



AGRICULTURAL COMMISSION

311 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 621-5520
(530) 626-4756 FAX

eldcaq@co.el-dorado.ca.us

Greg Boeger, Chair – Agricultural Processing Industry
Lloyd Walker, Vice-chair – Other Agricultural Interests
Chuck Bacchi – Livestock Industry
Bill Draper, Forestry/Related Industries
Dave Pratt – Fruit and Nut Farming Industry
Vacant – Fruit and Nut Farming Industry
Gary Ward – Livestock Industry

MINUTES

February 11, 2009

6:30 P.M.

Board of Supervisors Meeting Room
330 Fair Lane – Building A, Placerville

- Members Present:** Boeger, Bacchi, Draper, Pratt, Walker, Ward
**Mr. Draper arrived during Item IV. Public Forum*
- Members Absent:** None
- Ex-Officio Members Present:** William J. Stephans, Ag Commissioner/Sealer
- Staff Members Present:** Chris Flores, Agricultural Biologist/Standards Inspector
Nancy Applegarth, Clerk to the Agricultural Commission
Jason Hade, Development Services/Planning
- Others Present:** Don Carter, Davell Hays, Emily Hays, Eric Hays, Chris Hill, Ray Perry; John Smith, Jim Wilson, Bruce Wirtanen

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Bill Stephans stated that the applicant on Item VIII. requested that his application be heard at the March 11, 2009, due to the current weather conditions that prevented several individuals from arriving to testify regarding his project.

Motion passed.

It was moved by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Pratt to recommend Approval of the agenda with the requested change to move Item VIII to the March 11, 2009 agenda.

AYES: Bacchi, Pratt, Walker, Ward, Boeger

NOES: None

ABSENT: Draper

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of January 14, 2009

It was moved by Mr. Ward and seconded by Mr. Bacchi to recommend Approval of the Minutes of January 14, 2009

Motion passed.

AYES: Bacchi, Pratt, Walker, Ward, Boeger

NOES: None

ABSENT: Draper

IV. PUBLIC FORUM

- No comments were received

V. Brown Act Synopsis - Paula Frantz, County Counsel

Paula Frantz gave an overview of the Ralph M. Brown Act. She offered general answers to questions from the Commission Members regarding a quorum, “standing committees,” the definition of “meeting”, etc. She reminded the members that no deliberation should ever take place regarding any agricultural topics that normally come before them, outside of the scheduled Agricultural Commission meeting room. One of the main points is that members of the Ag Commission cannot discuss topics outside of the Commission meetings and try to reach consensus on issues that can come before them. She stated that the Agricultural Commission members, past and present, to her knowledge, have always been in compliance with the Brown act.

VI. Ranch Marketing/Winery Ordinance update and discussion

This item was continued to the March 11, 2009 meeting at the request of Bill Stephans due to the inclement weather conditions and the length of the agenda.

VII. Z08-04/TM08-1466/Black Hawk Estates/Bruce Wirtanen – Planning Services is requesting a re-review of this application, previously heard at the May 14, 2008 Agricultural Commission meeting. A second parcel, APN 078-200-70, has been added to the rezone request. The request for APN 078-200-70 is a rezone from AE to RE-5 but would not be part of the map. The Agricultural Commission recommended denial of the tentative map based on the project proposing 5 acre lots adjacent to agricultural zoning which was not consistent with General Plan policy 8.1.3.1. Of the two adjacent agriculturally zoned lots, APN 078-200-70 is now included in the rezone request and APN 078-200-69 is five acres in size, is located in a Rural Center, and does not contain an agricultural land use designation.

