

ESPARTO CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
**DRAFT MEETING MINUTES**  
12/19/17

Approved as revised

Attending: Colleen Fescenmeyer, John Hulsman Jr, Randy Jacobs, Giacomo Moris,  
George Pennebaker, Sandie Reed, Lisa Wyatt

Absent: Cynthia Havstad, Pat Harrison

**MEETING ADMINISTRATION**

- 1) Call to order at 07:05 pm by Chair G. Pennebaker.
- 2) Agenda:
  - a) **Motion** by C. Fescenmeyer to approve agenda, second by J. Hulsman. Vote: all in favor, none opposed.
- 3) Minutes for October
  - a) Edits were provided by J. Hulsman, G. Moris, and G. Pennebaker.
  - b) **Motion** by J. Hulsman to approve minutes for October as revised, second by R. Jacobs. Vote: all in favor, none opposed, 2 abstentions (C. Fescenmeyer and L. Wyatt).
- 4) Correspondence & Announcements
  - a) E. Parfrey introduced Charlie Tschudin as the new Assistant Planner, welcome!
  - b) G. Pennebaker: Inquiry from Cache Creek planning group regarding parkway. Maybe have them come to our January meeting.
  - c) G. Moris: Capay Open Space park planting days on 1/6, 1/7, 10:00 am to noon.
  - d) C. Fescenmeyer announced this will be her last meeting. The committee thanked her for her input and assistance over the years.

**PUBLIC FORUM**

- 5) Public Comments (None)

## 6) County Update

- a) Esparto Community Park and Aquatic Center. Update presented by Trini Campbell.
  - i) Five bids were received by 11/7/17 and they ranged from \$6.3-7.7M. Low bidder was SW Allen.
  - ii) Plan is for approval of construction to go before the Board of Supervisors 1/23/18. Construction to start in February, with groundbreaking ceremony on 2/15 at 4:00 PM.
  - iii) Trini presented a display of the site plan, finishes, and a copy of the updated timeline.
  - iv) C. Fescenmeyer – aquatic center restrooms in addition to field restroom? Yes, in same building.
  - v) G. Pennebaker – was new fire hydrant strategically placed? Yes. 8” main installed to supply pool and gas station if that project proceeds.
- b) Esparto Gas Station
  - i) Appeal hearing is set for 1/23/18 at the Board of Supervisors. Planning Commission approved project (without the restaurant), but was appealed by the tribe. When the appeal elevates the application, the Board of Supervisors can consider all aspects of the proposed project (including the restaurant).
  - ii) C. Fescenmeyer – development agreement didn't specify restaurant was needed? No.
  - iii) G. Pennebaker – Discussion of the sidewalk will be included?
  - iv) E. Parfrey suggested that everyone read the Tribe's appeal (on County website)
  - v) Anna Vasquez (Supervisor Chamberlain's deputy) went to Assemblywoman Cecilia Aguiar-Curry on this topic, She received a letter back which she read to the committee stating CalTrans was contacted and that sidewalks will be constructed on the west side of Yolo ave at Highway 16 north up to Lamb Valley Slough and they are currently investigating a sidewalk for the east side. G. Pennebaker reminded all that the concern was pedestrian crossing the slough.
  - vi) S. Reed - Who owns Lamb Valley Slough? Privately owned but maintained by MERCSA in the past. Yolo County Flood Control maintains it now.
- c) General Plan update – no new information (that Eric has).
  - i) Trini asked when was it last updated? 2007.

## 7) Action Items

- a) Sports Bar
  - i) Charlie Tschudin gave a description of the project as described in the NOI. Outdoor beer garden noted. Applicant (James Kinter) was not present.
  - ii) G. Moris – were neighbors notified of our meeting? Yes.
  - iii) C. Fescenmeyer – disappointed that second story was dropped. Two stories fits better in the plan.
  - iv) G. Moris suggested to rotate the project to have the building front the street with parking in the back.
  - v) Trini – Are hours of operation noted in the Neg Dec? Yes.
  - vi) Public – Is there concern with noise with an outdoor beer garden and hours?

