

MINUTES

YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

February 26, 1997

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: John Bencomo, Interim Director
David Flores, Senior Planner
Curtis Eaton, Associate Planner
Mark Hamblin, Associate Planner
Steven Basha, County Counsel

Linda Caruso, Planning Commission
Secretary

◆ ◆ ◆

1.1 OATH OF OFFICE

Tony Bernhard, the County Clerk, administered the Oath of Office for the new Planning Commissioner, Betty Woo.

◆ ◆ ◆

2. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Commission Action:

Approved the Minutes of the January 22, 1997 with no corrections.

MOTION: Merewitz SECOND: Stephens

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

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: Woo

◆ ◆ ◆

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.

Bonnie Spore, a horse rancher, questioned the Commission regarding the status of the Draft Equestrian Ordinance. Director Bencomo indicated that current regulations, in some cases, are either over burdensome or convoluted. Staff is attempting to simplify the present requirements.

◆ ◆ ◆

4. CORRESPONDENCE

Commissioner Walker acknowledged receipt of all correspondence distributed at the beginning of the meeting and sent with the packet.

◆ ◆ ◆

5. CONSENT AGENDA

Items on the Consent Agenda are believed by staff to be non-controversial and consistent with the Commission's previous instructions to staff. All items on the Consent Agenda may be adopted by a

single motion. If any commissioner or member of the public questions an item, it should be removed from the Consent Agenda and be placed in the Regular Agenda.

5.1 **96-078-** This item was removed from the Consent Agenda and placed on the Regular Agenda.

◆ ◆ ◆

5.2 **96-074-** This item was removed from the Consent Agenda and placed on the Regular Agenda.

◆ ◆ ◆

5.3 **96-059 -** A General Plan Consistency Review to allow the abandonment for a portion of CR 6, east of State Highway 45. A Negative Declaration has been prepared. APN # 053-110-04 & 053-100-06 Applicant: Riverside Garden Farms (Flores)

Commission Action:

1. **CERTIFIED** the Negative Declaration prepared for the project 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. **RECOMMENDED** to the Yolo County Public Works Department to proceed in formalizing the abandonment of a portion of County Road 6 in accordance with the "**CONDITIONS FOR COMPLIANCE**".

MOTION: Merewitz SECOND: Lang
AYES: Merewitz, Lang, Walker, Woo, Stephens, Rodegerdts, and Heringer

NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

CONDITIONS FOR COMPLIANCE

1. Gates that are installed at the entrance to the County Road to be abandoned, shall install "Knox Boxes" or similar design to allow multiple locks which can be applied to the gates for access by Agencies of Concern.

2. The County of Yolo shall reserve all current Public Utility Easements upon vacation of the portion of County Road 6.

FINDINGS

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

In certifying the proposed Negative Declaration (ND) 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 Article 7, Section 65402 of the Planning and Zoning Law, the Planning Commission finds:

That the proposed project conforms with the provisions of the Yolo County General Plan.

Staff has reviewed the application submitted by the Yolo County Public Works Department and determined the project consistent with the Yolo County General Plan specifically Circulation Element 8 (CIR.8), and Open Space Policies 9 and 11 which encourages access control and safety features and protection of wildlife. As indicated earlier in the staff report, the closing off of these various roadways will protect the wildlife habitat that exist along the Sacramento River, which complies with the Open Space Policies of the County.

The use of a "Knox Box" will allow multiple locks to be applied to the gates for access by authorized vehicles for inspection of the levee system and in the case of an emergency.



5.4 **96-067** - An Agricultural Contract Split of a 99 acre parcel resulting in one contract of 27 acres and two contracts of 36 acres. The property is located on State Highway 16, 1/4 mile south of CR 42B in Guinda in the A-P (Agricultural Preserve) Zone. A Negative Declaration has been prepared. APN# 60-210-02, 6 and 15. Applicant: Denise DeRicco/Terril Ellis (Flores)

Commission Action:

1. **CERTIFIED** that the attached Negative Declaration is the appropriate level of environmental review for this project.
2. **ADOPTED** the proposed FINDINGS for this project as presented in the staff report;
3. **APPROVED** a request to divide the existing 99 acre Williamson Act Land Use Contract into three separate contracts resulting in an 27 acre A-P Contract and two, 36 acre A-P Contracts subject to the conditions listed under CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL.
- ~~4. **APPROVE** the Zone Variance which establishes a subminimal Agricultural A-P Contract (27 acre and two 36 acres) in the Agricultural Preserve Zone.~~

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

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Planning:

- 1a) Within thirty days of the approval of the recommended action, the applicant shall submit, for review and approval to the office of the Yolo County Community Development Director, the revised agricultural preserve legal descriptions

to be incorporated into the revised Land Use Contracts for the subject properties prior to consideration of the amendment to Agreement No. 88-026 by the Board of Supervisors.

- 1b) After approval of the legal descriptions by the Community Development Agency Director, the applicant shall also transmit the above information to the Yolo County Counsel's Office and shall execute three new contracts as reflected in this report.

County Counsel:

2. 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.

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

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

FINDINGS

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

In accordance with Section 8-2.408. of Article 4 of Title 8 and provisions of the Blue Ribbon Ordinance No.1157, the 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 split is consistent with the minimum acreage requirement as established in the Blue Ribbon Ordinance No.1157.

The applicants have indicated their intent to continue farming the parcels (currently in row crop and walnut orchards). This statement and the fact that

surrounding lands are currently under contract, prevents the encroachment of nonagricultural uses other than the possibility of construction of one single family home on each parcel which is currently allowed under the proposed zoning and parcel size.

