



County of Yolo

PLANNING AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

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

JOHN BENCOMO
DIRECTOR

MINUTES

YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

July 8, 2004

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Woo called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Cameron, Cornejo, Gerber, Merwin, Peart, Stephens, and Woo
MEMBERS ABSENT: None
STAFF PRESENT: David Morrison, Assistant Director of Planning
Philip Pogledich, Deputy County Counsel
David Daly, Principal Planner
Lance Lowe, Associate Planner
Sarjit Dhaliwal, Associate Planner
Carole Kjar, Secretary to the Director

▽ ▽ ▽

2. ADOPTION OF REVISED MINUTES OF THE JUNE 10, 2004 MEETING

Commission Action

The Revised Minutes of the June 10, 2004 meeting were approved with the following correction.

9. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

ADD the following:

“(6) Presentation by Arthur G. Baggett Jr., Chair of the State Water Resources Control Board”.

MOTION: Peart SECOND: Cornejo
AYES: Cameron, Cornejo, Gerber, Merwin, Peart, Stephens, and Woo
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

▽ ▽ ▽

3. PUBLIC REQUESTS

MINUTES

YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

JULY 8, 2004

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.

▽ ▽ ▽

4. CORRESPONDENCE

4.1 Planning Division Quarterly Report, June 2004

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

▽ ▽ ▽

5. CONSENT AGENDA

Items on the Consent Agenda are believed by staff to be non-controversial and consistent with the Commission's instructions to staff. All items on the Consent Agenda may be adopted by a single motion. If any commissioner or member of the public questions an item, it should be removed from the Consent Agenda and be placed in the Regular Agenda.

None.

▽ ▽ ▽

6. REGULAR AGENDA

6.1 **2003-133** – Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) # 4673 to divide approximately 260 acres into three parcels of approximately 84, 87 and 88-acres. The property is designated Agriculture (AG) by the Yolo County General Plan and is within the Agricultural Preserve (A-P) Zone located on the south side of County Road 12A, west of Interstate 505, and 3 miles west of Zamora (APN: 054-100-16). No CEQA action is required. Applicant/Owner: John Roth III and Michelle Christison (S. S. Dhaliwal)

Sarjit Dhaliwal gave the staff report and answered questions from the Commission.

The public hearing was opened.

John Roth, third generation Yolo County farmer, explained the proposal, and requested that the item be pulled from the agenda until the August meeting so that information can be obtained on water viability for the parcels.

Rich Jenness, with Laugenour and Meikle, Civil Engineers, offered perspectives from an agricultural standpoint on this proposed land division. He summarized that the project provides an opportunity to create an environment for agricultural endeavors with little, if any, downside risk to the County.

John Roth III, a commercial beekeeper, said he would like to put a shop building on one of the 80-acre parcels to store equipment and work-related vehicles. He added that he might put a house on one of the parcels in the future.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Peart said that he is unable to support the project because the proposed land division is not consistent with Yolo County General Policies.

Commissioner Stephens stated that she has the same concerns as Commissioner Peart, and that she believes the project is precedent setting and could cause problems in the future.

Commissioner Gerber expressed that the overriding County goal, as stated in Yolo County's Land Use Guidelines, is to resist breaking up parcels of less than 320 acres. He said he doesn't believe a one-month extension would change his way of thinking.

Commissioner Cornejo said she, too, is concerned about the division of parcels.

Commissioner Merwin stated that he is in agreement with many of the comments expressed by the Commission. He said he believes that splitting the land into 80-acre parcels would not make it more agriculturally viable, but would make it easier to sell for homesites.

Commissioner Cameron expressed that she is in agreement with her fellow colleagues, and that she doesn't think a one-month extension would change her mind.

Chair Woo said she believes that splitting the property would eventually hurt farming, and that the project is precedent setting; therefore she is unable to support the project.

