

MINUTES

YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

June 10, 1999

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Walker, Woo, Heringer, Lang, and Peart  
MEMBERS ABSENT: Stephens, and Gerber  
STAFF PRESENT: John Bencomo, Assistant Director  
Mark Hamblin, Associate Planner  
David Morrison, Resource Manager  
Marshall Drack, Economic Development Coordinator  
Steven Basha, County Counsel  
Thomas Geiger, County Counsel  
David Daly, Senior Planner  
Lance Lowe, Assistant Planner  
Carole Kjar, Secretary to the Director

1.1\_ The Swearing in and Oath of Office for Donald Peart, the new Planning Commissioner for District 5, was administered by Linda Ford from the County Clerk's Office.



2. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS

**Commission Action**

The Minutes of the May 13, 1999 Planning Commission Meeting were approved with no corrections.

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

Commissioner Peart abstained from the vote of this item since on May 13, 1999 he was not yet a member of the Planning Commission.

♦ ♦ ♦

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 Lang 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.

- 5.1 **96-083** - A request for a 1 year time extension of a Tentative Parcel Map for Capay Valley Winery involving 4 parcels originally approved June 24, 1997. The subject property is located on the southeast corner of State Route 16 and Ranch Road, north of County Road 78. APN's 048-020-7, 11, 13 and 15.  
Owner/Applicant: Pamela Welch (D. Daly)

**Commission Action**

- (1) **ADOPTED** the FINDINGS as presented in the staff report; and,  
(2) **APPROVED** the requested Tentative Parcel Map 1 year extension.

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

**FINDINGS**

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

**Subdivision Map Act**

The proposed 1 year extension is authorized by §66463.5(a), of the Subdivision Map Act (SMA).

*The above referenced SMA section reads as follows: "When a tentative map is required, an approved tentative map shall expire 24 months after its approval, or after any additional period of time as may be prescribed by local ordinance, not to exceed and additional 12 months".*

**Yolo County Code**

The requested 1 year extension is consistent with Yolo County Code Section 8-1.804.

*Code Section 8-1.804 states: "...the tentative map shall expire unless a renewal is requested before such expiration date, and is granted by the Commission".*



5.2 **99-039** - Agricultural Review for a Proposed Addition to the Holland Land Company Headquarters (Yolo County designated Historic Landmark). The subject structure is located at 36533 Netherlands Road, Clarksburg. A Categorical Exemption has been prepared for this project. APN: 043-160-35. Applicant: Jim Bob Kaufmann (L. Lowe)

Commissioner Woo asked a question about the structure of the porte cochere, which Lance Lowe deferred to Mr. Kaufman, the Architect.

The public hearing was opened.

Jim Bob Kaufmann, Architect, answered Commissioner Woo's question by stating that the porte cochere is there now, and that it has a roof with a rail on top of it and posts on the corners. He said they're not changing the architectural character of it all, they're keeping everything and just filling in around the edges with screens so it can't be driven through. He said the material of the addition will be the same.

The public hearing was closed.

**Commission Action**

The Planning Commission acting in the capacity of the Historical Preservation Commission:

- (1) **CERTIFIED** the Categorical Exemption prepared for the project as the appropriate level of environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (**Exhibit "8"**);
- (2) **APPROVED** the proposed addition subject to the "Conditions of Approval" as presented in the staff report.

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

## **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

### **Planning and Public Works Department**

1. All materials shall remain consistent with the existing residence including, but not limited to siding, roofing, windows, and eave detail.
2. If, after approval of the design by the Planning Commission, any changes are proposed to the project by the applicant/owner, they shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator, who may defer to the Planning Commission if he/she interprets the changes to be more than minor.
3. Prior to construction of the project the applicant shall contact the Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department, Environmental Health Department, and Pacific Gas & Electric Company for necessary Encroachment/Building/Health Permits.

### **County Counsel**

- 4.(a) In accordance with Yolo County Code Section 8-2.2415, the applicants, owners, their successor's or assignees 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.
- (b) 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 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 the 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.
- (c) 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.

◆ ◆ ◆

6. REGULAR AGENDA

6.1 Receive comments regarding Yolo County Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), and Planning and Technical Assistance Grant Applications (M. Drack)

Marshall Drack stated that the purpose of this hearing is to receive comments from the public regarding the Yolo County Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, and Planning and Technical Assistance component of the 1999-2000 economic enterprise complement of the program. The hearing is required for CDBG application.

Marshall Drack read into the record the following list of information provided by the State of California.

1. The purpose of this hearing is to address the 1999-2000 Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) and the County's eligibility to participate in it. The County is eligible for up to \$870,000.00 in CDBG funds each year.

2. Components of the program and the funding limitations include:

Up to \$500,000.00 in economic development funds, whether through the economic enterprise fund which provides revolving loans to businesses or the "over the counter" program which assists a specific business. Examples of CDBG economic development business assistance include funds for equipment, working capital, facilities, expansion, and/or infrastructure.

Up to \$500,000.00 in the general program which includes funds for new housing construction, housing rehabilitation, community facilities, public services and public works.

Up to \$70,000.00 on planning/technical assistance grants as follows: up to \$35,000.00 for economic development planning/technical assistance grants and up to \$35,000.00 in general program planning/technical assistance grants.

