

LAKE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

April 8, 2021

Commission Members

**P John Hess, District I
P Everardo Chavez, District II
P Batsulwin Brown, District III
P Christina Price, District IV
P Lance Williams, District V**

Staff Members

**A Scott DeLeon, CDD Director
P Tocarra Thomas, Deputy Director
P Eric Porter, Associate Planner
A Nicole Johnson, Deputy City Counsel
P Kerrian Marriott, Office Assistant III**

REGULAR MEETING

9:00 a.m. CALL TO ORDER

Pledge of Allegiance lead by Comm. Brown

9:01 a.m. ACTION ON MINUTES

Comm. Hess motioned to approve the minutes from the March 25, 2021 PC Hearing seconded by Comm. Price.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays -- Motion Carried

9: 02 a.m. CITIZEN'S INPUT - NONE

Any person may speak for three minutes about any subject of concern, provided that it is within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission, and is not already on today's agenda or scheduled for a future public hearing. Total time allotted for Citizen's Input shall be fifteen minutes. Speakers are requested to complete a simple form (giving name, address and subject) available in the Community Development Department office, prior to 9:00.

Agendas of public meetings and supporting documents are available for public inspection in the Lake County Courthouse, Community Development Department, Third Floor, 255 North Forbes Street, Lakeport, California

Request for Disability-Related Modification or Accommodation: A request for a disability-related modification or accommodation necessary to participate in the Planning Commission meetings should be made in writing to the Planning Commission Assistant at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.

9:05 a.m. Public Hearing and Consideration of approving a Minor Modification (MMU 20-13) of original Use Permit UP 18-16 at a public hearing. Applicant/Owner: LC Private Reserves LLC. Proposed Project: A new 3,200 sq. ft. outdoor nursery area for immature cannabis plants; the conversion of 10,000 sq. ft. of previously approved greenhouse cultivation to outdoor cultivation area within the original footprint of the approved cultivation site known as Garden 1, and one A-Type 13 'Self Distribution' license that was not available at the time of the original approval for UP 18-16. Location: 13333 Big Valley Road, Middletown, CA. APN: 012-006-58.

Eric Porter, Associate Planner gave a presentation on proposed project. Applicant is looking to build a 3200 sq. ft. nursery and is looking to convert from a greenhouse to outdoor cultivation. Applicant has adequate amount of water and space as the overall sq. ft. of the property is 330 acres.

Comm. Hess inquired if there was a reason for the request of outdoor grow versus greenhouse grow?

Eric Porter responded that applicant did not list a reason for location and preference of grow.

Comm. Chavez stated a correction to Big Valley Rd Lower Lake that it should be Big Canyon Road in Middletown.

Comm. Williams confirmed the correction.

Jonathan Louie (Nicole Johnson Legal Representative) inquired if a Minor Modification is required for this project instead should it be an Amendment to the permit.

Eric Porter responded to Mr. Louie stating that he was correct and that was why the subsection was referenced.

Eric Sklar CEO of Napa Valley Fume and applicant spoke on his project and the history of his company. Mr. Sklar addressed the question of why outdoor versus greenhouse and that it was due to power reservation. Mr. Sklar also commented that his operation has ran smoothly with no neighbor complaints, while providing employment for residents of Lake County. Mr. Sklar also stated that the nursery license was primarily so that he can use seed from one grow area to another to stay in compliance with State Regulations.

Public Comment – NONE

Comm. Hess Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Price that the Categorical Exemption (CE 20-67) applied for by Eric Sklar on a property located at 13333 Big Canyon Road, Middletown, further described as APN: 012-006-58 will not have a significant effect on the environment, and this project qualifies for a Categorical Exemption pursuant to CEQA section 15304 with the findings listed in the staff report dated April 8, 2021.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays -- Motion Carried

Comm. Hess Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Chavez that the Planning Commission find that the Modification (MMU 20-13) applied for by Eric Sklar on a property located at 13333 Big Canyon Road, Middletown, further described as APN: 012-006-58 does meet the requirements of Section 60 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance and the Modification be granted subject to the conditions and with the findings listed in the staff report dated April 8, 2021.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays, - Motion Carried

NOTE: The applicant or any interested person is reminded that the Zoning Ordinance provides for a seven (7) calendar day appeal period. If there is a disagreement with the Planning Commission, an appeal to the Board of Supervisors may be filed. The appropriate forms and applicable fee must be submitted prior to 5:00 p.m. on or before the seventh calendar day following the Commission's final determination.

9:18 a.m. Public Hearing and Consideration of a Major Use Permit (19-40) to consider approval of a commercial cannabis cultivation project on a 77+ acre property, and consideration of adopting a Mitigated

Negative Declaration (IS 19-59) on Thursday April 8, 2021, 9:10 a.m., in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, 255 N. Forbes Street, Lakeport, California. Applicant / Owner: CUA Enterprises. Proposed Project: Three (3) A-Type 3 medium outdoor cannabis cultivation licenses requesting 104,800 sq. ft. of cannabis cultivation area and one (1) A-Type 13 self-distribution license. Location: 25252, 25322, 25372 & 25312 Jerusalem Grade Road, Middletown, CA; APNs: 013-017-92, 013-017- 74, 013-017-36 and 013-017-31

Eric Porter gave a presentation and review of applicant's project. Mr. Porter stated that site had adequate water supply with a well on property with four 8000 lbs. tanks. No negative or position comments received. The property is adequately sized for the project requested. Mr. Porter stated that he would recommend a deed restriction to the land, which would state land cannot be used for other cultivation.

Comm. Chavez Inquired about the BLM Federal regulated properties surrounding applicant's property and how they were set to deal with it.

Eric Porter Responded that he doesn't believe applicant has to pass through BLM land. Applicant should know if traveling through BLM land that it would be at their own risk.

Comm. Hess stated in reference to a letter received from Fire Chief Mike Wink that applicant would have to travel through BLM land to access project site. Comm. Hess asked for legal counsel regarding the County being held responsible for approving an application that had to traverse through BLM land?

Jonathan Louie stated he was not able to respond currently, but recommended that the current item be continued thus affording his office time to conduct a complete analyst.

Comm. Hess stated he did not find an issue with applicant but wanted to ensure the county was not held liable.

Eric Porter made a correction to a prior statement in his presentation, applicant would need to cross BLM land to get to their proposed site.

