church property** ~~northern property line of the church~~. This includes paving the lane to the satisfaction of the County Public Works Division and installing a barrier **(i.e., A barrier may be made up of any delineating or traffic channelizing structure that provides an added measure for pedestrian/bicyclist safety)** between the bike lane and vehicular traffic along the east side of CR 98. Alternatively, ~~b~~Bicyclists **may** ~~shall~~ be accommodated on church property by providing a path between the northern property line of the church property and the school building, as necessary. The path should be constructed with an all-weather surface suitable for bicycling.
6. Planning & Public Works staff will inspect the bicycle lane and barriers **proposed design** for compliance with Public Works standards and **insure that a good faith effort has been accomplished by applicants in the furtherance of the required construction. Additionally, the applicants will ban all student bicycling until such time that the required improvements are completed.** ~~prior to the opening day of school. The Planning and Public Works Department will review maintenance of the bicycle lane on a yearly basis, and will report to the Dept. Director.~~
7. Administrators of the church school should monitor the type of transportation used by its students and submit a yearly report to the Planning and Public Works Department. If

conditions warrant, a crossing guard will be required at the intersection of CR 98 and 32 between the relevant morning/afternoon rush hours of 7:30 and 9:00 AM whenever school is in session, including summer school.

8. The proposed project is a conditional use in the A-1 zone. Any mitigations that the Planning Commission considers appropriate for this project will be incorporated into the Conditional Use Permit as conditions of approval. If they are not implemented, ~~or if future monitoring demonstrates that maintenance is inadequate,~~ the project will be referred to the Planning Commission for failure to comply with the conditions of approval, which could lead to amendment or revocation of the Conditional Use Permit.

[ADDED AT THE PUBLIC HEARING]

9. That the subject school's expansion of operation shall have a maximum student population of 200, unless an amendment to this conditional use permit has been reviewed and approved by the appropriate decision making body.
10. That a certified landscape plan be submitted for review and approval, that addresses the potential aesthetic and noise impacts to the adjacent property owned by Mr. Flemming, as identified within the public hearing. Said landscape plan shall be implemented within six months from the effective date of this approval.

FINDINGS

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

California Environmental Quality Act & Guidelines (CEQA)

Mitigated Negative Declaration

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

The Mitigated Negative Declaration has identified all significant effects produced by the project and analyzed them objectively. Mitigation measures have been established for some of the effects, and others have been addressed through the normal "Conditions of Approval" section of the staff report.

Conditional Use Permit

In accordance with Section 8-2.2804 of Chapter 2, Title 8, the Planning Commission finds the following:

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

"Buildings and structures, educational, religious" is a conditional use within the A-1 Zone subject to the approval of the Planning Commission [Section 8-2.604.

(a). Chapter 2, Title 8].

(b) The requested use is essential or desirable to the public comfort and convenience;

The Christian school\church facility to be located on County Road 98 is desirable for a facility of this type to be located in an area accessible to the community of Davis and unincorporated residents of Yolo County. The facilities are necessary to meet the future growth of the surrounding community.

(c) The requested use will not impair the integrity or character of the neighborhood and be detrimental to the public health, safety, or general welfare;

The 21 acre subject property is surrounded by agricultural operations that are in production to the south, east and west and housing subdivisions to the north of this property. Scattered single family farm residences exist throughout the area.

As conditioned, the approval of the church\school facilities are not likely to cause serious public health problems based on Mitigation conditions which have been established and addressed in the staff report.

(d) The requested use will be in conformity with the General Plan;

Under the Recreational Policies (REC 4), the General Plan indicates that the County shall cooperate in the attainment of general educational and

recreational objectives for the children of Yolo County. This request complies with the provisions to meet the educational needs of the County.

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

Comments received on the project from responsible agencies during the public review process identify potential concerns and mitigations for issues regarding emergency services and student safety along the County Roadway. The implementation of the requirements established for the project by the agencies should adequately address this concern.

◆ ◆ ◆

6.3 A Public Hearing to solicit public comments and to discuss the County's participation in the 1998-99 Economic Development Allocation of the Small Cities Community Development Block Grant Program. CDBG Economic Development Allocation funds may be used for business/development activities (M. Drack)

Commission Action

The Public Hearing was held, no other action was required.

