

MINUTES OF THE SOLANO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting of June 21, 2018

The regular meeting of the Solano County Planning Commission was held in the Solano County Administration Center, Board of Supervisors' Chambers (1st floor), 675 Texas Street, Fairfield, California.

PRESENT: Commissioners Rhoads-Poston, Walker, Hollingsworth, Bauer, and Chairperson Cayler

EXCUSED: None

STAFF PRESENT: Bill Emlen, Director; Mike Yankovich, Planning Program Manager; Karen Avery, Senior Planner; Jim Laughlin, Deputy County Counsel; and Kristine Sowards, Planning Commission Clerk

Chairperson Cayler called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with a salute to the flag. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

Approval of the Agenda

The Agenda was approved with no additions or deletions.

Approval of the Minutes

There were no minutes available for approval.

Items from the Public

There was no one from the public wishing to speak.

Regular Calendar

Item No. 1

PUBLIC HEARING to consider Use Permit Application No. U-17-09 and Marsh Development Permit Application No. MD-17-02 of **Verizon Wireless** for a new wireless telecommunications facility to be located near the intersection of Marshview Road, Goodyear Road and Interstate 680 on Assessor's Parcel Number 0046-110-280. (Project Planner: Karen Avery) **Staff Recommendation:** Approval

Karen Avery gave a brief presentation of staff's written report. The report indicated that Verizon Wireless has discovered a coverage gap along I-680 between two of their existing wireless facilities. The applicant is requesting a conditional permit to construct a 50' wireless communication facility; a slimline monopole painted dark green, to provide better wireless

coverage in the area. The applicant is also requesting that the commission grant an exception to the height limitation per Section 28.81(D)(5)(e). The allowed height for a wireless facility is 35' within the I-680 corridor and the applicant is requesting 50'. The applicant had originally proposed a 65' standard monopole, and this design was rejected by staff due to concerns about the visual impact of the wireless site when driving along I-680. The applicant redesigned the site, proposing a slimline monopole versus the standard monopole, and proposes two antenna arrays versus one antenna array at the top of the 65' tower, also the applicant is proposing to mount the two antenna arrays closer to the pole than the standard antenna mounts. Ms. Avery described the components of the project. Staff recommended approval of the request. Ms. Avery noted that staff provided to the commission an updated resolution to correct a typographical error and to add an additional finding with regard to the marsh development permit.

Commissioner Walker referred to the Project Support Statement in the CEQA document under Aesthetic Impacts. The finding states how the facility height complies with the county's development standards for these types of facilities in the A-20 zoning designation, and has been designed at its minimum functional height. Mr. Walker wanted to know what this finding was based on.

Ms. Avery explained the reason the height limit was reduced to 50' was due to an overabundance of coverage. The applicant submitted maps depicting the coverage areas and staff felt the amount was about the same as the initial proposal of 65'. Ms. Avery said staff also discussed moving the site closer to the trees but unfortunately that would cause interfere with the radio frequency.

Since there were no further questions of staff, Chairperson Cayler opened the public hearing.

Maria Kim of Complete Wireless Consulting spoke on behalf of Verizon. She stated the industry term Minimum Functioning Height is used to describe the shortest height that a tower or facility can be to meet the coverage needs for the area and the targeted zones.

Since there were no further speakers, Chairperson Cayler closed the public hearing.

A motion was made by Commissioner Walker and seconded by Commissioner Bauer to adopt the Negative Declaration and the mandatory and additional findings and adopt the revised resolution and approve Use Permit Application No. U-17-09 and Marsh Development Permit Application No. MD-17-02 subject to the recommended conditions of approval. The motion passed unanimously. (Resolution No. 4656)

Item No. 2

PUBLIC HEARING to consider an ordinance amending Chapter 28 of the Solano County Code to define the short-term rental of a dwelling as a “**vacation house rental**” and to authorize such land use, subject to an administrative or minor use permit, within the Agricultural, Rural Residential and Watershed Zoning Districts. (Project Planner: Michael Yankovich) **Staff Recommendation:** Make recommendation to the Board of Supervisors