Commission Action

- (1) **ADOPTED** the **FINDINGS FOR DENIAL** of the proposed Tentative Parcel Map (**Exhibit B**); and
- (2) **DENIED** the proposed Tentative Parcel Map based on the **FINDINGS (Exhibit B)**.

MOTION: Cameron SECOND: Merwin
AYES: Cameron, Cornejo, Gerber, Merwin, Peart, Stephens, and Woo
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

FINDINGS FOR DENIAL *(A summary of evidence to support each FINDING is shown in Italics)*

Upon due consideration of the facts presented in this staff report and at the public hearing for Zone File #2003-133, the Yolo County Planning Commission finds the following:

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines

1. Environmental review is not required for the proposed project.

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §15270(a) CEQA does not apply to projects which a public agency rejects or disapproves.

General Plan

The proposed project is not consistent with the following Yolo County General Plan policies:

2. LU 6. Protect and Conserve: It is the policy of Yolo County to vigorously conserve and preserve

the agricultural lands in Yolo County. Yolo County shall protect and conserve agricultural land use especially in areas presently farmed or having prime agricultural soils and outside of existing planned urban communities and outside of city limits.

The subject property is designated Agriculture by the Yolo County General Plan and is zoned Agricultural Preserve (A-P). Although the property is not being farmed and contains mostly class III-VI soils, it is believed to be able to support a vineyard, or an olive orchard. The property is not located within a planned urban community or within any city limits.

3. LU 14. Subdivision Prohibited: New residential or suburban subdivisions are prohibited in the agricultural designated areas.

There is no evidence that the proposed 80-acre parcels can be farmed more effectively than the 260-acre parcel. The purpose of the proposed project is to divide the subject property into three 80-acre parcels to create two additional homesites.

4. LU 20. Prohibit Residential Use/Division: Yolo County may prohibit the development of residential land uses on parcels of property created by land divisions in agriculturally designated areas. Such requirement shall be assured by appropriate means.

The purpose of the proposed Tentative Parcel Map is to create two additional homesites.

5. LU 21. Agricultural Land Division: The division of land in an agricultural area for the purpose of providing homesites for persons not engaged in agricultural activities are prohibited by these policies.

There is no evidence that the proposed land division will promote agricultural activities. Thus the proposed project will amount to providing homesites to persons not engaged in agricultural activities.

Zoning Code

6. A minimum of 320-acre parcel size is required for the subject property.

The subject property is zoned A-P. According to Article 4. Agricultural Preserve Zone (A-P), Section 8-2.406(a) of County Code, lot area shall be no less than 80 gross acres where the soils are capable of cultivation and are irrigated, 160 gross acres where the soils are capable of cultivation but are not irrigated and 320 gross acres where the soils are not capable of cultivation (including rangeland and lands which are not income producing). The subject property is not irrigated. Due to their type and slope, staff believes these soils are not cultivable. Therefore, the minimum parcel size allowed would be 320 acres.

Subdivision Map Act (Government Code Section 66472)

7. The proposed project is not consistent with Section 66474 of the Subdivision Map Act, which requires that a legislative body of a city or county shall deny approval of a tentative map, or a parcel map for which a tentative map was not required, if it makes any but not limited to the following, findings:
 - a. That the proposed map is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans as specified in Section 65451.

As discussed above in Findings #2-5, the proposed Tentative Parcel Map is not consistent with the Yolo County General Plan, which encourages agriculture and discourages

fragmentation of agricultural lands.

▽ ▽ ▽

6.2 **2001-004** – Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow a “Yolo Store” operation and related activities including retail sales and kitchen improvements to be located in an existing barn under construction, and to incorporate existing on-site retailing of agricultural produce and an existing cider and juice press into the Yolo Store operation. The subject site is designated Agriculture (AG) by the Yolo County General Plan, within the Agricultural Preserve (A-P) Zone, and is located at the southwest corner of County Roads 31 and 98, approximately one mile west of the City of Davis (APN’s: 037-050-07). A Negative Declaration has been prepared for the project. Applicant/Owner: Clyde and Katie Kelly (S. S. Dhaliwal)

Sarjit Dhaliwal gave the staff report and answered questions from the Commission.

