



County of Yolo

PLANNING AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

John Bencomo
DIRECTOR

292 West Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695-2598
(530) 666-8775 FAX (530) 666-8728
www.yolocounty.org

YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

CHAIR: Jeb Burton
VICE-CHAIR: Richard Reed
MEMBERS: Leroy Bertolero; Jeff Merwin; Richard Reed; Keith Williams; Don Winters

MINUTES

March 11, 2010

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

1. Chair Burton called the meeting to order at 8:32a.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Kimball.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bertolero, Burton, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, Williams, and Winters
MEMBERS ABSENT: None
STAFF PRESENT: David Morrison, Assistant Director of Planning
Eric Parfrey, Principal Planner
Donald Rust, Principal Planner
Stephanie Cormier, Associate Planner
Jeff Anderson, Assistant Planner
Todd Riddiough, Senior Civil Engineer
Philip Pogledich, Senior Deputy County Counsel
Aundrea Hardy, Office Support Specialist

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE **JANUARY 28, 2010** MEETING.

Commission Action

The Minutes of the **January 28, 2010** meeting were approved with the following corrections.

Commissioner Reports

- A. Commissioner Bertolero reported that he toured the Granite Construction site, and attended several citizen advisory committees, including: Esparto, Knights Landing, Capay, Dunnigan, Clarksburg, and Madison.

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

March 11, 2010

Page 2 of 24

MOTION: Bertolero SECOND: Merwin
AYES: Bertolero, Burton, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, Williams, and Winters
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

4. PUBLIC REQUESTS

The opportunity for members of the public to address the Planning Commission on any subjects relating to the Planning Commission, but not relative to items on the present agenda, was opened by the Chair. 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.

5. CORRESPONDENCE

- 5.1 SACOG Blueprint Fifth Anniversary event
- 5.2 Invitation to the CA Preservation Foundation Reception
- 5.3 Great Valley Center Annual Conference flyer
- 5.4 Memo from Stephanie Cormier, Associate Planner regarding agenda item 6.3
- 5.5 Memo from Eric Parfrey, Principal Planner regarding agenda item 6.6 and 6.8
- 5.6 Letter from Yolo County resident, Jim Cassil, regarding agenda item 6.2

Chair Burton acknowledged receipt of all correspondence sent with the packet and distributed at the beginning of the meeting.

TIME SET AGENDA

- 6.1 **2009-001:** Continued public hearing on a request for a Use Permit for a 335-foot radio tower to be located on an Agricultural General (A-1) zoned parcel approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ mile south of the City of Davis (APN: 069-010-08). The applicant proposes to amend the application to construct a 365-foot radio tower at the Yolo County Central Landfill (APN: 042-140-06). The radio tower would be utilized by KDVS, Davis and KMJE, Woodland. An environmental document will be prepared to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act. Owner/Applicant: Yolo County/Results Radio, LLC (J. Anderson)

Jeff Anderson, Assistant Planner, presented information regarding the request for continuation and answered questions from the commission.

Chair Burton clarified that the project was moving to the landfill.

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

March 11, 2010

Page 3 of 24

Chair Burton opened and closed the public hearing.

No one from the public came forward.

Commissioner Bertolero commented on the decrease in correspondence he has received since the radio tower location was moved to the Yolo County Central Landfill, and felt the decrease is an indication of a good move.

Commission Action

The Planning Commission:

1. **CONTINUED** the item to the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting.

MOTION: Merwin SECOND: Winters
AYES: Bertolero, Burton, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, Williams, and Winters
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

- 6.2 **2009-044:** Continued public hearing on a request to abandon a 20-foot wide right-of-way for County Road 75A, located in Brooks, with access from State Route 16 (APNs: 060-030-15 and 060-030-16). County Road 75A serves both Tribal trust land and fee title property, owned by the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation. An Exemption has been prepared for this project. Owner/Applicant: Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation (S. Cormier).

Stephanie Cormier, Associate Planner, presented the project and answered questions from the commission.

There was discussion regarding monetary compensation from the applicant for the acquisition of the road; however, it was determined that there was no legal recourse for compensation of abandonment of County Road 75.

There was further discussion about an easement for neighboring property owner, Jim Cassil. The commission concluded that Mr. Cassil had no legal right to be granted an easement to his property from County Road 75A. Therefore, alternative options were recommended, including Mr. Cassil requesting a private easement from the tribe, or placing an easement across his own property to eliminate the chance of becoming landlocked in the future.

Chair Burton opened the public hearing.

Jim Eppers, Director of Land Management for Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation, provided an overview of their use of County Road 75A, and their intention to increase security for that area.

Commissioner Kimball asked Mr. Eppers if he was able to discuss an easement with Mr. Cassil.

Mr. Eppers responded that he was able to speak on the phone with Mr. Cassil while they were waiting for Laugenour and Meickle to determine which map was correct. The results came in recently; however they have not had another opportunity to speak.

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

March 11, 2010

Page 4 of 24

Commissioner Kimball asked if the tribe feels that granting an easement with the property owner would open up a security issue.

Mr. Etters said that after the request is finalized, then they can begin discussions with the property owner, as ultimately, the Tribal Council will have to make that decision.

Dan Gallardo, area resident, said that all the maps are vague, and for the county to put a road in and stop at 200 yards before the ranch seems illogical. Why would the county put a road there, and not run it onto that ranch?

Jim Cassil, resident, stated that he has not spoken once on the phone with Mr. Etters, but was told that when they decided what they were going to do, that they would call him. He talked about a history of people accessing the property, county maintenance of the road, and the boundaries that are shown on the assessor's map. He said all he is asking for is access to his property from County Road 75A.

Commissioner Bertolero asked Mr. Cassil about the statement in his letter about paying taxes on that area of County Road 75A.

Mr. Cassil responded that he assumes that he pays taxes on that because part of the worth of his land, is the access to it, and he receives three tax bills.

Commissioner Merwin asked Mr. Cassil if his current access was over another smaller parcel that he owns from County Road 72. He explained that one solution would be for Mr. Cassil to record an easement across the property that he already owns and already uses for access.

