



Solano County

675 Texas Street
Fairfield, California 94533
www.solanocounty.com

Minutes - Final Planning Commission

Thursday, September 1, 2022

7:00 PM

Board of Supervisors Chambers

CALL TO ORDER

The Solano County Planning Commission met on September 1, 2022, in regular session in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers at the Solano County Government Center, 675 Texas Street, Fairfield, California at 7:00 p.m.

Solano County staff members present were Resource Management Director Terry Schmidtbauer and Assistant Director James Bezek, Deputy County Counsel Jim Laughlin, Planning Services Manager Allan Calder, County Surveyor Stephen Fredericks, Engineering Manager Matt Tuggle, Senior Civil Engineer Pejman Mehrfar, Principal Planner Matt Walsh, Contract Planner Kathy Pease and Clerk Marianne Richardson.

SALUTE TO THE FLAG

ROLL CALL

Commissioners Paula Bauer, Kay Cayler, Michael Reagan and Chairperson Kelly Rhoads-Poston.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

On a motion by Commissioner Bauer, and seconded by Commissioner Reagan, the agenda was approved by affirmation.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

There were no minutes for approval.

ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Chairperson Rhoads-Poston invited members of the public to speak on items not listed in the agenda. Hearing no comments, the public comment hearing was closed.

REGULAR CALENDAR

[PC 22-030](#)

Conduct a noticed public hearing, to consider and make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors regarding Major **Subdivision Application No. S-21-01 (Wagner)** for the **Middle Green Valley Specific Plan**. The application proposes a **Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map** to divide

410.9 acres into 27 separate parcels, and a subsequent **Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map** to divide 137.2 acres into 322 separate residential parcels and multiple additional parcels for right-of-way, parks and open space, Village Green, Community Service uses, and stormwater detention areas. The property is located near the intersection of Green Valley and Mason Road, within the unincorporated portion of Solano County, north of the City of Fairfield. The property is designated "Specific Project Area" in the General Plan. The property is located within the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan and contains multiple zoning districts that allow a range of land uses, including residential, agriculture, open lands and agritourism. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provides that residential Projects which are consistent with an approved Specific Plan for which an EIR was prepared are exempt from a requirement to prepare additional environmental analysis. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, the subdivision is consistent with the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan and is within the scope of the certified Middle Green Valley Specific Plan Program EIR, which adequately describes the activity for purposes of CEQA, and no new environmental document is required.

Attachments: [A - Draft Planning Commission Resolution](#)
[B - Large Lot Tentative Map](#)
[C - Small Lot Tentative Map](#)
[D - Phasing Plan](#)
[E - Preliminary Financing Plan](#)
[F - Letters from Green Valley Landowners Association and Green Valley Agri](#)
[G - Realigned Roadway](#)
[H - Proposed Residential Land Use Table](#)
[I - Lands to be Conserved in Project Area](#)
[J - Vicinity Map](#)

Principal Planner Matt Walsh presented the major subdivision application to the Commission and discussed the handout Errata sheet revisions to the Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map Conditions of Approval including addition of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to Attachment A.

Chairperson Rhoads-Poston invited the applicant to speak.

Charity Wagner of Wagner Enterprises, representing six (6) landowners, presented an overview of the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan (MGVSP) process to date, review of proposed large and small lot subdivision maps, Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program in relation to land conservation easements, and the next steps in the MGVSP implementation.

Chairperson Rhoads-Poston opened the public hearing.

1. Glen Langstaff of Tartan Way spoke in support of the project citing thoughtful development of roadways, housing, landscaping and commercial businesses over the past few decades. He further stated awareness of increased traffic from this development, however he has witnessed the evolution of collaborative planning of the MGVSP.

2. Roger Merrill, Vice President of the Green Valley Landowners Association

(GVLA), spoke in support of the project. He stated that the GVLA was hesitant of the MGVSPP development approach back in 2006, and through collaboration with landowners and developers and rigorous review of proposed revisions, the GVLA approved and offered support of the MGVSPP in 2017 and 2021.

3. Mark Sievers of Siebe Drive spoke in support of the project. He has participated in all the (MGVSPP) planning public meetings and does have concerns and skepticisms but is in support of the thoughtful design. He commented that ABAG has long commented on the need for housing and this project is a thoughtful way to contribute.

4. Michael Fortney of Fox Hollow Circle spoke in support of the project stating he participated on the Citizens Advisory Committee in 2006. He spoke of the many landowners, committees, hearing bodies and registered voters that have approved the MGVSPP. He also spoke of the compatible residential development plan without urban encroachment that supports and sustains agriculture far into the future.

5. Herb Hughes of Green Valley Road spoke in support of the project having served on the GVLA, Green Valley Agricultural Conservancy (GVAC), and the neighbor citizen committee in 2004. He stated the plan incorporates the objectives and guidelines of the MGVSPP including approximately 1,500 acres of protected/agriculture land, and that the TDR is foundational to the MGVSPP.

6. Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins of Green Valley Road spoke of her personal experience with the GVAC and County permitting process for a pool. She stated it is unacceptable and socially irresponsible to use public process to institutionalize what she could only describe as a “good old boys” network. She stated support for responsible development but cited concern that the County is taking direction from landowners regarding development for others, and that having a process forcing citizens to plant flowers and change outdoor lighting is unacceptable.