The public hearing was opened.

Clyde Kelly, one of the owners of Impossible Acres, explained the details of the project.

Leon Wegge, resident of CR 98 next to the project area, distributed written comments to the Planning Commission, and expressed concerns about the traffic impact of the Yolo Store operation around the intersection of CR 98-CR 31. He said he is concerned about Yolo County’s welfare and urged the Planning Commission to ask County staff to analyze these security and traffic safety issues.

Eric Tavenier, resident of West Plainfield for sixteen years, spoke in favor of the application. He expressed that the operation promotes Yolo County Agriculture and family values.

Craig McDonald, neighbor of the Kelly’s and resident of Road 97D, said that his family believes that Impossible Acres is a jewel for the Davis agricultural community. He stressed that most of the traffic to this farming operation comes from Covell Boulevard to the corner. He concluded that he thinks this request is consistent with the priority of preserving agricultural land for agricultural uses.

Katie Kelly, applicant, addressed some of the traffic and parking concerns, and stated they are very comfortable with the traffic evaluation prepared by Grandy & Associates. She said that she doesn’t foresee any parking complications, and that they have five acres available for overflow parking.

Commissioner Peart asked if they would put in additional parking if it were found that cars are parking along County Road 98.

Katie Kelly assured that they would.

Commissioner Stephens asked if the pumpkin farm was open seven days a week.

Katie Kelly responded, yes.

Commissioner Gerber asked where they would put additional parking if the 17-vehicle parking lot were full.

Katie Kelly said that additional cars could park on both sides of the driveway to the facility.

Mr. Wegge asked for further clarification about the traffic issues.

David Morrison clarified that traffic modeling is based on square footage, not on the number of cars. He stated that staff is comfortable with the traffic analysis and assumptions used and the environmental

conclusion that this project would not have a significant impact on traffic.

Mr. Wegge asked David Morrison why staff didn't include their own traffic analysis in the staff report.

David Morrison said that typically, in planning projects, the burden of proving the case is on the applicant, not on the government. Therefore, the applicant provided the analysis to staff for their review and determination as to whether it should be accepted.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Cameron expressed that she is in full support of the project and that it would be a great asset for Yolo County.

Commissioner Merwin thanked the Kelly's for doing such tremendous work on the project. He concluded that he is very much in support of the project, and that it's a beacon of light that meets the intent of the Yolo Store concept. He also expressed that he respects Mr. Wegge's opinion and thanked him for sharing his concerns.

Commission Action

- (1) **ADOPTED** a Negative Declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (**Attachment D**);
- (2) **ADOPTED** the **FINDINGS** for the Conditional Use Permit (**Attachment B**);
- (3) **APPROVED** the proposed project for the Conditional Use Permit subject to the **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (Attachment C)**.

MOTION: Gerber SECOND: Peart
AYES: Cameron, Cornejo, Gerber, Merwin, Peart, Stephens, and Woo
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Planning

1. This project is approved to allow a Yolo Store operation and related activities as described in the Background and Project Description subsection under the 'Analysis' section of this report. Any modification to the approved plans, extent or manner of operation of the facility shall be submitted for review and approval to the Director of the Planning and Public Works Department.
2. The applicant shall be responsible for all expenses incurred in implementing the Conditions of Approval contained within this staff report.
3. The approved facility shall be continuously maintained and operated in accordance with the conditions of approval of this Conditional Use Permit and all other applicable County and State regulations.
4. Prior to the installation of any signs on the property, the applicant shall submit all sign plans for review and approval by the Planning and Public Works Director.
5. The hours of operation for the project shall be 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., seven days a week.

