



COUNTY OF LAKE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
Planning Division
Courthouse - 255 N. Forbes Street
Lakeport, California 95453
Telephone: (707) 263-2221 FAX: (707) 263-2225

FILED
With The Board of Supervisors
Of The County of Lake

Date: 1-14-26
BY: [Signature]

January 13, 2026

Appellant's Name: Peter Luchetti

Appellant's Mailing Address: PO Box 433 Middletown, CA 94924

Phone Number: 4157100906

Location of Project: 21333 GRANGE RD MIDDLETOWN CA 95461

Assessor Parcel Number: 014-400-04

Previous Action Taken (reason for appeal):

Date: January , 2026

To: Lake County Board of Supervisors

Cc: Lake County Community Development Department (Planning Division)

From: 276 Ranch LLC (Appellant)

Subject: NOTICE OF APPEAL - Planning Commission Approval of Rancho Lake LLC (File No. PL-25-13) (UP 21-15) and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS 21-16), for commercial cannabis cultivation for 16.9 acres of outdoor canopy and a Type 13 Distributor, Self Transport only, Applicant Rancho Lake LLC; Location: 19955, 19986, 20110 and 22222 Grange Road, Middletown (APN's 0140290-08, 014,300.02, 03,& 04) collectively referred to as the Comstock Ranch.

RE: Appeal of the Planning Commission's January 8, 2026 decision approving the Major Use Permit and Mitigated Negative Declaration for Rancho Lake LLC.

Appellant Information:

276 Ranch LLC / Luchetti Family
21333 Grange Rd. Middletown CA 95461

Peter Luchetti (415) 710-0906

email: peter@tablerockpartners.com

Project Being Appealed:

Applicant: Rancho Lake LLC

Project Location: [Insert Grange Road Address if known, e.g., 19955 Grange Road], Middletown, CA

Permit Number: PL-25-13 (Major Use Permit) / IS 21-16 (Initial Study)[1][2]

GROUND'S FOR APPEAL

276 Ranch LLC ("Appellant") hereby formally appeals the Lake County Planning Commission's decision on January 8, 2026, to approve the Major Use Permit and adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Rancho Lake LLC cannabis cultivation project. The Appellant is an aggrieved party owning the adjacent 56-year-old organic cattle ranch ("276 Ranch") and contends that the Planning Commission's decision was not supported by substantial evidence and constitutes an abuse of discretion.

The specific grounds for this appeal include, but are not limited to, the following:

I. SUBSTANTIVE CEQA VIOLATIONS & INADEQUATE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The County erred in adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND).^[3] Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required when there is a "fair argument" supported by substantial evidence that a project may have a significant effect on the environment.^{[3][4][5]}

1. Water Resources and Hydrology Impacts

The hydrology report relied upon is insufficient to demonstrate that the extraction of water for 19.6 acres of cannabis canopy will not adversely affect the underlying aquifer, which 276 Ranch relies upon for its cattle operation and 276 Ranch LLC's senior water rights in Putah Creek which is directly adjacent to the project. The analysis fails to account for cumulative impacts of this project combined with other approved cultivation sites in the Middletown/Grange Road area. The analysis disregards hydrological analysis provided by 276 Ranch LLC, which was prepared by GHD Resources (Ryan Crawford) who is the hydrologist who runs the well monitoring program in the Coyote Valley for the Hidden Valley Community Services District.

2. Traffic Impacts and Emergency Evacuation (Public Safety)

Office of Emergency Services (OES) Letter: The project failed to include a required consultation of wildfire evacuation and overall combined traffic impacts specifically addressing the Rancho Lake LLC project and Guenoc Valley Resort emergency evacuation via the Grange Road Connector which runs through the Comstock Ranch.

3. Inadequate Biological Study

The biological assessment provided by the applicant is dated and contains significant errors and omissions regarding local flora and fauna as well as water and other environmental impacts. It fails to adequately survey for sensitive species during the correct seasons and does not reflect current site conditions, rendering the "No Significant Impact" finding invalid.