Mike Yankovich provided a brief overview of the written staff report. The report noted at the May 17th meeting of the Planning Commission, staff presented information on the subject of vacation house rentals that included six different options for the Commission's consideration. The information covered subjects such as Airbnb/VRBO in Solano County, Transit Occupancy Tax, public service calls resulting from the land use, standards currently being used by other jurisdictions, and similar land uses. Nine individuals testified with six supportive of allowing vacation house rentals and three opposed. Following a discussion period, the commission directed staff to prepare an ordinance that would fall in the middle, Options 3 (Administrative permit) and 4 (Minor Use permit), of the regulatory options scheme.

Staff has prepared two ordinances for the Commission's consideration. The first follows a suggestion that was made at the last commission meeting where vacation house rentals could be grouped into hosted and un-hosted rentals. A hosted rental is a vacation house rental where the property owner remains on the property during the vacation house rental period. An un-hosted rental is where the property owner does not reside on the property during the vacation house rental period. The assumption is that since the property owner is on site during the vacation house rental period, any issues with tenants and neighbors could be addressed within a fairly short time period. As a result, the level of regulation required for a hosted rental would potentially be less than that required of an un-hosted rental.

For the record, Commissioner Walker disclosed an ex parte conversation he had with Kevin Browning that followed after the Commission's May 17th meeting. Commissioner Walker noted that Mr. Browning is a professional appraiser and their conversation focused on the subject of highest and best uses of properties in residential market conditions within the county, as well as information Mr. Browning had already shared when he spoke before the commission regarding a non-conforming use.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston referenced requirement no. 5 in both proposed ordinances that address sound. She said it states that no radios, televisions or sound amplification equipment may be used outdoors, between 8 p.m. and 10 a.m. She felt 8 p.m. to be quite early and wanted to know if this only pertained to amplified sound. Mr. Yankovich stated that the idea was borrowed from several existing ordinances from other counties where many short term rentals exist and seem to work.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston spoke to requirement no. 2 where it says space used for overnight accommodations as part of a vacation house rental must be located entirely within a dwelling or a dwelling in combination with an approved guest house. She wanted to know what would happen in the event there was more than one approved guest house. Mr. Yankovich stated that only one guest house is allowed on a property. If there are multiple units, that would then become a code enforcement issue. Commissioner Rhoads-Poston felt this requirement needed to be clarified. She commented that she has seen a recent advertisement where three separated dwellings on a property were for rent.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston asked about the stipulation on the unhosted rentals for a forty-five minute response time for a manager to respond to a complaint. She wanted to know if that specific time period was in order to acknowledge the complaint or have the matter resolved. Mr.

Yankovich stated for the most part it would be the amount of time to address the situation, allowing adequate time to fix the problem.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston made a comment about information the commission received via email that was forwarded from county staff on behalf of Mary Browning. The information was a chapter out of the Saint Helena Municipal Code. Commissioner Rhoads-Poston said she thought there was some good language pertaining to short term rentals and suggested that county staff review the language particularly the standard relating to the length of time for a vacation rental permit. She said these are some of the details that she would like to see explored.

Jim Laughlin, county counsel, stated that Solano County has some options for regulating short term rentals. One option is a land use matter which would come before the planning commission for review; another option, that has not been proposed as of yet, is to regulate this use as a business enterprise where the county regulates the operator rather than the land use. Mr. Laughlin explained that this route is what some jurisdictions follow. They require operators to participate in training and the approval is personal to the individual.

Mr. Laughlin stated that California law is clear that land use approvals run with the land. If the county approves the use there is no reason for the land use to cease after a fixed period of time, it generally runs forever once the county deems it appropriate in that location. However, Mr. Laughlin explained that if the commission wanted, the county could take the approach and start regulating the operator rather than the land use itself. In that case the use could be made subject to renewal more frequently or expire after a certain period of time.

Since there were no further questions, Chairperson Cayler opened the public hearing.

