



County of Yolo

John Bencomo
DIRECTOR

PLANNING AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

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

YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

CHAIR: Don Peart
VICE-CHAIR: Leroy Bertolero
MEMBERS: Amy Cameron, Mary Kimball, Mary Liu, Jeff Merwin, Don Winters

MINUTES

August 9, 2007

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

1. Vice-Chair Bertolero called the meeting to order at **8:37** a.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Merwin.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bertolero, Kimball, Merwin, Winters, Cameron, Liu
MEMBERS ABSENT: Peart
STAFF PRESENT: David Morrison, Assistant Director of Planning
Eric Parfrey, Principal Planner
Phil Pogledich, Deputy County Counsel
Craig Baracco, Assistant Planner
Susan Provencal, Office Support Specialist

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE **June 14, 2007** MEETING.

Commission Action

The Minutes of the **June 14, 2007** Meeting were approved with no corrections.

MOTION: Kimball
SECOND: Winters
AYES: Cameron, Merwin, Kimball, Bertolero and Winters
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Liu
ABSENT: Peart

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. Conservation Quarterly, newsletter from Yolo County Resource Conservation District.

5.2 July 2007 newsletter from the California County Planning Commissioner's Association.

5.3 Memorandum letters (Yackson and Lin) and errata for item 7.2

5.4 Memorandum comments and corrected Capay maps for item 7.1

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

CONSENT AGENDA

6.1 None

TIME SET AGENDA

7.1 **2002-043:** Review of final text revisions to the updated 2006 Capay Valley Area General Plan, which generally covers the area from the town of Capay, northwest to the County line (APN: various). A Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project. Owner/Applicant: Yolo County (E. Parfrey/S. Berg)

Eric Parfrey, Principal Planner, presented the staff report and changes including, text edits, updated maps and staff modifications and answered questions from the commission. He note that the Commission may want to consider re-zoning one small parcel in Guinda at the northwest corner of SR 16 and Cleveland from commercial to agricultural to reflect an existing farmworker rental house.

Vice-Chair Bertolero opened the public hearing.

Don Tompkins, Chair of the Capay Valley Citizens Advisory Committee (CVCAC), said that the agricultural commissioner, Rick Landon, needed to be included as participating agency. He said the CVCAC concurs with staff on the notes in the memorandum dated August 9, 2007. He requested that the Commissioners adopt the Capay Valley General Plan with the suggested changes and recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the plan.

Joe Azzolino said his question was answered.

Commissioner Kimball asked staff to clarify and confirm Mr. Azzolino's concern regarding the zoning at 24815 Main Street, Capay.

Eric Parfrey said that staff has recommended that the commercial zoning remain unchanged along State Route 16 in the town of Capay, so the split-lot zoning with the commercial in the front and the residential in the back will remain the same.

Mr. Jimmy Smith, representing property owner Bob Boldt, said that the Boldt property at 24815 Main Street is zoned commercial according to the assessor's office, and he would like it to remain as commercial zoning.

Mr. Parfrey said that the zoning for the Boldt property is residential, not split zoning, but that there may be commercial non-conforming uses on the property.

Mr. Morrison asked that the owner provide paper work to Mr. Parfrey. It is possible that the assessor's office is taxing a non-conforming use as commercial, while the actual zoning is residential.

Mr. Parfrey said staff would ensure the zoning would be correct before going to the Board of Supervisors.

Vice-Chair Bertolero closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Liu had no comments and supported the Capay Valley General Plan.

Commissioner Kimball thanked the citizens committee for their work. She said she was happy to see that there is so much conformity between staff and the citizens.

Commissioner Merwin concurred with Commissioner Kimball and said he was pleased to see the process coming to a close. He said he supported the Plan.

Commissioner Winters said he echoed the comments of his fellow commissioners. He said he liked reading about the history and was pleased that staff and the citizens committee worked with the Wintun tribe to preserve their culture.

Commissioner Cameron agreed with staff's recommendation and thanked everyone for their work. She asked if differentiating between the tribal lands would be helpful going into the future.

Mr. Morrison said he would not recommend differentiating, as it would be a difficult process to follow upon sale of lands on which the county has no jurisdiction. The differences in the tribal lands are those owned by the tribe, and those managed by the tribe but owned by the federal government.

Commissioner Bertolero said he was impressed by the General Plan document and thanked all the people and staff that worked on the Plan. He said he supported it.