Comm. Williams Stated that he had two inquires the first being if a letter was signed from the applicant releasing the county of any liability and the exact location of the Bridge, was the bridge on the applicants property or crossing over to Jerusalem. Comm. Williams asked if there was a Building Dept. fire official or Fire Chief Wink.

Tocarra Thomas CDD Deputy Director commented that Fire Chief Wink is not on the call but she could request his attendance.

Comm. Hess stated that he does not oppose the project, but would like to clarify on the exposure to the County.

Comm. Price stated her agreeance with the other Commissioners and would prefer if an indemnification letter or a held harmless letter for the county was included with the application.

Eric Porter Read into the record the indemnification letter of liability but stated that the letter was more geared towards the applicant and not the County and is unclear if the county would have any liability.

Comm. Williams reiterated a portion of the BLM letter which stated that they could not control what was done on private property, the letter did not state that the applicant could not grow and recommended that the commissioners take a closer look into that.

Comm. Hess requested a clarification on the letters use of the word "Violator" Does it refer to the applicant crossing BLM land or does it filter back to the county that approved the application.

Comm. Price requested clarification on who would be held liable, the applicant or the County?

Jonathan Louie reiterated his earlier statement of continuing the item at a future date, allowing his team the time to do a bit more research.

Brian Klein applicant asked if helicopter transport would alleviate any BLM violation concerns.

Comm. Hess stated that the helicopter option might be an expense that the applicant might not have to bare if the question regarding the county's liability was answered.

Comm. Price confirmed that the application was not what was in question but the Commissioners wanted to ensure that the county would not be held accountable if an approval was given.

Comm. Williams stated that this wasn't the first application submitted with concerns with BLM violations and they have in previous planning commissioners meetings been approved. Comm. Williams stated that he believed it was safe and that as the Commissioners we are just giving the applicant to permission to use their land.

Comm. Hess restated that he again had no objection to the application but would like legal counsel prior to continuing.

Tocarra Thomas Deputy Director recommended a continuance of the item. Ms. Thomas stated that she agreed with legal counsel, in addition a

transfer license would be required for applicants to transfer product and more research would be necessary to review potential BLM impacts.

Comm. Williams stated that he was also concerned with BLM ramifications as it pertained to the county but the applicant without a distribution license was unable to move product in or out of their property thus not breaking any laws.

Eric Porter stated that the applicant had submitted for a self-distribution license and was a part of the application.

Comm. Williams Motioned to move item to PC Hearing April 22, 2021, seconded by Comm. Price

Public Comment – None

5 AYES, 0 NAYS -- Motion Carried

NOTE: The applicant or any interested person is reminded that the Zoning Ordinance provides for a seven (7) calendar day appeal period. If there is a disagreement with the Planning Commission, an appeal to the Board of Supervisors may be filed. The appropriate forms and applicable fee must be submitted prior to 5:00 p.m. on or before the seventh calendar day following the Commission's final determination.

9:38 a.m. Public Hearing and Consideration of a Major Use Permit (UP 19-33) to consider approval of a commercial cannabis cultivation project on a 335+ acre property, and consideration of adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS 19-51) on Thursday April 8, 2021, 9:20 a.m., in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, 255 N. Forbes Street, Lakeport, California. Applicant / Owner: Three Bees LLC. Proposed Project: Sixteen (16) A-Type 3 medium outdoor cannabis cultivation licenses requesting 696,960 sq. ft. of cannabis cultivation area and one (1) A-Type 13 self-distribution license. Location: 21210, 21470, 21355 and 21340 Eureka Road and 18464 Butts Canyon Road, Middletown, CA. APNs: 014-003-24; 014-140-17, 19, 20 and 21.

Eric Porter gave an overview of project, self-distribution permit request and neighbor concerns regarding water and one support document. Staff shared that applicant was in compliance with all violation codes and fully compliant with development standards i.e. "less than significant" impact to cultural, geological or tribal resources i.e. Project complies with all applicable development standards found within Lake County Zoning Ordinance, article 27.

Comm. Price asked if staff had the opportunity to review the letter sent by the applicant's neighbor.

Eric Porter responded that he had.

Comm. Hess stated that he had a question regarding the letter of concern sent by the applicant's neighbor and the applicant's awareness of when a generator was to be used. Comm. Hess referred to the letter of complaint as the neighbor had stated that the generator utilized to operate the well was ran every day, all day last year.

Damien Ramirez applicant spoke on his communication with neighbors. Mr. Ramirez stated that he responded to his neighbor's letter and was hopeful that he was able to clarify any misunderstandings. Mr. Ramirez also stated that he received a follow-up letter in regards to the size of the lot used to grow as the neighbors were under the impression that he would be growing on all 335 acres owned. Mr. Ramirez also spoke on the neighbor's generator concerns, he had been working on alternative options i.e. solar. Mr. Ramirez stated that fuel time and operational times are logged by his staff and turned in monthly to LCQM.

Comm. Hess asked Mr. Porter if the Ordinance was clear on the use of generators.

Comm. Williams stated that he was familiar with the ordinance, indoor and mixed light were not allowed to utilize a generator but outdoor was, but was unable to confirm as he did not have the ordinance directly in front of him.

Tocarra Thomas CDD Deputy Director virtually showed article 27 which stated that indoor or mixed light cultivation should not rely on generators but would be allowed when permitted and applicable i.e. power outages or emergency situations.

Eric Porter referenced article 27-155 subsection 21 ii that reiterated what Tocarra Thomas Deputy Director had visually shown but was in reference to both in-door, mixed light and outdoor cultivation.

Tocarra Thomas Deputy Director clarified that the article that Staff had referenced was specific to manufacturers and not cultivators.

Eric Porter Concurred.

Comm. Williams stated that outdoor grow was carbon friendly and recommended solar panels to alleviate the concern of noise.

Comm. Hess stated that he felt sympathetic to the communities concern of noise nuisance due to a consistently running generator.

Damien Ramirez responded that a generator log is completed, the generator was not ran 24 hours per day but instead was only ran for 5 hours. Mr. Ramirez also stated that he was willing to work with his neighbors on the possibility of different times of generator usage more conducive to neighbor's schedule. Mr. Ramirez stated that he had been doing his part to be compliant with all agencies involved throughout his application process.

