

DEPARTMENT: Planning

BY: Duane Hall

PHONE: 966-5151

RECOMMENDED ACTION AND JUSTIFICATION: (Policy Item: Yes ___ No X)

Adoption of resolution approving with conditions Agricultural Preserve Applications No. 92-1 (James W. Johnson III, applicant), No. 92-2 (John Reininghaus), No. 92-3 (Douglas Strathearn), No. 92-4 (Richard Ortiz), No. 92-5 (Denzil and Lois McNiece), and No. 92-6 (Buckhorn Ranch Properties) based on the findings and conditions set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 92-22. This recommendation is based on the recommendation of the Planning Commission for approval of the applications with conditions based on the findings the applications are consistent with the General Plan and the Agricultural Preserve Policy.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF BOARD ACTIONS:

The Board has not taken any action on these applications.

LIST ALTERNATIVES AND CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Alternatives: 1) Approve the applications with modified conditions and findings; 2) Deny one or more of the applications; 3) Continue matter for discussion.

Negative action would result in denial of the applications and prevent the recordation of Land Conservation (Williamson) Act contracts on the properties.

COSTS: () Not Applicable

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| A. Budgeted current FY | \$ N/A |
| B. Total anticipated costs (1st yr) | \$ 3,117.53 |
| C. Required additional funding | \$ N/A |
| D. Internal transfers | \$ N/A |

SOURCE: () 4/5ths Vote Required

| | |
|------------------------------|----------|
| A. Unanticipated revenues | \$ _____ |
| B. Reserve for contingencies | \$ _____ |
| C. Source description: | _____ |

Balance in Reserve for Contingencies, if approved: \$ _____

- SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:
List the attachments and number the pages consecutively:
1. Memo to the Board
 2. Planning Commission Resolution No. 92-22
 3. Planning Commission Minutes
 4. Agricultural Preserve standards
 5. Planning Commission staff reports

CLERK'S USE ONLY:

Res. No.: 92-670 Ord. No. _____

Vote - Ayes: 3 Noes: None

Approved: Baggett () Abstained: _____

Minute Order Attached () No Action Necessary

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION:
This item on agenda as:

Recommended

Not Recommended

For Policy Determination

Submitted with Comment

Returned for Further Action

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

Date: _____

ATTEST: MARGIE WILLIAMS, Clerk of the Board
County of Mariposa, State of California

By: _____
Deputy

Comment: _____

A.O. Initials: [Signature]

MARIPOSA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

MINUTE ORDER

TO: TONY LASHBROOK, PLANNING DIRECTOR
FROM: MARGIE WILLIAMS, CLERK OF THE BOARD *mw*
RE: AGRICULTURAL PRESERVE APPLICATIONS

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF MARIPOSA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
ADOPTED THIS Order on December 15, 1992

ACTION AND VOTE:

11:01 a.m. PUBLIC HEARINGS to Consider the Approval or Denial of Agricultural Preserve Applications No. 92-1/Johnson, Applicant; No. 92-2/Reininghaus, Applicant; No. 92-3/Strathearn, Applicant; No. 92-4/Ortiz, Applicant; No. 92-5/McNiece, Applicant; and No. 92-6/Buckhorn Ranch Properties, Applicant
BOARD ACTION: Hearings were opened and continued to 11:10 a.m. for a recess. Duane Hall/Associate Planner, provided staff report. Tony Lashbrook/Planning Director, provided input. Public input was provided by John Langlois/Applicant for Application No. 92-6, who requested that two parcels be added back in the application without any conditions or restrictions; and Gary Estep/Assessor. Motion of Erickson to approve the applications without conditions recommended by the Planning Commission, failed for lack of a second. (M)Radanovich, (S)Taber, Res. 92-670 adopted approving, with conditions and without adding the additional parcels for Ap. No. 92-6, all of the Agricultural Preserve Applications/Ayes: Erickson, Radanovich, Taber; Noes: Punte; Excused: Baggett. Hearings were closed.

cc: File