Staff reported on the site visit of January 9, 2009. The subject parcel is located on the southwest corner of Blackhawk Lane in the Pleasant Valley area and is 3.04 acres. Surrounding parcels are zoned R2A (Single-Family Two-Acre Residential) and have a land use designation of MDR (Medium Density Residential). The subject parcel has a land use designation of LDR (Low Density Residential). This land use designation allows for a maximum density of one dwelling unit per 5.0 acres, with parcel sizes ranging from 5.0 to 10.0 acres. The subject parcel’s land use designation is not consistent with its size of 3.04 acres. The subject parcel and surrounding parcels have “Choice soils.”

Relevant General Plan Policies: General Plan Policy 8.1.3.2 states, “Agriculturally incompatible uses adjacent to agricultural zoned lands shall provide a minimum setback of 200 feet from the boundary of the agriculturally zoned lands. The implementing ordinance shall contain provisions for Administrative relief to these setbacks, where appropriate, and may impose larger setbacks where needed to protect agricultural resources.”

General Plan Policy 8.1.4.1 states, “The County Agricultural Commission shall review all discretionary development applications involving land zoned for or designated agriculture, and shall make recommendations to the reviewing authority.”

Considerations: On May 14, 2008, the Agricultural Commission recommended denial of the proposed tentative parcel map (TM 08-1466) until the adjacent AE zoned parcels were rezoned to something other than agriculture, or Lots 1 and 9 were combined to create a 10 acre parcel with a consistent zoning.

If the requested rezone is approved, proposed Lot 9 (5.1 acres), on the tentative parcel map would be consistent with applicable agricultural policies.

Bill Stephans referred to a “Note” on this agenda item that stated, “(Depending on the Board of Supervisors action at their February 3, 2009 meeting, staff may be able to make additional recommendations on TM 08-1466 if General Plan Policy 8.1.3.1 is further clarified.)” He stated that the Board of Supervisors had adopted an interpretation of General Plan Policy 8.1.3.1. which would no longer allow the Commission to make a recommendation regarding Lot no.1 on the tentative parcel map, because the AE zoned parcel adjacent to it, is in a Rural Center and has a land use designation of Low Density Residential (LDR) .

Bruce Wirtanen was present for questions and review of the project.

Don Carter, representing, Clarence, David and Michael Alvis expressed their general concerns regarding the entire project and did not specifically address this request for rezoning the AE parcel. The creation of smaller parcels in agricultural areas is a major concern of theirs because once smaller parcels are approved; increases in conflicts and lack of agricultural uses follow. In his opinion, this area has some of the best soils for agriculture and should not be residentially developed. The effect on the local water supply, due to increased usage is another.

It was moved by Mr. Pratt and seconded by Mr. Draper to recommend Approval of Z 08-0004, the rezone of APN 078-200-70 from AE to RE-5, as all of the required findings can be made for General Plan Policy 8.1.4.1., the proposed use:

- A. Will not intensify existing conflicts or add new conflicts between adjacent residential areas and agricultural activities;***
- B. Will not create an island effect wherein agricultural lands located between the project site and other non-agricultural lands will be negatively affected; and***
- C. Will not significantly reduce or destroy the buffering effect of existing large parcel sizes adjacent to agricultural lands.***

Motion passed.

AYES: Draper, Pratt, Walker, Boeger

NOES: Bacchi, Ward

ABSENT: None

- VIII.** Clayton G. & Ed Stetson – requesting administrative relief from agricultural setbacks for a future single-family dwelling to be located 30 feet from the west, south, and east property lines on the south portion of the property and a future second dwelling to be located 30 feet from the west property line on the north portion of the property. The subject parcel is adjacent to Residential Agricultural (RA-20 & RA-40), Planned Agricultural (PA-20), and Timberland Preserve (TPZ) zoned land, within the General Plan land use designation of Natural Resources (NR) and therefore subject to special agricultural setbacks in accordance with the Interim Interpretive Guidelines adopted June 22, 2006. The proposed primary and secondary dwellings do not meet the requirements for the Development Services Director to allow up to a 50 and/or a 75 percent setback reduction and therefore requires the Agricultural Commission review for administrative relief.