4. Failure to Comply with Fire Safety Standards (Section 4290 et. al.)

The project fails to demonstrate full compliance with **Public Resources Code Section 4290** and **4291** (Fire Safety Regulations).^[6]

1. **Access Standards:** The ingress/egress roads do not meet the minimum width and surface standards required for heavy firefighting equipment.
2. **Water Supply:** There is a lack of verified on-site water storage dedicated strictly to fire suppression as required for a commercial operation of this scale in a High Fire Severity Zone.
3. **Increased Ignition Risk:** Introducing a large-scale commercial operation into a volatile fire area (historically impacted by the Valley Fire) creates "152 unique points of ignition" (generators, machinery, human activity) that have not been adequately mitigated.

II. LAND USE INCOMPATIBILITY & GENERAL WELFARE

The approved project is fundamentally incompatible with the existing, long-standing agricultural character of the immediate vicinity, specifically the Appellant's 56-year organic beef operation.

1. Threat to Organic Certification (Pesticide Drift)

276 Ranch holds a USDA Organic Certification essential to its business model. The applicant's project introduces a proven risk of pesticide and chemical drift, use of fertilizers and other inorganic compounds related to cannabis farming and processing.

Inadequate Buffers: Proposed setbacks are insufficient to prevent drift from commercial cannabis pesticides/fungicides onto organic grazing pastures. Contamination would result in the immediate loss of organic certification for 276 Ranch, causing irreparable economic harm not analyzed in the initial study.

1. Absence of Engineered Odor Control

The project lacks a designed and professionally engineered odor control system. Relying on an "Odor Management Plan" without physical engineering controls (e.g., carbon filtration or enclosed structures) is insufficient for a project of this magnitude located adjacent to residential and agricultural receptors. Posing

adverse impacts on 276 Ranch organic cattle production and the Luchetti Family and ranch staff residential and recreational use of the 276 Ranch.

1. Inadequate Setbacks and Conflicts with Residential Use

The approved setbacks are insufficient to mitigate nuisance impacts on the Luchetti family residence and ranch staff housing. The project conflicts with the established residential and recreational use of the 276 Ranch property, creating significant noise, dust, and odor nuisances that degrade the quality of life and property value.

1. Prime Farmland Incompatibility

The project converts California designated "Prime Farmland" of statewide significance into a monoculture cannabis operation, conflicting with the County's General Plan goals to preserve traditional agricultural diversity (cattle ranching).

III. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

Appellant reserves the right to submit additional evidence, expert testimony, and legal arguments prior to and during the public hearing on this appeal. 276 Ranch LLC is currently evaluating other technical issues and errors in the application materials.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, 276 Ranch LLC respectfully requests that the Board of Supervisors:

Grant this appeal;

Overturn the Planning Commission's approval of the Use Permit and Mitigated Negative Declaration; and

Require the preparation of a full Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to adequately analyze the significant environmental impacts and land use conflicts.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peter Luchetti
Managing Member, 276 Ranch LLC

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY (Below this line)	
Appeal Number:	PL-26-12
Related Record Number:	PL-25-13 Rancho Lake, LLC
Fee:	\$1,779.03
Date Received:	1/13/2026
Receipt Number:	2427
Received By:	Mary Clayton



County of Lake, CA

\$1,779.63 Paid

Via Credit Card

Peter Luchetti
January 13, 2026

Fee Payment (Cannabis)	\$1,727.00
PL-26-12 - Planning Application	
Technology Fee - Planning	\$20.00
General Plan Maintenance Fee-Planning	\$64.00
Cannabis Appeal to the Board - Planning	\$1,000.00
Cannabis Appeal to the Board - County Counsel	\$420.00
Cannabis Appeal to the Board - Env. Health	\$113.00
Cannabis Appeal to the Board- Public Works	\$110.00

Processing fee \$52.63

Total paid **\$1,779.63**



Powered by OpenGov
Receipt number #2427