Comm. Hess asked the applicant about his plans for permanent restrooms versus applicant's current setup of portable hand wash stations and restrooms.

Damien Ramirez responded to Comm. Hess's inquiry stating that he could look into permanent restroom solutions but found that due to the size of the project area it was more convenient for his staff to be able to move and relocate the portable restrooms, focusing more on areas where concentrated work was being done. Mr. Ramirez referenced past Commissioner Meetings that had approved projects with blue rooms and in certain cases recommended additional "blues rooms" due to that projects specific needs. Mr. Ramirez reiterated that he would be looking into solar or would attempt to work with PG&E in an effort to get power to the site.

Comm. Hess thanked Mr. Ramirez for his responses.

Comm. Price asked Mr. Ramirez if he had any thoughts on changing access to the site from Butts Canyon.

Damien Ramirez responded to Comm. Price stating that an access change to the site could have detrimental environmental impact. Mr. Ramirez stated that there are approximately 20-40 trips during peak harvesting season and the increase of 16-8 acres should not produce more traffic as it only occurs during a peak season. Mr. Ramirez compared the influx of traffic during peak season to a single family home's traffic, if measured on a per trip basis for an entire year.

Comm. Williams asked if applicant would consider a three year plan regarding his generator and decreasing decimal levels. Comm. Williams asked what type of generator the applicant had at the sight.

Damien Ramirez responded stating that the generator was a 20 horse power, tier 4 and run quiet. Mr. Ramirez also stated that due to the

location of the generator being on a hill and the wind which typically blows North East of the property of concern that those factors should alleviate the noise level.

Public Comment –

Eric Sklar Endorsed Mr. Ramirez, considered him a great contribution to the Cannabis community.

Audra Vanpatten stated that the coverts on Eureka road were extremely compromised due to the high volume of traffic. Ms. Vanpatten also shared her concerns regarding accessibility. Ms. Vanpatten stated that she had ranched in the area for 30 years and was accustomed to having the road to herself. Ms. Vanpatten confirmed that Mr. Ramirez had graveled the road but due to the high volume of traffic, that it should be paved. Ms. Vanpatten also stated that she did not appreciate the smell of cannabis.

Doug Ebert stated that the applicant did not speak on the generators utilized to operate his building during the trimming season. Mr. Ebert also spoke on traffic concerns that had become tedious. Mr. Ebert stated that he and Audra had maintained the roads both dumping yards of rock. Mr. Ebert stated applicant brought in 800 tons of rock, which was used to pave the road outside Ms. Vanpatten's house to his site but was not shared with neighbors. States that applicant has employees living in tents utilizing generators that applicant has not disclosed.

Lauren Fuller stated that the grow site was very visible by the surrounding neighbors. Ms. Fuller also shared her frustration with visitors of Mr. Ramirez's site not displaying road side manner as they speed or are unable to find access to property so they loiter. Ms. Fuller shared that neighbors felt they had lost their privacy and that Mr. Ramirez should financially compensate for wear and tear on roads.

Jan Ebert asked several questions regarding financial responsibility for the road? Were there preventative fire measures in place and insurance coverage? Was there a plan for odor control?

Mary Draper spoke on behalf of Damien Ramirez and recommended within the three year plan that a cover could be built over the generator to decrease noise.

Audra Vanpatten asked how long Mr. Ramirez's project would last.

Comm. Williams responded that permits were good for ten years.

Tocarra Thomas CDD Deputy Director stated that each permit required an annual inspection and an annual report would be submitted to the

Community Development Department, which can be revoked if applicant is not meeting the conditions of approval.

Ecomment -

[Jennifer Smith](#) at April 08, 2021 at 9:17am PDT

Support

This project has been operating in compliance with state and local laws. There have been no complaints from the neighbors. The owners operate with integrity and valuable contributors to the community. This project brings well-paying jobs and a positive financial impact to our community. There seems to be a misconception from the public comment about the size of the existing and proposed project. I believe that if the neighbor knew the actual canopy size of the project that their concern would be alleviated. Open communication between the applicant and the neighbor would surely result in a positive relationship.

Overall, this is the type of cannabis operation that we should want to operate in the County of Lake.

-Jennifer Smith

Damien Ramirez read in the record a letter of support from neighbor Shannon Sanders. Mr. Ramirez also referenced a correction to the taxable area of his property as it was incorrect on the Staff Report. Mr. Ramirez then addressed his neighbor concerns, addressing the road concerns brought up by neighbors, agrees with neighbors in regards to moving the gate back. Mr. Ramirez also stated the fire measures he had set in place. Mr. Ramirez stated that he would look into Ms. Draper's suggestion of an enclosure for the generator to decrease noise. Mr. Ramirez reiterated that he was willing to work with his neighbors.

Discussion was then opened to the Planning Commissioners

Comm. Hess shared his thoughts and commended Mr. Ramirez on his willingness to work with his neighbors.

Comm. Price suggested looking into an alternative road, due to traffic impact on Neighbors.

Comm. Williams stated that he had reached out to Mr. Ramirez and believes that he will take the necessary steps to alleviate the neighbor

concerns of relocating the gate, road concerns and decreasing the decimal level of the generator.

Comm. Price stated that she is not opposed to the project but would recommend additional language be added i.e. a road maintenance agreement or an alternative route to the project.

Comm. Chavez agreed that adding language regarding shared road maintenance would work. Comm. Chavez shared that he believes applicant would work with neighbors and achieve a middle ground.

Comm. Brown stated that he supported his colleague's comments. Comm. Brown also stated that he believe the applicant is willing to hear his neighbors' concerns and is willing to address them. Comm. Brown agreed that he would also like to see language added.

Comm. Hess asked the applicant if all were in agreeance with the discussion of shared maintenance of the road, relocation of the gate, good faith efforts to decrease the decimal level of the generators.

Damien Ramirez stated that he was willing to implement some of the changes shared by his neighbors

Eric Porter added four new conditions to the project – Enclosure of generator, alternate power source within a 3 year time span, Gate relocation and shall enter in a road maintenance agreement.

Tocarra Thomas stated that in regards to the road maintenance agreement that it was best left to the applicant and the neighbors to work through an arrangement that best suited each party.

Eric Porter stated that he would strike the road maintenance agreement from the conditions.

Comm. Hess agreed stating that the county could not require a road maintenance agreement.