Philip Pogledich, County Counsel, advised that if County Road 75A has been used historically as an access to an adjoining property, it could be that there is a prescriptive right, which exists independent of the public road. Any prescriptive right, which is a right that is acquired by use over a period of time, and has to be taken to court to prove, would not be affected by abandonment of the road today.

Chris Lerch, Surveyor for Laugenour and Meickle, said that he has prepared two Records of Survey maps; one in 2005 for the tribe, and one for the Wyatt Ranch that Mr. Cassil owns, in 2006. He stated that County Road 75A on both maps was shown as it appears on the assessor's map, meaning that they weren't researched to find legality in the road, or anything else. He explained that a Record of Survey that is filed by a surveyor at the county does not create parcels, easements, abandonments, or right of ways. It is merely a record of the boundary that the surveyor marked; therefore, the fact that a feature is shown on the maps, does not make it exists.

Mr. Lerch stated that approximately six months ago, the tribe asked him to prepare a road abandonment for County Road 75A. When they prepare an abandonment, they go to the county surveyor, who has an index of all roads. He found that in the index for County Road 75A, there was reference to the Yolo County Board of Supervisors Minutes, in which the roads were accepted by the Board of Supervisors. In doing the research, he found that the record interest that the county has in County Road 75A is reflected on the Tancred 1911 map.

Chair Burton closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Williams requested that they return to him after the other commissioner's comment.

Commissioner Merwin said that he doesn't like to abandon roads that are contested in any way, and it seems to him that the issue with this one is simply that Mr. Cassil wants access to his eastern parcel. Mr. Cassil does have options to access that parcel if he chooses, and if he feels that he has a prescriptive right to County Road 75A, then he may pursue that. He expressed his support of

abandonment.

Commissioner Winters stated that even though the request seems straightforward, it is a difficult issue, especially with the assessor's map not being the legal definition of where that road actually goes and with the county's current budgetary constraints and the inability to maintain certain roads. He certainly understands the needs of both parties, and while he hopes that they will have some success working on a good neighbor policy; he is in support of the abandonment.

Commissioner Bertolero stated that the tribe is the sole owner of the property, and it was theirs prior to the easement being granted by the county. He explained the flows in Cache Creek, and how they would limit the access Mr. Cassil would have to utilize an easement across the creek. In addition, Mr. Cassil has the option to create an easement on his own property, so he doesn't see where there is a need for legal access on County Road 75A, unless Mr. Cassil is able to work out something with the tribe. He expressed sympathy with Mr. Cassil, but he supports abandonment of the road.

Commissioner Kimball agreed that the request is a complicated issue, and it isn't just about the road, but its' underlying issues such as time, technology, and mapping differences. All of those things are completely different than they were in 1911. In addition, there is a cultural and traditional history in utilizing the creek. She stated she does not like road abandonments, and though she sympathizes with Mr. Cassil, she has to support staff recommendation. She appealed to the tribe to implement a good neighbor policy with Mr. Cassil, and recommended that Mr. Cassil record an easement across his own property.

Vice-Chair Reed expressed his appreciation of staff's consideration of alternatives to abandonment and the issue of compensation. In particular, he appreciated staff's work on proposing a case-by-case consideration using the five general factors included in the staff report. He made recommendations for increasing awareness, to modify the information sheet posted on the website used by potential road abandonment applicants, to include alternatives to road abandonment, such as, ceasing maintenance and vehicular traffic, ceasing access but retaining the right of way, and abandonment with fair market compensation in cases where appropriate. In regards to the current request of road abandonment, he said that the survey issue is clear. He liked Commissioner Merwin's suggestion for Mr. Cassil to record an easement on his parcel to the east, and encouraged the tribe to negotiate with Mr. Cassil for an easement on County Road 75A.

Chair Burton said this is one of the cases where secondary facts, or secondary circumstances, have overshadowed the main objective. What they are making a decision on is a road abandonment of a road that is not being used and that ends 200 feet from any adjacent parcels. It would seem that it would be the current landowner's right to block off the end of the road, and not allow anyone past that. There may be a question of prescriptive rights and so forth, but it's within the landowner's legal power to pursue such a thing. There is at least one other potential right of way that provides access to Mr. Cassil's existing property. In addition, there is a second road, although it does not have a bridge over the creek, which will Mr. Cassil may use to keep his property from becoming landlocked. Even if the property was going to be landlocked, it is not relevant to the decision regarding the abandonment. While he understands the concerns over the issue, it is a legal question that a court needs to decide, and is not under the purview of the Planning Commission. He strongly agrees with staff's recommendation to approve the road abandonment.

Vice-Chair Reed made a motion to approve staff's recommendation for approval and encouraged staff to review his recommendation regarding updating the road abandonment information sheet located on the website.

Commission Action

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

March 11, 2010

Page 6 of 24

The Planning Commission recommended that the Board of Supervisors take the following actions:

1. **HOLD** a public hearing and receive comments;
2. **DETERMINE** that the project is exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines (**Attachment C**);
3. **ADOPT** the Findings (**Attachment D**) and Conditions of Approval (**Attachment E**); and
4. **APPROVE** the request for a road right-of-way abandonment of County Road 75A.

MOTION: Reed SECOND: Winters
AYES: Bertolero, Burton, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, Williams, and Winters
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

FINDINGS

Upon due consideration of the facts presented in this staff report and at the public hearing for Zone File #2009-044, the Yolo County Planning Commission recommends that the Board of Supervisors find the following:

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

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Guidelines

That the recommended Notice of Exemption was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Guidelines, and is the appropriate environmental level of review for this project.

The notice of exemption for the project, prepared pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, states that, "A project is exempt from CEQA if the activity is covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. Where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment the activity is not subject to CEQA. The environmental review process has concluded that the project is exempt from CEQA, as the project will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment.

General Plan

That the proposal is consistent with the Yolo County General Plan as follows:

Circulation Policy CI-3.17 Ensure adequate access for emergency vehicles.

Privatization of County Road 75A will not impede emergency services, but will allow for greater control over security and emergency efforts.