3. The purpose of CDBG funds is to primarily benefit low-moderate income persons. With economic development funds there may also be the objective of removing blight.

4. CDBG presents public opportunities for public comment on its programs. We will have two public meetings in the process, this one today; and, another, or second public meeting, when an application is pending before the Board of Supervisors.

5. This meeting was noticed on May 27, 1999, and information has been on file with the County since then which could assist any public member with any question or comment.

6. This hearing is handicapped available; the County does not discriminate; and, if a bilingual translator is necessary, one will be appointed for you.

7. Yolo County is considering an application for a CDBG, economic development grant, planning and technical assistance grant, on June 22, 1999, or as soon as possible thereafter.
8. There is an attendance sheet for anybody who is here to speak or address the public hearing regarding the CDBG grant options.
9. I would ask that the Chair now open the public hearing for comment.

The public hearing was opened. An attendance sheet was circulated. There was no one present to comment.

The public hearing was closed, and there was no discussion amongst the commissioners.

Marshall Drack announced that the process has been completed, and we now comply with the State Departments to fulfill our application requirements.

**Commission Action**

No action required.



**6.2 Presentation on Economic and Revenue Analysis Report Recently Adopted by the Yolo County Board of Supervisors (M. Drack)**

Marshall Drack stated that the Economic and Revenue Analysis was recently conducted by a Consultant firm known as Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. (EPS), a well known and respected firm who have done a great deal of work in our County and in our Cities, and in relation to LAFCO. He introduced Joe Chinn, Vice President of EPS, who presented the information before the Board of Supervisors on May 25, 1999, and said it was the Board’s interest that this Commission have the pleasure of this presentation also.

Joe Chinn, Vice President of EPS, stated that the purpose of the Economic and Revenue Analysis Study was to evaluate the economic and county revenue impacts of various different types of development opportunities that exist within the County. He distributed a handout of the Economic and Revenue Analysis, Yolo County, and presented the following economic and fiscal overview of past and current financial conditions within the County to better understand the current County financial and economic position.

**ECONOMIC SETTING**

- A decade of strong employment growth in Yolo County
- High jobs to population ratio - County a net importer of jobs rather than a commuter county.
- Lower unemployment rate than State average.
- Per capita personal income that ranks 20<sup>th</sup> in 58 counties.

**COUNTY FISCAL SETTING**

- Yolo County receives the lowest property tax share of the 58 counties in the State.
- Yolo County’s assessed value per capita is about 8% lower than State average.
- County’s general-purpose revenues are stagnant or declining despite a growing economy.
- State legislation (ERAF property tax shift) and State program mandates have reduced County revenues and flexibility.

## COUNTY REVENUE ANALYSIS GENERAL FINDINGS

- Most fiscally positive land uses will be those that generate the most sales tax or hotel tax revenues.
- Low property tax share received by the County diminishes some of the importance of businesses with high assessed value.
- The County receives significantly more sales tax and transient occupancy tax revenues from businesses that locate in unincorporated areas.
- For a business with low or no sales or motel tax revenues, it is less important to County General Funds whether business locates in unincorporated or incorporated areas.
- Current County Policies regarding urban development in unincorporated areas limit sales and transient occupancy tax revenues.

## ECONOMIC CONCLUSIONS

- Yolo County should continue to support the ag-related business sector, biotechnology, and transportation, warehousing, and distribution-related industries. Building on current strengths has the strongest probability for expanded economic activity.
- Yolo County should build off the regional strengths in information services, electronics manufacturing, and health services and expand those sectors within Yolo County to diversity its economic base.

## CONCLUSIONS OF COUNTY FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

- Under the current State/County taxing structure, the County is unlikely to see an improved revenue picture in the future unless the County can increase:
  - Sales tax revenues by the development of sales tax generating businesses in unincorporated areas or through sales tax sharing agreements with the cities.
  - Transient occupancy tax revenues by adding lodging in unincorporated areas.
  - Economic development anywhere in the County can assist in indirectly reducing County services costs to the extent new jobs reduce the number of unemployed or low-wage earners in the County.

Joe Chinn answered questions from the Commission and elaborated on information he had presented.

Marshall Drack added that the Board of Supervisors discussed trying to work with the State or lobby the State to try to solve Yolo County's property tax problem. They also talked about working with the cities to address some form of revenue sharing, and about looking at programs or projects that this Commission might bring to them from time to time. They asked him to come back to the Board, through the Commission, with some programs that might be done to facilitate or create opportunities.

## Commission Action

No action required.



- 6.3 **99-025** - Replacement of Yolo County Zoning Map Insets #16 through #30 with Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Maps #16 through #20 and a composite Zoning Map. A Categorical Exemption has been prepared for this project. Location: County Wide. Applicant: Yolo County (D. Daly)

David Daly gave the staff report, stating that this item is an effort by staff to modernize and replace zoning maps. He said that no change in the zoning classifications will occur with the adoption of these maps.

The public hearing was opened and closed. No one from the public came forward.