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

The applicants have stated that they intent to continue farming the three proposed land contracts. This statement, and the fact that surrounding lands are currently under contract, supports the finding that the parcels tend to maintain the agricultural economy.

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

The proposed splits will continue the preservation of prime agricultural lands as classified by the Soil Survey of Yolo County.

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

The subject properties are being utilized for row crop and walnut orchards. The possibility of allowing one (1) single-family homesite on the unoccupied parcel, as currently allowed under Title 8 of the Yolo County Code, will not significantly degrade the public value of open space of the subject property.

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

The applicants have stated that they intend to continue farming of the three parcels. This statement, and the fact that surrounding lands are currently under contract, supports the finding that the proposed split is consistent with the preservation of agriculture as mandated by the Yolo County General Plan.

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

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

(7) That the three parcels are at least 20 acres in size of irrigated land.

Assessor's Parcel No. 60-021-02,06 and 15 are currently irrigated. Water is available to the property by the means of three wells. Existing parcels are 27 acres, and two, 36 acres respectively.

◆ ◆ ◆

6 . R E G U L A R A G E N D A

T h e f o l l o w i n g i t e m w a s r e m o v e d f r o m t h e C o n s e n t
A g e n d a .

5.1 **96-078** - A Conditional Use Permit to allow for the installation of a wireless communications facility on a 161 acre property. Proposed improvements include the installation of a 100' monopole with 12 panel antennas, 4 microwave dishes, and a 12' X 28' equipment shelter. Property is located on the west side of CR 94 1 mile north of CR 29, 2 miles northwest of the Yolo County Airport in the A-P (Agricultural Preserve) Zone. A Negative Declaration has been prepared. APN# 040-150-15 Applicant/Owner: AT & T Wireless Services/Fletcher (Hamblin)

C o m m i s s i o n e r s R o d e g e r d t s a n d S t e p h e n s a b s t a i n e d f r o m
t h i s i t e m d u e t o p o s s i b l e c o n f l i c t s o f i n t e r e s t .

M a r k H a m b l i n g a v e t h e S t a f f R e p o r t . A b r i e f
d i s c u s s i o n r e g a r d i n g l i g h t i n g t o o k p l a c e .

S t e v e n B a s h a a s k e d i f t h e a p p l i c a n t h a d a n y
o b j e c t i o n s t o t h e p r o p o s e d C o n d i t i o n s o f A p p r o v a l .

K e i t h B r a y , r e p r e s e n t i n g A T & T , s a i d h e i s i n
c o n c u r r e n c e w i t h a l l t h e C o n d i t i o n s o f A p p r o v a l
s u b m i t t e d b y S t a f f .

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

(1) **C E R T I F I E D** 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 this project as presented in the staff report;
- (3) **APPROVED** the Conditional Use Permit subject to the conditions listed under "Conditions Of Approval" presented in the staff report.

MOTION: Merewitz SECOND: Lang

AYES: Merewitz, Lang, Walker, Woo, and Heringer

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Rodegerdts and Stephens

ABSENT: None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Community Development Agency

1. The development of the site, including the construction and/or placement of structures, shall be as shown on the approved site plan - **Exhibit "3"** - Site Plan and **Exhibit "4"** - Elevation Plan, or by minor modification or expansion which is in keeping with the purpose and intent of this conditional use permit and administered through a site plan review approved by the Community Development Agency. The development shall operate in a manner consistent with the project's approval. Upon the termination of the use approved by this conditional use permit the leaseholder shall restore the site back to its original environmental setting within a time period not to exceed 180 days.

2. The applicant shall cooperate with the County in addressing the concerns regarding the usage of shared facilities/sites for future communication towers and shall not be opposed to sharing the subject site/facilities when necessary to meet the demands of other communication service providers, provided that any additional proposed uses on this site will not serve as a detriment to the safe and effective operation of the AT&T Wireless Services delivery system and that the property owner is in agreement.
3. The applicant shall keep their designated leasehold area (site) free from flammable brush, grass and weeds. Any structures on the leasehold shall be maintained and free from graffiti.
4. Any lighting and/or glare generated from the subject property shall be directed away from the public rights-of-way and adjoining properties.
5. The monopole and any accessory structures/buildings, perimeter fencing, and landscaping shall be designed, constructed and finished with materials that will be consistent with the surrounding environmental setting to the satisfaction of the Yolo County Community Development Agency.
6. This Conditional Use Permit (Z.F. No. 96-078) shall commence within one (1) year from the effective date of the Planning Commission's

approval of the Conditional Use Permit or said permit shall be deemed null and void without further action.

F e d e r a l A v i a t i o n A d m i n i s t r a t i o n

- 7 . The applicant as required by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), shall file a construction notice with the FAA for their evaluation and approval of the proposed project at least 30 days before the earlier of the following: (1) the date the construction or alteration is to begin; (2) the date the application for a construction permit will be filed. A copy of the FAA's approval of the construction notice shall be submitted to the Yolo County Community Development Agency prior to the issuance of the building permit for the wireless communication facility.

C o u n t y C o u n s e l

- 8 . 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.

Failure to comply with the CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL as approved by the Planning Commission may result in any or all of the following:

- . the revoking of the Use Permit;
- . non-issuance of a future building permit.

FINDINGS

[Supporting evidence has been indented and italicized]

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-P 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 essential or desirable to the public comfort and convenience;

The cellular telephone 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.

Wireless telephone coverage in the area of the site is not adequate to serve demand for the area, especially along U.S. I-505.