◆ ◆ ◆

- 6.4 **98-008** - A request for a Conditional Use Permit to legalize the expansion of an existing residential care facility for the adult mentally disabled on a .5 acre parcel. Subject property is located at 16730 County Road 87 in Esparto in the Commercial/Mixed Use/Planned Development (C-2/PD) zone. A Negative Declaration has been prepared for this item. APN: 049-240-07. Applicant/Owner: Marlene Hart/Rosella Fugate/Orchard View Board and Care Guest Home (D. Flores)

Commission Action

- (1) **CERTIFIED** the Negative Declaration as the appropriate level of environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines;
- (2) **ADOPTED** the Findings for this project as presented in the staff report; and,
- (3) **APPROVED** the project subject to the “Conditions of Approval” as presented in the staff report.

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

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

- 1. Applicant shall provide one parking space for each four beds, in accordance with the County’s Zoning Ordinance. Handicap parking space requirements shall be in accordance with the Uniform Building Code.

Yolo County Environmental Health Department

- 2. The existing water and septic system shall be reviewed for adequate capacity for the additional patients for the facility.

Yolo County Building Division

- 3. Recently constructed buildings on the property shall conform with the Uniform Building Codes as related to care facilities.

Esparto Fire District

- 4. The applicant shall install a full NFPA 13 sprinkler system in accordance with the Uniform Fire Code, and Esparto Fire District requirements.
- 5. The property owner shall comply with the requirements of the Esparto Fire District to

ensure emergency access to the care facility is adequate.

State Board of Social Services

6. The applicant shall secure the necessary revisions to their State license for the additional eight patients and reflect age group of clientele. The Esparto Fire District shall also approve the State license for compliance.

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 cooperate fully in the defense. If the County fails to promptly notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding, or if the County fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify, or hold the County harmless as to that action. The County may require that the applicant post a bond in an amount determined to be sufficient to satisfy the above indemnification and defense obligation.

FINDINGS

[Supporting evidence has been indented and italicized]

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:

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.

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 applicant's request is to have greater than six clients (14) at their existing residential care facility. The facility is within the C-2 Zone. This particular request is not a specifically identified use in the C-2 Zone. However, the use is one that has a similar relationship to the uses set forth in Section 8-2.1304 (p) of Article 6 of the Yolo County Zoning Regulations.

Section 8-2.1304 (p) permits "Foster homes, nursery schools, and day care centers" subject to the approval of a conditional use permit.

- b. The requested use is essential or desirable to the public comfort and convenience;

This an appropriate location for an care facility (i.e. proximity and accessibility to medical services and emergency medical services, public transportation, etc.) The ability of the County Planning Department to monitor these types of facilities is limited, since they are not publicly reviewed until such time when an owner of a facility chooses to exceed the six clients. However, the request is for a commercial use (commercial residential care facility) within an area designated, in this case, for commercial uses by the General Plan.

- c. The requested use will not impair the integrity or character of the neighborhood nor be detrimental to the public health, safety or general welfare;

A residential care facility that has more than six clients is a commercial use (commercial residential care facility). It is a commercial operation within a commercial designated area by the Esparto General Plan and zoned for Community Commercial (C-2) uses. The .5 acre subject property currently maintains an existing care facility, and a separate garage/shop area.

- d. The requested use will be in conformity with the General Plan;

The Esparto General Plan, adopted in January, 1996 of the Yolo County General Plan land use designation for the .5 acre site is C-2(Community Commercial) and provides for residential care facility in the zoning designation. With the fourteen clients, this facility is a commercial use (commercial residential care facility), and appropriate for this area.

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

The subject property is currently serviced by Esparto Community Services District for water, PG&E for electrical utilities and has an existing sewage disposal system to handle the additional residence of the facility.



- 6.5 **98-010** - A Public Hearing to receive comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for an Amendment filed to Zone File 95-079, regarding the Syar Industries Long-Term, Off-Channel Mining Permit and Reclamation Plan. The property is located between County Roads 87 and 89, between State Highway 16 and Cache Creek, north of Madison and Esparto. APNs: 049-060-04 and 13; 049-120-05, 06, and 16; and 049-130-05 and 27. Applicant/Owner: Syar Industries (D. Morrison)

Commission Action

No action is required of the Planning Commission. The staff recommends that the Commission hear a brief report from staff, receive testimony from the public, and provide individual testimony from members of the Commission on the adequacy of the Draft Supplemental EIR (DSEIR).