### **Commission Action**

Recommend that the Board of Supervisors:

- (1) **CERTIFY** that the recommended action is Statutorily Exempt pursuant to Sections 15268, 15357 and 15369 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines; and,
- (2) **ADOPT** the FINDINGS as presented in the staff report, and **ADOPT** an Ordinance replacing Zoning Inset Maps #16 through #30 with Geographic Information System Zoning Inset Maps #16 through #20 and Composite Zoning Map.

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

Following presentation of the application and the recommended action, a public hearing was held at which no one from the public appeared, followed by a brief deliberation of the Planning Commission.

### **FINDINGS**

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

The Yolo County Planning Commission finds the following concerning the proposal:

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

That the action of replacing existing Zoning Inset Maps #16 through #30 with the recommended Inset Maps #16 through #20, and Composite Zoning Map, has been deemed to be Statutorily Exempt from further environmental review.

*Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, the*



*requested action involves determination of conformity between the existing "Inset Maps" and replacement inset maps (CEQA §15357), and is additionally "Ministerial" in nature (CEQA §15357), and is additionally "Ministerial" in nature (CEQA §15268 and §15369), and therefore, statutorily exempt from further environmental review.*

### **Zoning Map Conformity**

That no change in zoning as identified by Yolo County Zoning Inset Maps #16 through #30 has been proposed with, or will occur as a result of, the recommended action to replace the "Inset Maps" with the recommended Yolo County Zoning (GIS) Inset Maps #16 through #20, and a single Composite Zoning Map.

*The Yolo County Planning Commission has determined that Zoning (GIS) Inset Maps #16 through #20 conform, as to the identification of zoning classifications, to the existing "Inset Maps" identified above. The new GIS Zoning Inset Maps #16 through #20 and recommended Composite Zoning Map were developed and created based on the existing "Inset Maps" through a scanning and digitizing process to insure accuracy and conformity.*



- 6.4 **G-7** - A request to establish Financial Assurances in the amount of \$14,610 for the former County aggregate mine site. The project is located south of County Road 20, between Cache Creek and County Road 96, three miles west of the City of Woodland. A Categorical Exemption has been prepared for this project. APN: 025-120-41. Applicant/Owner: Yolo County (D. Morrison)

David Morrison presented the staff report. He said the Financial Assurances have been submitted to the Department of Conservation who has reviewed them and has not made any comment. With regards to the expectations for reclamation of the site, staff expects to bring to the Board of Supervisors in July a bid from a gravel company for leasing the six-acre property that the County owns for storage, not mining, and that in return for rent for using the property, they would finish reclamation at no cost to the County. He said the Financial Assurances will remain in place until the reclamation is completed, then it will come back to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Heringer asked if the \$14,610 is an adequate figure. David Morrison said he developed these costs based on County standard reclamation costs, and that the figure is not the lease amount, it is what the County would have to put up to ensure that the reclamation is completed. The lease agreement is not being brought before the Planning Commission at this time.

The public hearing was opened and closed. No one from the public came forward.

### **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) **APPROVED** the establishment of financial assurances for the Yolo County aggregate mine site for \$14,610.

MOTION: Woo                      SECOND: Walker

AYES: Walker, Woo, Heringer, Lang, and Peart  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: Stephens, and Gerber

Following presentation of the application and the recommended action, a public hearing was held at which no one from the public appeared, followed by a brief deliberation of the Planning Commission.



6.5 **99-016** - A request for a Parcel Map to divide an approximate 15 acre parcel into 3 five acre single family home sites in the Agricultural General (A-1) Zone. Subject property is located between County Road 24 and County Road 25, north of County Road 94A, approximately 3 miles southwest of the City of Woodland. A Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project. APN: 040-040-01. Applicant/Owner: Donald & Martha Sharp (L. Lowe)

Lance Lowe gave the staff report. He prefaced his introduction of the project by saying that it was publicly noticed under Cal-Penn/Bill Streng, and the property has since changed hands, and the applicant now is Mr. Donald Sharp.

Commissioner Lang asked if this was the area designated years ago by the County and the City of Woodland for this type of ranchette small housing. Lance Lowe answered yes, that the General Plan at the time it was drafted in 1980 entailed that eventually this area may be annexed.

Commissioner Peart asked if there is a problem with dividing it up into five-acre parcels. Lance Lowe said, no, it is consistent with the rural residential designation and meets the minimum size of A-1 zone, and that it is one of the last remaining in this particular area.

The public hearing was opened.

Donald Sharp, applicant, thanked the staff for providing information which helped him through this process. He also thanked the neighbors surrounding this property for their help, and stated that it is his intention that his family will build a home and live on this property. He said he read and understood the Conditions of Approval and agrees with them. He commented on Item 15, the Fish and Game Requirement, and that he would request that any mitigation monies that are required for Fish and Game mitigation be collected at the time of the issuance of a building permit, because he's not sure if there will be more than one permit issued for the three parcels for building.

John Bencomo said that is do-able, and that it has been arranged for prior parcel maps. It basically defers the payment of the fee to the Habitat Program or whatever mitigation is worked out with Fish and Game to the point of the issuance of the building permit as opposed to the filing of the map.