Streets and Highways Code

That the proposal is consistent with Section 8321 of the Streets and Highways Code.

The road vacation petition is consistent with Section 8321(a), which prescribes that ten or more freeholders may petition the board of supervisors to vacate a street or highway under this chapter. At least two of the petitioners shall be residents of the road district in which some part of the street or highway proposed to be vacated is situated.

That the proposal is consistent with Section 8324 of the Streets and Highways Code.

The approximately 2,408 feet of the CR 75A road right-of-way serves only one user and does not provide access to any public lands. The county has no plans to use this right-of-way for future public use.

Section 8324 of the Streets and Highways Code states, "If the legislative body finds, from all the evidence submitted, that the street, highway, or public service easement described in the notice of hearing or petition is unnecessary for present or prospective public use, the legislative body may adopt a resolution vacating the street, highway, or public service easement. The resolution of vacation may provide that the vacation occurs only after conditions required by the legislative body have been satisfied and may instruct the clerk that the resolution of vacation not be recorded until the conditions have been satisfied."

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The applicant shall comply with all requirements of agencies of jurisdiction, including Yolo County Planning and Public Works, Yolo County Sheriff's Department, and Caltrans.
2. The applicant shall be responsible for all costs associated with implementing the Conditions of Approval contained herein, including costs for the removal of existing county road signage along County Road 75A and State Route 16 by the Planning and Public Works Department.
3. The applicant shall be responsible for installing explicit signage at the intersection of State Route 16 and County Road 75A alerting the traveling public of private property, and that trespass and other laws will be strictly enforced by the Yolo County Sheriff. Contact Tom A. Lopez, Undersheriff-Coroner, at the Yolo County Sheriff's Department, (530) 668-5227.
4. The applicant shall coordinate with Caltrans regarding their request for fee title or highway easement dedication to State Route 16 adjacent to County Road 75A. Contact Paul Tonn of the Office of Right of Way Engineering at (530) 741-5302 regarding specific procedures for making the dedication.
5. The applicant shall provide legal description(s) and plat(s) of the proposed road abandonment, signed and sealed by a surveyor licensed in the State of California, to the Planning and Public Works Department for review and approval. The map(s) shall be approved by the Director of Planning and Public Works and recorded in the Office of the County Recorder upon approval by the Yolo County Board of Supervisors.
6. The applicant shall file a Record of Survey, prepared by a licensed surveyor in the State of California, whenever any of the following instances occur:
 - a. A legal description has been prepared that is based upon a new field survey disclosing data that does not appear on any previously filed Subdivision Map, Parcel Map, Record of Survey, or other official map.
 - b. Permanent monuments have been set marking any boundary.
7. In accordance with Section 8-2.2415 of the Yolo County Code, 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.

8. 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.**

Chair Burton called a five-minute recess.

- 6.3 **2009-033:** A Use Permit request to construct and operate an unstaffed wireless Communications facility at the El Macero Country Club, located at 44571 Clubhouse Drive in El Macero (APN: 068-130-06). The project will provide wireless Internet and VOIP (voice over Internet protocol) phone services to the south Davis vicinity. The project proposes installation of a 70-foot “monopine” (fake pine tree) pole and adjoining Clearwire radio equipment located in a 2,400-square foot lease area, with room for future co-locations. A Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project. Owner/Applicant: El Macero Country Club/Clear Wireless, LLC (S. Cormier)

Mrs. Cormier presented the project, distributed and reviewed a memorandum, and answered questions from the commission.

Chair Burton opened the public hearing.

Larry McDonough, representative for Clearwire, responded to questions from the commission and explained that the chosen site is the location available to enable them to provide coverage in south Davis and the adjoining area. In addition, the extra five feet of the monopine, will enable them to collocate other carriers.

Robert Crain, homeowner in Davis, said he would probably be the most affected homeowner in Davis, as his living room window points directly towards the location of the tower. He added that he understands the need for the communications tower, but he hoped that some consideration would be given to shift the tower a few feet. He wanted to know what the maximum build out would be, as he has concerns over value of degradation of his home because of the tower being so close.

Bill Dendy, El Macero resident, member of the Country Club Board and Homeowners Association, as well as Chair of the Service Area Advisory Committee, said he has been involved in discussions leading up to the proposal. The proposal was submitted to the Homeowners Association Board, and they had no comment. He further expressed his and the community’s support of the project.

Professor William M. Jackson, resident of El Macero, said that he first heard of the monopine proposal when he learned of the Planning Commission hearing, so he is confident there are other residents that are not aware. In addition, he expressed his desire to know how much money the El Macero Country Club would receive if the project was approved. He provided his experience with the quality of service in the area, and explained that the monopine would be an opportunity, but questioned how will it effect the overall view, and why they must increase the height an additional five feet.

Chair Burton closed the public hearing.

There was clarifying discussion regarding future placement of additional facilities in the same location, and what the current Use Permit request allowed, in regards to future additions.

Commissioner Bertolero said the he lives in El Macero, and he has spoken to several residents in regards to the new cell tower. Some residents do have good coverage, but many others, including him, do not, depending on the carrier. He said the applicant seems to be in agreement with the conditions of approval. He has received only five responses in opposition from residents, in comparison to the approximately one-thousand notices sent out, so overall, the project seems to be acceptable. In addition, the fact that the local El Macero associations and committees have put their stamp of approval on the project rings pretty loud with him. In closing, he addressed the visual effects and the additional five feet in height requested by the applicant and the long-term benefits from the additional height.

Commissioner Kimball agreed with Commissioner Bertolero in that the monopine proposed for the El Macero Country Club site, is by far the most stealth, and although she is in favor of the recommended action, she expressed her understanding of opposition from some of the local residents.

Vice-Chair Reed stated that he believes that the proposal fits within the City of Davis, and Yolo County's telecommunication ordinances, with some visual impact that is somewhat muted by the power lines already in place. He explained that he lives in Davis, and does not have good cell phone coverage; consequently, he feels that Davis will appreciate having a wireless internet option in the community.