Written comments may be submitted by any interested party until 5:00 p.m. on September 7, 1998.



6.6 **97-066** - A request for a Zone Change, a General Plan Amendment, and a Tentative Subdivision Map to create eight lots on a thirteen acre parcel. Subject property is located at Netherlands Road between David Lane and County Road 146, in the Clarksburg area in the Residential Suburban (RS-B430) zone. A Negative Declaration has been prepared for this item. APN: 043-250-08. Applicant/Owner: John Carvalho and Vincent Stanich, Jr. (D. Flores)

Commission Action

- (1) **DENIED** the attached Negative Declaration as the appropriate environmental document for this project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Guidelines (Exhibit 4);
- (2) **DENIED** the FINDINGS for this project as presented in the staff report; and,
- (3) **DENIED** the General Plan Amendment of a Low Density Residential of one dwelling unit per 10 acres (RL-10) to a Low Density Residential one dwelling unit per 1 acre (RL-1);
- (4) **DENIED** a Zone Change from a Residential Suburban B430 (RS-B430) to a Residential Suburban B43(RS-B43);
- (5) **DENIED** a Tentative Subdivision Map to create 8 lots from a 13 acre parcel.

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

FINDINGS

Negative Declaration:

In certifying the proposed Negative Declaration for this project as the appropriate level of environmental review under CEQA, the 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.

Subdivision Map Act/Parcel Map

Section 66463(a) Except as otherwise provided for in this code, the procedure for processing, approval, conditional approval, or disapproval and filing of parcel maps and modifications thereof shall be as provided by local ordinance. The Planning Commission finds that:

- (a) That the proposed map is consistent with applicable general and specific plans as specified in Section 65451;

*Based on a Public Hearing, the Tentative Subdivision Map and request has been determined by the Planning Commission to be **inconsistent** with the Yolo County General Plan as required by the Subdivision Map Act, and the Clarksburg General Plan.*

- (b) That the design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is consistent with applicable general and specific plans;

*Based on Public Hearing the proposed map was reviewed and determined by the Planning Commission **not** to be in conformance with the criteria (required buffers, conservation easements, affordable housing) established under the Clarksburg General and Yolo County General Plan.*

- (c) That the site is physically suitable for the type of development;

*The property is currently zoned Residential Suburban (R-S B430). The parcel split will be **inconsistent** with this zoning. The Planning Commission determined that the rezoning of the parcel from RS-B430 to RS-B43 was not appropriate for this area of Clarksburg.*

- (d) That the design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements are not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidable injury to fish or wildlife or their habitat;

Fish and wildlife resources will not be effected by the approval of the subdivision. The parcel is in an rural residential area and has remained fallow within the last few years.

- (e) That the site is physically suitable for the proposed density of development;

*The Planning Commission determined that the proposed project **does not** meet the criteria established under the Yolo County and Clarksburg General Plan for creating higher density parcels in this area.*

- (f) That the design of the subdivision or type of improvements is not likely to cause serious public health problems;

Any development on the Parcels must be reviewed and approved by the Environmental Health Division as to septic and water system design.

- (g) That the design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of, property within the proposed subdivision.

Access to the parcels will be from a dedicated roadway to the County within the project area via access to Netherlands Road.

Delta Protection Act of 1992

The Delta Protection Act, sponsored by Senator Patrick Johnson was approved by the Governor on September 24, 1992. This bill created the Delta Protection Commission which is required to prepare, adopt, review and maintain a comprehensive long term resource management plan for the Primary Zone of the Delta. The project area is located within this Primary Zone.

Local governments may approve development within the Primary Zone only after making the following findings (evidence to support each finding is in italics):

- (a) The development will not result in wetland or riparian loss.

The proposal may result in wetland or riparian loss. The proposed subdivision will create eight new homesites which will be set back from the levee and is adjacent to a wetland or riparian area.

- (b) The development will not result in the degradation of water quality.

The proposal will not result in the degradation of water quality in the area because the proposal will require individual wells to be drilled which will be constructed to County Environmental Health standards.

- (c) The development will not result in increased non-point source of pollution or soil erosion, increased subsidence or sedimentation.

The project will not result in increased non-point source of pollution, soil erosion, increased subsidence or sedimentation. The proposed housing units will implement a soil erosion program consisting of landscaping and other methods to reduce sediment losses.

- (d) The development will not result in the degradation or reduction of the Pacific Flyway habitat.