Donald Sharp commented that in the development of parcels he'll be very careful not to intrude on the neighbors, and since he's going to be there it is important that he get along with the people on any drainage issues and other items that are involved in development will be researched to minimize the impact on the neighboring properties.

Janet Carter, owner of property south of Donald Sharp, expressed that she is thoroughly satisfied that Don Sharp is going to be a good neighbor since he just answered her question about the drainage, and that he will work with them on the drainage when he places his road, etc., so he doesn't impact them with extra water.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Heringer said that he believes we should have a pass-through tax. Steven Basha stated that his understanding, based on the pass-through agreements as they presently exist, is that this will happen if it is ever annexed by the City of Woodland. He doesn't know that there's been any movement yet that the City is headed in that direction. He stated that he thinks that's already taken care of without a specific designation on these parcels.

John Bencomo added that, since the adoption of this particular plan, the interest in the City has changed dramatically and that during the years he's been here, there hasn't been any interest by the City to look at annexing any of this area.

**Commission Action**

- (1) **CERTIFIED** the Negative Declaration prepared for the project as the appropriate level of environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (**Exhibit "5"**);
- (2) **ADOPTED** the Findings of Approval as presented in the staff report, and;
- (3) **APPROVED** the Tentative Parcel Map (TPM # 4409) subject to the "Conditions of Approval" as modified in the staff report.

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

Following presentation of the application and the recommended action, a public hearing was held at which two people from the public appeared, followed by a brief deliberation of the Planning Commission.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

**Planning:**

- 1. The proposed right-of-way extending from the southwest corner of parcel 1 and continuing north to the northwest property boundary; thence running east connecting to Hilltop road will not be accepted by the County for dedication. Additionally, all rights-of ways not used for ingress or egress shall be deleted prior to the recordation of the Parcel Map.
- 2. The applicant shall provide access by either of the following:
  - (a) Record a Private Vehicular Access Easement (PVAE) for ingress and egress at County Road 94A and extending to the southwest corner of Parcel 1; thence running east and terminating with a 90' turnaround for fire apparatus at the southwest corner of Parcel 3. The PVAE shall be shown on the Final Map as a "private access and emergency services vehicle access easement".

OR

- (b) Obtain and record a Private Vehicular Easement (PVAE) for ingress and egress accessing the property via the extension of Hilltop Road at the northeast corner of Parcel 3 and extending to the northeast corner of Parcel 1 and terminating with a 90' turnaround for fire apparatus. The PVAE shall be shown on the Final Map as a

“private access and emergency services vehicle access easement”.

3. The property owner(s) shall record a “Private Road Maintenance Agreement” for the above noted Private Vehicular Access Easements. The agreement will provide for funding of the installation, maintenance and repair of on-site roads not assumed by the County. All the terms, conditions, restrictions and covenants contained in the Agreement are deemed covenants running with the land, are for the benefit of the land affected by the agreement and shall inure to the benefit of, and be enforceable by, all owners of said lands and their heirs, devisees, assigns and successors in interest. A copy of the recorded agreement shall be provided to Planning and Public Works Department prior to recording of the Final Map.
4. The applicant shall record an “Avigation and Noise Easement” covering the subject property for the Watts-Woodland Airport prior to recording of the Final Map. Said easement shall be recorded as a separate instrument and approved as to form by County Counsel of Yolo County. Said easement shall be recorded in the Office of the Yolo County Clerk/Recorder at the applicant’s expense. Said copy shall be submitted to the Planning and Public Works Department.
5. The Final Map for the project shall be filed with the Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department within two years from the date of approval by the Planning Commission or the Tentative Parcel Map shall become null and void without any further action in accordance with the State Subdivision Map Act.
6. The individual property owner(s) of Parcels 1, 2, and 3 shall be responsible for the cost of installation and/or relocation of any public utility required to service the construction or placement of a residence or accessory building on the property. Public utilities shall be installed in accordance to the requirements of the Uniform Building Codes and subject to the approval by the Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department, Building Division.

**Building:**

7. Residential dwellings shall be constructed so that the indoor sound level will not exceed a Ldn of 45dBa (as specified in “Information on levels of environmental noise requirements to protect public health and welfare with an adequate margin of safety, March 1974”).
8. As part of each building permit submittal, the applicant shall provide a site drainage plan showing the finish floor elevation, finish grade elevation, and general topography into the natural drainage way off the site.
9. If grading limits set forth in Appendix 33 of the Uniform Building Code are exceeded, a permit shall be required with a grading plan as approved by the Chief Building Official of Yolo County.
10. If a building pad is to be raised, a soils report for the pad performed by a geotechnical

engineer will be required. Building foundations and slabs shall comply with any special requirements included in the soils report.

**Fire District:**

11. All new residential construction requires the installation of a fire sprinkler system. Incoming power shall be first connected to the pump and then to the residence or building.
12. A fire department water supply connection of 1 ½" male fire thread shall be placed after the pump or water tank with the shut off valve.
13. Access shall be 20' all weather, year round driveway/road with a ninety foot 90' turnaround for fire apparatus, capable of supporting a 40,000 pound load.

**Public Utilities:**

14. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the individual property owner(s) of the parcels created by this project shall call Pacific Bell's Underground Service Alert 800-642-2444 two working days prior to digging.