Commissioner Winters spoke of the number of similar proposals heard by the Planning Commission during his tenure, and said that the current request seems to be the least controversial. The community of El Macero and south Davis in general, are quite capable of making their feelings heard if they are against something going in, and although a few are in opposition, the overarching need of the proposed telecommunications improvement will probably take the lead in making the decision. Although he sympathizes with those that are opposed, he agrees with Commissioner Bertolero, in that after some time, the telecommunications tower will become less visually noticeable.

Commissioner Merwin stated that he feels the creation of the monopine idea was precisely for the type of site in the current proposal. He explained that the reason for the request of additional height on the monopine as being for line of sight for high-speed wireless broadband, which is different from cellular coverage. He provided further detail behind the requirements for broadband coverage, and said that he is in support of the proposal, as he is all for options for different services.

Commissioner Williams said that his first thought was of what the proposal isn't; which is a one hundred yard, three hundred foot tower sticking up that everyone is going to see from miles around. He does not find the proposed monopine particularly obtrusive and is not finding it difficult to support the request for a single monopine.

Chair Burton said that the issue he thinks they are running into is, as technology increases and grows, there has to be some type of adjustment or change to what we are accustomed. He added that the proposed attempt to install the telecommunications facility in an obscure manner is rare, and even rarer, is the well thought out idea of allowing multiple units to come up through the facility. He applauds Clearwire, and feels that they are an example to be followed.

Commissioner Bertolero made a motion to approve staff recommendation, including the amended Findings and the request for an additional five feet in height.

Commission Action

The Planning Commission took the following actions:

- 1 **HELD** a public hearing and received comments; and
- 2 **ADOPTED** the Negative Declaration as the appropriate level of environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines (Attachment C; and
- 3 **ADOPTED** the Findings (Attachment D); and
- 4 **APPROVED** the Use Permit subject to the Conditions of Approval (Attachment E).

MOTION: Bertolero SECOND: Reed
AYES: Bertolero, Burton, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, Williams, and Winters
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

FINDINGS

Upon due consideration of the facts presented in this staff report and at the public hearing for Zone File #2009-033, the Yolo County Planning Commission finds the following:
(A summary of evidence to support each FINDING is shown in Italics)

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Guidelines

That the recommended Negative Declaration/Initial Study was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and is the appropriate environmental document and level of review for this project.

The environmental document for the project, prepared pursuant to Section 15000 et. seq. of the CEQA Guidelines, provides the necessary proportionate level of analysis for the proposed project, and sufficient information to reasonably ascertain the project's potential environmental effects. The environmental review process has concluded that there will not be a significant effect on the environment as a result of the proposed project.

General Plan

That the proposal is consistent with the Yolo County General Plan as follows:

The Yolo County General Plan designates the subject property as Agricultural (AG).

The project is consistent with the following General Plan Policies:

Community Character Policy CC-1.18: Electric towers, solar power facilities, wind power facilities, communication transmission facilities and/or above ground lines shall be avoided along scenic roadways and routes, to the maximum feasible extent.

Public Facilities and Services Policy PF-11.2: Encourage expanded coverage and enhanced quality for communication technology, such as mobile connectivity, high-speed wireless internet access, and emergency communication systems.

Economic Development Policy ED-1.4: Encourage the telecommunications industry to install and maintain high-speed high-capacity telephone and Internet service throughout the

county so that businesses can effectively compete.

Zoning

That the proposal is consistent with the Wireless Communication Facilities Ordinance (Section 8-2.2417 of the Yolo County Code) as follows:

The site is adequate for the development of the proposed wireless communication facility.

The subject property is currently in use as a maintenance facility for the El Macero Golf Course Country Club. The area proposed for the monopine and lease area is a previously disturbed area located on the north side of two existing buildings and propane/fuel tanks. The proposed project location on the property does not contain any biologic or wetland resources, and would not require removal of any productive farmland. The site is considered adequate for the proposed project.

Opportunities to collocate the subject facility on an existing facility have either been exhausted or are not available in the area.

There is currently inadequate wireless internet and VOIP reception in the project area. According to the applicant, they typically seek to collocate their facilities on existing structures, which can be verified by several collocation permits in the unincorporated area of the county. No appropriate structures within the required service area were available for collocation in the general project area. The only wireless towers existing in the area are too far from the proposed service area.

The facility as proposed is necessary for the provision of an efficient wireless communication system.

The proposed facility is specifically designed to coordinate with other nearby Clearwire collocation facilities, and to augment the Clearwire connection in the City of Davis and surrounding unincorporated area. There is no other tower located in the area where new Clearwire equipment can be collocated, in order to provide adequate wireless internet and VOIP signal coverage. Therefore, the applicant's proposal to provide wireless internet and VOIP service to a significant portion of this underserved area is considered necessary.

The development of the proposed wireless communication facility will not significantly affect the existing onsite topography and vegetation; or any designated public viewing area, scenic corridor or any identified environmentally sensitive area or resource.

Since the subject property is relatively flat and has been previously disturbed, the proposed project would not require significant grading and thus would not impact the existing topography. Although the surrounding area has mature landscaping, no vegetation will be removed for the proposed project as it is located in a vacant area adjacent to two maintenance buildings on El Macero Country Club property. An access route will be granted by the property owner for access to the site. The proposed project is located adjacent to a golf course, in a maintenance facility compound area, which is screened by a sound wall. The project is not within any designated public viewing area or scenic corridor.

The proposed wireless communication facility will not create a hazard for aircraft in flight and will not hinder aerial spraying operations.

The project site is approximately five miles from the UC Davis airport. The proposed facility and height of the monopole will have no potential to create an additional hazard for aircraft or to hinder aerial spraying operations.

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

March 11, 2010

Page 12 of 24

The applicant agrees to accept proposals from future applicants to collocate at the approved site.

The project proposal currently includes one provider – Clearwire – with additional space for future providers. As a condition of project approval, the applicant is required to cooperate with the County and other providers in collocating on the subject monopine pole. According to the applicant, Verizon has indicated an interest in collocating should the facility be approved.

That the proposal is consistent with findings required for approval of a Use Permit (Section 8-2.2804 of the Yolo County Code) as follows:

The requested land use is listed as a conditional use in the zoning regulations.