- 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;

As designed and conditioned, the proposed project is determined to create "a less than significant effect" to the character of agricultural area surrounding the site.

Wireless communication cellular technology has been determined not to be detrimental to the public health safety or general welfare.

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

The proposed project is determined to be in conformance with the applicable provisions of the General Plan.

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

The applicants will be providing all necessary infrastructure and utilities for the proposed project. Wireless telephone communication coverage will be provided to the area and along U.S. I-505.

The following item was also removed from the Consent Agenda.

- 5.2. **96-074** - A Conditional Use Permit to convert the second floor of a barn to a guest house. Property is located on the south side of CR 29, 660 ft. west of CR 96, east of the Yolo County Airport in the A-1/B860 (Agricultural General Special Building Site Combining) Zone. This item is Categorically Exempt. APN# 040-190-55 Applicant: Edwin Lentz (Eaton)

The Staff Report was given by Curtis Eaton. He stated that the applicant has agreed to remove the stove and refrigerator from the guest house. He added that another Condition of Approval requiring a two year Compliance Review should be added.

Commissioner Rodegerdts asked how the County became aware of the existence of the guest house in the first place. Curtis Eaton answered that the Building Inspector discovered it during a routine visit to another site.

Edwin Lentz, the applicant, explained how the guest house came into existence during his recuperation from heart surgery. He added that he would comply with all the Conditions of Approval, including the two year Compliance Review.

Commissioner Woo asked the applicant if the guest house was occupied at this time. It was answered no.

Commissioner Lang asked if the unit could be rented and Staff answered no.

A discussion regarding fire sprinkler regulations took place.

Commissioner Stephens had deep concerns over the County's policies regarding the issue of penalties. It seems to be sending a message to all that if you don't get the required Conditional Use Permits and/or Building Permits in the first place, its okay because if you are discovered, no penalties will be administered. This is a loss of fees for the County.

Director Bencomo agreed that he too, had concerns regarding this issue. He indicated that there is a 50% penalty in place on the fee schedule, which is imposed, in addition to any of the resulting application fees required to legalize the use and remedy the existing infraction.

Brett Hale, the Chief Building Inspector, stated that the applicant will be required to have sprinklers installed in the downstairs barn as well as in the guest house.

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

Debra Bee, in the audience for another item, commented on people not acquiring building permits. The Public Hearing was closed.

Commissioner Rodegerdts spoke about penalties and said that the point is well taken, however, he did not agree that applying them in this circumstance would be appropriate. Unless the County is prepared to expend the energy to bring all violations in the County up to compliance, a penalty in this instance is not fair.

Steve Basha, County Counsel, said he did not think the Commission had the authority to impose the penalties unilaterally. He recommended that the Planning Director look into whether penalties are appropriate within his authority.

Commissioner Woo said that a penalty should be imposed, since Mr. Lentz did not come forward on his own accord.

Commissioner Stephens said that the ground rules for future penalties needs to be considered.

Commission Action:

- (1) **CERTIFIED** the proposed project as Categorical Exempt as per Section 15303, Class 3, 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** Conditional Use Permit ZF# 96-074 subject to the conditions of approval presented in the Staff Report as modified.

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

Commission Action:

The motion was made to agendaize for discussion at the next Planning Commission Meeting the topic of the imposition of penalty fees.

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

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Planning Division

1. The guest house shall be occupied overnight only by friends and relatives of the property owner and shall be operated in a manner consistent with the project's approval. As a guest house is defined as having no kitchen, neither a stove nor a refrigerator shall be installed. No income shall be derived from the use of the guest house.
2. The property owner shall pay all fees, including the County Facility and Service Authorization Fee (County Development Impact Fee) and the school impact fee if required by the Davis Unified School District, for the guest house prior to the issuance of a building permit.
3. A Compliance Review will be required two years from the date of Planning Commission approval (February 26, 1999) for the purpose of ensuring the continued compliance with the adopted Conditions of Approval. The applicant will be required to pay any applicable fees for this review.

Building Division

- ~~3.~~ 4. The property owner shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, including demonstrating that the guest house is in compliance with the current Unified Building Code.

The property owner shall contact the Yolo County Environmental Health Services to discuss permitting and expansion of the current sewage disposal system on the site to accommodate the guest house prior to the issuance of an building permit for the guest house.

- 4.5. Conditional Use Permit ZF #96-074 shall commence within one (1) year from the effective date of the Planning Commission's approval of the Conditional Use Permit, or said use permit shall be deemed null and void without further action.

Environmental Health Services

- ~~5~~-6. The property owner shall obtain the necessary permits to upgrade the septic system to meet County standards.

West Plainfield Fire District

- ~~6~~-7. The property owner shall improve the access road to meet the width and surface requirements of the West Plainfield Fire District.

County Counsel

- 7.8 In accordance with Yolo County Code §8-2.2415, the applicant shall agree to indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the County or its agents, officers and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding (including damage, attorney fees, and court cost awards) against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of the County, advisory agency, appeal board, or legislative body concerning the permit or entitlement when such action is brought within the applicable statute of limitations. The County shall promptly notify the applicant of any claim, action or proceeding and that the County cooperates fully in the defense. If the County fails to promptly notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding, or if the County fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify, or hold the County harmless as to that action. The County may require that the applicant post a bond in an amount determined to be sufficient to satisfy the above indemnification and defense obligation.

Failure to comply with the Conditions of Approval as approved by the Planning Commission may result in all of the following: revoking of the Conditional Use Permit, non-issuance of future building permits, or legal action.