Comm. Williams moved to motion, seconded by Comm. Chavez that the Planning Commission find that the Initial Study (IS 19-51) applied for by Three Bees LLC on property located at 21340 Eureka Road, Middletown, and is APNs: 014-003-24; 014-140-17, 19, 20 and 21 will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore a mitigated negative declaration shall be approved with the findings listed in the staff report dated April 8, 2021 and as amended today.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays, - Motion Carried

Comm. Williams moved to motion, seconded by Comm. Chavez that the Planning Commission find that the Use Permit (UP 19-33) applied for by Three Bees LLC on property located at 21340 Eureka Road, Middletown, and is APNs: 014-003-24; 014-140-17, 19, 20 and 21 does meet the requirements of Section 51.4 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance and the Major Use Permit be granted subject to the conditions and with the findings listed in the staff report dated April 8, 2021 and as amended today.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays, - Motion Carried

NOTE: The applicant or any interested person is reminded that the Zoning Ordinance provides for a seven (7) calendar day appeal period. If there is a disagreement with the Planning Commission, an appeal to the Board of Supervisors may be filed. The appropriate forms and applicable fee must be submitted prior to 5:00 p.m. on or before the seventh calendar day following the Commission's final determination.

11:00 a.m. Break

11:11 a.m. Public Hearing and Consideration of a Major Use Permit (UP 19-31) to consider approval of a commercial cannabis cultivation project on a 333+ acre property, and consideration of adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS 19-39) on Thursday April 8, 2021, 9:15 a.m., in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, 255 N. Forbes Street, Lakeport, California. Applicant / Owner: Badlands LLC. Proposed Project: Twelve (12) A-Type 3 medium outdoor cannabis cultivation licenses requesting 529,560 sq. ft. of cannabis cultivation area and one (1) A-Type 13 self-distribution license. Location: 21518 Bartlett Springs Road, Lucerne, CA; APN: 016-032-01.

Eric Porter gave a verbal presentation on project. Mr. Porter recommended a continuation on the project due to its location to BLM land and until directive from the legal department was received in regards to ramifications for the County should the project be approved. Mr. Porter also stated that the applicant currently has an approved permit for 4 acres already on the site.

Comm. Williams stated that he would like to table the item until April 22nd, in an effort to stay consistent with item number 2 that was also tabled due to proximity of BLM land.

Comm. Hess stated that he would second the motion.

Damien Ramirez applicant stated while he appreciated the efforts of consistency today he referenced several past cases in which the Planning Commissioners had previously approved similar projects to his own. Mr. Ramirez also reiterated that he had a current permit to farm his land and is only looking to expand his grow. Mr. Ramirez stated that he would be willing to cancel his self-distribution license if necessary. Mr. Ramirez stated that the issue was with distributors and not with farmers looking to cultivate their own land.

Comm. Williams stated that while he appreciated Mr. Ramirez response most of the commissioners still would prefer to table the item until legal counsel was consulted. The proposed motion still stood.

Comm. Williams Motion to table item until the April 22nd PC Hearing, seconded by Comm. Hess.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays – Motion Carried.

NOTE: The applicant or any interested person is reminded that the Zoning Ordinance provides for a seven (7) calendar day appeal period. If there is a disagreement with the Planning Commission, an appeal to the Board of Supervisors may be filed. The appropriate forms and applicable fee must be submitted prior to 5:00 p.m. on or before the seventh calendar day following the Commission's final determination.

11:21 a.m. Public Hearing and Consideration of a Major Use Permit (UP 14-09) to consider approval of a construction project on a 36.55+ acre property, and consideration of adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS 14-33) on Thursday April 8, 2021, 9:25 a.m., in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, 255 N. Forbes Street, Lakeport, California. Applicant / Owner: Hidden Valley Lake Homeowner's Association. Proposed Project: demolition of the 7,200 sq. ft. (existing) HOA headquarters, and new construction of a 12,483 sq. ft. building that would house the HOA office, a restaurant, golf pro shop and lobby, and construction of a new 3,180 sq. ft. covered patio area. Location: 19210 Hartmann Road, Hidden Valley Lake, CA. APN: 141-371-01.

Eric Porter gave a verbal presentation on the project. Mr. Porter stated that there was a point of clarification the homeowner's association office

was not located in the existing or proposed building which only housed the restaurant and pro shop. Proposed project started in 2014. Mr. Porter stated that he had received numerous letters of objection from residents within the HOA. Property is located in a flood plain, which does allow construction.

Public Comment –

Randy Murphy general manager for Hidden Valley Homeowners Association applicant, spoke on the history of the project and some of the setbacks. Mr. Murphy spoke on the reasons for the new building as the previous building was built in the late 1960's and the community was much smaller, the new build was to sustain the ever growing community.

Comm. Williams asked about the population at Hidden valley.

Randy Murphy stated that there was approximately 6065 people, 330 lots and 240 developed lots.

Elizabeth Montgomery a homeowner in Hidden Valley and is opposed to the plan. Stated that there are financial concerns, homeowners would likely see a spike in dues, and there might be an effect on property value. Ms. Montgomery also stated that the HOA was neglecting fire precautions in lieu of the project. Ms. Montgomery also spoke on flooding concerns and the projects location to nearby homes and local schools.

Lisa Kaplen stated that she is in agreeance with Ms. Montgomery's comments. Stated that the communities public spaces i.e. dog park, pool area are being neglected in favor of proposed project. Ms. Kaplen also shared her noise concerns.

Christina Pernesie a member of the Hidden Valley Lake spoke on the financial concerns of the community. Ms. Pernesie spoke on the flood plain concern. Stated that herself and Ms. Kaplen are not only speaking on behalf of themselves but on behalf of all the residents that oppose that project that are not able to attend the meeting.

Bobby Dutcher is in support of the project. Mr. Dutcher commented on the petition list and he 48 signatures received. Mr. Dutcher stated that he hoped the commissioners would approve the project.

Elizabeth Montgomery commented on the petition, stating there were two petition list.

Ecomment

Unable to attach ecomment. Document is available to view via eComment portal.

Discussion was then opened to the Planning Commissioners

Randy Murphy stated that the comments received are a bit biased and are based on a “what if” situation. Mr. Murphy stated that the project was well funded and addressed concerns regarding the flooding of the levy.

Comm. Hess referred to a photo submitted in report by staff and asked if the current building was in the AO floodplain.