6. The sale of beer and tobacco products is prohibited on the subject property.
7. Square footage used for the sale of foods prepared on the premises for consumption off the premises and seating area for the consumption of food prepared on the premises, shall be limited to one-third of the total square feet used for sales and retail. Sales and storage areas shall be limited to 5,000 square feet.
8. Only over the counter food sales are permitted. No table service shall be allowed.
9. The applicant shall obtain building permits for all structures prior to the commencement of construction.
10. The site shall be landscaped. At least four weeks prior to the occupancy of any of the buildings, two copies of a landscaping plan shall be submitted to the Director of Planning and Public Works for approval. The landscaping plan shall be in sufficient detail to identify the location, specie, and size of the proposed landscaping materials. At maturity, the landscape plan shall be able to screen the proposed facility from any public road. Prior to the occupancy of any of the buildings, the approved landscaping shall be either installed or a bond posted for its installation within one year. The bond amount shall be equal to a nursery or contractor's estimate of the cost of installation of the plan which shall be submitted along with the bond. The bond shall be made payable to Yolo County for that cost estimate shall be submitted to the Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department.
11. The project site including any existing or new landscaped areas and/or fences shall be continuously maintained by the applicant and the site shall be continuously maintained in a litter-free, weed-free, healthy, growing condition.

Environmental Health

12. Sewage disposal plans that address food processing and other waste flows shall be reviewed by the Environmental Health Department.
13. The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits for the public water supply from the Environmental Health Department and shall perform ongoing testing as needed.
14. The food processing shall require compliance with State law as determined by the Environmental Health Department.

Building

15. Public restroom facilities shall be in compliance with applicable regulations regarding access for persons with disabilities.
16. Fire-sprinklers shall be installed in the Yolo Store, if the Store building area exceeds 5,000 sq. ft.

County Counsel

17. In accordance with Yolo County Code Section 8-2.2415, the applicant shall agree to indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the County or its agents, officers and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding (including damage, attorney fees, and court cost awards) against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attach, set aside, void, or annul an approval of the County, advisory agency, appeal board, or legislative body concerning the permit or entitlement when such

action is brought within the applicable statute of limitations.

The County shall promptly notify the applicant of any claim, action or proceeding and that the County cooperates fully in the defense. If the County fails to promptly notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding, or if the County fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify, or hold the County harmless as to that action.

The County may require that the applicant post a bond in an amount determined to be sufficient to satisfy the above indemnification and defense obligation.

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.**

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

Upon due consideration of the facts presented in this staff report and at the public hearing for Zone File #2001-004, the Yolo County Planning Commission finds the following:

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines

1. That the proposed Negative Declaration and Initial Study prepared for the project is the appropriate environmental documentation.

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, an environmental evaluation (proposed Negative Declaration and Initial Study prepared on June 7, 2004) has been available for public review since June 14, 2004. The initial study shows that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the project may have a significant effect on the environment.

As of the writing of this report, no comments were received regarding the Negative Declaration and Initial Study.

The proposed Negative Declaration is the appropriate level of environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Article 6, Section 15070 of the CEQA Guidelines.

General Plan

2. That the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan Policy LU 6 that states: It is the policy of Yolo County to vigorously conserve and preserve the agricultural lands in Yolo County. Yolo County shall protect and conserve agricultural land use especially in areas presently farmed or having prime agricultural soils and outside of existing planned urban communities and outside of city limits.

The subject property is currently in agricultural production. The existing agricultural use will not change upon approval of the Conditional Use Permit. No new buildings are required for the proposed use. The proposed Yolo Store will be located in a currently under-construction barn. A parking lot for 17 vehicles is the only additional development that will be required for the proposed use. The remainder of the property will retain the existing agricultural production and accessory uses.

3. That the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan Policy LU 18 that states: Yolo

County shall consider the placement of certain agricultural related land uses in agricultural areas, by means of conditional use permits, which uses may be incompatible with urban sites by reason of hazard or nuisance to concentrations of people. Findings for approval shall include, but are not limited to:

- i. The use is directly related to agricultural land use (cultivation of agricultural plants or the raising of animals; and,
- ii. Will not diminish nor prevent agricultural use on site or on adjoining agricultural lands; and,
- iii. The use has some hazard or nuisance aspect which precludes it from being placed in an urban area; and,
- iv. The use can be developed in the area without significant reduction of cultivation, growth, and harvesting of the indigenous agricultural products.