FINDINGS

In accordance with Section 8-2.2804 of Article 27 of the Yolo County Zoning Regulations, the Planning Commission makes the following findings (a summary of the evidence to support each finding is shown in italics):

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

Sec. 8-2.604 of the Zoning Ordinance states that the following conditional use shall be permitted in the A-1 zone: (ae) Guest houses not rented or otherwise conducted as a business.

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

The applicant is providing overnight accommodations to friends and relatives who visit from "out of town". Because his family is large, and his children now have children of their own, it has become necessary to provide sleeping quarters in addition to the guest room in the main residence.

- 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.

Included in the conditions of approval for the project is a specific condition requested by Yolo County Environmental Health Services requiring the property owner to contact them to discuss permitting and expansion of the current sewage disposal system on the site to accommodate the guest house. The guest house is in a structure originally approved as a barn, in an approved location, so there should be little impact on the neighbors above and beyond the original approved project. The guest house is screened from view by windrows of mature Eucalyptus trees to the north and west of the structure. As designed and conditioned the project will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or general welfare

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

The proposed project is determined to be in conformance with the applicable provisions of the General Plan, referenced above in this staff report.

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

The applicant is required to have demonstrated that he has met the requirements of the 1994 Unified Building Code and received appropriate permits from Environmental Health prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy. The applicant will provide all necessary infrastructure and utilities to service the proposed project in accordance with state and local requirements.



- 6.1 **96-082** - A Conditional Use Permit and a Variance to construct a single family dwelling on a .41 acre parcel. Property is located on the east side of CR 96, 1800 feet south of CR 31, south of

the Yolo County Airport in the A-1 (Agricultural General) Zone. This item is Categorically Exempt. APN# 037-080-17 Applicant/Owner: Hiatt/Dowling (Hamblin)

The Staff Report was given by Mark Hamblin. He told the Commission the reason for the recommendation of denial is due to the project not being in compliance with the safe installation of a domestic well and septic tank system on an inadequately sized parcel. In addition, the project may create a problems for the surrounding agricultural operations, which includes horse stables and a commercial dog kennel.

Commissioner Heringer noted that the parcel is land locked and cannot be farmed.

A discussion about the applicant or his representative not being present took place.

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

Arnold Bloom, surrounding property owner, stated his concerns of flooding due to the land slopes from the subject parcel to his parcel and of the proposed septic system not being adequate.

Bridget Curry, owner of the dog kennel, agreed with Staff's recommendation for denial. Her main concern was flooding. In addition, even in restricting the site to a one bedroom house, it has no bearing on the number of people that will or can actually live in the house, or the amount of sewage the household can produce.

Mark Hamblin indicated that the applicant was not present because he thought the Planning Commission Meeting was at 8:30 **PM**.

Tom To, the Director of Environmental Health, said his department has not changed its view or its standards from the previous years. He explained to the Commission about a discussion which took place with the applicant. He told the applicant the project would only be possible if the following conditions were met; 1) a very small one bedroom house without a den, library or other space that could conceivably be used to increase the occupancy of the house, 2) the setback from the street would have to be minimal, and 3) the distance from the septic system to the property line has to be less than what is lawfully required. A Variance would be needed.

The Commission recessed at 10:27 and reconvened at 10:40.

Ken Hiatt, representing the applicant, arrived at 10:49. He said the existence of the other residences has encumbered his property due to the location of their wells and leach fields. He requested that the Variance for the frontyard setback requirements be reduced to something more like the others along Road 96, which is less than 90'. Two adjacent properties have setbacks which are only 67'. He added that the applicant would not have applied for the Use Permit if Tom To had not indicated that a one bedroom house on the property was feasible.

The Public Hearing was closed.

Commissioner Rodegerdts said what is being asked today is to approve an urban configuration in what is a rural setting and a production agricultural area. Approving this would seriously impinge on that agricultural configuration.

Commission Action:

- (1) **DETERMINED** that Section 15270(a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Guidelines is the appropriate for the project. Section 15270(a) states that CEQA does not apply to projects which a public agency rejects or disapproves;
- (2) **ADOPTED** the "FINDINGS" for the project as presented in the staff report;
- (3) **DENIED** the zone variance request as presented in the staff report;
- (4) **DENIED** the conditional use permit request as presented in the staff report.

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

FINDINGS

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

Environmental Determination

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

Under Section 15270(a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Guidelines, CEQA does not apply to projects which a public agency rejects or disapproves.

Conditional Use Permit

In accordance with Section 8-2.2804 of Article 27 of the Yolo County Zoning Regulations the Planning Commission finds:

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

Section 8-2.604 (s) . . . "One single family dwelling or one mobile may be approved on a parcel containing less than five (5) acres when such parcel complies with the provisions of Section 8-2.2606 of Article 26 of this article."

Section 8-2.2606 (c). Upon the approval of a use permit, one single family dwelling which complies with all the other regulations of the zone in which it is situated may be constructed on any lot or parcel contains an area or dimension smaller than that required by the provisions of this chapter and which was of record in the Office of the Clerk-Recorder on December 18, 1963, where the owner thereof on such date, or his successor in interest, owned no adjoining land."

The property owner is proposing to construct a single family dwelling on a .41 acre parcel that was created in 1963.

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

The property owner is attempting to construct a 1,000 to 1,100 square foot single family dwelling next to horse stables and boarding facilities, a commercial dog kennel and agricultural operations. These uses have long-standing nuisances associated with their operations. For this purpose these uses have been designated for agricultural zones and residential uses that occur next them are subject to the County's Right To Farm Ordinance.