Daniel Schwartz, Blue Ridge Road, Vacaville, urged the commission to take the simplest approach. He spoke to the choice between hosted vs unhosted and believed there are going to be locations that will have a combination of both. He said what is being proposed is similar to a cookie cutter approach and he encouraged that the uses be looked at on an individual basis. Mr. Schwartz stated that his property is located within the watershed zoning district and spoke of the stipulation that excludes this activity from that district. He did not agree it should be excluded due to fire danger. He said all of Solano County and a good portion of California is subject to fire danger.

Mr. Schwartz mentioned that staff has already identified vacation rentals are not an issue for Solano County. He said these vacation rentals are self-policing. As a host, Mr. Schwartz said he understands the primary driver of this ordinance is tax revenue. He said he is trying to understand why the county would exclude an established vacation rental that has been very successful within Solano County and is generating income. If the county is going to exclude certain zoning districts, he asked that the county be willing to grandfather existing vacation rentals. By excluding watershed zoned property the county will force a successful small business out of operation; a business that has been promoting agritourism in Solano County successfully for several years.

Reta Jones, Suisun Valley Road, Fairfield, stated that her main concern is with enforcement. She has seen so many times where certain people break the rules and nothing happens. She said she has been attending these planning commission meetings for a while and at one meeting she listened to a property owner on Morrison Lane speak about buying several tiny houses that can be stored away and then at certain times of the year be brought out to be used for vacation rentals. Ms. Jones voiced firm disapproval of this activity and said the residents in the Valley are not out here to grow tiny houses, this is an agricultural area.

Ms. Jones stated that she has lodged complaints in the past but these kinds of complaints are not high priority for the Sheriff's Department, therefore these calls may not get logged in. Ms. Jones said she understands that people need the income, but she said these people also need to follow the rules. Ms. Jones commented that county code enforcement could be funded with the infractions she has seen already happening in the Valley.

Linda Tenbrink, Gordon Valley Road, Fairfield, encouraged the commission at minimum to adopt the proposed ordinance no. 2 with the possibility of including watershed districts such as those in the Pleasants Valley Road area. She said that area is working very hard to come up with a strategic plan similar to the Suisun Valley Strategic Plan and that plan would add to the stability of the agriculture in those areas. She said to exclude that area at this point would be detrimental. Ms. Tenbrink questioned the 8pm curfew for sound noting that this is not the standard and it should be the same as in other areas of the county. With regard to the requirement for a business license, Ms. Tenbrink remarked that obtaining a business license in Solano County is difficult. She commented that she applied for a business license in February and is still waiting for approval. Ms. Tenbrink stated that she is in favor of a Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) however she would like clarification of where those taxes would be applied. She proposed language to state that this tax remain in the area where it is collected so that the improvements can remain in the district and not just rolled over into the general fund.

Ms. Tenbrink stated that in Suisun Valley there is an unmanned fire station and she would propose as priority no. 1 any taxes from the TOT go specifically to staff the Clayton Valley Road fire station. Ms. Tenbrink spoke to the notion that property values would be negatively affected and disagreed. She said when a property is appraised a common equation exists as to how much income is generated by the property.

Charles Wood, attorney, Jefferson Street, Fairfield, spoke on behalf of Vezer Family Vineyards as well as representing the views of many of the people in Suisun Valley with regard to vacation rentals. He said these vacation rentals promote tourism by encouraging people to come and stay and spend money in the Valley. This is what the Suisun Valley Strategic Plan is supposed to do, to promote tourism, economic growth, and when alternative housing is available it accomplishes that goal. Mr. Wood stated that these vacation rentals tend to be on the higher end attracting the higher end tourist who will spend more money in the area. Generally these rentals are on million dollar properties so that will not affect the shortage of affordable housing because these rentals would rent for a higher cost long term anyway. For these reasons, Mr. Wood asked that the commission not impose any additional or unreasonable restrictions on these properties.