The applicant requested that this item be continued to the March 11, 2009 meeting. (Contained in the Motion to approve the agenda, Item II)

This item was continued to the March 11, 2009 meeting due to inclement weather conditions after Chair Boeger opened this item for public comment. No public comments were received.

- IX.** Z 08-0017/P 08-0002 – Young Rezone and Parcel Map (Stephen R. Young/ Carlton Engineering, Inc.): A request for a tentative parcel map to create two 20 acre parcels on a 40 acre site and a consistency rezone from Estate Residential Districts (RE-10) to Residential Agricultural-20 Districts (RA-20). Also a request for a Waiver of Design and Improvement Standards Manual, Volume II, Section 3 Street A12 “a dead-end street connecting to a county or state maintained street may exceed 500 feet in length, but not more than 2,640 feet, and only when geographical features restrict a street extension and the street will not serve more than 24 existing or potential parcels.” The applicant is proposing deed restrictions on each of the newly created parcels to limit them to one residence each. The property, identified by Assessor’s Parcel Number 099-170-87, consists of 40.12 acres, and is located on the north side of Byecroft Road approximately 1,000 feet east of the intersection with Springer Road, in the Pleasant Valley area.

Staff reported on the site visit of January 9, 2009. The subject parcel is located north of Byecroft Road in the Pleasant Valley area. Surrounding parcels have the following zonings; RE-5 and RE-10. An adjacent parcel to the south has submitted an application to Development Services to change their zoning from RE-10 to RA-20 (Residential Agricultural Twenty). The subject parcel has a land use designation of AL (Agricultural Lands). Surrounding parcels have an AL designation or an RR (Rural Residential) designation. The subject parcel and all surrounding parcels are located in the Pleasant Valley Agricultural District and all have “Choice soils”

Relevant General Plan Policies: General Plan Policy 2.2.2.2 states, “The purpose of the Agricultural District overlay designation is to identify the general areas which contain the majority of the County’s federally designated prime, State designated unique or important, or County designated locally important soils (collectively referred to as “choice” agricultural

soils) and which the Board of Supervisors has determined should be preserved primarily for agricultural uses.”

General Plan Policy 2.2.2.2 Section B states, “The minimum residential parcel size for lands containing choice agricultural soils within an Agricultural (-A) District shall be twenty (20) acres or the minimum lot size established by the underlying land use designation, whichever is greater.”

General Plan Policy 8.1.3.1 states in part, “...Those parcels used to buffer agriculturally zoned lands shall have the same width to length ratio of other parcels.”

General Plan Policy 8.1.3.2 states, “Agriculturally incompatible uses adjacent to agricultural zoned lands shall provide a minimum setback of 200 feet from the boundary of the agriculturally zoned lands. The implementing ordinance shall contain provisions for Administrative relief to these setbacks, where appropriate, and may impose larger setbacks where needed to protect agricultural resources.”

Resolution No. 079-2007 Exhibit A of the Board of Supervisors pertaining to the adoption of the Criteria and Procedures for Administrative Relief from Agricultural Setbacks states, “...Whenever a rezone to an agricultural designation is recommended by the Planning Commission, the recommendation shall also include an analysis and recommendation for the setback for each surrounding parcel that would be affected by the new setback.”

General Plan Policy 8.1.3.5 states, “On any parcel 10 acres or larger identified as having an existing or potential agricultural use, the Agricultural Commission must consider and provide a recommendation on the agricultural use or potential of that parcel and whether the request will diminish or impair the existing or potential use prior to any discretionary permit being approved.

General Plan Policy 8.1.4.1 states, “The County Agricultural Commission shall review all discretionary development applications involving land zoned for or designated agriculture, and shall make recommendations to the reviewing authority.”