Pursuant to Section 8-2.804 (b), the proposed wireless communication facility is allowed within the R-1 Zone through the Use Permit review and approval process.

The request is essential or desirable to the public comfort and convenience.

Wireless communication is widely used as an efficient communication system for business and personal use and is recognized by the California Public Utilities Commission as a necessary public service that provides an additional notification service for emergency communications. The Yolo County Sheriff's Department has indicated that their in-car computer capabilities will be increased by approval of the project.

The requested land use will not impair the integrity or character of a neighborhood or be detrimental to public health, safety or general welfare.

As evidenced in the Negative Declaration/Initial Study, the proposed project will not create a significant effect on the character of the surrounding urban area. Aboveground utility lines currently line the east side of Mace Boulevard, which is adjacent to the proposed project location. The facility would be partially screened by an existing sound wall and mature foliage.

As identified in the Negative Declaration/Initial Study, wireless communication technology has been determined not to be detrimental to the public health, safety, or general welfare so long as the appropriate federal standards are implemented. As a condition of project approval, the proposed wireless telecommunications facility shall comply with, and at all times shall be maintained and operated in accordance with, all applicable FCC rules and regulations with respect to environmental effects of electromagnetic emissions. Therefore, the proposed project does not pose a detrimental effect to public health, safety, or general welfare.

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

All necessary infrastructure and utilities will be required of the proposed project.

That the proposed project is consistent with findings required to exceed the maximum height limit in the R-1 (Residential One-Family) Zone, as established by Section 8-2.805 in the Yolo County Code:

No main building in the R-1 Zone shall exceed thirty (30') feet in height, except as provided in Section 8-2.2605 as follows:

(a) In any zone, other than the Airport Zone (AV) and Special Height Combining Zone (H), the following structures may extend not more than thirty (30') feet above the height limits set

forth in such zone; provided, however, applicable State and Federal regulations shall govern wherever conflicts occur: chimneys, church spires, flagpoles, monuments, water towers, fire and hose towers, observation towers, distribution lines and poles, communication equipment buildings, windmills, smokestacks, radio towers, television towers, radar towers, masts, aerials, television antennas, outdoor theater screens, equipment penthouses and cooling towers, grain elevators, farm equipment and storage barns, silos, and gas holders.

- (b) *Upon the approval of the Planning Commission, the structures set forth in subsection (a) of this section and all structures normally permitted in such zones may be permitted to further exceed the height limits for the particular zone when the Planning Commission finds that such additional height is necessary for the normal operation of a permitted use and will not be injurious to neighboring properties or detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare.*

The proposed 70-foot monopine will exceed the extended height limitation by an additional five feet, which is necessary for the Clearwire antenna to locate at the requested 68-foot elevation. This will also allow room for future collocations.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Planning

1. Development of the site, including construction and/or placement of structures, shall be as described in this staff report for this Use Permit (ZF #2009-033). Construction shall be limited to: 1) One 70-foot high wireless telecommunications “monopine” (fake pine tree) pole with three Clearwire 26-inch directional antennas (microwave dishes) placed at the 68-foot elevation; three Clearwire 42-inch panel antennas placed at the 64-foot elevation; and three Clearwire BTS (base transceiver station) units; 2) one 2,400-square foot fenced lease area with one 50-inch by 25-inch Clearwire support cabinet; and 3) additional space for future wireless communication systems both on the pole and on the ground (**Attachment A**). Any minor modification or expansion of the proposed use shall be in keeping with the purpose and intent of this Use Permit, and shall be administered through Site Plan Review approved by the Director of the Planning and Public Works Department. The facility shall be operated in a manner consistent with the project’s approval. Upon termination of the wireless communication system use, the project site shall be restored back to its original condition within 180 days.
2. Any proposed modification determined to be significant, such as an increase in pole height, shall require an amendment to this Use Permit with approval from the Planning Commission.
3. The use allowed under this Use Permit (ZF #2009-033) shall commence within one (1) year from the date of approval by the Yolo County Planning Commission or said permit shall be deemed null and void without further action.
4. Assessment of fees under Public Resources Code Section 21089, and as defined by Fish and Game Code Section 711.4 will be required. The fees (\$2,010.25 plus \$50 Recorder fee) are payable by the project applicant upon filing of the Notice of Determination by the lead agency, within five working days of approval of this project by the Planning Commission.
5. The applicant shall cooperate with the County in addressing shared usage of the facilities and/or site for future collocation on the communication tower and shall not be unreasonably opposed to sharing the site and facilities with other service providers.
6. Any lighting and/or glare generated from the subject facility shall be directed away from the public right-of-way, nearby residences and adjoining properties.
7. Prior to issuance of any grading or building permit, the applicant shall provide ~~a copy~~ verification of the signed and executed lease agreement, which includes an exhibit that identifies ~~the 12-foot~~

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

March 11, 2010

Page 14 of 24

- utility and an access easement as shown in the Site Plan for this project (ZF #2009-033), to the Director of Planning and Public Works.
8. Construction details shall be included in construction drawings, submitted concurrent with building permit application, and are subject to review and approval by the Director of the Planning and Public Works Department.
 9. The proposed “monopine” pole and ground equipment lease area shall be designed, constructed, and completed utilizing materials consistent with the surrounding environmental setting to the satisfaction of the Director of the Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department.
 10. The wireless telecommunications facility shall comply with, and at all times shall be maintained and operated in accordance with, all applicable FCC rules and regulations with respect to environmental effects of electromagnetic emissions.
 11. During construction activity, any open trenches shall be covered overnight to prevent animals from becoming trapped. Any open trenches shall be inspected prior to commencement or continuation of construction activity and any trapped animals shall be allowed to exit on their own ability.

Engineering

12. No improvements are proposed for the existing access to the project site (El Macero Country Club maintenance facility). However, should any improvements be made, an encroachment permit may be required from the City of Davis. The applicant shall be responsible for obtaining all necessary permits prior to any work done in the City’s right-of-way.