- vii) Bill – Confused about the process. If you are a builder you wouldn't build if you were unsure on what you can build. Eric explained level of detail required for use permit vs building permit.
  - viii) G. Pennebaker – Changes are significant and we need to address them with the applicant. Want to hear what others think.
  - ix) Thaddeus Barsotti – lives to the south and east of the property. He is in support of the project. Understands concern, but overall thinks it is positive for the community and encourages us to be supportive.
  - x) Robert Fescenmeyer – Agrees with Thaddeus – this will help the town and provide a second option to Road Trip.
  - xi) Public – Remembers last meeting where this was presented initially - James has good intentions and wants to invest in the community.
  - xii) Robert – Rotating the building could be helpful, beer garden further away from neighbor.
  - xiii) Bill – Is there a specific list of requirements? G. Pennebaker – requirements are in the Esparto Area Plan.
  - xiv) Thaddeus – as a member of the community he suggested we state our support and list our concerns.
  - xv) C. Fescenmeyer expressed concern that once we make our recommendation then it is out of our hands.
  - xvi) S. Reed suggested we invite James to come to our next meeting to give an update.
  - xvii) Robert – hold a special meeting as an option?
  - xviii) G. moris noted the Area Plan also calls for tree shading in the parking lot.
  - xix) J. Hulsman noted the design guidelines appendix of the Area Plan has suggestion for architectural elements.
  - xx) **Motion** by C. Fescenmeyer to recommend for approval of the use permit, with consideration of our suggestions related to the Esparto Area Plan (listed below with Plan document references). Second by R. Jacobs, Vote: All in favor, none opposed. Suggestions for consideration:
    - (1) Reconsider two story – even if just a façade to front the street. (E-D.21)
    - (2) Rotate the building to front street, beer garden behind it. (E-D.21)
    - (3) Parking lot trees for shading (50% over 15 years). (E-D.17)
    - (4) Review Design Guidelines for architecture elements. (Appendix A, pages 36 and 50)
- b) Yolo County Housing's Vacant Lots
- i) Charlie provided the update as per the NOI.
  - ii) G. Moris – this has been a sore subject for the committee and it is good to see some movement on these properties. One public comment received questioned that maybe duplexes as planned prior would be more fitting and a more efficient use of space.
  - iii) C. Fescenmeyer – happy something is being done, but thinks they should not be split.
  - iv) S. Reed – asked for clarification on process: Lots would be divided, then builder would build, then sold . . .
  - v) Real estate values concern? S. Reed – overall it should not make much difference.

- vi) R. Jacobs – will put house very close to there property line, a likely concern for existing neighbors.
- vii) Trini – is there a path to ownership or remains rental? Charlie – Yolo Housing indicates ownership is the plan.
- viii) G. Moris – any downside to duplexes? Eric explained it will be renters unless it is “condo’d (not likely).
- ix) **Motion** by C. Fescenmeyer to recommend not subdividing because parcels would be too small. Second by L. Wyatt. Discussion:
  - (1) G. Moris – is affordable requirement not being met if we do this?
  - (2) G. Pennebaker – What is the urgency? Eric – goes to Planning Commission on 1/18.
  - (3) Eric – it is pertinent that there may be a commitment for affordable housing – County will check on that. *(In a follow up correspondence after the meeting it was confirmed that the affordability requirement had been met).*
  - (4) Bill – suggested looking at original subdivision – subject to the map act – does County have the title? Yes.
  - (5) G. Pennebaker– hesitant to take action if we don’t know facts if affordability requirement still applies. Can we get clarification – Eric yes, soon after the first of the year. Also, does it have to be restricted to affordable housing or not.
  - (6) C. Fescenmeyer **rescinded motion** to be tabled until next meeting. Second by J. Hulsman. All in favor – aye.

8) Future Agenda Items

- a) Yolo Housing Vacant Lots Subdivision follow up
- b) Discussion with County for funding for updating the Esparto Area Plan.
- c) Election of officers

9) Adjournment

- a) **Motion** to Adjourn by C. Fescenmeyer at 08:50 PM. Vote: All in favor, none opposed.

11) Community Forum (no further discussion noted)

GLM

12/24/17

1/16/18