Mr. Wood stated that in general he would favor ordinance no. 2 which allows for an administrative permit. He stated there are a couple of regulations he would call into question

such as the requirement for three parking spaces, specifically if a rental unit is limited to only two people. Also, regulation no. 10 allows only one dwelling per property be allowed as a vacation rental. He did not see reason for this particular regulation especially when this use is only allowed to occur within legal dwelling units. If someone has two or even three legal dwelling units he did not see reason to restrict that if those property owners are following the rules. As far as the noise regulation, he believed it would be more reasonable to move the restriction to the property line. He stated if music is not audible off the property there is no reason to regulate it. Mr. Wood said he did not have an issue with the requirement for a business license but would request that the process be streamlined.

Commissioner Bauer asked Mr. Wood if his client currently has a vacation rental and if it is in conjunction with the vineyard. Mr. Wood stated that his client does have a vacation rental which is located on Clayton Road near a winery, but is not part of that winery operation. Commissioner Bauer wanted to know if concerts will be held at that location this summer. Mr. Wood replied that no concerts will take place at the vacation rental property. He noted that until they get permit approval for the Mankas Corner location, all concerts are scheduled for the Blue Victorian.

Commissioner Bauer asked if those concerts at the Blue Victorian are fully permitted. Mr. Wood said that they believe they are in compliance and are currently working with county staff to move forward in clearing up any discrepancies.

With regard to special events, Commissioner Walker asked staff if the county currently has a noise ordinance and if not, would the venues currently hosting special events be operating unlawfully. Bill Emlen, Director, responded by saying that the county does not currently have a noise ordinance. He noted that the Blue Victorian has a use permit to operate. They have an arrangement for off-street parking and so the issues are not the same as they would be with the Mankas Corner facility where parking is on-street. This has been the hang up in the process as staff are trying to figure out how deal with this concern.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston referred to an application that came before the commission some time ago where noise was an issue. She asked if staff could refresh her memory with regard to the required decibel levels that were discussed at that time. Mr. Yankovich stated that staff used the county's general plan threshold with regard to decibel level which is 65db at the property line. He said even though the county does not have a specific noise ordinance, noise is addressed in the general plan and staff uses that calculation for a basis. Mr. Emlen also noted that with a use permit the county has the ability to impose conditions of approval to deal with noise issues on a case-by-case basis.

Rander Bains, Suisun Valley Road, Fairfield, stated that his property is located across the street from the Blue Victorian winery. He noted that he does not have any issues with noise. He commented that many people who live out in the valley are not farmers. He stated that he is a farmer. He said he bought an orchard two years ago and 90% of his crop died last year. Mr. Bains stated that what saved him was the ability to rent out the house on his property as a vacation rental. He said he agrees with the requirement for a obtaining a permit but the process needs to be very simple. He said this use is essential to farming.

Commissioner Bauer asked Mr. Bains if he resides on the property. Mr. Bains responded that he did not, that he resides on other property in Suisun Valley. In response to Commissioner Bauer, Mr. Bains stated if this use becomes a hosted rental he would not be able to rent his house anymore on Airbnb.

Michael Rhoads, Blue Mountain Drive, Fairfield, stated that this is a very self-regulated environment and he viewed this online environment as the new economy. He found that the proposed rules as described to be old school and perhaps more bureaucracy than is needed. Mr. Rhoads stated one thing he did not agree with is the restriction of 10 people per home. He believed it should be based on the size of the home. He said also the recommendation of 2 people per bedroom should not apply if for example there are 8 bedrooms. Mr. Rhoads stated that the requirement for commercial insurance is not necessary since a lot of these rental platforms come with insurance for the short term stay. He said Airbnb provides a one million dollar insurance package for every rental and he encouraged staff to look into this. Mr. Rhoads did not like the requirement of having to have a sign listing the owner's name posted at the front of the property due to privacy reasons. He believed host vs unhosted should not be differentiated. He did not believe that physical access to a manager is necessary since in today's world communication can be maintained easier and quicker without physical presence. He disagreed with the restrictions on location and encouraged staff to look at property size perhaps using that as better guidance than using zoning districts. Mr. Rhoads encouraged the county to make the permitting process more streamlined, at a low cost, and in perpetuity.