Building

13. The applicant shall obtain building permits for all structures prior to commencement of their construction. Engineered construction and structure plans shall be required at the time of building permit application submittal.
14. New construction shall meet State of California minimum code requirements for fire, life, and safety standards. All proposed structures shall be constructed in accordance with the California Building, California Plumbing, California Mechanical and California Electrical Codes.
15. The project shall be constructed and operated in compliance with all applicable federal and state laws, including Yolo County Code regulations and FCC standards regulating wireless telecommunications facilities.

Environmental Health

16. Prior to the issuance of a building permit the applicant shall submit a hazardous materials/waste business plan and inventory for review and approval by Yolo County Environmental Health, if reportable quantities are reached or exceeded. Reportable quantities are amounts of hazardous materials that equal or exceed 500 pounds, 55 gallons, 200 cubic feet of gas, or any quantity of hazardous waste.

County Counsel

17. In accordance with Section 8-2.2415 of the Yolo County Code, 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.

18. 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.**

6.4 **2009-019:** Modification of an existing Use Permit, Lot Line Adjustment, and Williamson Act Successor Agreement for properties located on the south side of County Road 27, east of State Route 113, approximately three miles south of the City of Woodland. The project is located in the A-1 (Agricultural General) and A-P (Agricultural Preserve) zoning districts (APNs: 042-080-20, 041-060-27, and 041-060-28). The Use Permit will allow a runway safety extension to a private airport. A Categorical Exemption has been prepared for this project. Owner/Applicant: Holsclaw (S. Cormier)

Mrs. Cormier presented the request for modification, and answered questions from the commission.

There was a discussion about land under conservation easements, and the requirement to notify the Yolo Land Trust of changes.

Commissioner Kimball commented that Yolo Land Trust has a new executive director that may not have knowledge of actions taken by previous directors; therefore, she requested that information regarding conservations easement actions somehow be given to the new director, so that she is aware of changes.

Chair Burton opened the public hearing.

Greg Forest, legal representative for the applicant, stated that the complicated part of the request is the Lot Line Adjustment detail. He provided some history of actions taken by the two parties, in order to provide the commissioners with sufficient understanding of how they came to the current request. He added that the conservation easement allows for their request as an exception to some other provisions that provide for the current owner to give notice to Yolo Land Trust sixty days before the actual action takes place, of which, he has already drafted the email to remind the owner to take the appropriate steps to notify Yolo Land Trust.

Chair Burton closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Winters stated that he had no additional comments, as his questions were answered during the presentation.

Commissioner Merwin expressed his support of the project, as it is a reasonable solution to a problem. He added that he appreciates Commissioner Kimball's reminder about notification to the holders of conservation easements.

Commissioner Williams had no further comment.

Commissioner Bertolero said that he was glad the two parties were getting everything resolved and he supports staff's recommendation for approval.

Commissioner Kimball agreed with Commissioner Bertolero and she has no issues with the modification or the Lot Line Adjustment. She explained that her concerns were with the easement and the notification appropriate parties regarding changes.

Vice-Chair Reed concurred with his fellow commissioners and stated that he is comfortable supporting the staff's recommendation for approval.

Chair Burton explained that he had no issues with the request; therefore, he also supports approval of the request.

Commission Action

The Planning Commission took the following actions:

1. **HELD** a public hearing and received comments; and
2. **DETERMINED** that a Categorical Exemption is the appropriate level of environmental documentation in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines (Attachment C); and
3. **ADOPTED** the Findings (Attachment D) to modify and existing Use Permit and approve the Lot Line Adjustment; and
4. **APPROVED** the Conditions of Approval for the Use Permit and Lot Line Adjustment (Attachment E) to allow the extension of a runway.

MOTION: Merwin SECOND: Williams
AYES: Bertolero, Burton, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, Williams, and Winters
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

FINDINGS

Upon due consideration of the facts presented in this staff report and at the public hearing for Zone File #2009-019, the Yolo County Planning Commission finds the following:

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

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Guidelines

1. That the recommended Categorical Exemption was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and is the appropriate environmental document and level of review for this project.

Pursuant to CEQA Section 15301 (f), Class 1 (Existing Facilities), Section 15305, Class 5 (Lot Line Adjustments), and Section 15317, Class 17 (Open Space contracts or Easements), the project is categorically exempt from further environmental review. Class 1 includes the addition of safety or health protection devices in conjunction with existing structures or facilities. Class 5 includes minor lot line adjustments not resulting in the creation of any new parcels. Class 17 covers the establishment of agricultural preserves and the making and renewing of open space contracts under the Williamson Act.

General Plan

2. That the proposal and requested land use are in conformity with the General Plan.

The General Plan Land Use designation for the property is Agricultural. The project is consistent with the following General Plan Land Use policies:

Land Use Policy LU-3.5: Avoid or minimize conflicts and/or incompatibilities between land uses.

Agriculture Policy AG-1.20: Encourage the retention of existing and development of new airport facilities for agricultural aerial applications.

Agriculture Policy AG-3.4: Recognize and protect agricultural infrastructure, such as farm-to-market routes, water diversion and conveyance structures, fertilizer and chemical sales, airfields, processing facilities, research and development and farm worker housing.

Economic Development Policy ED-1.3: Encourage businesses that promote, provide services, and support farming, with an emphasis on value-added agriculture, agri-tourism, food processing and agricultural suppliers.

Economic Development Policy ED-2.7: Encourage the retention and expansion of existing businesses and attract new businesses into the county.

Zoning Code

3. That the requested land use is listed as a conditional use in Sections 8-2.404.5(e) and 8-2.406.5(b) of the Yolo County Code, and is allowed under the following authorization:

Private airports and landing strips are listed as a conditional use in both the A-1 (Agricultural General) and A-P (Agricultural Preserve) zones. This application is an amendment to an existing Use Permit (ZF # 581) for the operation of a private airport to provide aerial spraying operations.

Use Permit

That, in accordance with Section 8-2.2804 of the Yolo County Code:

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

The proposed project will allow the implementation of safety features for the continuation of a private airport/ landing strip to provide aerial spraying operations, which serves a vital role in the agricultural economy.