Considerations: 8 surrounding properties could be affected by the imposed 200 foot agricultural setback if the zoning is changed from residential zoning to agricultural. Ag staff will work with Planning staff to analyze the surrounding properties for setback recommendations if the Planning Commission recommends the rezone. A rezone to agricultural zoning would be consistent with the land use designation of AL and the Ag District overlay. The creation of two 20 acre parcels would also be consistent with the minimum parcel size in the Ag District overlay but the proposed parcels used to buffer agriculturally zoned lands would be inconsistent because they are required to have the same width to length ratio of other parcels.

Referring to the staff recommendation on the agenda, the Commission asked why the creation of the new parcels would “intensify existing conflicts.”

Staff explained that due to the long, narrow shape of the proposed parcels, conflicts could

arise in the future with setback issues, etc. It is staff's belief that potential problems should be avoided, not created.

Jim Wilson, Carlton Engineering, representing Stephan Young, offered further explanation of the project. He stated that reshaping the map would result in the removal of more trees and require building a 20 foot wide gravel road to access the back parcel. He explained the narrow portion of the parcel is very steep and there is natural drainage in the area. It is his opinion that the only buildable area is at the northwest corner of the parcel where the property levels out, although this area too, is greatly restricted because a good portion is basically wetland.

Ray Perry, owner of land to the north of the parcel offered his objections to building a 20 foot wide road to access a parcel. He also offered his support of the project as proposed.

After studying the parcel map and a lengthy discussion of various possible parcel configurations, it was decided by Jim Wilson to come back to the Commission with a new design for the project.

It was moved by Mr. Pratt and seconded by Mr. Draper to recommend APPROVAL of Z 08-0017, to rezone APN 099-170-87 from RE-10 to RA-20, as the agricultural zoning is consistent with the parcel's land use designation of AL and the Agricultural District overlay. The Commission recommends DENIAL of P 08-0002 as findings for General Plan Policy 8.1.4.1 cannot be made. Even though the parcels are proposed to be twenty acres in size, the proposed dimensions:

- A) Could intensify existing conflicts or add new conflicts between adjacent residential areas and agricultural activities; and***
- C) Could significantly reduce or destroy the buffering effect of existing large parcel sizes adjacent to agricultural lands.***

Motion passed.

AYES: Ward, Walker, Pratt, Draper, Bacchi, Boeger

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

- X.** Z 08-0018/P 08-0003 – Gutierrez Rezone and Parcel Map (Daniel Charles Gutierrez/Carlton Engineering, Inc.): A request for a tentative parcel map to create two lots of 20 and 20.7 acres from a 40.7 acre parcel and a consistency rezone from Estate Residential Districts (RE-10) to Residential Agricultural-20 Districts (RA-20). Also a request for a Waiver of Design and Improvement Standards Manual, Volume II, Section 3 Street A12 “dead-end” street connecting to a county or state maintained street may exceed 500 feet in length, but not more than 2,640 feet, and only when geographical features restrict a street extension and the street will not serve more than 24 existing or potential parcels.” The applicant is proposing deed restrictions on each of the newly created parcels to limit them to one residence each. The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 099-170-88, consists of 40.70 acres, and is

located on the south and north sides of Bycroft Road at the intersection with Springer Road, in the Pleasant Valley area.

Staff reported on the site visit of January 9, 2009. The surrounding parcels have the following zonings: RE-5 and RE-10 (Adjacent parcel to the north has submitted a rezone request to Development Services, to change their zoning from RE-10 to RA-20 (Residential Agricultural-Twenty). The subject parcel has a land use designation of AL (Agricultural Lands), as well as, surrounding parcels to the north, east, and south. Parcels to the west are designated RR (Rural Residential). The subject parcel and surrounding parcels are in the Pleasant Valley Ag District. The subject parcel and some of the surrounding parcels have "Choice soils."

Relevant General Plan Policies: General Plan Policy 2.2.2.2 states, "The purpose of the Agricultural District overlay designation is to identify the general areas which contain the majority of the County's federally designated prime, State designated unique or important, or County designated locally important soils (collectively referred to as "choice" agricultural soils) and which the Board of Supervisors has determined should be preserved primarily for agricultural uses."

