

Meeting Minutes for Industrial Hemp Ad Hoc Committee
1/17/2020

01 Roll Call

- Steve Hajik, Lance Williams, Hank Lescher, Brenna Sullivan, Michalyn Delvalle, Rob Brown, Bruno Sabatier

02 Approval of Minutes

- Steve motioned and Brenna second, unanimous votes for approval of minutes.

03 Public Comment

- No public comment

04 Updates on laws for hemp production

- No new updates

05 Discussion of Land Use and Development

- **Zoning Restrictions**

- Rob stated that PDR is not conducive to farming due to complaints and requirements when near residential. Hank asked about why PDR allows it and not.
 - no deed restrictions so if all agree now, then not all will agree later which can create problems for the ag site for future use if allowed for PDR.
 - Add TPZ to the included list
 - PDC was given consensus to be added to the list
 - Zones approved
 - APZ
 - TPZ
 - A
 - RR
 - RL
 - PDC
 - O
 - Table PDR for future conversation
 - Public Comment Michael Greene – RR you can't do cannabis except for cottage grow, thorny issue for cannabis, look at minimum parcel size, canopy size, have specific zoning for RR
 - Public Comment Jonathan Icing – federally approved ag crop, if other ag crops are allowed you should allow hemp in those areas.
 - Public Comment John Oliver – zoning makes good sense, not same issue with criminal activity or smell, strongly disagree with barring it from rural residential with stop associating with cannabis
 - Brenna – federally different, but on the ground looks different, agrees it's a hybrid
 - Steve, sonoma county acreage minimum is offered
 - Lance offered 1 acre, mentioned irrigation registration, Michalyn mentioned that zoning code states 20-30 ft from creeks/top of bank,, grading has other setbacks and may make it more than 100 feet
 - Mentioned greenhouses can't be separate and add up to more than .1 acre.
- **Setbacks**
- Property setbacks can be done via grading permits which would dictate the setbacks.
 - Ag department recommends the setbacks from property line, typically it's between 150 – 300 feet or less depending on adjacent property uses.

- Michalyn is wondering if we are aiming for a zoning permit.
- Hank offered that these setbacks are checked in through pre-app site inspection by ag department.
- 150 feet minimum set back from residence
- bring back with Michalyn check list and zoning permit
- Public Comment Michael Greene says Sonoma offered 200 feet from property or 600 feet from residences. Neighbors can approve less setbacks. Sonoma didn't allow for rural residential.
- Public Comment Luis Lincoln – ag products in Kelseyville and spraying, wants flexibility on setbacks based on size of grow and how pesticides are being applied.
- Public Comment Jennifer Smith – setback from other cannabis grows
- Lance states that pollen is still a concern.
- Public Comment Michael Greene – BMP not strong enough. Strongly support towards ministerial permit program. On pollination setback for cannabis permit this was dealt with indoor for ag prime farm land. Asking for setback language about not processing zoning permit without getting a setback from garden to garden.
- Michalyn offering outdoor setback and indoor setback.
- Public Comment Luis Lincoln offered different setback for type of operation and final product.
- **Community Growth Boundaries**
 - o Consensus for no grows in community growth boundaries
- **Fines/Enforcement**
 - o Tabled for another day to discuss