Eric Porter responded that it was.

Comm. Hess asked what was being done to avoid a similar flood as the one in 2017.

Randy Murphy stated that a tree blockage contributed to most of the flooding of the parking lot and the new building design has a higher elevation.

Comm. Hess asked if there were provisions made for the parking lot area, as it was also in the floodplain area.

Randy Murphy stated that improvement were made to the drainage of the new parking lot. Mr. Murphy also stated that the tree which contributed to the flooding of the parking lot in 2017 was removed but could potentially happen again.

Comm. Williams inquired if the parking lot concern was mitigated, and referred to drainage concerns.

Randy Murphy stated that there was improvements to the filtration system but that there was no mitigation.

Comm. Williams stated that mitigation would be an improvement to the drainage system.

Randy Murphy stated that the flood did not get into the building but affected the substructure.

Comm. Hess stated that he resided in Hidden valley and was aware of the conflicts between residents and Hidden Valley Lake Homeowners Association but has no objection to the proposed project.

Comm. Brown stated his concern with residents in opposition of project.

Tocarra Thomas Deputy Director stated as the applicant had stated that there would be mitigation set in place due to being in the floodplain. Ms. Thomas also stated that staff would discuss additional innovative water

disbursement options with applicant. Ms. Thomas also referred Commissioners to the Initial study completed by staff.

Comm. Williams stated that he was aware of the mitigation measures and overall conclusion. Comm. Williams proceeded to read a portion of the Initial Study into the record as it pertained to drainage concerns.

Comm. Price moved to motion, seconded by Comm. Williams that the Planning Commission find that the Initial Study (IS 14-33) applied for by Hidden Valley Lake Homeowner's Association on property located at 19210 Hartmann Road, Hidden Valley Lake, and further described as APN 141-371-01 will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore a mitigated negative declaration shall be approved with the findings listed in the staff report dated April 8, 2021.

4 Ayes, 0 Nays. Motion Carried – Comm. Chavez had to leave early.

Comm. Price moved to motion, seconded by Comm. Hess move that the Planning Commission find that the Hidden Valley Lake Homeowner's Association on property located at 19210 Hartmann Road, Hidden Valley Lake, and further described as APN 141-371-01 does meet the requirements of Section 51.4 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance and the Major Use Permit be granted subject to the conditions and with the findings listed in the staff report dated April 8, 2021.

4 Ayes, 0 Nays. Motion Carried

NOTE: The applicant or any interested person is reminded that the Zoning Ordinance provides for a seven (7) calendar day appeal period. If there is a disagreement with the Planning Commission, an appeal to the Board of Supervisors may be filed. The appropriate forms and applicable fee must be submitted prior to 5:00 p.m. on or before the seventh calendar day following the Commission's final determination.

12:04 p.m. Public Hearing and Consideration of a Major Use Permit (UP20-80) to place a 150' tall cell tower on a 28.61+ acre property, and consideration of a Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS 20-96) on Thursday April 8, 2021, 9:25 a.m., in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, 255 N. Forbes Street, Lakeport, California. Applicant: New Cingular Wireless PCS, dba AT&T Mobility. Owner: Michael Worth. Proposed Project: New 150' tall cell tower and appurtenant equipment within a 45' by 40' fenced enclosure. Location: 15650 E.

Highway 20, Clearlake Oaks, CA 95423; APN: 006-530-03 and 006-530-04.

Michael Taylor gave an in-depth report and power point presentation on the cell tower project. Mr. Taylor stated that the proposed wireless facility complies with all applicable requirements of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Taylor also stated that prior to construction the applicant should submit and obtain a grading and building permit.

Comm. Hess referred to Comm. Brown regarding his concern for raptors and their relocation.

Comm. Brown responded that he was.

Mike Taylor stated that all concerns were addressed in the Initial Study attachment provided if any raptors were observed that all construction activity would be ceased.

Comm. Brown stated that his concerns were addressed.

Carl Jones representative for the AT&T project gave a background on the project and shared his excitement that the project was a first net site for the first responder's network.

Public Comment – NONE

eComments –

Good day,

I tried to make an e comment on the AT&T Clearlake Oaks CCL05772 Telecommunications Project - Biological Resources Assessment Report, but couldn't figure the process.

This was to be my e comment, I hope it will be considered in future projects involving chaparral.

If I might comment...there are errors in the field study report submitted by biologist Cord Hute in regards to chaparral.

Hute states: 3.2 Vegetation Communities and Wildlife Habitat 1 Shrubland Alliance "Chaparral generally is thought to be a fire-dependent system, based on the many adaptations of its characteristic species, and its resilience in form and species composition to periodic burning."

My comment: Old-growth chaparral is a beautiful, healthy ecosystem. It does NOT need fire to "renew" or clean out "built-up" or "over-grown" vegetation. As an ecosystem, old-growth chaparral does not "need" fire to remain healthy. The terms "over-grown," "decadent," and "senescent" are value judgments that may be applicable to our managed backyards and urban parks, but not wild plant communities. Old-growth chaparral continues to be a productive ecosystem, growing fresh, new growth in its upper canopy every year. In fact, some chaparral plants require the leaf litter and shade provided by older chaparral stands for their seeds to successfully germinate. Instead of becoming "trashy" or unproductive, as some claim, old-growth chaparral (in excess of 60 years) is actually just beginning a new cycle of life.

Hute states: "The abundance and diversity of wildlife in California's chaparral is not commonly recognized." And "Chaparral habitat supports nearly 50 species of mammals, but none live exclusively in chaparral."

My comment: There are 64 essential plants and animals of California chaparral. (from the book Fire, Chaparral, and Survival in California)
These species are most likely species seen most of the time while taking a walk through the chaparral.

Important: The Wrentit and CA Thrasher live exclusively in chaparral and are found and nest in the project area.

May I share for the record some chaparral myths(besides #1 I just shared) that are not true:

Myth #1: Chaparral needs fire to "renew" and clean out "decadent" or "over-grown" vegetation.

Myth #2: Past fire suppression has built up "unnatural" levels of "fuel," i.e., habitat.

Myth #3: Large chaparral wildfires are unusual and preventable.

Myth #4: Chaparral is adapted to fire and "needs" to burn frequently.

Myth #5: Chaparral plant species are "oozing combustible resins."

Myth #6: Hot chaparral fires "sterilize" the soil.