The applicant's request involves a residential use of the site. A single family residence on an approximate 18,000 square foot lot not associated with an existing agricultural operation that will be constructed next to horse boarding facilities and stables, a commercial dog kennels and agricultural operations may result in the development of an attractive nuisance situation to the detriment of the existing agricultural operations.

- c. The requested use will impair the integrity or character of the neighborhood or be detrimental to the public health, safety or general welfare;

The applicant's site plan does not meet Environmental Health Services proposed condition of approval number 2 in their memorandum dated January 10, 1997. Thereby resulting in a potential for contamination of the site and neighboring properties.

Specifically, the project does not meet the minimum 35 foot setback from the property lines including a 100% replacement area for the installation of a septic tank and leach field. In view of the applicant's submitted site plan there is not area for a house, a septic tank and leach field, and a 100% replacement area that can meet the required setbacks from the property lines (35 feet), the dwelling (15 feet), a domestic well (100 feet).

The neighborhood involves scattered single family residences, agricultural operations, a commercial dog kennel, horse boarding operations and horse stables. The building of a single family dwelling on the 18,000 square foot lot not in conjunction with a farming operation in an environment where known nuisances

associated with the operations of horse boarding facilities and horse stables will result in conflicts between a new resident and the neighbors.

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

The proposed residence is in conflict with Land Use Policy 17 and 20. of the Yolo County General Plan.

LU 17. Residential Uses/Agricultural Lands

Residential land uses in the agricultural areas shall be limited to dwellings only of preservation of the family farm, for farm employees and those persons who own the farm land, up to a limit established by ordinance and implemented by Conditional Use Permit. All such dwellings shall be encouraged to locate on lands unsuited for agricultural use and/or in "clustered" configurations to minimize the conversion of agricultural lands to any other uses. a maximum dwelling unit density for the total acreage in the farm or ranch shall be established by ordinance.

LU 20. Prohibit Residential Use/Division

Yolo County may prohibit the development of residential land uses on parcels of property created by land divisions in agriculturally designated areas. Such requirement shall be assured by appropriate means.

The subject property is within the A-1 Zone . The 18,000 square foot lot does not provide area for a sustainable family farm though the property. The parcel was created in 1963. The proposed residence is not being constructed specifically to provide farm worker housing in conjunction with the operation of a farm.

- e. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, sanitation, and/or other necessary facilities will **not** be provided.

Setbacks for the installation of a septic tank, leach field and domestic well on the 18,000 square foot site and their distance from neighboring wells and sewage disposal systems is not adequate. As shown on the applicant's site plan, the project does not meet Environmental Health Services proposed condition of approval number two as stated in their memorandum dated January 10, 1997.

The applicant is required to have appropriate permits (i.e. building permit, encroachment permit, sewage disposal permit, etc.) prior to the issuance of the building permit and other permit requirements to be completed prior to the final inspection.

Zone Variance - Front Yard Requirement of 90 Feet

In accordance with Section 8-2.2904 of Article 27 of the Yolo County Zoning Regulations the Planning Commission finds:

- a. Any variance granted shall be subject to such conditions as will assure that the adjustment thereby authorized shall constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which the subject property is situated;

The A-1 Zone stipulates a front yard requirement of 90 feet from the centerline of the right-of-way. A 10 foot setback difference exists between the requirement and what is requested by the applicant.

Properties exist to the north of the subject parcel that are less than 5 acres (2 ac, 2.7 ac., 4.7 ac., 2.3 ac., 1.9 ac., etc.) that have residences on them and have setbacks 90+ feet from County Road 96 which is consistent with the front yard setback for the A-1 Zone for

a residence.

In order for the single family dwelling on the subject parcel to have sufficient area for the installation of a septic tank, leach field, and domestic well and meet the required setbacks for their installation, including a 35 foot setback from the rear property line. The applicant located the proposed house 80 feet from the centerline of the right of way of County Road 96 to meet Environmental Health's requirement and filed a variance to the zoning regulations.

However, not all available options have been exhausted at this time. An engineered designed sewage disposal system may provide the necessary sanitation needs for the proposed house and allow it to meet the required zoning and environmental health setbacks.

Planning staff has offered the idea of using an engineered sewage disposal system. The applicant was to discuss the use of this type of system with the Environmental Health Services. This type of system may eliminated the need for the zone variance. Also, no evidence has been provided demonstrating that the applicant explored purchasing additional land from neighbors so that a sewage disposal system could be installed without a planning and environmental health variance approval.

- b. That, because of special circumstances applicable to the subject property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict

application of the provisions of this chapter is **not** found to deprive the subject property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity and under the identical zone classification; and

The approximate 90' X 200', (18,000 sq. ft.) subject parcel was created in 1963. The applicant was aware of the septic tank and leach field issues effecting the site.

Properties exists to the north of the subject parcel that are less than 5 acres (2 ac, 2.7 ac., 4.7 ac., 2.3 ac., 1.9 ac., . etc.) that have residences on them and have setbacks 90+ feet from County Road 96 in accordance with the County's zoning regulations.

A 2,400 square foot steel agricultural storage building was constructed on the site. The building has provided storage area for agricultural equipment, products, etc. since 1976.

In order for any single family dwelling on the subject parcel to have sufficient area for the installation of a septic tank, leach field, and domestic well and meet the required setbacks for their installation, including a 35 foot setback from the rear property line the house can only be located 80 feet from the centerline of the right of way of County Road 96.