Commission Action

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

1. **APPROVE** the additional minor policy and text revisions to the draft updated Capay Valley Area General Plan (**Attachment A**), including the changes outlined in the staff

memorandum dated August 9, 2007, including the re-zoning of the one small parcel in Guinda at the northwest corner of SR 16 and Cleveland from commercial to agricultural, and including any appropriate corrections to the zoning of the Boldt parcel in Capay, as determined by staff.

MOTION: Liu
SECOND: Merwin
AYES: Merwin, Liu, Bertolero, Winters, Cameron, Kimball
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Peart

7.2 **2007-038:** A Use Permit to construct and operate a multi-carrier wireless telecommunications facility northeast of County Road 99 and Covell Boulevard, west of the City of Davis. The project includes a new 110-foot high steel monopole with six MetroPCS antennas, three Clearwire antennas, three Clearwire microwave dishes, and additional space for at least four future wireless communication systems; related equipment would be housed in an approximately 2,500 square foot ground lease fenced area. (**Attachment A**)

David Morrison, Assistant Director of Planning, presented the staff report on behalf of Stephanie Berg. He said the project was not opposed by the City of Davis and that comment letters have been supportive with the exception of three letters in opposition to the aesthetics and noise. He answered questions from the commission.

Commissioner Winters asked the about the status of the NW quadrant for future development.

Mr. Morrison said the Board of Supervisors has not released the minutes of the last Board meeting, but that the NW quadrant was removed from consideration at this time as a preferred land use alternative, according to his notes of the meeting.

Commissioner Cameron asked if there was consideration given to camouflaging the pole.

Mr. Morrison said the city of Davis prefers the monopole, as it is visibly less intrusive. The applicant can certainly consider a different design.

Commissioner Kimball asked if this was the first application for a monopole of this height in this area.

Mr. Morrison said there are similar poles of similar height and higher throughout the county and in the city of Davis. In order to accommodate multiple carriers, more poles are required with the common use of cell phones. He said, to his knowledge, this was the first application in this area.

Commissioner Liu asked the height of the monopole near F Street in Davis and whether or not the applicant could install a shorter pole.

Mr. Morrison said the F Street pole is 95 feet and that the Commission could approve a lower height.

Vice-Chair Bertolero opened the public hearing.

Rochelle Harry-Swanson, representing ComSites West, thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak. Addressing the issues mentioned, she said the lower the pole, the more poles are needed and state requirements are asking for more co-locations, which require a higher pole. She said that she has received letters of interest from other carriers. She said the location is best for providing coverage for areas near Davis that do not have coverage at this time. She said she believed that monopole design is the least visible, but that ComSites is open to other designs. In regards to the noise from the air conditioners, she said the noise studies were within the requirements for the city of Davis and the County and conducted at a 20-foot distance.

Commissioner Kimball asked if the air conditioners ran on a 24-hour basis, 7 days a week.

Ms. Harry-Swanson said they are dependent on the temperature and the equipment. The noise study was based on constant use. She also provided visuals for other designs of other facilities in nearby areas.

Jessie Owens, a resident of the Binning tract, said she is opposed to the monopole based on the noise and the aesthetics. She recommended further studies.

Randy Yackzan, landowner of property to the west, said that the location for the proposed monopole is not rural. He said that he does not think the neighbors have had enough time to consider the impact of the noise and aesthetics or alternatives. He said he would like to delay the decision until the neighbors and the applicant can discuss the issues further.

Les Portello, resident of Davis, said he is aware of the discussions on development of the NW quadrant and that the Board of Supervisors has deferred to the city of Davis regarding land use in this area. He said that a 110-foot tower is significant development on this property, and impact development of this area. He urged the Planning Commission to defer to the city of Davis on the monopole decision.

Joseph Lin, representing Dr. and Mrs. Elliott and Mr. Monfared, thanked the Commission for allowing him to speak. He said there was no discussion of the proposal with the neighbors until he received the negative declaration. He said he was alarmed when he realized what was planned for his back yard. He questioned if this was the best location for the monopole. He said the monopole is a massive, imposing structure in his backyard. He said Sutter Hospital might allow the monopole on their location. He asked the Planning Commission not to rush into a decision and possibly consider an environmental impact study.