**Fish & Game:**

15. Prior to the issuance of a building permit with the County of Yolo, the applicant shall mitigate for the loss of Swainson's hawk habitat according to the California Department of Fish & Game Swainson's hawk Guidelines or by participation in the preparation of the Yolo County Habitat Management Plan. Mitigation for the project shall be to the satisfaction of the California Department of Fish & Game.

**County Counsel:**

16. In accordance with Yolo County Code Section 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 attach, 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 the following actions:

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

**FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL**

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

Pursuant to Section 66474 of the Subdivision Map Act a legislative body of a city or county shall

deny approval of a tentative map, or a parcel map for which a tentative map was not required, if it makes any of the following findings:

1. That the proposed map is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans as specified in Section 65451;

*The Yolo County Zoning ordinance designates the site as Agricultural General (A-1) which allows minimum parcel sizes of 5 acres. The project is consistent with the Woodland Area General Plan adopted in January 1980. Pursuant to the plan, the property is designated as Rural Residential (RR) and contains provisions for a maximum density of one dwelling unit per five acres.*

2. That the design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans;

*The applicant is proposing to divide a 15 acre property into 3 single family home sites. Due to the rural nature of the project and surrounding area, minimal improvements will be required. The project will be serviced by individual well and septic for water/sanitation. Utilities will be provided at the expense of the owner by P. G. & E for electrical, a private gas supplier for gas services, and Pacific Bell for phone service. The project has been sent to all applicable regulatory agencies. There were no significant comments received.*

3. That the site is not physically suitable for the type of development;

*As noted in the staff report, the property is in close proximity to the Watts-Woodland Airport which prevents higher density development than is proposed. The property is currently dry land farmed. The size of the property, the soil classification and the sloping topography render the property unsuitable for farming. The proposal, as conditioned, is physically suited for the applicant's request to create the proposed 3 lots for single family development.*

4. That the site is not physically suitable for the proposed density or development;

*In November, 1975, the Yolo County Planning Department prepared the Monument Hills Environmental Impact Report. Due to the soil types, the need for individual wells and septic tanks, the proximity of the Watts-Woodland Airport as well as the conclusions found in the EIR, 5 acre home sites constitute the residential density limit for this area.*

5. That the design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements are likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat;

*An initial study has been conducted and staff has determined that a Negative Declaration is the appropriate level of environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. The Negative Declaration has been sent to the appropriate regulatory agencies with no major concerns noted. As part of the Conditions of Approval, if required, by the California Department of Fish and Game, prior to the filing of a Final Map or the issuance of a building permit with the County of Yolo, the applicant shall mitigate for the loss of Swainson's Hawk habitat according to the California Department of Fish and Game Swainson's Hawk Guidelines or by participation in the preparation of the Yolo County*

*Habitat Management Plan. Mitigation for the project shall be to the satisfaction of the California Department of Fish and Game.*

6. That the design of the subdivision or type of improvements is likely to cause serious public health problems;

*The design of the property will not cause serious public health problems. All issues regarding health safety and general welfare of the area will be dealt with accordingly by the appropriate regulatory agency prior to occupancy of the dwelling units.*

7. 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 subdivision. In this connection, the governing body may approve a 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 easements of record or to easements established by judgement of a 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 property within the proposed subdivision.

*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.*

A land division may be approved for a parcel in the Woodland Area General Plan when all of the following findings are made:

8. The design of the land division and the development proposed for construction on the parcels to be created by the land division is consistent with the County Woodland Area General Plan, and the City of Woodland reports to the Planning Commission that the type and timing of construction of the development improvements proposed for the land division is in compliance with the City of Woodland Urban Development Policy and applicable City Development improvement standards.

*The parcels created are consistent with the Woodland Area General Plan for type and density of development. A request for comments has been sent to the City of Woodland to address any potential concerns regarding development standards. There were no concerns noted.*

9. The property owner has agreed in a written and recorded agreement with the City, binding on all successors, heirs, and assigns, to annex the parcels created by the division to the City when so required by the City.

*The Woodland Area General Plan adopted in 1980 was a collaborative effort to guide the anticipated growth for the city of Woodland into the year 2000. Although growth has occurred within this area at the density permitted pursuant to the Woodland Area General Plan, the City has no intention, at this time, to annex the rural residential development of the Monument Hills/Hillcrest/Hilltop area. Consequently, the City of Woodland has not enforced the above condition on development within the area.*

California Environmental Quality Act & Guidelines (CEQA)

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

On the basis of the whole record, including the initial study and any comments received, that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment and that the negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration reflects the lead agency's independent judgement and analysis.



6.6 **99-027** - A Lot Line Adjustment to reconfigure two existing parcels and concurrent Williamson Act Contract Division (#74-028) in the Agricultural Preserve (A-P) Zone. Subject parcels 025-340-18 and 21 are located between County Road 97A and County Road 98, approximately 1,000 feet south of County Road 19A. Subject parcel 025-330-08 is non-contiguous and located approximately 1/4 mile northwest of County Road 97A, adjacent to Cache Creek. A Categorical Exemption has been prepared for this project. Applicant: George T. Oliver (L. Lowe)

Lance Lowe gave the staff report. He stated that both properties will be encumbered by one single contract.