5. The requested land uses will not impair the integrity or character of a neighborhood or be detrimental to public health, safety or general welfare.

The requested use is an expansion of an existing runway, in order to implement safety features. There will be no changes to the integrity or character of the surrounding area. Implementation of the proposed improvements will increase safety in the area.

Based upon conditions set forth by Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department, the proposed use will not be detrimental to public health, safety or general welfare. Continued compliance will be required with all agencies.

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

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

March 11, 2010

Page 18 of 24

See above under (2).

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

An existing septic system and onsite well serve the existing facility. Stormwater runoff will be addressed through onsite drainage improvements. All necessary facilities are currently provided. The increased runway will not result in an increased demand for services.

8. The requested use will serve and support production of agriculture, the agricultural industry, animal husbandry or medicine; or is agriculturally related, and not appropriate for location within a city or town; and the requested use, if proposed on prime soils, cannot be reasonably located on lands containing non-prime soils.

The proposed project is an amendment to an existing Use Permit, for an extension of a runway on a private landing strip, which provides aerial spraying services to the local agricultural community.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Planning

1. The applicant shall be responsible for all costs associated with implementing the Conditions of Approval contained herein. The applicant shall comply with both the spirit and the intent of all applicable requirements of the Yolo County General Plan, the County Code, and these Conditions of Approval.
2. This Use Permit Amendment shall commence within one year from the date of the Planning Commission's approval of the Use Permit or said permit shall be null and void. The Director of Planning and Public Works may grant an extension of time; however, such an extension shall not exceed a maximum of two years.
3. Upon approval of the Lot Line Adjustment by the Planning Commission, the Planning and Public Works Department shall issue a "Certificate of Compliance" with Lot Line Adjustment plat map and legal descriptions, as provided by the applicant. The Certificate of Compliance shall be recorded in the Office of the Yolo County Clerk-Recorder within 12 months of issuance.
4. Recordation of the Certificate of Compliance for the Lot Line Adjustment shall not in any way result in the elimination, obstruction, or reduction in size of any access way to the resulting parcels.
5. Upon recordation of the Certificate of Compliance for Lot Line Adjustment, the property owners shall execute the Williamson Act Successor Agreements for the subject properties on a form approved by the Office of the County Counsel of Yolo County. Said contracts shall be recorded in the Office of the Yolo County Clerk-Recorder.
6. The applicant shall keep the site area free from flammable brush, grass, and weeds. All structures on the site shall be adequately maintained and free from graffiti.
7. Prior to issuance of any grading or building permits, all outstanding fees owed to the Planning and Public Works department shall be paid in full.

Public Works

5. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit a grading and drainage plan for the site, for review and approval by the Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department. A Storm

Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall also be submitted that meets all the requirements of a SWPPP, including Best Management Practices (BMPs).

Building

6. All grading plans shall be submitted to the Planning and Public Works Department for review and approval in accordance with Yolo County Building Standards, prior to the commencement of any construction.
7. The applicant shall pay the appropriate fees prior to the issuance of building permits, including, but not limited to, School and Fire District fees, County Facilities Fees and Environmental Health Fees.

Environmental Health

8. The applicant shall continue to maintain a hazardous materials/waste business plan and inventory, and submit an updated plan, should any changes take place to the Growers Air Service operations, for review and approval by Yolo County Environmental Health.

County Counsel

9. In accordance with Yolo County Code Section 8-2.2415, the applicants, owners, their successors 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.
10. 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.

Failure to comply with the **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL** as approved by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors may result in the following:

- **Non-issuance of future building permits;**
- **Legal action.**

- 6.5 **2010-006:** Resolution to provide guidelines for developing future Specific Plan applications, consistent with the General Plan. The framework is intended to guide the organization of all Yolo County specific plans with the goal of creating effective, efficient, and statutorily complete documents that share a common outline countywide. The content of a Specific Plan must meet the requirements of California Government Code Section 65451. (D. Rust/H. Tschudin)

Donald Rust, Principal Planner presented the project and answered questions from the commission.

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

March 11, 2010

Page 20 of 24

There was a discussion regarding the inclusion of the Design Guidelines within the framework.

Commissioner Bertolero felt it would be appropriate to add a section that included abbreviations and acronyms spelled out to make the document more user friendly.

Mr. Rust explained how the Specific Plan framework will work with future applications, and how it can assist in streamlining the process.

Chair Burton opened and closed the public hearing.

No one from the public came forward.

Vice-Chair Reed, said that the concept is great, and he encourages staff to take into consideration the editorial recommendations made by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Kimball recommended that within item 8, agriculture be included as an item and then sub-items under agriculture, in order to call out agriculture more dramatically.

Commissioner Bertolero complimented staff on their work and recommended the document be made a little more user friendly. He provided an example of abbreviations that were not defined in Exhibit A, which he would like to see spelled out; otherwise, he supports the document.

Commissioner Winters also complimented staff on a clearly written document and explained that he is pleased to see that the Covell area is included.

Commissioner Merwin concurred with his fellow commissioners and thanked staff and Heidi Tschudin.

Commissioner Williams had no further comments.

Chair Burton had no further comment, but wanted to say that he appreciates how straight forward and easy it is for someone to pick up and understand.

Commissioner Kimball made a motion to recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Countywide Specific Plan Framework resolution with the recommendations by the commissioners.

Commission Action

The Planning Commission took the following actions:

1. **HELD** a public hearing and received public comments; and
2. **RECOMMENDS** that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Countywide Specific Plan Framework resolution (Attachment A).

MOTION: Kimball SECOND: Merwin
AYES: Bertolero, Burton, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, Williams, and Winters
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

WORKSHOP

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

March 11, 2010

Page 21 of 24

- 6.6 **2010-005:** Discussion of the upcoming comprehensive update of the Zoning Ordinance, Title 8, Chapter 2 of the County Code (E. Parfrey)

Eric Parfrey, Principal Planner, lead a discussion regarding the update of the Zoning Ordinance, and answered questions from the commissioners. Recommendations from the Planning Commission included: changing the language in the document from “pot clubs” to “cannabis clubs”; rather than increasing the amount of regulation, work with current regulation to see what can be consolidated; change the language of “intensive and extensive” to something more explanatory; and address the buffer zone between a residential and ag area with the possibility of allowing organic farming within the buffer zone.