Myth #7: Chemicals suppress seed germination under the chaparral canopy (allelopathy).

Thank you for the chance to comment. donnamackiewicz@gmail.com

Sincerely,

Donna Mackiewicz

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

Comm. Price moved to motion, seconded by Comm. Williams that the Planning Commission find that the Initial Study (IS 20-96) applied for by New Cingular Wireless PCS, dba AT&T Mobility on property located at 15650 E. Highway 20, Clearlake Oaks, CA 95423, and further described as APN: 006-530-03 and 006-530-04 will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore a mitigated negative declaration shall be approved with the findings listed in the staff report dated April 8, 2021.

4 Ayes, 0 Nays – Motion Carried.

Comm. Price moved to motion, seconded by Comm. Williams that the Planning Commission find that the Use Permit (UP 20-80) applied for by New Cingular Wireless PCS, dba AT&T Mobility on property located at 15650 E. Highway 20, Clearlake Oaks, CA 95423, and further described as APN: 006-530-03 and 006-530-04 does meet the requirements of Section 51.4 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance and the Major Use Permit be granted subject to the conditions and with the findings listed in the staff report dated April 8, 2021.

4 Ayes, 0 Nays – Motion Carried.

Comm. Price moved to motion, seconded by Comm. Hess that the Planning Commission find that the wireless communication facility applied for by New Cingular Wireless PCS, dba AT&T Mobility on property located at 15650 E. Highway 20, Clearlake Oaks, CA 95423, and further described as APN: 006-530-03 and 006-530-04 does meet the requirements of Section 71.13 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance and that the Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the Mitigated Negative Declaration which was adopted for this project and the Wireless Communication Facility be granted subject to the conditions and with the findings listed in the staff report dated April 8, 2021.

4 Ayes,0 Nays – Motion Carried.

NOTE: The applicant or any interested person is reminded that the Zoning Ordinance provides for a seven (7) calendar day appeal period. If there is a disagreement with the Planning Commission, an appeal to the Board of Supervisors may be filed. The appropriate forms and applicable fee must be submitted prior to 5:00 p.m. on or before the seventh calendar day following the Commission's final determination.

12:28 p.m.

Public Hearing and Consideration on Major Use Permit application UP 18-24 proposing to allow for the development of facilities associated with a campground that offers lodging units, central facilities and amenities, on-site water and sewer, and other support facilities on April 8, 2021. The project applicant is Huttopia Six Sigma, LLC. The Planning Commission will consider adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project based on Initial Study IS 18-24. The project is located at 13444 Spruce Grove Road, Lower Lake California on Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 012-012-69.

Tocarra Thomas CDD Deputy Director introduced Marilyne Tremblay Chief Development Developer for the Huttopia project and Annje Dodd with North Point Consulting Group.

Marilyne Tremblay gave a power point presentation on the project. Ms. Tremblay gave an overview of the project and stated that the goal was camping with all the amenities included or "glamping". Ms. Tremblay also gave an overview of her company.

Annje Dodd gave a power point presentation outlining the details of the project, entry point and location to the tasting room. Ms. Dodd also gave a background on Six Sigma and events held on the property.

Tocarra Thomas Deputy Director spoke of conditions of approval such as the lot line adjustment. Ms. Thomas highlighted the points that the project was low impact, minimum grading requirements, the tents would be placed on wooden platforms and there would be no removal of trees.

Comm. Williams stated that he had to pull over numerous times for opposing traffic on his visit. Comm. Williams also asked if there were fire measures in place and has assumed that the road would be 20 ft. and meet the 4290 specifications.

Annje Dodd responded that road had met all standards, requested clarification on whether the conversation was for spruce grove road or the ranch drive way.

Comm. Williams responded that he was not comfortable with the road in its current state.

Annje Dodd responded that the first half mile of road leading to the project is in compliance with current standards.

Comm. Hess commented that the road he felt was a part of the overall experience of Six Sigma. Comm. Hess enquired if there were any

concerns to the use of the road, were conversations happening between Huttopia and Six Sigma regarding shared road maintenance.

Marilyne Tremblay responded that her team and the owners of Six Sigma were currently working on an agreement for shared responsibility.

Comm. Brown stated that he enjoyed his visit to the project site and had no concerns with the road.

Public Comment –

Melissa Fulton CEO of the Lake County Chamber of Commerce is in support of the project. Ms. Fulton stated that the project is thorough and it is something that Lake County needs.

Michael Riviera with Midletown Rancheria Tribal Department stated his support for the project.

eComment –

[Bobby Dutcher](#) at April 08, 2021 at 7:50am PDT

Support

The American public is increasing their desire to enjoy outdoor activities. This project will allow many people to come to Lake County and enjoy camping in a controlled setting. This seems much safer than having them try camping on their own and increasing the risk of wildfires from escaped campfires or poorly operated stoves. Glamping will definitely expand in the future nationwide and I'm glad to see Lake County taking a big step forward in this form of recreation. I strongly support this project. Thank you.

Bobby Dutcher

[Richard Knoll](#) at April 07, 2021 at 7:48pm PDT

Support

Lake County Planning Commissioners:

The Huttopia Six Sigma Ranch Glamping Resort, as with other Huttopia Resorts in Canada, Europe, and the USA will incorporate an eco-design approach with a light development footprint that will minimize impacts on the environment and preserve many of the natural features of the Six Sigma Ranch and Winery site. There will be an emphasis on privacy and on maximizing space in between lodging sites.

This project is a great fit for Lake County, and will be a showcase facility

that will attract visitors to the area and create positive economic development impact.

I support approval of the Major Use Permit for the Huttopia Six Sigma Ranch Glamping Resort and hope that the Planning Commission will too.

Sincerely,

Richard Knoll

707-349-0639

From: [warren sheerin](#)

To: [Toccarra Thomas](#)

Subject: [EXTERNAL] 6Sigma "glampground" hearing

Date: Wednesday, April 7, 2021 2:30:02 PM

Ms Thomas,

As per our phone conversation please read the following statement onto the official record at tomorrow's hearing.