As provided for under the County Code §8-2.404(n), the proposed Yolo Store is being considered under a conditional use permit application.

The proposed retailing of agricultural produce is directly related to the existing agricultural use of the property. Yolo County encourages direct marketing of agricultural products by allowing roadside stands as a permitted use and Yolo Stores with a conditional use permit in agricultural zoning.

The proposed Yolo Store will be located in a currently under-construction building. The only new development required for the proposed use will be a parking area for 17 vehicles. Therefore, the proposed use will not take substantial farmland out of production and will not diminish or prevent agricultural use on site or on adjoining agricultural lands. The use can be allowed on the property without significant reduction of cultivation, growth, and harvesting of the indigenous agricultural products.

The proposed use being an agricultural use cannot be located in an urban area.

4. That the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan Policy LU 17 that states: Residential land uses in the agricultural areas shall be limited to dwellings only for preservation of the family farm, for farm employees and those persons who own the farm land, up to a limit established by ordinance and implemented by Conditional Use Permit. All such dwellings shall be encouraged to locate on lands unsuited for agricultural use and/or in "clustered" configurations to minimize the conversion of agricultural lands to any other uses. A maximum dwelling unit density for the total acreage in the farm or ranch shall be established by ordinance.

Building permit issued for the under-construction barn includes construction of one dwelling on the upper floor. The proposed project will use that dwelling for a caretaker. The proposal does not include additional dwellings.

Pass-through Agreement

5. The subject property is located within 'Pass-Through Agreement' area around the City of Davis. The proposed project is consistent with this Agreement between the City of Davis and Yolo County.

The purpose of the Pass-Through Agreement is to preserve agricultural land by limiting 'urban development' within the Agreement area which in turn, will result in concentrating urban development within the City of Davis Redevelopment Plan area. In accordance with the terms of the Agreement, the City of Davis has reviewed the proposed project and found the project to be consistent with the Pass-Through Agreement.

Zoning Code

6. That the proposed Conditional Use Permit portion of the proposed project is consistent with the findings required by the Yolo County Zoning Code including:

a. The requested use is listed as a Conditional Use in the Zone regulations for Agricultural Preserve (AP) Zone.

The Zoning Code §8-2.404(n) lists the Yolo Store as a Conditional Use in the Zone regulations of Agricultural Preserve (AP).

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

Due to its location being on two of the important county roads and close to Davis, the proposed Yolo Store will be desirable for public comfort in providing easy access to locally grown fresh produce. Additionally, the proposed Yolo Store will contribute towards supporting agriculture in the County.

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

The proposed Yolo Store is an agricultural use located in an agricultural area. It will be operated in accordance with the conditions of approval for this project, which will ensure that it will not result in detrimental impacts to the public health, safety, or general welfare.

d. The request will be in conformity with the Yolo County General Plan.

The proposed Yolo Store is consistent with policies of the County General Plan as discussed in para #'s 2-4 in the General Plan subsection above.

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

All utilities, access road, septic system, water well and other necessary facilities are currently existing on the subject property.

▽ ▽ ▽

A ten-minute recess was called.

6.3 **2003-031** – Workshop on Yolo County's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. Yolo County has proposed to adopt an Inclusionary Housing Ordinance to implement the adopted Yolo County Housing Element. The Inclusionary Housing Ordinance would require that a percentage of all residential development proposals are reserved for affordable housing. The Inclusionary Housing Ordinance would apply countywide (L.E. Lowe)

Lance Lowe gave the staff report and answered questions from the Commission.

David Morrison gave a synopsis about the affordable housing process.

The public hearing was opened.

