RECOMMENDED ACTION AND justIFICATION:  Policy Item: Yes ___ No  X ___

Consider Planning Commission action, appeal issues, and public input. If the Board elects to uphold the appeal and reverse the Commission's action, the required action would be to initiate process to amend the boundaries of Planned Development Zone 84-1 through ordinance to reflect adjusted golf course parcel; the formal action on the appeal, the PDZ boundary amendment and lot line adjustment approval would occur at a future meeting. If the Board elects to deny the appeal and uphold the Commission's action, adopt attached resolution with findings of denial.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF BOARD ACTIONS:

None

LIST ALTERNATIVES AND CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

ALTERNATIVES:  1) Uphold appeal and allow completion of the lot line adjustment. Approval of adjusting this lot line adjustment will first require the initiation of process to amend the boundaries Planned Development Zone 84-1 as it relates to the golf course parcel.

2) Deny the appeal and not allow completion of the lot line adjustment

NEGATIVE ACTION:  If the amendment to the PDZ and subsequent lot line adjustment are not approved, the two residential parcels and the Hidden Hills (Lake Don Pedro) Golf Course parcel would remain in their present configuration.

COSTS:  (X) Not Applicable

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Budgeted Current FY</td>
<td>$ ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Total anticipated Costs</td>
<td>$ ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Required additional funding</td>
<td>$ ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Internal transfers</td>
<td>$ ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS

List the attachments and number the pages consecutively:

Memorandum to Board with Attachments
Attachment 1  Notice of Appeal and supporting documentation
Attachment 2  Staff Reports to Planning Commission
Attachment 3  Planning Commission Minutes
Attachment 4  Exhibits submitted to Commission by applicant
Attachment 5  Draft Board Resolution to deny the appeal

COSTS:  ( ) 4/5th Vote Required

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Unanticipated revenues</td>
<td>$ ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Reserve for Contingencies</td>
<td>$ ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Source Description</td>
<td>$ ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Balance in Reserve Contingencies, If Approved: $ ___

CLERK'S USE ONLY

Res. No.:  02-59  Ord. No.:  ______

Vote - Ayes:  ______  Noes:  ______
Absent:  ______  Abstained:  ______

☐ Approved  ☐ Denied
☐ Minute Order Attached  ☐ No Action Necessary

The foregoing instrument is a correct copy of the original on file in this office.

Date:

ATTEST:

MARGIE WILLIAMS, Clerk of the Board

By:  ____________

Deputy

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER’S RECOMMENDATION:

This item on agenda as:

☐ Recommended  ☐ Not Recommended
☐ _______ For Policy Determination  ☐ _______ Submitted for Comment
☐ _______ Returned for Further Action

Comment:  ____________

A.O. Initials:  ____________

Action Form Revised 10/95
TO:          ERIC TOLL, Planning Director
FROM:        MARGIE WILLIAMS, Clerk of the Board
SUBJECT:     Appeal No. 2002-1; Appeal of Planning Commission Denial of Lot Line Adjustment Resolution No. 02-69

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF MARIPOSA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA,

ADOPTED THIS Order on March 19, 2002

ACTION AND VOTE:

10:56 a.m. Eric Toll, Planning Director;
PUBLIC HEARING: Consider Appeal No. 2002-1; an Appeal of the Planning Commission Denial of a Lot Line Adjustment 636; Kalvin and Shirley Gile, Appellants
BOARD ACTION: Eric Toll advised that additional information was received after the Planning Commission’s consideration of this matter. He advised that the Board could hear this matter and initiate a zone change for the lot line adjustment, or refer the matter back to the Planning Commission to review the new information. Jeff Green, County Counsel, responded to questions from the Board relative to options for considering this matter given the additional information that was received. Eric Toll advised that, based on the additional information, staff recommends approval. Eric responded to questions from the Board relative to the timeframes for processing this matter if it considered by the Board and if it is referred back to the Commission; whether there would be any problems with processing this matter if the golf course sells in the interim; and relative to costs for processing this matter.

The public portion of the hearing was opened, and input was provided by the following:

Kalvin Gile, appellant, stated he does not have a problem with the timeframes, and he is okay with having this go back to the Commission.

The public portion of the hearing was closed. (M)Parker, (S)Balmain, Res. 02-69 was adopted referring this matter back to the Planning Commission for consideration of the new information. Discussion was held by the Board relative to the location of the lot line adjustment in relation to the golf course. Ayes: Unanimous. The hearing was closed.

cc:       Jeff Green, County Counsel
          File