WORKSHOP

- 6.7 **2010-005:** Discussion of the creation of local CEQA Guidelines, as part of the comprehensive update of the Zoning Ordinance (E. Parfrey)

Mr. Parfrey presented information regarding the creation of local CEQA Guidelines, and accepted comments, questions, and direction from the commission.

WORKSHOP.

- 6.8 **2010-005:** Discussion of the proposed Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Ordinance and Clustered Agricultural Housing Ordinance, as part of the comprehensive update of the Zoning Ordinance (E. Parfrey)

Mr. Parfrey gave a PowerPoint presentation on the subject of Clustered Agricultural Housing, and Transfer of Development Rights. He answered questions, accepted comments, and received recommendations from the commission, including presenting the Clustered Agricultural Housing Ordinance at a Yolo Land Trust meeting, and ensure there is small farming representation within the Ag Advisory Committee.

Commissioner Merwin volunteered to participate in the proposed Ag Advisory Committee meetings.

REGULAR AGENDA

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

None

8. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

A report by the Assistant Director on the recent Board of Supervisor's meetings on items relevant to the Planning Commission and an update of the Planning and Public Works Department activities 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.

David Morrison brought the commission up to date on the following:

8.1 Personnel and Budget:

- a. The budget is not yet finalized so he is unable to provide information on that. However, he shared information received from the County Administrator's Office about the county as a whole; between the years of 2000 and 2010, the amount of money the county spends that comes from the state, decreased from 68% to 59%. Over the last decade, countywide revenues increased 44%, but expenditures increased 77%. The countywide budget shows 20% goes to mental health and health services; 30% goes to public assistance, such as welfare and unemployment; 30% goes to safety, such as district attorney, sheriff, and probation departments etc.; and the rest of the budget, approximately 20%, goes to the remainder of the county services/departments.

Over the last decade, expenditures have increased, with the county attempting to fill in the gap with the general fund, but the general fund was tapped out around 2007. At that time the county switched over to the reserves fund to help fill the gap, and those have been used up as of this fiscal year, so at this point, there is nothing left. With nothing left, all there is left to do is reduce expenditures. The county does have a low debt ratio, with a minimum of debt in general; however, in the current climate it doesn't do much good, as there is very little credit.

- b. The development services division has three broad areas within the budget, revenues, salaries, and services and supplies. The total division budget is expected to increase from 2.3 million to 2.5 million dollars. A large part of that increase is because of Dunnigan and the Dunnigan Specific Plan. However, the budget is structured to balance out in the event that the Dunnigan project does not move forward.
- c. Due to layoffs, payroll has decreased; therefore, the division is proposing a 6% decrease in fees starting in July 2010.
- d. The upcoming fiscal year will see further layoffs, including a front counter employee that has been digitally scanning departmental files and documents. In addition, the receptionist at the front counter is retiring after many years with the county. The department will actively recruit to fill that position.

8.2 Board of Supervisors:

- a. The Bains' map was approved.
- b. The contract and the \$100,000 grant from SACOG was approved to prepare the county Climate Action Plan, which deals with greenhouse gasses.
- c. The Board of Supervisors held a budget summit. In addition, they set goals for the upcoming fiscal year. Goals set for the planning and building department revolve around improving agriculture/economic development, dealing with the Williamson Act loss of subvention funding, adopting the Clarksburg Ag District, working on issues involving the Delta, and approving the Dunnigan Specific Plan.
- d. The Transportation Impact Study guidelines were approved.
- e. The Board of Supervisors approved an application to apply for a five million dollar grant for a community park and swimming pool in Esparto.

- f. Every year the Board of Supervisors selects employees that are representative of the county's values. This year they selected two employees from the planning/building division. Lonell Butler, Chief Building Official, was selected for the Integrity award, and Angelica Yopez, Permit Counter Technician, was selected for the Service Award.
- g. Upcoming projects going before the Board of Supervisors for approval include abandonment of a portion of Bonyng St, the Specific Plan Framework, a housing report, and reauthorization of a fee that is charged to houses in Esparto that will eventually go to the cost of building a bridge over Lamb Valley Slough.

9. 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.

- A. Commissioner Bertolero reported his attendance at several of the citizens' advisory committee meetings, including Dunnigan, Yolo-Zamora and two in Knights Landing.
- B. Commissioner Kimball attended a conference in DC for beginning farmers, and spoke briefly of it's relevance to Yolo County.
- C. Vice-Chair Reed had no report.
- D. Commissioner Winters gave an account of his drive around the county to visit site locations related to the day's agenda including the landfill, County Road 75A, and the El Macero Country Club.
- E. Commissioner Merwin stated that he attended the Yolo County Farm Bureau meeting, which included reports from the Ag Commissioner and Cooperative Extension.
- F. Commissioner Williams reported his attendance at citizens' advisory committee meetings in Yolo-Zamora, Dunnigan, Esparto, and two in Knights Landing. He shared some of the discussion that was held at the Knights Landing meeting regarding the abandoned school and some solid movement towards getting a Charter School.
- G. Chair Burton stated that he spoke to the legal representative for the Holsclaw project and attended two meetings in West Sacramento and Clarksburg.

10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

The opportunity for commission members to request that an item be placed on a future agenda for discussion. No discussion by other commission members will occur except for clarifying questions.

10.1 Cancellation of the April 2010 meeting.

10.2 Results Radio, LLC

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

March 11, 2010

Page 24 of 24

- 10.3 Unitarian Church expansion
- 10.4 Trucking firm at Clark Pacific (business license)
- 10.5 Dunnigan Specific Plan workshop
- 10.6 Western Kingdom Use Permit
- 10.7 Possible road abandonments in the Capay Valley

11. ADJOURNMENT

The Regular Meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission was adjourned at 1:33 p.m. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission is May 13, 2010, in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers.

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 the 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,

David Morrison, Assistant Director
Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department