It is incredible to me that at this late date educated people entrusted with the public welfare and encumbered by precaution and common sense will risk human life, and make a deteriorating situation even worse, purely for "development," the promise of jobs and profit. Last year was likely the worst wildfire season in California history, or at least, the worst yet. The 60 by 40 mile wide LNU Complex fire burned to within a mile of this proposed "glampground." ONE mile. Over the last five years more than 60% of this county has burned: the Valley fire, the Rocky fire, the Jerusalem fire, the Clayton fire, the LNU fire and many, many others have destroyed thousands of homes, structures, vehicles, animals, hopes, and far too many human lives. Look at the county website wildfire map. It is glaringly obvious that the fires mentioned above, plus several smaller fires missing from the county tally, missed incinerating the proposed "glamping" site only by pure chance. Spruce Grove Road is the sole public ingress and egress to 6Sigma vineyard, the instigators of this "glampground." Vineyard workers, owners, and now probably several hundred "glampers" will depend on it, and only it, to escape a wildfire. Spruce Grove Road is also the sole northsouth ingress and egress to all of Lake County when accident or wildfire block Route 29, as happened just last week, and which happens regularly several times a year. The road is almost wholly rural, badly maintained, serpentine, narrow, has no painted centerline, and a 55 mph speed limit for most of its length. There are no guardrails. There is typically no place to pull off the macadam, no gravel apron for accidents, turn-arounds, animals, bicyclists, or pedestrians. And worse, now it seems the county is allowing landowners to erect wire stock fences directly on the roadbed, making the road into a chute, just like fences the people who burned to death running from wildfire couldn't climb over in Paradise, 80% of them over 60 years-old. Spruce Grove Road was an old stagecoach

road. It winds roughly 9 miles up hills so steep that my truck needs second gear to climb them, along hillside cuts, up and down ravines, and over colls, all the worst possible places to be caught in a wildfire, places where even trained smokejumpers burn to death. To my knowledge no section on Spruce Grove has burned in 80 years. The fuel loading is enormous --- walk 100 feet uphill from the 6Sigma entrance on Spruce Grove Road for a typical example. The land where I'm building, my home, lies directly uphill from the proposed 6Sigma "glampsite." During the Valley fire hundreds if not thousands of terrified local people diverted from Route 29, or from Hidden Valley Lake, or from Jerusalem Road, and from Spruce Grove Road itself, escaped north in their cars and trucks on Spruce Grove Road from a wildfire that was advancing upon them at a rate of 80 football fields an hour, roughly a brisk walk. The traffic was stop-and-go, bumper-to-bumper, all wide eyes and white knuckles on steering wheels. At my gate nobody let y truck into the traffic stream for four minutes, an eternity in a wildfire. Fiv minutes later and 600 yards north, at the entrance to 6Sigma and within sight of the proposed project, 4 trucks from the vineyard were attempting to enter the traffic stream just like I had. Nobody in the approximately 25 vehicles in my view let them in. I allowed one truck to edge into the line and got a 10 second horn blast from the vehicle behind me. Now, instead of four vineyard trucks trying to squeeze into a 9 mile long solid line of panicked drivers, imagine an extra 200 terrified "glamper" vehicles trying to squeeze in. What are you thinking? Huttopia's chief development officer has assured me in writing that Spruce Grove Road has been adequately studied and fully up to handling excess "glamping" traffic. I am skeptical. The evidence of my senses says otherwise. Corporations will say anything for profit, anything for permission, anything to get a foot in the door, and once the profits start rolling in they revert to their bottom lines. Watch. Jobs? What kind of jobs? What do they pay? Who gets them? How many people, really, in Lake County can afford to go "glamping"? Why should I or my neighbors burn to death just so a huge vineyard can add to its coffers? What enforceable guarantees do we who actually live here get that fine promises will be kept, and that no happy "glamper" from here to eternity will ever, EVER flick a lit joint into the bushes and fry us all?

--Warren Sheerin

13714 Spruce Grove Road

[Michael Colbruno](#) at April 06, 2021 at 8:52am PDT

Support

I strongly support the glamping proposal submitted by Six Sigma. I am just down the road from them on J-Grade and they're property is visible to us from from the north end of our parcel. Six Sigma is a vital part of our

community in the Spruce Grove area. They are not only an outstanding winery with incredible events, but they open up their property for recreational uses like hiking, walking dogs, camping, mountain biking or just exploring nature. They provide amenities to the public, like a guide to wildflowers and books on the local history of the area. Six Sigma sets the standard for how a business should operate and what it means to be a good neighbor. They have taken an area of Lake County that was once considered isolated and, some would say, even dangerous, and turned it into a community resource for all ages. This proposal has my enthusiastic and unquestioned support!

Discussion was then opened to the Planning Commissioners

Marilyne Tremblay Spoke on prior experiences working in fire risk areas and stated that they are in communications with local authorities to vet all emergency and evacuation plans.

Comm. Hess stated he had no questions and is in support of the project.

Comm. Price stated that she supports the project.

Comm. Williams stated that he liked the site, agreed that the county needed the project. Stated that he could not approve project if the road was not 4290 compliant.

Comm. Brown stated that he appreciated the environmental consideration of the project. Comm. Brown stated that he supports the project.

Comm. Williams stated that the application and project is great, appreciates the environmental consideration but would not give his vote due to road concerns.

Comm. Price inquired to applicant if there was any consideration in widening the road.

Marilyne Tremblay stated that a consultation with the fire department was completed in the design of the road.

Tocarra Thomas CDD Deputy Director stated 4290 standards is sited to stop before winery. Project was reviewed to the lot line for 4290 compliance.

Annje Dodd stated that the project had to go through Public Works and Calfire before full approval.

Comm. Price moved to motion, seconded by Comm. Hess that the Planning Commission find on the basis of the Initial Study No. 18-24, , that the Major Use Permit, UP 18-24 and Lot Line Adjustment, LLA 20-04, as applied for by Huttobia Six Sigma, LLC will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and associated Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program with the findings listed in the Staff Report dated November 24, 2020.

4 Ayes, 0 Nays -- Motion Carried

Comm. Price moved to motion, seconded by Comm. Hess that the Planning Commission find that the Major Use Permit, UP 18-24 applied for by Huttobia Six Sigma, LLC, on property located at 13372 Spruce Grove Road, Lower Lake, CA 95457, APN: 012-012-69 does meet the requirements of Section 51.4 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance and approve the Major Use Permit, subject to the conditions of approval and with the findings listed in the Staff Report dated November 24, 2020.