The public hearing was opened.

George Oliver, resident on the eastern part of the property, stated that he is executor for his mother's estate and her wishes were for the 80 acres to be divided in half so it falls back to where it should be, and that he will continue to farm the property.

Steven Basha asked Mr. Oliver if he had read the Conditions of Approval. Mr. Oliver answered no.

A ten minute recess was called so the applicant could review the Conditions of Approval.

Mr. Oliver stated that he is in agreement with the way the Conditions of Approval are written.

The public hearing was closed.

### **Commission Action**

|          |                                        |         |        |
|----------|----------------------------------------|---------|--------|
| MOTION:  | Heringer                               | SECOND: | Walker |
| AYES:    | Walker, Woo, Heringer, Lang, and Peart |         |        |
| NOES:    | None                                   |         |        |
| ABSTAIN: | None                                   |         |        |
| ABSENT:  | Stephens, and Gerber                   |         |        |

Following presentation of the application and the recommended action, a public hearing was held at which one person from the public appeared, followed by a brief deliberation of the Planning Commission.



6.7 **99-031** - A request for a 3 year extension of time to file a Tentative Subdivision Map for the Wildwing Country Club Subdivision. Subject property is located on the north side of State



Highway 16, 5 miles west of Woodland in the Residential/PD-45 zone. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR), was previously certified for this project. APN: 025-440-17, 43 and 025-190-61. Applicant/Owner: Milton Watts (M. Hamblin)

John Bencomo said that the applicant has asked for more time to address concerns raised by staff.

### Commission Action

**DIRECTED** staff to continue this item at the July 1999 Planning Commission Meeting.

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



6.8 **99-001** - A request for a General Plan Amendment, Zone Change and a Lot Line Adjustment to provide additional parking area and a potential future wastewater holding pond area for the proposed Pilot Travel Center. A Zone Variance for the installation of a 50 foot sign within the Highway Service Commercial (C-H) Zone is also requested. The project site is located on the east side of U.S. Interstate 5, approximately 300 feet south of County Road 8 in the Town of Dunnigan. A Tiered Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project. APN: 052-050-07. Applicant: Pilot Corporation (M. Hamblin)

Mark Hamblin presented the staff report.

The public hearing was opened.

Danny Gregory, Project Manager and representative of Pilot Corporation, gave a brief overview of their business. He said they're a privately-held company, with about 7,000 employees. Their headquarters is in Knoxville, Tennessee, and their revenues this past year have exceeded \$2 billion. They are primarily in the business of selling diesel fuel, selling about 8% of the road diesel fuel in the country. They just celebrated their 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary. The business was started as a little service station and convenience store. Now there are 45 to 50 convenience store/gas stations located primarily in Southwest Virginia and Eastern Tennessee. It then developed into the travel center business which accommodates not only commercial trucks, but also the traveling public. They were ranked 25<sup>th</sup> in Restaurant Nations News just recently and they are ranked 99<sup>th</sup> from the Forbes 500 privately-held companies in the country.

Danny Gregory said the project is currently under construction, and the addition of this property will allow them to add some additional truck parking which will help them maximize their sales potential, which obviously increases the sales tax potential for the County and it also increases safety by getting trucks off the road.

Mark Hamblin added that Danny Gregory has been working with neighbors in the area regarding off site drainage, and this is an area where the County was concerned also, because they have run into several situations where that intersection has been flooded out, and it had to be closed off from historical account. He said that Danny and Mel Smith working together have come up with an agreement where some improvements were going to be conducted as this facility starts to build out,

which was a significant accomplishment between the two of them, because this is a voluntary arrangement.

Danny Gregory said that in addition to working with Mr. Smith, which has been a very amicable situation, they've also worked with their neighbor who owns the restaurant next to them, so their businesses mesh very well together.

Commissioner Peart asked if any portion of this sales tax will go to the Dunnigan Community. John Bencomo answered that this is a Board issue which we will be getting into as part of the General Plan.

Commissioner Woo expressed that, under Equal Opportunity Employer, it says the average wage is in excess of minimum wage. She thinks this statement would cause more questions than answers, because you could take a whole bunch of people at minimum wage and have one person getting paid a whole lot more, and then average it, and then everybody would be above minimum wage. Mr. Gregory said OK.

Commissioner Lang asked how many managers there will be. Mr. Gregory said that typically there is a general manager of the entire facility and a separate restaurant manager for the restaurant part, and some Assistant Managers also – there is a team of managers. He said total staffing will be about 90 to 100 employees. They will draw everybody from the local community that they possibly can and send them for extensive training at the Pilot University in Knoxville.

John Bencomo asked Danny Gregory if he has had an opportunity to review the Conditions of Approval. Mr. Gregory stated that he has reviewed them and they agree with complying with all of the Conditions.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Woo asked if all of the Dunnigan townsfolk know what's going on here. Mark Hamblin said this item has been circulated to members of the former Dunnigan General Planning Committee, the Community Service, Water and Fire Districts, and that all property owners within the 300-foot area were notified, as well as Caltrans. Mark Hamblin said that nothing negative has been received on this particular project.