Eleanor MacMakin, Mix Canyon Road, Vacaville, stated that the watershed zoning district needs to be included in this proposal. She stated that she has had a successful vacation rental business for the past 6 years. She said the so called dangers such as fire and slope instability do not apply to her property. She could not understand why watershed properties would be excluded from this consideration. Ms. MacMakin stated that bringing value to the region is something only individuals can do. She shared some feedback she received from several of her house guests by reading their reviews. She noted that her home is rented every weekend and is her main source of income. Ms. MacMakin commented that this is reality, this is how people are experiencing this area, and it is a self-regulating industry. With regard to the TOT, she said the county could contact Airbnb and VRBO in order to make arrangements to collect those monies. She suggested a new term for the industry as Domestic Cottage since this is a domestic practice and not a commercial venture. Ms. MacMakin spoke to the general plan and how it speaks to the use of watershed property as recreation, conservation, and lodging as primary uses which she believed are appropriate for this region.

Kevin Browning, Clayton Road, Fairfield, stated that many speakers have acknowledged they have been doing this activity for a number of years and those are the same folks that are asking the county to trust them to self-regulate, yet they have not been abiding by the law because the use does not comply with zoning. Mr. Browning spoke of an example of a family in his neighborhood that has been given the opportunity to rent a home in the area for the long term. With this type of zoning change to allow for vacation rentals it will take away the option that allows people to have the quality of life of living in a residential home in the rural county. He commented that the income stream for these vacation rentals will be potentially as high as 5 times that of what a typical home would rent for in the long term. He stated long term rentals will disappear in exchange of short term rentals.

Mr. Browning questioned if both homes on a property could be used as a vacation rental. He questioned why certain roads or streets are specifically targeted. Mr. Browning wanted to know if there will be a limitation on the number of rentals or if every home will have the ability to become a short term vacation rental. Mr. Browning noted that certain other counties have done this by a permit process with a maximum on the number of permits and the permits are issued by lottery. He said this is something the county should consider in order to be able to give everyone the opportunity if this is going to be allowed. Mr. Browning questioned how well and septic will be addressed with the increase in the number of occupants. He recommended that the commission table this matter until further study. He did not feel either ordinance is acceptable.

Mary Browning, Clayton Road, Fairfield, stated that this industry has spiraled out of control. She provided the commission with some written information that included statistics from other jurisdictions. She shared with the commission some facts from the County of Sacramento where they have 400 homes listed in their area as vacation rentals, but yet the city has only 35 on record with official permits. She also noted that in Napa 97% of the TOT actually come from hotels vs 3% from short term rentals. She believed any monies generated from use permits, fines and penalties, as well as TOT need to go toward funding enforcement. Ms. Browning commented that a good number of these property owners that are generating such high incomes from their vacation rentals are not paying taxes, and therefore this use actually encourages income tax evasion. She stated that a thirty minute response time by the Sheriff is too long. She commented that this income producing venue is a business and should be considered commercial. Ms. Browning said residents do not want to be in weekend party zones with traffic in and out at all hours. She said guests do not care if they are loud and the sound carries throughout the valley. She noted that on nights when the wind carries she can hear the concerts from the Blue Victorian and her residence is two miles away. Ms. Browning stated that a noise ordinance is needed.

Chairperson Cayler read the comments of an audience member who had to leave the public hearing due to an emergency. These were the comments as written by Elissa DeCaro. "This ordinance is too simplistic. It doesn't cover safety, traffic or existing zoning in a substantive manner. It also does not adequately provide for future vacation homes and the process to apply or plan should new development be proposed. Ordinance does not provide enforcement or consequences for those who do not meet code. Ordinance is contradictory regarding residential vs commercial and runs counter to the purpose of Suisun Valley Strategic Plan. Has potential for adverse consequence and his should require EIR."

Gary Bacon, Suisun Valley Road, Fairfield, said that he has been involved in the short term rental business for 40 years and now owns and operates the Suisun Valley Inn. He noted that the Inn has accommodated approximately 1,300 guests in the past 24 months. He said the majority of those guests would probably have stayed in Napa as their first choice, but it was more cost effective to stay in the Suisun Valley. Mr. Bacon agreed that the concept of requiring commercial insurance is a good one. He said he had to obtain commercial insurance for his business and when the Inn was shut down due to the Atlas fire last year, they received a healthy settlement for lost business. Mr. Bacon said he looks at his business not as managing property but managing guest expectation. He noted that they do not live full time on site but do

always show up to greet their guests as well as see them off when they leave. He believes regulation could work in the short term rental business, but it should be kept simple.

