

1                                    **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF LAKE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

2  
3        In the Matter of John Evans / Pillsbury Family Farms, Inc.  
4        [AB-PL-25-85]

**FINDINGS OF FACT AND  
DECISION**

5            These proceedings were commenced by virtue of an appeal of the Planning Commission’s March  
6        27, 2025 revocation of the Major Use Permit (UP 20-50) for outdoor cannabis cultivation of up to  
7        110,000 sf, located at 26102 19N16 Road, Lake Pillsbury (APN 001-030-36) in Lake County  
8        California.

9            A duly noticed public hearing on the appeal scheduled before this Board was heard on June 17,  
10       2025, at which time, evidence, both oral and documentary, was presented. Based upon the evidence  
11       and applicable law, we find the following:

- 12           1. That the Planning Commission held a noticed public hearing on June 17, 2025, to consider the  
13           revocation of Major Use Permit (UP 20-50) for commercial outdoor cannabis cultivation. The  
14           project is located at 26102 19N16 Road, Lake Pillsbury (APN 001-030-36) in Lake County  
15           California
- 16           2. That, at the June 17, 2025 public hearing, the Planning Commission revoked Major Use  
17           Permit (UP 20-50).
- 18           3. That the Project Appellant is John Evans / Pillsbury Family Farms, Inc. (hereinafter,  
19           “Appellant”). The appeal to this Board was timely filed on April 3, 2025. The reasons  
20           provided for the appeal include, but are not limited to, the following allegations:
- 21           a. The Appellant diligently pursued its State license. The Appellant has legal authority  
22           and a statutory corrective mechanism to bring itself into compliance without the need  
23           for revocation.
- 24           b. Appellant’s pending expungement should delay action. Premature revocation would  
25           undermine the purpose of rehabilitative measures.
- 26           c. Due process and discretion should be exercised fairly. Revocation here appears  
27           premature and contrary to staff’s own recommendation in prior correspondence.

- 1 d. There is no ongoing public safety risk. There' no indication of willful non-compliance  
2 or concealment of unlicensed cultivation. The Appellant fixed any violation related to  
3 cultivation by diligently trying to – and then getting – the state license. Any violations  
4 were cured when Appellant got its State license.
- 5 e. The disqualification of one individual member should not invalidate the entire permit.  
6 Appellant is composed of multiple individuals, including John Evans and Skiela Lawa,  
7 who have passed background checks and remain in good standing.
- 8 4. That the Board of Supervisors conducted a hearing in this matter on June 17, 2025 as required  
9 by a de novo revocation hearing as required by Articles 58 and 60 of the Lake County Zoning  
10 Ordinance.
- 11 5. That the Appellants presented evidence both documentary and testimonial in support of their  
12 appeal.
- 13 6. That the Community Development Department presented testimony and documentary  
14 evidence relevant to these proceedings including, but not limited to, a staff report dated March  
15 27, 2025, and attachments 1 through 14 thereto.
- 16 7. That this Board finds, based on the evidence and facts presented in this matter, as follows:
- 17 a. Sufficient information exists in the record of this matter that Appellant violated  
18 Conditions A.2 and A.6 of Major Use Permit (UP 20-50) during the term of said  
19 permit. However, Appellant has subsequently resolved said violations and is currently  
20 in compliance with Conditions A.2 and A.6 of Major Use Permit (UP 20-50).
- 21 b. In order to comply with Condition A.10 of Major Use Permit (UP 20-50), Appellant .  
22 must submit written confirmation to the County of Lake Community Development  
23 Department confirming that Justin Quayle is and shall not be employed by the permit  
24 holder under this Major Use Permit unless Justin Quayle undergoes and passes a “live  
25 scan” background check by the Lake County Sheriff Department.
- 26 8. That this Board has considered and incorporates by reference the Community Development  
27 staff memorandum and attachments thereto submitted to this Board for the hearing, as well as  
28 other documentation submitted to this Board.

- 1 9. Based upon all the foregoing and for the reasons set forth hereinabove, this Board grants the  
2 appeal of the Appellant, John Evans / Pillsbury Family Farms, Inc., in part with Condition  
3 A.10 to Major Use Permit (UP 20-50) amended to state as follows: "All applicants and/or  
4 employees shall undergo and pass a "live scan" background check by the Lake County Sheriff  
5 Department. The permit holder must submit written confirmation to the County of Lake  
6 Community Development Department confirming that Justin Quayle is and shall not be  
7 employed by the permit holder under this Major Use Permit unless Justin Quayle undergoes  
8 and passes a 'live scan' background check by the Lake County Sheriff Department."
- 9 10. **NOTICE TO APPELLANT**: You are hereby given notice that the time within which any  
10 judicial review of the decision herein may be sought is governed by the provisions of the  
11 Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5.

12 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIR, Board of Supervisors

13 ATTEST: SUSAN PARKER  
14 Clerk to the Board of Supervisors

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

15 By: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
LLOYD C. GUINTIVANO  
County Counsel