General Plan Policy 2.2.2.2 Section B states, "The minimum residential parcel size for lands containing choice agricultural soils within an Agricultural (-A) District shall be twenty (20) acres or the minimum lot size established by the underlying land use designation, whichever is greater."

General Plan Policy 8.1.3.1 states in part, "...Those parcels used to buffer agriculturally zoned lands shall have the same width to length ratio of other parcels."

General Plan Policy 8.1.3.2 states, "Agriculturally incompatible uses adjacent to agricultural zoned lands shall provide a minimum setback of 200 feet from the boundary of the agriculturally zoned lands. The implementing ordinance shall contain provisions for Administrative relief to these setbacks, where appropriate, and may impose larger setbacks where needed to protect agricultural resources."

Resolution No. 079-2007 Exhibit A of the Board of Supervisors pertaining to the adoption of the Criteria and Procedures for Administrative Relief from Agricultural Setbacks states, "...Whenever a rezone to an agricultural designation is recommended by the Planning Commission, the recommendation shall also include an analysis and recommendation for the setback for each surrounding parcel that would be affected by the new setback."

General Plan Policy 8.1.3.5 states, "On any parcel 10 acres or larger identified as having an existing or potential agricultural use, the Agricultural Commission must consider and provide a recommendation on the agricultural use or potential of that parcel and whether the request will diminish or impair the existing or potential use prior to any discretionary permit being approved."

General Plan Policy 8.1.4.1 states, "The County Agricultural Commission shall review all

discretionary development applications involving land zoned for or designated agriculture, and shall make recommendations to the reviewing authority.”

Considerations: A few of the surrounding properties could be affected by the imposed 200 foot agricultural setback if the zoning is changed from residential zoning to agricultural. Ag staff will work with Planning staff to analyze the surrounding properties for setback recommendations if the Planning Commission recommends the rezone. A rezone to agricultural zoning would be consistent with the land use designation of AL and the Ag District overlay. The creation of two 20 acre parcels would also be consistent with the minimum parcel size in the Ag District overlay but the proposed parcels used to buffer agriculturally zoned lands would be inconsistent because they are required to have the same width to length ratio of other parcels.

Jim Wilson, representing Dan Gutierrez, gave further explanation of the project. After discussion regarding possible redesign of the parcel map, Mr. Wilson offered to come back to the Commission after further consultation.

Ray Perry, spoke in support of the project and believes it will be a plus to the Pleasant Valley area.

It was moved by Mr. Pratt and seconded by Mr. Ward to recommend APPROVAL of Z 08-0018, to rezone APN 099-170-88 from RE-10 to RA-20, as agricultural zoning is consistent with the parcel's land use designation of AL and the Agricultural District overlay. The Commission recommends DENIAL of P 08-0003 as findings for General Plan Policy 8.1.4.1 cannot be made. It is staff's analysis that even though the parcels are proposed to be twenty acres in size, the proposed dimensions:

- A) Could intensify existing conflicts or add new conflicts between adjacent residential areas and agricultural activities; and***
- C) Could significantly reduce or destroy the buffering effect of existing large parcel sizes adjacent to agricultural lands.***

Motion passed.

AYES: Bacchi, Draper, Pratt, Walker, Ward, Boeger

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

- XI.** S 08-0026 – Chateau Davell Winery – Vernon, Eric, Emily and Davell Hays: A request for a special use permit for an expanded home occupation to allow a winery. The project will not result in construction or grading. No employees or on-site retail sales. The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 091-170-21, consists of 12.54 acres, and is located on the west side of Big Canyon Road, approximately 0.5 miles south of the intersection with French Creek Road, in the Shingle Springs area.