Commissioner Bauer inquired if this Inn was a commercial hotel. Mr. Bacon described the Inn as a residential home with 8 bedrooms and 6 ½ bathrooms on property zoned A-20. He stated that they live part time in an apartment on the property but had to purchase a home elsewhere due to their expanding family. Commissioner Bauer asked Mr. Bacon if his inn would be affected if the regulations were made to only allow hosted facilities. Mr. Bacon stated that they have an Administrative Permit from the county to operate the business. He added that they would like to obtain a special events permit and they are in the process of working with planning staff to accomplish this.

Mr. Yankovich clarified that Mr. Bacon has a permit to operate his business and does not fall within the short term rental description.

Since there were no further speakers or questions, Chairperson Cayler closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Hollingsworth wanted to know when a short term vacation rental becomes something else such as a bed and breakfast (B&B) or hotel.

Jim Laughlin explained that the definition of a hotel is found within both the Zoning and Building Codes and is defined as anything with six or more guest rooms. That is one reason short term rentals are being defined as five bedrooms or less. A hotel is required to meet a different building code standard which is an important dividing line. He noted normally any dwelling serving food on a commercial basis is required to have a commercial kitchen, however under state law if the use is defined as a B&B, which means having a limited number of guest rooms and only serving a morning meal, a normal residential kitchen would be acceptable. Mr. Laughlin stated that the county is defining a vacation rental as a dwelling which can have any number of bedrooms and is meant for a family or group of people living together. As long as it is rented out on a short term basis and does not have more than five bedrooms, it would fall within the definition of a short term rental.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston spoke to the concern expressed by a public speaker regarding business licenses. Ms. Rhoads-Poston wanted to know how long it takes to process an application. Mr. Yankovich explained that there are several different departments that review a business license. He believed the speaker was concerned with the fact that fingerprinting is a step in the process which is something the Sheriff's Department requires. Mr. Yankovich stated that the process should take approximately 4 to 6 weeks unless there are issues with the application.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston spoke regarding the suggestion brought up by one of the public speakers to the TOT being applied to a specific entity. Mr. Yankovich stated that the Board of Supervisors would be the ones who would make such a decision. They would consider such a matter at the time they are defining their budget as to where those proceeds would go.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston asked about the concern for well and septic as brought up by a member of the public. Mr. Yankovich said a septic system is determined by the number of bedrooms and those bedrooms define the actual operation of the system itself. With regard to a rental home, the system is still meeting a residential need and therefore it should qualify for certification to handle the load that is going to be placed on it by the number of individuals. Mr. Yankovich stated that staff is looking at the maximum requirements up front because it is difficult to go back and change those requirements after the fact.

Commissioner Walker was curious to know the zoning for the neighborhood area known as Homeacres in Vallejo. Mr. Yankovich noted that the zoning is residential traditional community. Commissioner Walker wanted to know if staff is looking at this area for short term rentals as well. Mr. Yankovich said staff did not happen to find any rentals in that area and are only looking at the areas that seem to be desirable which is the western portion of the county. Mr. Yankovich commented that the Homeacres area is different in a sense that there are some large parcels but the majority are small. He said the county is taking a more cautious approach and not examining every zone district in the county, but trying to gather some public feedback in order to fine tune the use in the future.

Chairperson Cayler inquired about how staff envisions approaching the issue relating to the people that own and are operating short term vacation rentals in the watershed area. She wanted to know if this means they would no longer be able to operate, or would they be grandfathered in as an already functioning business.