7. Joshua Paulson of Vintage Lane within the MGVSPP spoke in opposition of the project citing concerns of school capacity and resources stating the elementary school is already oversubscribed and under resourced. He encouraged Commissioners to consider a pause rather than moving ahead at this time.

8. Nora Dizon of Ramsgate Court spoke in opposition of the project citing concerns of the project’s use of city water and sewer utilities for dense urban development that will negatively impact area residents. She commented that the new residents will be very affluent and will unfairly be using the taxes from the less affluent Fairfield residents. She requested this project be paused.

9. Michelle DePass of Vintage Lane within the MGVSPP area spoke in opposition of the project citing concerns of school capacity, pressure on infrastructure, rising temperatures and water crisis, noting the plan was not subject to a full environmental impact study and felt it allowed the project to breeze through issues like fire, traffic and schools. She asked for a pause on this project.

10. Alicia Minyen of Cornell Court stated she had no opinion of the project but cited concerns and questions of the financing plan to extend water/sewer, use

of a Community Facilities District (CFD), indemnification clause language, presumptions used to support the financial analysis, annexing of other developments, and noted errors in owner names on the map (exhibit).

11. Marilyn Farley of United Circle stated she is not opposed to the project but was concerned of technical issues that should be corrected. She stated the conservation easement is to be held by an accredited land trust and asked that language be included in condition 12.M.1. She stated the definition section refers to conservation easements being based on Department of Fish & Wildlife which should be corrected, the amount of conservation acreage does not match up, and a large parcel on Green Valley Road is not included in a chart which should be in the conservation easement.

12. Stephanie Fox on Spring Lane spoke in opposition of the project citing concerns of school capacity, environmental and traffic/safety impacts including evacuations. Further stating the plan does not consider the apartment complex currently in construction. She is concerned with the plan with Fairfield water, which has been trying to annex the area, that should be considered by all stakeholders.

13. Liz Fickner of Green Valley Road spoke in opposition citing concerns of school capacity, water and crime. She requested a pause so all can feel good about the project.

After hearing no further public comments, Chairperson Rhoads-Poston closed the public hearing and thanked those in attendance and via teleconference for their comments and participation.

Commissioner Reagan motioned to adopt the resolution for an approval recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Commissioner Bauer stated she had questions to discuss with staff. Hearing no second, the motion failed.

Responding to questions by Commissioner Bauer, Mr. Walsh provided the following:

- 1) A traffic study was completed in 2008/2009 and took into consideration Fairfield's General Plan (build-out) of the I-80/Green Valley Road area.
- 2) The water supplier has not been decided; however, both the City of Vallejo and SID have submitted will-serve documentation that they have capacity to supply this development.
- 3) It is confusing how the MGVSP deals with the accreditation of the easement holder. There are MGVSP sections stating it needs to be an accredited non-profit organization, but the development agreement cross references to a MGVSP section that does not state that provision. The Commission can recommend this inclusion in the condition.
- 4) Confirmation that the staff report exhibit outlining the areas within the application boundary do contain discrepancies in the Assessor Parcel Number and owner names. However, the intent of the exhibit is to map the lands to be under conservation easements resulting from this application, to which the exhibit does illustrate.
- 5) He believes the discrepancy of conservation easement acreage is due to this application building out 322 units of the total 390 units of the MGVSP. There will be 1,100+ acres going under conservation easement with this specific application, and more acreage will be added when future developers bring in their subdivision applications.

Responding to a question by Commissioner Bauer, Contract Planner Kathy Pease stated there is no CFD proposed at this time. There will be a menu of options or mechanisms for developers to fund improvements. The only CFD currently proposed is part of a condition to ensure a back stop for the sewer service, and it would be a dormant CFD at this point.

Ms. Pease stated as part of the environmental impact report, they looked at public services and school generation, noting that 322 units does not generate 322 students at one time (student generation rate starts about 58 K-12 kids). The development will gradually build out over time, noting they will be contributing funds to help schools.

Responding to a question by Chairperson Rhoads-Poston, Ms. Pease stated the Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District is aware of this development and can use the approved MGVSF in their planning for future school facilities.

Commissioner Bauer commented she agrees with the public requesting a pause until we can get answers to some of the issues before moving forward.

Chairperson Rhoads-Poston asked County Counsel Jim Laughlin to discuss the indemnification clause. Mr. Laughlin stated that a subdivision project is subject to rules and regulations by the Subdivision Map Act which states exactly how the indemnification provisions must be written, and the conditions in this project match exactly with the requirements.

On a motion made by Commissioner Reagan, and seconded by Commissioner Cayler, the Commission adopted a resolution for the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan Large Lot and Small Lot Tentative Map Major Subdivision application S-21-01 (Wagner) with Errata sheet revisions, and forward a recommendation of approval to the Board of Supervisors to adopt resolutions for the Tentative Maps. Chairperson Rhoads-Poston amended the motion to modify condition of approval 12.M to state the conservation easements will be held by an accredited land trust. So ordered by 3-1 vote.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS

Mr. Calder stated he believed an item is scheduled for the September 15, 2022 meeting.

ADJOURN

This meeting of the Solano County Planning Commission adjourned at 8:39 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for September 15, 2022.