Bill Stephans mentioned that the Board of Supervisors has adopted the new Winery Ordinance which does not allow a winery as a home occupation but it does allow a micro-winery with 1 acre or more of vineyard. Since this application, for a Home Occupation Winery, was being processed when the new Winery Ordinance was adopted by the Board of Supervisors, staff is unsure whether the applicant would still qualify for a home occupation Special Use Permit, or if the applicant would have to qualify for a micro-winery. Bill Stephans suggested that the application be heard but that Paula Frantz, County Counsel be consulted in regards to how the application should be handled.

Staff reported on the site visit which took place January 28, 2009. The application is for a Special Use Permit for a home occupation winery to allow a maximum of 500 cases of wine per year. The subject parcel is 12.54 acres, has RE-10 zoning, and a land use designation of RR (Rural Residential). The parcel has an existing vineyard (one acre in size) that was planted approximately 9 years ago, per the applicants. The vineyard has 6 varieties of grapes, is trellised, is protected by deer fencing, and has drip irrigation serviced by an on-site well. There is an existing building on the property, to be used for the production and storage of wine. During the visit, the applicants stated that they supplement their grapes with grapes grown locally.

Relevant General Plan Policies: General Plan Policy 2.2.1.2 describes the land use designation of the subject parcel, Rural Residential (RR) as "...areas for residential and agricultural development." It also states, "Clustering of residential units under allowable densities is encouraged as a means of preserving large areas in their natural state or for agricultural production. Typical uses include single-family residences, agricultural support structures, a full range of agricultural production uses, recreation, and mineral development activities."

General Plan Policy 8.1.3.5 states, "On any parcel 10 acres or larger identified as having an existing or potential agricultural use, the Agricultural Commission must consider and provide a recommendation on the agricultural use or potential of that parcel and whether the request will diminish or impair the existing or potential use prior to any discretionary permit being approved.

The proposed home occupation winery is consistent with the RE-10 zoning and RR land use designation.

Eric Hayes stated that they support Biodynamic Agriculture and propose to improve the agricultural capabilities of their parcel. Since their application appears to be poorly timed with the recently adopted Winery Ordinance, he proposed the Ag Commission endorse the approval of both the Special Use Permit for a home-occupation winery and/or Conditional Use Permit for a micro-winery under the new ordinance. Bill Stephans agreed with Mr. Hayes suggestion in the interest of not having to bring this item back to the Commission if the newly adopted ordinance takes precedence.

It was moved by Mr. Pratt and seconded by Mr. Ward that the Agricultural Commission finds that the proposed home occupation winery will not change the residential character of the parcel nor will it adversely affect the other uses permitted in a residential area, therefore the Agricultural Commission recommends APPROVAL OF s 08-0026 based on the current uses allowed with a Special Use Permit on RE-10 zoned property, as stated in the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance Section 17.70.100 subsections A & G., which includes, “The packing and processing of agricultural or wood products and the necessary buildings and structures required therefore where the nature of the product is changed” and “Home occupations not listed in subsection C of Section 17.70.090 which require special occupations not listed in subsection C of Section 17.70.090 which require special consideration such as the use of power tools, accessory building, noise, and will not change the residential character of the premises or adversely affect the other uses permitted in a residential area.” Additionally, since Ordinance 4808 pertaining to wineries was recently adopted by the Board of Supervisors on February 3, 2009 (effective 30 days after adoption), and the Agricultural Commission is unsure as to whether the new requirements in Ordinance 4808 takes precedence over the existing ordinance code, the Agricultural Commission also recommends the APPROVAL of a Conditional Use Permit for a micro-winery pursuant to Section D.10 et seq of Ordinance 4808.

Motion passed.