Ms. Harry-Swanson said the city of Davis unanimously approved the height and design of the monopole. She said Sutter Hospital was not a viable location, as it not high enough. She said it was her understanding that notifications were sent to North Davis Meadows, Binning and all homeowners within 1000 feet of the proposed monopole.

Vice-Chair Bertolero closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Merwin said he was sensitive to the needs of the community. He said what was critical to him was that neighbors were only contacted last week. He said he does not find the photo simulations offensive. He said current development is quite a distance from the proposed monopole. He asked what the setbacks were for new development.

Mr. Morrison said there are no setbacks and you do have towers in numerous cities. He said the county does have a requirement to co-locate wireless facilities with transmission towers where possible.

Commissioner Winters said he appreciated all of the comments made. He said he lives in Binning Farms and just received his notice and would be comfortable with a longer period of time to make a decision. He is not sure that this is the best location.

Commissioner Cameron supported the monopole, although she preferred the windmill look. She said she felt due diligence was done in selecting the location. She said she could move forward now or wait for a month.

Commissioner Liu said she understands that there is a need for a communications tower. She said she has concern about the location and the design. She said she liked the windmill design. She said she would support gathering additional information from the applicant and the neighborhood.

Commissioner Kimball said she agreed with what has been said. She said she believed more time is needed and that there should be input from the rural neighbors.

Commissioner Bertolero said he would like to see the applicant consider other locations further west that would still service the area and possibly a lower height or different color. He would like to have everyone that is impacted involved in discussions. He said he believed that people would get used to seeing the monopoles.

Commissioner Winters asked for more dialogue with the neighborhood and research a different location.

Mr. Morrison said an alternative site would likely result in a delay, as another site could require a new environmental impact. He said he would recommend that staff come back in September with findings for an alternative design and color as well as schedule a meeting with the applicant and neighbors.

Commission Action

1. **HELD** a public hearing and received comments;
2. **Continued** project until September, with staff and the applicant providing an alternative design and colors, including photographs and simulations; and continue the dialogue with the applicant and the neighbors to gather additional input.

MOTION: Liu
SECOND: Winters
AYES: Merwin, Liu, Bertolero, Winters, Cameron, Kimball
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Peart

Vice-Chair Bertolero called a 10-minute break.

- 7.4 Presentation by Linda Fiack, Executive Director, regarding future plans and recent activities of the Delta Protection Commission.

Linda Fiack, Executive Director of the Delta Protection Commission (DPC), assisted by Suzanne Butterfield, Deputy Director of Special Projects, presented the report and answered questions from the commission. Ms. Fiack explained that the DPC is not a permitting agency, but hears local land use decisions on third party appeals or by a majority vote of the commission. The mission of the DPC is to protect, maintain and enhance and the restore the overall quality of the Delta environment. She said one of the DPC goals was to implement the DPC Management Plan through effective general plan integration. Ms. Fiack stated that no general fund monies could be used, so input for creative funding is welcomed.

Vice-Chair Bertolero opened the public hearing.

Peggy Bohl, resident of Clarksburg, said she supported the DPC as a protector of the Delta. She said she was concerned that the zoning, changing 100 acres in Clarksburg from agriculture to agricultural industrial, in the proposed Yolo County General Plan Update is not consistent with the DPC Management Plan. She asked that the Planning Commission preserve agriculture by incorporating the DPC Management Plan into the Yolo County General Plan.

Vice-Chair Bertolero closed the public hearing.

7.3 **2007-047:** Use Permit for a first-phase 96-foot high and second-phase 130-foot high, broadband wireless Internet tower in the Agricultural General (A-1) Zone. The property is located at 50400 Gaffney Road in the Clarksburg area (APN: 043-160-02). A Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project. Owner/Applicant: Wilson/California Broadband (C. Baracco).

Craig Baracco, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report and answered questions from the commission.

Commissioner Winters asked if it was next to a residence.

Mr. Baracco said the tower was proposed next to an agricultural workshop building.

Commissioner Liu asked if there were any comments received.

Mr. Baracco said the only comment received was from the Clarksburg Citizens Advisory Committee, and they supported the project.

Commissioner Kimball inquired about the need for air conditioning.

Vice-Chair Bertolero opened the public hearing.

Kees Hugo, representing California Broadband Services, clarified that the tower is a communications tower that would provide Internet services for the Clarksburg area and does not require air conditioning.

