

ESPARTO CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
12/16/08

Attending: Gretchen Adan, Wayne Belshaw, Colleen Fescenmeyer, John Hulsman Jr, Melissa Jordan, Giacomo Moris, Patrick Scribner.

Absent: Tammy Fullerton, Pat Harrison

**MEETING ADMINISTRATION**

- 1) Call to order at 7:05pm by Chair Jordan.
- 2) Agenda: **Motion** to approve agenda by G. Adan, Second by W. Belshaw, all in favor, none opposed.
- 3) Minutes and Notes from previous meetings:
  - a) **Motion** to approve minutes of 9/16/08, 10/21/08 and 10/27/08 as revised by W. Belshaw, second by J. Hulsman, all approved, none opposed.
  - b) **Motion** to acknowledge notes from 9/03/08 (no quorum) by C. Fescenmeyer, second by J. Hulsman, all in favor, none opposed, one abstention (G. Moris).
- 4) Correspondence & Announcements:
  - a) M. Jordan distributed e-mail correspondence with Chris Robbins of Yolo RCD who is almost ready for letter regarding Lamb Valley Watershed.
  - b) M. Jordan – Went to BOS to speak against Waste Management compliance issues. State exemption for low quantity generators.
  - c) Save Rural Yolo made \$2500 with candy sales. \$30M County gets is not free money – it’s a “lease hold”. State holds title to jail.
  - d) G. Moris announced request from County via Capay Valley Vision for qualified consultant for Brownfield study (for Esparto Downtown).
  - e) G. Moris – possible grocery and hardware tenants for old downtown buildings. CDC may have more info.

**PUBLIC FORUM**

- 5) Public Requests
  - a) G. Moris relayed Sue Heitman’s request to present a Streetscape update on our January agenda.

**COUNTY UPDATE** (by Eric Parfrey)

- 6) Casino Expansion: January 5 is new deadline before going to arbitration.
- 7) Yolo General Plan: Working towards Board of Supervisors workshop meetings 1/20-22. Planning Commission meeting Thursday AM then staff going away until January 5<sup>th</sup>.

## ACTION ITEMS

- 8) DMX zoning
  - a) M. Jordan – staff report received today – insufficient time to review.
  - b) Staff recommends:
    - i) No single family detached.
    - ii) Up to 60 % housing OK – horizontal lot coverage (not vertical).
    - iii) Lodging – 40 units to trigger use permit.
  - c) Discussion on 60% horizontal vs. vertical.
  - d) C. Fescenmayer – Loophole for more residential growth in vertical direction.
  - e) P. Scribner – Last commercial land left. Allow only residential above?
  - f) Type of housing you could get with subdivided single family lots. M. Jordan – 30 acres of 70 acre piece could turn into 800 apartments.
  - g) This goes to Planning Commission this Thursday.
  - h) J. Hulsman – Wes Ervin study numbers (10 of 25) match conveniently to the 60% number.
  - i) G. Moris – Capay Valley region must go out Highway 16 to get groceries. They would go to Esparto if there was something worth while.
  - j) P. Scribner – 60% residential mix is too much in commercial zone.
  - k) Throw out the DMX if residential component is too large?
  - l) G. Adan – Arbuckle has a couple hotel/motels downtown. People loitering at those places.
  - m) G. Moris – wouldn't throw out DMX – sees some residential as good for apartments, housing needs for Casino, farm workers.
  - n) M. Jordan – why does County keep pushing the residential at 60%?
  - o) G. Adan – can we wait 5 years on this? Eric: No since old C2 is very old and too restrictive.
  - p) P. Scribner - Can we have DMX without the residential component? Prefer not duplexes, houses, apartments. Not a problem with live work.
  - q) C. Fescenmeyer cited example of a shopping area in American Canyon.
  - r) Discussions in preparation for a motion included:
    - i) Live Work area OK.
    - ii) Residential component above first floor OK.
    - iii) Excess acreage back to ag or non-residential?
  - s) **Motion** by P. Scribner, second by C. Fescenmeyer: Recommend to the Planning Commission that the DMX be revised to not allow any residential component on a horizontal basis (other than live-work). Residential above the first floor to be allowed.

- i) Discussion on residential above first floor.
- ii) Vote: All in favor, none opposed, one abstention – J. Hulsman.
- t) Discussion that excess acreage, if any, as determined by the Absorption Study regarding the large undeveloped parcels north of Woodland avenue be retained as commercial, or rezoned as non-residential.
- u) Prefer not to do motion. Won't absorb in the first term, but in long term can bring in.
- v) P. Scribner – we have a better chance if we have a study that says we have 10 acres that we can zone for DMX, than say 20 acres in back ???.
- w) Discussion around lodging and conditional use for greater than 16 or 39?
- x) **Motion** by G. Moris, second by Pat. to support Planning Staff's recommendation for 39 unit max by right lodging units. All in favor, none opposed.

9) Waste Management. Melissa noted 9 people in Esparto that have complained.

10) Future Agenda Items

- a) Special Meeting on Yolo GP plan draft?

11) NA

12) Meeting adjourned 12/16/08.

GLM 1/12/09