AYES: Bacchi, Draper, Pratt, Walker, Ward, Boeger

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

XII. LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

- A draft comment letter has been crafted regarding AB 885 and the proposed regulations for On-site Wastewater Treatment Systems by the State Water Resources Control Board. Staff asked the Commission Members for their review and comment. Mr. Draper asked for the inclusion of the discussion regarding the limited sewage capacity at the Union Mine Wastewater Treatment Plant in El Dorado County. The Commission approved of the letter and asked staff to verify the submittal process with County Counsel. The Commission was concerned that the correct process be followed. Bill Stephans will follow up with the requested additions and ensure that the letter is submitted correctly after he discusses the process with County Counsel.

XIII. CORRESPONDENCE

- Mary Harris Nugent – letter of intention to operate under the Williamson Land Act for the Albert Harris Ranch

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

- El Dorado County Board of Supervisors approval of Williamson Act Contract 08-0001 and adopted Resolution 336-2008 establishing Agricultural Preserve No. 319 – Paul and Alice Clary
- El Dorado County Board of Supervisors approval of Williamson Act Contracts 08-0002, 08-0003, 08-2006 and adopted Resolution 337-2008 establishing Agricultural Preserve No. 66, Resolution 338-2008 establishing Agricultural Preserve No. 320, and Resolution 339-2008 establishing Agricultural Preserve No. 229 – Gael and Joan H. Barsotti
- Williamson Act & Farmland Security Zone Contracts – Agricultural Data Survey for Calendar Year 2008
- On February 3, 2009, the Board of Supervisors adopted the following interpretation of General Plan Policy 8.1.3.1:

- 1) General Plan Policies 8.1.3.1 and 8.1.3.2 do not apply where the adjacent agriculturally zoned parcel was assigned an urban or other non-agricultural land use in the Land Use Map for the 2004 General Plan (MFR, HDR, MDR, LDR, C, R&D, I, TR, AP or PF).

Projects located adjacent to agriculturally zoned parcels meeting the above criteria will not be subject to review by the Agricultural Commission unless the proposed project is within or adjacent to an Agricultural District, adjacent to an existing commercial agricultural operation or adjacent to land currently under a Williamson Act Contract.

2. Open space parcels meeting the setback provisions of Policy 8.1.3.2 may be created to buffer agriculturally zoned lands. Open space parcels created for this purpose are not required to maintain the same length to width ratios of other (developable) parcels.
3. This Policy direction shall remain in effect until July 1, 2010 at which time the County shall have completed the comprehensive update of the Zoning Ordinance, including revisions to the Zoning Maps or when Policy 8.1.3.1 is otherwise amended.
4. We will agendize the Ag Commission's criteria for February 24, 2009 with modifications to apply that criteria to be utilized for RR, NR, OS & AL Land Use Designations.

In response to Item 4 of the above adopted directive, Bill Stephans, Chris Flores and Peter Mauer met and crafted the following:

Criteria for the Consideration of a Reduction of Minimum Parcel Size Agricultural Buffer Requirement of Policy 8.1.3.1 in the Rural Regions of the County

The decision-making authority may approve a reduction of the minimum parcel size requirement pursuant to Policy 8.1.3.1 in the Rural Regions of the County as designated on the Land Use Diagram of the General Plan if all of the following criteria have been met:

1. The proposed development is consistent with the existing land use designation;
2. The adjacent agriculturally zoned land is not located within an Agricultural District or designated AL, Agricultural Land;
3. The adjacent agriculturally zoned land does not have an active agricultural operation; and
4. The adjacent agriculturally zoned land scores less than 60 points utilizing the Procedure for Evaluating the Suitability of Land for Agricultural Use as adopted by El Dorado County or the Agricultural Commission finds that 70% of the agriculturally zoned land is unsuitable for agricultural.

After discussion regarding the proposed response to the RR criteria, the Commission thought that it would be appropriate to place the criteria on the March agenda for discussion and possible action and directed Bill Stephans to ask the Board of Supervisors to continue the February 24, 2009 item until after the Ag Commission's March meeting.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:32 p.m.

APPROVED: Greg Boeger, Chair

Date: March 11, 2009