Commissioner Bertolero asked if there was a plan for trees and if the applicant agreed to the conditions of approval recommended by staff.

Mr. Hugo said there were no plans for trees and he did agree to the conditions of approval.

Vice-Chair Bertolero closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Liu said she supported the project because it has the support of the Clarksburg Citizens Advisory Committee.

Commissioner Kimball supported the project, as it seems to be less problematic in regards to noise. Commissioner Cameron supported the project.

Commissioner Winters supported the project.

Commissioner Merwin disclosed that he was a subscriber in a temporary trial, and he supported the tower.

Commissioner Bertolero concurred with his fellow commissioners.

Commission Action

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

MOTION: Winters
SECOND: Cameron
AYES: Merwin, Liu, Bertolero, Winters, Cameron, Kimball
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Peart

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 #2007-047). Construction shall be limited in the first phase to one 96-foot high lattice tower and in the second phase to a 130 high lattice tower as shown on the approved Site Plans (**Attachment B**). 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. The use allowed under this Use Permit (ZF #2007-047) 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.

3. 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.
4. The applicant shall keep the surrounding site free from flammable brush, grass and weeds. All structures shall be adequately maintained and free from graffiti.
5. The proposed lattice tower, 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, Resources and Public Works Department.
6. The applicant shall satisfy all requirements of the Federal Aviation Administration, including FAA form 7460-1, *Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration*.

Building

7. The applicant shall obtain building permits for all structures prior to commencement of their construction. 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.
8. The project shall be constructed and operated in compliance with all applicable federal and state laws, Yolo County Code regulations, and County Engineering Design Specifications and Standards.

Environmental Health

9. Prior to the issuance of a building permit the applicant shall submit a hazardous materials business plan and inventory for review and approval by Yolo County Environmental Health.

Public Works

10. The applicant shall obtain a County Encroachment Permit to pave the driveway connection to Gaffney Road for commercial use.

County Counsel

11. 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.

12. 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.**

7.5 Discussion of the policies and regulations regarding agricultural buffers required for new development (R. Landon).

Mr. Morrison said that the presentation was in response to the Planning Commission's interest in agricultural buffers for pesticide spraying during the recent consideration of proposed subdivisions in Esparto. He introduced Rick Landon.

Rick Landon, Yolo County Agricultural Commissioner, presented the report and answered questions from the commission. He clarified that he was presenting information on the agricultural buffer policies. He said the policies were originally developed for pesticide applications near urban development, but are applicable for other agricultural applications such as tractor noise, dust and fertilizers. The buffers are from environmentally sensitive areas. He said the buffers vary in distance and gave examples of the buffer distances for urban dwellings, schools and farm worker housing. He said when asked to comment on land use projects, his mission is to protect and promote agriculture, so his comments would address the negative impact to agriculture. He said he would prefer to see the buffer come out of the development land rather than the agricultural land.

Commissioner Kimball asked Mr. Landon to comment on the expectation that people moving into agricultural areas have to deal with it.

Mr. Landon said this is not realistic with development at this time. He said his job is to ensure and enforce the 500-foot buffer between agriculture and development.

Vice-Chair Bertolero opened the public hearing.

Robert Ramming, member of the Yolo County Ag Futures Alliance and the Yolo County Farm Bureau Board, said he supported having buffers taken out of proposed development and would like to see the Yolo County General Plan conform with the Ag Commissioner's buffers. He read letters from the organizations he represents supporting the agriculture buffers.

Vice-Chair Bertolero closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Bertolero asked staff what the priorities were between policies, implementation measures and development standards.

Mr. Morrison explained that they actually support each other.

Commissioner Cameron thanked Mr. Landon for the presentation and said that it does appear that the agricultural buffer policies and the general plan policies are not in agreement. She said it would be her hope that in the future they could be better aligned.

Mr. Morrison said that the Planning Department and the Agriculture Commission have different roles. He said the Agriculture Commission protects agricultural interest and that planning tries to balance competing societal interests, such as development. He said buffers needed to be

considered individually in each development situation, and cited several examples. He said if the Planning Commission wishes, staff could look further into aligning buffers with agricultural policy.

Commissioner Kimball thanked staff for the presentation. She said felt the language was vague and inconsistent. She said she would like to see the word buffer have a stronger meaning and consider more progressive buffers with multiple benefits, such as hedgerows, walking paths, native plants and waterways.