However, not all available options have been exhausted at this time. An engineered designed sewage disposal system may provide the necessary sanitation needs for the proposed house and allow

it to meet the required zoning and environmental health setbacks.

Staff has offered the idea of using an engineered sewage disposal system. The applicant was to discuss the use of this type of system with the Environmental Health Services. This type of system may eliminate the need for the zone variance. As of the printing of this report, staff has not received comments regarding the potential use of this system. Also, no evidence has been provided demonstrating that the applicant explored purchasing additional land from neighbors so that a sewage disposal system could be installed without a planning and environmental health variance approval.

- c. That the granting of such variance will **not** be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this chapter and will be in conformity with the Master Plan.

Properties exists to the north of the subject parcel that are less than 5 acres (2 ac, 2.7 ac., 4.7 ac., 2.3 ac., 1.9 ac,. etc.) that have residences on them which have setbacks that range between 90+ feet from County Road 96.

*The Yolo County General Plan designates the subject property as AG (Agricultural).The project is **not** consistent with the following applicable policies from Land Use (LU), element of the General Plan:*

LU 17. Residential Uses/Agricultural Lands
Residential land uses in the agricultural areas shall be limited to dwellings only of

preservation of the family farm, for farm employees and those persons who own the farm land, up to a limit established by ordinance and implemented by Conditional Use Permit. All such dwellings shall be encouraged to locate on lands unsuited for agricultural use and/or in "clustered" configurations to minimize the conversion of agricultural lands to any other uses. A maximum dwelling unit density for the total acreage in the farm or ranch shall be established by ordinance.

LU 20. Prohibit Residential Use/Division

Yolo County may prohibit the development of residential land uses on parcels of property created by land divisions in agriculturally designated areas. Such requirement shall be assured by appropriate means.

Horse boarding facilities, commercial dog kennels and agricultural operations have long-standing nuisances associated with their operations (i.e. vectors, odors, barking dogs, etc.). These uses have been designated for agricultural zones for this purpose. The applicant's request involves a residential use of the site. A single family residence on an approximate 18,000 square foot lot not associated with an existing agricultural operation next to horse stables, horse boarding facilities, a commercial dog kennels and other agricultural operations. Given these concerns the question is why the County would want to introduce a single family dwelling to an environment where known nuisances will create and potentially generate conflicts between the new resident and the neighboring agricultural operations.

Also, potential contamination to existing domestic wells on neighboring properties and the proposed installation of a domestic well on this site, and the concern that no replacement area (a designated area where a potential 2nd sewage disposal system can be installed in a case where failure were to happen to the initial system) exists in case failure of the sewage disposal systems occurs.

◆ ◆ ◆

6.2 **96-057-** A continuation of a hearing for a Conditional Use Permit to allow an existing mobile home on a 4.78 acre property designated as a senior housing unit. Property is located on the north side of CR 23, 1000 feet west of CR 85C near Esparto in the A-1 (Agricultural General) Zone. This item is Categorically Exempt. APN #: 049-180-66 Applicant/Owner: Dean Marks (M. Hamblin)

Dean Marks, the applicant, submitted a request in the form of a letter, asking the Commission to continue this item due to employment obligations.

A discussion took place regarding a memo sent by Staff to the surrounding property owners, which may or may not have confused the issue of whether or not this item would be heard by the Commission. Due to the ambiguity of the memo, it was decided by the Commission to continue this item to the next Planning Commission Meeting.

Commission Action:

To continue this item to the next Planning Commission Meeting which will be held on April 2, 1997. There will be no further continuances on this item.

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

Commission Action:

To open the Public Hearing.

MOTION: Walker SECOND: There was no second to this motion
AYES: Walker, Rodegerdts, Merewitz, Stephens, Woo, and Lang
NOES: Heringer
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The Public Hearing was opened.

Jody Trotter, nearby property owner, said the mobile home is an eyesore and should not be allowed.

Commission Action:

To close the Public Hearing.

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



6.3 96-058 - 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, the Senior Planner, who was assigned the Dunnigan General Plan Update, no longer is an employee of the County. In his absence, Director Bencomo gave the Staff Report and presented a synopsis of events leading up to the present. The key issues were groundwater concerns, the amount of residential development, integrating roads to the Hardwood Subdivision, drainage, redevelopment, sewer ponds, etc.

He also addressed the Dunnigan Citizens Advisory Committee recommendations which include the following.

1. The Primary Source of Water for any "Public Water System for the Town of Dunnigan SHALL be based upon the use of Surface Water with a groundwater backup system as a secondary emergency system. Existing Private wells shall be allowed to be continued unless there is a documented health and safety problem associated with the continued use of those private wells. Existing Private wells shall be permitted to be used for irrigation purposes.