John Gianola, the Managing Attorney of Legal Services in Northern California, and Chair of the City of Davis Affordable Housing Task Force, highlighted issues he has experienced in going through inclusionary housing ordinances. He said that it's important to establish an ordinance that has sufficient guidance and information to implement the goals that are already in the General Plan, and to provide

enough details and information to carry out those goals in a practical way.

The public hearing was closed.

David Morrison mentioned that on Tuesday, July 20, 2004, 1:30 p.m., the Board of Supervisors will be discussing the SACOG report about the Affordable Housing Compact.

Commission Action

- (1) **RECEIVED** a brief report from staff, received comments from the public, and provided individual comments from members of the Planning Commission;
- (2) **DIRECTED** staff to continue to work with the Housing and Community Development Advisory Committee (HACDAC) and bring back a draft Inclusionary Housing Ordinance to the Planning Commission for recommendation to the Yolo County Board of Supervisors.

▽ ▽ ▽

- 6.4 Set a tentative date for a special Planning Commission meeting in the town of Clarksburg to receive public comment on the Draft Old Sugar Mill Specific Plan project and on the project's Draft Environmental Impact Report (D. Daly)

David Daly gave the staff report and answered questions from the Commission.

Commission Action

The Planning Commission selected Tuesday, September 14, 2004, 7:00 P.M. as the date to hold a Planning Commission meeting in the Town of Clarksburg on the Old Sugar Mill Specific Plan, and to receive public comment on the Draft EIR for the project.

▽ ▽ ▽

- 6.5 Presentation by Thomas Barandas, Director of North Natomas Water Agency

Thomas Barandas gave background information about himself and the North Natomas Water Agency. He explained their encroachment permit process and defined encroachment as an opportunity to collectively plan improvements to a water delivery system. He concluded that a good encroachment process delivers system improvements, improved community relations, a greater understanding of the issues, being educated, always learning, having a standard operating procedure, and the ability to be adaptable.

▽ ▽ ▽

7. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

A report by the Assistant Director on the recent Board of Supervisor's meetings on items relevant to the Planning Commission. An update of the Planning and Public Works Department activity for the month. No discussion by other Commission members will occur except for clarifying questions. The Commission or an individual Commissioner can request that an item be placed on a future agenda for discussion.

Assistant Director Morrison brought the Commission up to date on the following:

- (1) SACOG Issues: Affordable Housing Compact and Regional Blueprint Project

- (2) Notice of Preparation on the Covell Village Project
- (3) General Plan Workshops
- (4) Furloughs for County Employees
- (5) Revised Hours: PPW is closed for lunch due to increased workload.
- (6) Fee Increases
- (7) County Service Area Coordinator Position
- (8) Code Enforcement Position
- (9) Water Resources Coordinator
- (10) PPW Staffing Update
- (11) Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

▽ ▽ ▽

8. COMMISSION REPORTS

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

- (1) Commissioner Cameron: No report.
- (2) Commissioner Merwin reported that he talked with Katie Kelly about their "Yolo Store" project.
- (3) Commissioner Cornejo said that she also talked with Katie Kelly.
- (4) Commissioner Gerber stated that he received a message on his answering machine from Katie Kelly, but was unable to return her call.
- (5) Commissioner Stephens said she attended the Esparto Advisory Meeting regarding the school site location, and received a message from someone about development in Madison.
- (6) Commissioner Peart reported that he received a call about the Greg Amaral project.
- (7) Chair Woo: No report.

∨ ∨ ∨

9. 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.

- (1) No items requested.

∨ ∨ ∨

10. ADJOURNMENT

The Regular Meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission was adjourned at 12:20 p.m. The next Regular Meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission will be held on Thursday, August 26, 2004, at 8:30 a.m., 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 that Board within fifteen days from the date of the action. A written notice of appeal specifying the grounds and an appeal fee immediately payable to the Clerk of the Board must be submitted at the time of filing. The Board of Supervisors may sustain, modify or overrule this decision.

Respectfully submitted by,

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