Mr. Laughlin stated if a use is legal non-conforming then that use would be grandfathered in. He explained that to be legal non-conforming an operation needs to establish themselves in compliance with all laws in effect at the time the use was established, and continuously meet all of those laws. He said it appears most of these operations have not been paying TOT which they would need to do in order be legal non-conforming. Also, under the code these uses are currently prohibited, this proposed ordinance is intended to open up the range of allowed uses to make what is now a prohibited use an allowed use or a conditionally permitted use in some zoning districts. Mr. Laughlin did not believe these property owners could make a good argument that the use was established legally at the time they began operation. As far as the watershed district, he explained that it is an area of the county where uses have been restricted quite severely because of hazards such as fire, slope stability, and inaccessibility of emergency services. He said the county does not allow a second unit by right on those properties. Mr. Laughlin stated that the uses allowed under a conditional permit in the watershed district are lodge and resort. Staff can examine those individual properties to determine if the property is appropriate for a tourist type use.

Commissioner Hollingsworth wanted to know from staff what they are looking for from the commission as far as making a decision on the ordinance. Bill Emlen stated that there are a lot of variables. He said staff tried to mirror what they heard at the last commission meeting in order to bring forward something specific. Within that there is some interchangeability and other things the commission could add based upon input received at the public hearing. Commissioner Bauer wanted to know if a traffic study had been done. Mr. Yankovich stated that because staff was unaware of these uses taking place in the different zone districts that a traffic study had not been done.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston said that she felt a little more fine-tuning of the ordinance was necessary. She said there is a website currently advertising three rental units on one property and she believed this is a subject that should be addressed. She said she would like to see conversations happen with regard to the watershed area and maybe define that a bit more. Ms. Rhoads-Poston said she did not want to make the ordinance so vague that the problem gets worse, but then again did not want to make it overly specific. She commented that she felt the ordinance is too vague as it currently stands.

Commissioner Hollingsworth commented about noise. He suggested the language in the ordinance be modified to say any amplification should not be allowed, and to include a timeframe as agreed upon by the commission. He said he personally did not have a problem with the 8pm to 10am curfew. He said radio and television should be removed from the language altogether because those items are usually located within the household anyway.

Commissioner Walker stated that he believes the county is trying to arrive at a balanced and reasonable series of ordinances. He commented that this is not just about generating revenue nor should it be. He said he is trying to be cognizant of impacts to neighbors, but also recognizes the benefit this brings both in terms of revenue for people that need that income and to promote agritourism. Mr. Walker stated that he is more inclined to go with ordinance no. 1 and is open to modification. He commented that the character of an agricultural area is completely different than life within the city limits, and he believed people make choices on where they live based upon that flexibility. He believed there is a need to have different standards for hosted vs unhosted and did not want the ordinance to be cumbersome. Commissioner Walker stated that he was not in favor of ordinance no. 2.

Commissioner Bauer commented that the simplest thing, which has been talked about in the past, would be to ban this use altogether but noted that it would not be feasible nor realistic. She said limiting it to a hosted activity keeps it simple and residential. She said the commission has heard a lot about self-policing and self-regulating but she did not see that happening. She said letting this activity go full tilt will turn Solano County into something similar to Napa. She commented that it is almost impossible to travel in and around Napa because of all the event centers, the wineries and Airbnbs. Ms. Bauer said she toured Suisun Valley this past week with one of the area residents and she did not believe the roads are adequate for the increased traffic this kind of business would bring. She said there is no question that this will reduce housing stock. She said other counties have started restricting this use because it is not working, it is turning residential areas into commercial districts and it is not fair for the people who live there. Commissioner Bauer said she would be, at most, in favor of limiting the use to hosted only. She said she would be in favor of tabling this matter to allow staff more time to work on it.

Chairperson Cayler commented that she would agree to both the hosted and unhosted aspect in the ordinance.

A motion was made by Commissioner Rhoads-Poston and seconded by Commissioner Bauer to continue this item to the regular meeting of July 19, 2018. The motion passed unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENTS and REPORTS

Mr. Yankovich announced to the commission that the City of Fairfield will host a training session for planning commissioners. The training will most likely take place sometime within the last week of August and will possibly be held in Vallejo. Mr. Yankovich asked if any of the commissioners are interested in attending to let staff know. He will pass on further information as it becomes available.

Since there was no further business, the meeting was **adjourned**.