Commissioner Peart stated that this is a very good project which will be great for Dunnigan, and he thinks most of the people are looking forward to this type of development which is well fitted in the Dunnigan area.

### **Commission Action**

Recommend that the Board of Supervisors:

- (1) **APPROVE** the attached Tiered Negative Declaration as the appropriate environmental document for this project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and Guidelines (CEQA);
- (2) **ADOPT** the FINDINGS for this project as presented in the staff report;
- (3) **APPROVE** the General Plan Resolution and Map Amendment (**Exhibit 4**) from "AG" (Agricultural) to "HSC" (Highway Service Commercial), a Zoning Ordinance and

Change of Zone Map (**Exhibit 5**) from "A-1" (Agricultural General) to "CH" (Highway Service Commercial) and a Lot Line Adjustment (**Exhibit 3**) to enlarge an existing 9.3 acre parcel to 15.6 acres (increase of 6.6 acres) subject to the conditions listed under CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL presented in the staff report;

- (4) **APPROVE** a Variance to the maximum height limitation of 40 feet in the "CH" zone to allow for the installation of a 50 foot double face unipole ID sign for the Pilot Travel Center.

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

Following presentation of the application and the recommended action, a public hearing was held at which one person from the public appeared, followed by a brief deliberation of the Planning Commission.

### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

#### **Planning and Public Works Department**

##### **Planning Division**

1. The property owner(s) shall record the Certificate of Compliance prepared for this Lot Line Adjustment at the property owners expense in the Office of the Yolo County Clerk/Recorder within one year from the date of the Yolo County Board of Supervisors's approval or said Lot Line Adjustment shall be deemed null and void without any further action. The applicant shall provide new legal descriptions of the lot line adjusted parcels created by this lot line adjustment for inclusion into said Certificate of Compliance.
2. The Variance to allow the installation of a 50 foot sign on the Pilot Travel Center property shall commence within one (1) year from the effective date of the Yolo County Board of Supervisors's approval of the Change of Zone or said Variance shall be deemed null and void without further action.
3. The applicant shall submit to the Director of the Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department a copy of the approved wastewater discharge permit from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board prior to any future expansion or development of new wastewater holding ponds.

##### **Public Works Division**

4. The applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit from the Public Works Division for any work (i.e. driveway apron, installation of culverts, curb and gutter, etc.) conducted in the County public right-of-way.
5. Prior to the final inspection for the Pilot Travel Center, the applicant shall install Type A2-6 curb, gutter and sidewalk along the subject property's frontage with County Road 99W in accordance with the County of Yolo Improvements Standards to the satisfaction of the Director of the Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department.

6. Prior to the final inspection for the Pilot Travel Center, the applicant shall install rumble strips, buttons and/or signage along or within County Road 99W subject to the approval of the Director of the Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department in order to alert automobile and truck traffic to slow down as they approach the intersection of County Road 8 and County Road 99W.
7. Prior to the final inspection the applicant shall install stormwater drainage improvements to accommodate the stormwater flows generated by the overall build out of the Pilot Travel Center. Said improvements shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the County of Yolo Improvements Standards to the satisfaction of the Director of the Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department.

#### **California Department of Fish & Game**

8. Prior to the granting of an entitlement to initiate grading on the subject property (6.6 acres) or issuance of a building permit, the project proponent shall pay the appropriate fee per acre pursuant to California Fish and Game Code Section 2081 to the Yolo Habitat Management Trust Account (the current Fish & Game mitigation fee is \$1995.00 per acre of disturbed land) or obtain a Section 2081 Management Authorization Agreement approved by the Department of Fish & Game.

#### **County Counsel**

9. 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 Board of Supervisors may result in any or all of the following:

- . **non-issuance of a future building permit;**
- . **legal action.**

#### **FINDINGS**

*[Supporting evidence has been indented and italicized]*

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

In accordance with CEQA the Yolo County Board of Supervisors finds:

*A Tiered Negative Declaration has been approved as the environmental determination for this project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) and Guidelines. The Negative Declaration was tiered off of the EIR for the Dunnigan General Plan certified by the Yolo County Planning Commission on September 3, 1997.*

### **General Plan and Change of Zone**

In accordance with Section 8-2.3005, Article 30, Chapter 2 of Title 8 of the Yolo County Regulations, and Chapter 4 of Title 7 of the Government Code of the State, the Yolo County Board of Supervisors finds:

1. That the public health, safety, and general welfare warrant the change of zone;

*The project supports the development of the Pilot Travel Center currently under construction on the adjoining property that is highway commercial zoned along County Road 8.*

*The overall project presents significant public improvements to County Roads 8 and 99W. It reconstructs and updates the existing stormwater drainage system, including placing an existing open air stormwater drainage ditch underground. It provides curbs, gutter and sidewalk along portions of County Roads 8 and 99W.*

*The project addresses public safety concerns by providing clean-up (petroleum seepage) of the former Dunnigan Truck Stop site. It stops off-site parking of trucks along County 99W, and provides traffic slowing mechanisms for the County Road 8/99W intersection.*

*The project presents an aesthetic improvement to the original site;*

*The project will provide employment opportunity (about 100 new jobs) and generate additional sales tax.*