The project will not result in the degradation or reduction of the Pacific Flyway habitat because the future proposed homesites will not affect the Sacramento River.

- (e) The development will not result in reduced public access, provided that access does not infringe upon private property rights.

The project will not result in reduced public access. A new roadway will be constructed in accordance with County standards and tie into Netherlands Road.

- (f) The development will not expose the public to increased flood hazards.

Although the proposed subdivision is within a 100-500 year flood zone (Flood Zone B), the public will not be exposed to increase flood hazards. The proposed physical changes in the use of the property which will not increase flood hazards, or expose the public to flood hazards. The applicants will prepare a drainage plan to address potential flooding problems within the proposed project area. The plans will be reviewed for consistency with County standards.

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

The proposal will not adversely effect the southwestern property, as agricultural buffers will be incorporated into the housing project to the satisfaction of the Planning and Public Works Department, and Agricultural Commissioner.

- (h) The development will not result in the degradation or impairment of levee integrity.

The project will not result in the degradation or impairment of the levees at Elk Slough or the Sacramento River.

- (i) The development will not adversely impact navigation.

Navigation will not be adversely impacted as there will no development on or near the river,.

- (j) The development will not result in any increased requirements or restrictions of agricultural practices in the primary zone.

There will not be increased requirements or restrictions of agricultural practices in the primary zone. There should be no conflict with farming operations to the southwest of the subdivision with agricultural buffers in place.

Clarksburg General Plan:

When considering any application for development of a single family residential subdivision, the following criteria (Goals of the General Plan) shall be used, and the following findings shall be made to allow such use, or insure the subdivision will serve the community while minimizing its potential adverse impacts. If all the findings are made in the affirmative, the subdivision may be approved within the unincorporated area of the County and within the Urban Limit Line of the community of Clarksburg:

1. Development of housing should be encouraged only within the Urban Limit Line to prevent "sprawl" onto agricultural lands adjacent to the community. Improvement and replacement of existing substandard housing should be encouraged;

Staff has reviewed the proposal in respect to the Clarksburg General Plan and determined the project site is within the urban limit line as established in General Plan document. The current zoning of the property is Residential Suburban.

2. New street construction required by any new development shall be supplied by the

developer;

The project proponent has proposed to build the necessary roadway into the project, and shall be built to County Public Works Standards.

3. Any approved urban development proposal within the Clarksburg Urban Limit Line must include “will serve” statements from the Clarksburg Fire District, Delta Unified School District, County Health Department, Sheriff’s Department, and Public Works Department, which addresses the adequacy of the existing urban services required by the development, cost of servicing the development, and their ability to provide these required services. Each service agency shall indicate satisfaction with the service levels and funding sources provided for in the development proposal before approval is made of the tentative map by the County Planning Agency;

The proposed project has been reviewed by the above stated Agencies, and conditions have been established which satisfy their concerns.



- 6.7 **98-029** - A request for a Conditional Use Permit to legalize and expand an existing non-conforming petroleum bulk plant and services in order to install a cardlock station. Subject property is located on the south side of County Road 6, east of County Road 99W, west of the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks in Dunnigan in the Agricultural General (A-1) zone. SBE#572-57-21-2. Applicant/Owner: Ramos Oil Company (M. Hamblin)

Commission Action

- (1) Item will be continued at the request of the applicant.

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



- 6.8 A workshop to discuss Draft Amendments made to the Yolo County Zoning Ordinance (M. Drack/J. Bencomo)

Commission Action

No action is required. Staff was given direction to continue the work.



7. ASSISTANT DIRECTOR’S REPORT

A report by the Assistant Director on the recent Board of Supervisor's meetings on items relevant to the Planning Commission. An update of the Planning and Public Works Department 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. Assistant Director Bencomo brought the Commission up to date on the following:

- (1) Economic Development Council Discussion



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) Reported project/site meetings with constituents.



9. ADJOURNMENT

The Regular Meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission was adjourned at 4:05 p.m. The next Regular Meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission will be held on Wednesday, September 2, 1998, 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** from the date of the action. A written notice of appeal specifying the grounds and an appeal fee **immediately** payable to the Clerk of the Board must be submitted **at the time of filing**. The Board of Supervisors may sustain, modify or overrule this decision.

Respectfully submitted by,

John Bencomo, Assistant Director
Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

clk