Mr. Morrison clarified that in many cases, such as in Esparto; buffers include trails and other benefits. He said one consideration is the maintenance of multiple use buffers, therefore putting a cost on the landowners and special districts.

Commissioner Merwin said he appreciated Mr. Landon's presentation and Mr. Morrison's clarifications. He asked the commissioners to be aware of the fact that there is a significant impact to agriculture when compromises are made.

Mr. Morrison said he would follow up with Mr. Landon to determine the possibility of modifying the county's language and the agricultural conditions to recognize hedgerows and include environmental features.

7.6 Scoping session for the update of the Yolo County Housing Element of the General Plan (D. Morrison/D. Early).

David Morrison, Assistant Director, introduced Ricardo Bressanutti, a planner with Design, Community and Environment (DCE), hired by Yolo County to prepare the Housing Element of the updated General Plan.

Mr. Bressanutti clarified that the information to be presented covers only the unincorporated areas of Yolo County, not the incorporated cities. He introduced Ben Noble, the DCE housing element expert.

Vice-Chair Bertolero called a five-minute break.

Ben Noble, DCE Consultant, said his purpose was to seek feedback from the Commission and public on the housing element. He said the government code is specific as to the requirements, including effectiveness of previous element, demographic, economic and housing profiles of the county, housing needs assessment, constraints analysis, inventory of at risk units and land resources, goals, new goals, policies and programs and quantified objective for next five years.

The discussion focused on low income and affordable housing. He said DCE is seeking input on special needs population and location to public transportation, farm worker housing needs, what programs are in place currently and what barriers to affordable housing exist.

Commissioner Bertolero asked what would happen if the County did not meet the numbers directed by the Regional Housing Needs Allocation.

Mr. Noble said it was the County's role to encourage developers to meet the numbers, for example, through zoning changes.

Mr. Morrison clarified that there is no penalty for not meeting the numbers at this time.

Commissioner Kimball asked where the numbers come from and if the numbers took into account the future expansion of the Cache Creek Casino.

Mr. Noble said the state department of finance prepares population and employment projections for the state and assigns the numbers to each region in the state, such as SACOG for Yolo County. Each region has flexibility to decide how to meet the projections.

Commissioner Kimball asked if there was an update as to whether the previous numbers were met.

Mr. Morrison said he could provide general information at the next meeting. SACOG determines the numbers. The County meets the high-income housing through developments such as Wildwings. The county meets the low income housing via mobile homes. Yolo County has not been very successful in meeting low and moderate-income housing. The County's affordable housing ordinance targets the low and moderate-income housing by requiring new development to include 10% of the homes built to meet the needs of each of these categories.

Commissioner Winters asked about housing for students as UC Davis expands.

Mr. Morrison said the County does not have land use jurisdiction over UC Davis, as it is State owned. The County has been involved through financing partnerships and is aware of the plans at UC Davis. The question is whether or not the County gets credit towards meeting the housing needs.

Commissioner Cameron said she would like to focus on the farm worker housing. There appears to be many constraints with zoning and environmental health. She asked how the County could work within the constraints to resolve this housing need. She said resolving these housing needs helps the agricultural community and also the schools.

She also said elderly housing may not be as large an issue as services are not available in the unincorporated areas, such as medical and social services.

Vice-Chair Bertolero opened the public hearing.

Robert Ramming, representing the Yolo County Farm Bureau, said the trend is for full-time farm workers and farm owners is to live in the cities in order to access services and schools are available. He said the Farm Bureau supports town infill growth model in order to preserve agriculture land. He said there is a growing trend for farm workers to take full-time jobs, which could impact the type of housing that is needed. He said the development plans in the proposed General Plan appeared to exceed the SACOG requirements.

Ron Voss, representing Esparto Citizens Advisory Committee and Capay Valley Vision, said that zoning changes in the updated Esparto General Plan allow for multiple dwellings in Esparto. He said Esparto would also like to have mixed-use zoning to meet needs. The Capay Valley Vision housing study of several years ago indicated the need for farm housing, starter housing, senior housing and rental units. His recommendations include: (1) Do not convert industrial and commercial zoning to residential zoning; (2) Convert R-1 and R-2 to R-3 zoning for higher density; (3) Do not convert park and open land to residential housing; (4) Develop tighter design guidelines, including energy consideration, streetscapes and community values.