2. That the County SHALL create a redevelopment area or some other mechanism to return a portion of the funds generated by new development to the Town of Dunnigan. At least fifty Percent (50%) of all new excess*** revenue from new development should be returned to the Community of Dunnigan for community-wide infrastructure improvements. Fixing existing drainage problems shall be the first priority for the use of these excess funds ***Excess=figure achieved after subtracting costs associated with the General Plan Build out (See Dunnigan EIR Figure 4.11-3 "Annual Net Surplus").
3. That the County SHALL attempt to foster the relocation of the Dunnigan Water District Offices from "Old Town/Antelope" to an area with access on a site acceptable to the Dunnigan Water District. That the present site of the Dunnigan Water District be converted to residential development in combination with any surrounding area parcels to make it more feasible. That sewer and/or water service be extended to these new homes and the existing "Old Town/Antelope" Area so that they will not be affected by existing nitrate contamination problem.
4. That the County Road 89/County Road 6 intersection provide for turning movements northbound and southbound onto County Road 89.
5. That the 10-acre vacant parcel at the northeast quadrant of County Road 8 and Interstate 5 remain designated by the General Plan as Highway Commercial and not be redesignated as Truck Commercial.
6. Drainage problems in the existing community should be examined through the final engineering process prior to construction of new development. In accordance with policies in the Dunnigan General Plan, the Dunnigan Citizens Advisory Committee shall review and make comment on proposed drainage improvements. Some existing problems include:
 - A) Clean and enlarge existing agricultural ditches (especially Dunnigan Creek, Ditch through Shriners Property)
 - B) Buckeye Creek
 - C) County Road 89/County Road 5 Outfall
7. Residential Development shall occur as follows:
 - A) 50 Homes/20 acres in Dunnigan Village tied to commercial development
 - B) Old Town Area- redevelop area where Dunnigan Water District is now along with any other aggregated vacant parcels
 - C) Hardwood Subdivision
 - D) No further new development in Dunnigan Village should be allowed until 75% of the Old Town and Hardwood Area are built-out

8. There should be a roadway(s) established between Dunnigan Village and the Hardwood Subdivision in addition to the proposed pedestrian access.
(This is a change in policy from previous vote of the DCAC)
9. The County shall encourage PG & E to provide Natural Gas Service to new development through the Hardwood Subdivision.
10. If substantial alterations are made to these recommendations, the DCAC recommends that the General Plan be referred back to the DCAC for further consideration.

Commissioner Rodegerdts said the proposed General Plan does not appear to be ready for approval at this time.

Director Bencomo said that due to the scale down of the proposed residential development there will also be less improvements provided.

Commissioner Merewitz agreed with Commissioner Rodegerdts that because the Plan has been so long in the process, he has not seen many of the important documents needed for a sound decision. Among these include the Infrastructure Study and the Fiscal Analysis. He also had concerns regarding the AG/Industrial component no longer being included in the Plan, flooding, and the financing of sewer and water.

Commissioner Stephens also had concerns with water, since groundwater, not surface water, was the main focus of the study done by Psomas. Additionally, she had concerns with the redevelopment issue, drainage, and the actual number of houses being proposed during the phasing process.

Commissioner Lang agreed with Commissioner Stephens.

The Public Hearing was opened at this time. Mark Atlas, the attorney for the Dunnigan Water District, clarified that the Water District's water supply is currently inadequate for ultimate use of the entire District. The District has a contract with the Bureau of Reclamation for 19,000 acre feet of water supply from the Tehama-Colusa Canal. Individual land owners in the District do have supplemental supplies available that they have privately developed through the drilling of wells. The possibility of the District ever receiving the 5,500 acre feet of water that is needed is extremely slim. He also disagreed with the Staff Report's claim, that according to District Staff, there is sufficient surface water supply for the proposed new development.

A lengthy discussion regarding the availability of water and the transfer of water from other sources took place.

Edward Johanson, of Lakemont Development, clarified for the Commission that in the past, the approach to water supply was for groundwater. What is now being proposed is surface water.

Mark Atlas said the District's previous contract was for AG services only. The renewed contract includes Municipal and Industrial.

A thirty minute lunch recess took place from 1:00 p.m. to 1:30.

Wayne Stoops, of Wayne Stoops and Associates, said that the Dunnigan Park Expansion will create 300 new jobs, including management, technical, and entry level jobs. He added this has been an extremely long process and asked the Commission for a decision.

Jay Donaldson, representing the Aulman Property, concurred with Mr. Stoops that a decision needed to be made.

Pat MacAvery, a member of the Dunnigan Advisory Committee, said he was disappointed with the Staff Report because it contradicts the wishes of the Committee.

Keith Williams, the Chair of the Dunnigan Advisory Committee, said the Committee wanted to see surface water from the Tehema-Colusa Canal as the primary source of water for Dunnigan, with groundwater as a backup. This is because they were concerned with deep wells not being sealed and the possibility of drawing down the water table and thus impacting those shallow water wells. He added that a percentage of the tax needs to come back into the Community. Infill is needed.

Dr. Jim Lutz, representing the Pierce Joint Unified School District, said that when and if the Plan is

approved and the housing phase begins, then what is a secondary issue now will become a primary issue in the mitigation of the impact of the housing on the School District.

Don Peart, trustee with the Pierce Joint Unified School District, spoke about the possibility of the wells being "pulled down".

Willard Ingraham, resident of Dunnigan, spoke about the existing problems in the Hardwood Subdivision including wells, water issues, and flooding. These problems need to be fixed before a "boom town" is built.

Gary Shaad, a member of Dunnigan Advisory Committee, said water issues need to be solved before any building is done. He said he wanted the new homeowners to be part of the Community, not to commute elsewhere.

Ed Johanson, of Lakemont Development, said there is a need for services in Dunnigan, however, there is little capability of supplying those services on their own. Infill development is going to create an increase of the same existing problems such as septic and wells. Infill development is incapable of bringing in Municipal Services. Only through new development will there be a tax increment to allow funding to go back to improve those problems. He added that fifty units will not support redevelopment. The amount of proposed new housing

development has been decreased, but the list of services requested has been increased.

Commissioner Walker suggested that an "assurance bond" be in place from all of the developers guaranteeing there will be water in the future.

A discussion regarding the funding of redevelopment took place.

Commissioner Merewitz asked Mr. Johanson how many homes would be needed to support the retail component of the plan. He answered that 600 homes would be needed.