*Appropriate requirements regarding road improvements, sewage disposal stormwater drainage, grading and structures have been recommended. The conditions of approval, as proposed, will ensure that the public health, safety, and general welfare will be protected.*

2. The zone or regulation is in conformity with the Master Plan (General Plan);

*The proposed project as conditioned is determined to be in compliance with the Dunnigan Area General Plan, dated December 22, 1981.*

### **Yolo County Zoning Regulations**

#### **Lot Line Adjustment**

In accordance with Yolo County Code Section 8-1.457 the Yolo County Planning Commission finds:

1. That the application is complete;

*The application was deemed complete for processing by the Planning and Public Works Department on February 5, 1999.*

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

*The record title holders have consented to the proposed Lot Line Adjustment and the Planning and Public Works Department is recommending approval of the project.*

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

*The preliminary legal descriptions submitted with the application appear to accurately describe the proposed adjusted parcels to be created by the project. The applicant will provide a final version of the legal descriptions for inclusion into the lot line adjustment's Certificate of Compliance prepared for this project that is to be recorded with the County Clerk/Recorder.*

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

*No street or utility easements will be abandoned by the requested Lot Line Adjustment.*

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

*The Lot Line Adjustment will not result in the elimination or reduction in size of an access way to any resulting parcel.*

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

*After review of the application, State and County regulations, the responses to the Request For Comments, etc. it was determined that the design of the resulting parcels will comply with existing requirements as to the area, improvements and design, flood and water drainage control, applicable improvements to the public road, sanitary disposal facilities, water supply availability, environmental protection, and all other requirements of State laws and this Code and is in conformity with the purpose and intent of the General Plan and zoning provisions.*

### Variance

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 65900 through 65905 of Article 3, Chapter 4 of Title 7 of the Government Code of the State, the Yolo County Board of Supervisors has determined all of the following:

- (1) That any Variance granted shall be subject to such conditions as will assure that the adjustment thereby authorized shall not 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;

*Other fuel facilities within the unincorporated area along U.S. I-5 in the commercial and industrial zones have been granted a Variance by the Planning Commission or Zoning Administrator for sign height. The highway sign for the Ramos CFN Fuel Facility in the Woodland area was approved at 50 feet. The sign for the Beacon Station in Dunnigan was approved at 60 feet and the highway sign at the Zamora Mini Mart was approved at 80 feet. Also an additional 50 foot sign has previously been approved for the Pilot Corporation to be installed at the Pilot Travel Center in Dunnigan.*

- (2) That, because of special circumstances applicable to the subject property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict application of the provisions of this chapter is found to deprive the subject property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity and under the identical zone classification.

*Other fuel facilities within the unincorporated area have been granted a Variance due to the height of an existing overpass crossing along U.S. I-5 which blocks or limits the view of the facility to the traveling public on the highway. A forty foot sign at this site has a limited visibility due to the height of the County Road 8 highway overpass. Additional sign height would allow the sign to be seen by the traveling public at a distance that is horizontally farther from the highway overpass.*

- (3) The granting of such Variance will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this chapter and will be in conformity with the Master Plan.

*The granting of the Variance for the subject parcel will be consistent with the requirements of the Government Code, Yolo County Zoning Ordinance and Master Plan for the vicinity.*



## 6.9 Nominations and Election of Planning Commission Vice Chair

### **Commission Action:**

Commissioner Woo was nominated as Vice Chair.

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

## 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) "Impossible Acres" (McDonald and Kelley) Ag. Contract Split
- (2) Enforcement Issues: Roving Nights Mobile Home Park in Knights Landing  
Reclamation (Junk) Yard in Dunnigan
- (3) Agricultural Conservation Program for Yolo County
- (4) Zoning Code Amendment



## 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 Lang requested that the City of West Sacramento present their General Plan to the Planning Commission as a future agenda item.
- (2) Commissioner Peart expressed that he enjoyed the meeting today and is looking forward to working with the Commission.
- (3) Commissioner Walker said that at the last meeting he suggested that a letter be directed to the Board of Supervisors extolling the virtues of the staff. He suggested that Vice Chair Woo prepare the letter. She said she would love for that to be her first assignment.

Commissioner Walker stated that a couple of weeks ago he met with Supervisors Lois Wolk and Lynnel Pollock, and he'll meet with Supervisor Stallard, encouraging them to be aggressive in matters relating to water. He also told them about his plan for conversion of ag. lands to urban developments, about involving an economic part to it so that we end up with larger areas than were being converted.

- (4) Commissioner Woo welcomed Commissioner Peart to the Commission.

Commissioner Woo said she attended the California Planning Commissioner's Organization meeting at the Mondavi Winery in Woodbridge. The subject of the meeting was agricultural conservation. They also toured winery operations.

- (5) Commissioner Lang asked if anything has come back from the Board regarding compensation for attending conferences. John Bencomo said he will verify the Board's direction and update the Commission regarding this accommodation.



## 9. ADJOURNMENT



The Regular Meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission was adjourned at 11:25 a.m. The next Regular Meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission will be held on Thursday, July 8, 1999, 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

MYFILES\CAROLE\PCMinsJune.99.wpd