Kim Coontz, Executive Director of the Yolo County Mutual Housing Association, asked that the County consider using land dedication projects that allows non-profits to compete for land that is dedicated by developers for development to ensure long-term, quality housing. Special needs in

rural areas are a part of inclusionary development and should include not just migrant and farm housing, but also transitional housing.

Commissioner Cameron left the meeting at 12:32 pm.

Vice-Chair Bertolero closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Kimball agreed with Mr. Voss regarding the mixed-use zoning. She said the design review guidelines process is underway and specifically the committee is focusing on energy conservation for each of the zoning categories. She said she would like to see more creative ways to increase farm worker housing. Commissioner Kimball said she believed the casino expansion would significantly impact farm worker and other low-income housing. She asked how Yolo Housing Authority fit in with the housing element.

Commissioner Merwin said he agreed with Commissioner Kimball and Commissioner Cameron's comments regarding the need for farm worker housing. He said the County needed to find ways to entice or provide incentives to farmers to develop and maintain farm worker housing, removing the burdens of regulations. There is a need for single-family and dormitory style housing for farm workers.

Mr. Morrison asked if the regulations were imposed by the state or county.

Commissioner Merwin answered the state. However, if a farmer wants to build housing, the county fees for permits are prohibitive.

Commissioner Bertolero said fewer farm workers are required today with the advances in farm equipment, creating a trend to downsize the numbers of workers. He said organic farming is more labor intensive. He said it is important to determine what the farm and labor trends are in Yolo County.

8. DISCUSSION ITEMS

8.1 Report on recent actions taken regarding the County General Plan Update (D. Morrison).

Mr. Morrison said the minutes from the July 17, 2007 Board of Supervisor's meeting, clarifying the preferred land-use alternative, have not been approved as yet, so his report was based on his notes from the meeting. He provided a summary. He said staff will go back to the Board on September 18, 2007 to confirm the boundaries for the Road 12A and I505 interchange and to present the analysis of the size of industrial growth in Clarksburg and the appropriate size of growth in Dunnigan, Madison and the boundaries of the agricultural district.

9. 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, Resources 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.

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

1. Introduced new Assistant Planner, Jeff Anderson. He said two new Principal Planners were joining the staff on Monday, August 16, 2007.
2. Joanne Coleman, Permit Counter Technician, was retiring effective August 10, 2007.
3. The Zamora Citizens Advisory Committee would hold their first meeting on August 29, 2007.
4. The Rumsey Band of Wintun Indians released of the Notice Of Preparation for the Environmental Impact Report for the Cache Creek Casino expansion.
5. Comment area maps were sent to the Citizen Advisory Committees for review and discussion at their individual meetings.
6. The items that are scheduled for the September 25, 2007 Board of Supervisors meeting include Orciuoli, the ag mitigation ordinance and the animal control ordinance.
7. Discussed a brochure from a proposed development, the Calusa Heritage Ranch, in Calusa County.

10. 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.

1. Commissioner Liu spoke to Mr. Yackzan and Mr. Lin regarding the proposed ComSites cell tower.
2. Commissioner Kimball said she had also received calls from Mr. Yackzan and Mr. Lin. She also said that she would no longer continue with the Yolo Watch group as the discussion of the re-inclusion of Dunnigan as an agricultural district was problematic.

Mr. Morrison said staff would need further direction from the Board of Supervisors on the nature of agricultural districts. Ms. Tschudin and Mr. Morrison are preparing the boundary for the Dunnigan Hills ag district and formulating concepts for the agricultural districts and transfer of development rights.

3. Commissioner Winters said he had been on vacation. He did receive calls from Mr. Yackzan and Mr. Lin regarding the cell tower.
4. Commissioner Merwin said he attended the Design Review Committee meeting and the

Farm Bureau meeting. He said he was also contacted by citizens opposed to the ComSites cell tower.

5. Commissioner Bertolero said he attended the June 19, 2007 Esparto Citizens Advisory Committee meeting. He attended Design Guidelines meeting on July 10, 2007 and the Dunnigan Citizens Advisory Committee meeting on July 18, 2007.

* * *

11. 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.

There was no discussion of future agenda items.

* * *

12. ADJOURNMENT

The Regular Meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission was adjourned at 1:11 p.m. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission is September 13, 2007 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, Resources and Public Works Department