The Public Hearing was closed at this time.

Commissioner Rodegerdts said, "The Community of Dunnigan does not have anything to fall back on once the developers have gone. There is nothing in the Plan to suggest a successful program will come out of this with a significant housing component. Even a housing component of 50 homes. What we have before us should be referred back to Staff. There is enough here to put together a meaningful plan, consistent with the desires of the Community and what I think to be the consensus of this Board." Commissioner Rodegerdts also recommended that Staff return with one balanced, finished document.

Commissioner Heringer said the commercial component of the Plan could be adopted without including the residential component.

Commissioner Merewitz said "Clearly there is interest in commercial and AG industrial. With that comes more people. No development can take place right now in Old Town Antelope. There is a moratorium on building, the nitrate levels are too high. I saw a handful of new houses in the Hardwood Subdivision. There are problems with those. There are problems with flooding there. There is no problem with available lots. There are not the services there to facilitate the new housing. I don't know that we want to put together a General Plan that doesn't have a housing component."

Commissioner Stephens said she thought that the Advisory Committee recommendations represented what the Community wanted. She suggested that "As a commission, we can resolve and clarify items 2, 7 and 10. Ten being very easy to resolve. That we could recommend that as our Plan. It just seems like so many years have gone into this thing, just to say no or delay it for more discussion. What else is there to discuss? It's pretty much all been said."

Commissioner Lang said, "I feel the frustration of the residents, builders, the Commission and the Board of Supervisors. I think at this time, we need to send this back to Staff. I know they're frustrated too. But, I think that we have to come up with a

plan that is going to protect the Hardwood area, that has some industrial and heavy commercial on the road and have a plan for development. All issues have to be answered for the housing, water, sewer, etc., before we can move ahead. But, to send anything less than that to the Board of Supervisors could mean that they would start hearing this for several years also."

Commissioner Woo said that there has been a lot of research done on this plan. Fifty houses won't support the infrastructure that it needs. It's regrettable that the residents of Dunnigan feel as if this plan is being shoved down their throats. This General Plan could actually end up benefitting them quite a bit by taking care of some of the problems that they're worried about.

The problem is that people disagree on the Plan, not that more research is needed.

Commissioner Walker said the Plan is for the people of Dunnigan. However, there still remains the problem of where to get water.

A lengthy discussion took place regarding whether or not to send this item back to Staff and whether or not there has been sufficient research performed on the Plan.

Commission Action:

The Planning Commission directed Staff to return to the Commission, at a workshop hearing, with an analysis of the following seven points. Staff will list all pros and cons or discussion topics for each of the seven items without making a recommendation. The Commission will entertain, if it chooses, input from the residents and the proponents at that workshop.

- Housing and the relationship with the number of jobs
- Drainage Infrastructure
- Economic impacts on existing residents
- Infrastructure financing
- Water supply
- Agricultural/AG Industrial/Industrial and Commercial development
- Schools

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

Commission Action:

The motion was made to continue this matter until the next Planning Commission Hearing on April 2, 1997. No other items will be heard on this day except Item 6.2 (Dean Marks), which was continued earlier in the meeting. Staff will send 20 copies of the report to Keith Williams, the Chair of the Dunnigan Advisory Committee for distribution to the other members of the Committee and to the Developers on March 19, 1997.

MOTION: Merewitz SECOND: Rodegerdts
AYES: Rodegerdts, Merewitz, Heringer, Walker,
 Woo, 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 on items relevant to the Planning Commission. An update of the Community Development Agency activity for the month. No discussion by other Commission members will occur except for clarifying questions. The Commission or an individual Commissioner can request that an item be placed on a future agenda for discussion.

John Bencomo updated the Commission on the following:

- 1) A letter from Louis Spicer requesting an extension of a Use Permit/Building Permit. Since this letter was received after the posting of the Agenda, the Commission was able to make a motion on this.

Commission Action:

The Motion was made to place this item on the Agenda.

MOTION: Rodegerdts SECOND: Woo

AYES: Rodegerdts, Woo, Walker, Merewitz, Lang,
Heringer, Stephens

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

Commission Action:

The Motion was made to grant an extension of two weeks.

MOTION: Rodegerdts SECOND: Merewitz

AYES: Rodegerdts, Woo, Walker, Merewitz, Lang,
Heringer, Stephens

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

- 2) The Esparto General Plan will be heard by the Board of Supervisors on March 18, 1997.
- 3) An update of the Knights Landing General Plan
- 4) Revision of the Permit Application Packets
- 5) The development of a "Home Page" for the Internet
- 6) The status of the "Economic Development Coordinator" position

- 7) Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program projections
- 8) The Enforcement Ordinance
- 9) The Equestrian Ordinance



8. COMMISSION REPORTS

Reports by Commission members on information they have received and meetings they have attended which would be of interest to the Commission or the public. No discussion by other Commission members will occur except for clarifying questions. The Commission or an individual Commissioner can request that an item be placed on a future agenda for discussion.

- 1) Commissioner Merewitz took a tour of Dunnigan and a tour of Clarksburg with Commissioner Heringer.
- 2) Commissioner Stephens attended a CEQA workshop and Flood Control meeting for Esparto.
- 3) Commissioner Woo announced she was a member of the Coalition of Women Environment Design. The next meeting will be April 24, 1997.



9. ADJOURNMENT

The Regular Meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission was adjourned at 4:40 p.m. The next meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission is scheduled April 2, 1997 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.

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

Respectfully submitted by,

John Bencomo, Interim Director
Yolo County Community Development Agency

LAC