4 Ayes, 0 Nays -- Motion Carried

NOTE: The applicant or any interested person is reminded that the Zoning Ordinance provides for a seven (7) calendar day appeal period. If there is a disagreement with the Planning Commission, an appeal to the Board of Supervisors may be filed. The appropriate forms and applicable fee must be submitted prior to 5:00 p.m. on or before the seventh calendar day following the Commission's final determination.

1:40 p.m. (Continued from March 25, 2021) PUBLIC HEARING to Discuss and Consider Zoning Text Amendment (AM 21-01) to Article 27 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the Cultivation of Commercial Cannabis. The applicant is the COUNTY OF LAKE.

Tocarra Nicole Thomas, CDD Deputy Director gave a verbal presentation on the zoning text amendment for Article 27 guidelines. Ms. Thomas shared that this was an agenda item that was continued from the March 25th hearing pertaining to the Buffer requirement between gardens of 500 ft.

Comm. Williams stated that due to unknown numbers, is requesting a smaller setbacks with the buffer square footage. Referenced BOS meeting and their recommendation for deemed complete applications.

Public Comment –

Julia Jacobson from Aster Farms asked for clarification, amendments to application 6 to 8 month period to approve amendment along with the fees. If the amendments are made will it be the same process?

Joseph Gustafson stated he had concerns with the turnaround time for permits submitted.

Tocarra Thomas provided an overview of the permit process. Ms. Thomas also reviewed amendments or changes to the application. Ms. Thomas stated that applicants issued a permit or have an approved application are fine, if applicants are still in the process of obtaining a permit they would have to change the project to meet the new ordinance.

Comm. Hess asked what Comm. Williams had in mind for smaller set backs

Comm. Williams responded that 200 ft. buffer was what he thought would work.

Comm. Hess why not allow indoor growers the same acreage as outdoor grows?

Comm. Price stated that she agreed that a smaller setback would not be as detrimental to project currently operational.

Tocarra Thomas unable to obtain existing agricultural uses that are in the county. CDD only captures land use and permits issued. Staff has decreased applications from 160 to 147 active applicants. 5 located in Farm land Protection Zones and of that five, three have completed CEQA. 64 applications have farmland designation with nine having completed CEQA.

Comm. Williams stated that it is not enough information and has requested putting this item off to a later time with no date. Comm. Williams stated that he would prefer counsel to be present during the grandfather conversation.

Comm. Hess asked if staff was being given a deadline, if a date was set certain what information would staff need to provide.

Public Comment Reopened

Steven Hajik stated that he felt strongly about the 500 ft. buffer and Farmland Protection Zone.

Comm. Williams reiterated that the zone is finalized and the farmland protection zone ordinance has been finalized. The topic up for discussion was the 500 ft. buffer and how many applicants would be effected by the decision made today.

Tocarra Thomas CDD Deputy Director suggested that the items be continued after permitting season.

Julia Jacobson gave a financial overview from a cultivators point of view.

Public Comment Closed

Comm. Hess perfection be the enemy of the good. Does continuing the item put applicants in a compromised situation?

Comm. Williams clarified that continuing the item would allow growers to continue as is. Comm. Williams states that information requested from the prior meeting has not been provided.

Comm. Hess stated that actions taken today will have no immediate effect, the items would still require the Board of Supervisors approval.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director stated that today's discussion was for a written recommendation to Board.

Comm. Brown asked if Comm. Williams's district was the prime area being impacted.

Comm. Williams stated that he has the agricultural district.

Comm. Brown commented that he has only received two projects between this year and last. Comm. Brown asked if there were specific recommendations.

Comm. Williams if application was deemed complete, they should be grandfathered in.

3:05 p.m. Break until 3:20 p.m.

Tocarra Thomas CDD Deputy Director looked into bylaws and recommended language as it pertained to buffers for different agricultural uses. Ms. Thomas also reviewed the separation between hemp and cannabis which does have a buffer to prevent cross pollination. Ms. Thomas then reviewed additional language change to submit to the Board of Supervisors.

Jonathan Louie recommended tabling item to next PC Hearing to confer with Council.

Comm. Hess stated he would prefer not to overload the language but would recommend a language that stated why the decision was deferred.

Tocarra Thomas CDD Deputy Director showed an update to the language.

Comm. Williams asked if the new language would assist staff with continuing to move forward and permits out.

Tocarra Thomas CDD Deputy Director stated that the vegetative screening, approved by PC and submitted to the board. Parcel that are farmland designated and isolated from other parcel and have vegetative screening. Originated from pesticide drift concerns. Getting this to the BOS would not impede the permit process.

Comm. Williams stated that he wanted to ensure that permit processing was not going to be put on hold. Comm. Williams also stated that the requirement for new applications would require the 500 ft. buffer vegetative screening any new applications must be 500 ft. away.

Comm. Hess should we report to BOS that item has been continued indefinitely.

Comm. Williams stated that he was in agreement with continuing indefinitely.

Comm. Brown stated that he is also in agreement.

Comm. Hess asked if item is tabled indefinitely as to not delay the season in order to come up with better recommendation

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director stated that the PC had a few options, a recommendation to the board stating that the item had been tabled indefinitely, or has been deferred to the Board of Supervisors for a decision. Staffs recommendation is to continue the item until after the grow season.

Comm. Williams motioned to move, seconded by Comm. Hess That the Planning Commission Report to the BOS that after through considerations of the Board of Supervisors resolution of intention to the Planning Commission to consider and discuss AM 21-01 item #1 implementation of a 500' buffer between proposed cannabis cultivations and existing and active agricultural uses, that this item

be continued until the earliest December 2021. The planning commission is deferring this zoning text amendment discussion due to the lengthy amount of deliberation that the Planning Commission has conducted and is ultimately unable to reach agreement on a cohesive decision and the desire to not further impact permit application processing.

4 Ayes, 0 Nays – Motion Carried

NOTE: The applicant or any interested person is reminded that the Zoning Ordinance provides for a seven (7) calendar day appeal period. If there is a disagreement with the Planning Commission, an appeal to the Board of Supervisors may be filed. The appropriate forms and applicable fee must be submitted prior to 5:00 p.m. on or before the seventh calendar day following the Commission's final determination.

3:23 p.m. Untimed Staff Updates

Thanked all the Community Development employees. Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director gave a visual presentation of the Cannabis section of the community development website.

3:31 p.m. Adjourned