



**LAKE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING**

MINUTES

JULY 14, 2022

Commission Members Present:

**P - John Hess, District I
P - Everardo Chavez, District II
P - Batsulwin Brown, District III
P – Christina Price, District IV
P – Maile Field, District V**

Staff Members Present:

**Mary Darby, CDD Director
Jim Feenan, Office Assistant III
Eric Porter, Associate Planner**

9:00 a.m. CALL TO ORDER

9:00 a.m. Pledge of Allegiance – All

9:01 a.m. - Approval of Minutes from the June 23, 2022 Planning Commission Hearing.

On the motion from **Commissioner Chavez** that the Planning Commission approved the minutes from the **June 23, 2022**. Planning Commission Hearing. Second by **Commissioner Field**.

The motion was carried by the following vote:

5 Ayes 0 Noes – Motion Carried

9:01 a.m. - Citizens Input

No individuals stepped forward or raised their hand in the Zoom Room. Citizen input is closed.

9:05 a.m. – Public Hearing on Consideration of a Rezone (RZ 22-02) and a Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS 22-19). The Planning Commission will be asked to make a formal recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, which will occur during a later public hearing. The applicant, DANIEL SOSA is proposing a rezoning to change two property's zoning from CH Highway Commercial to C2 Service Commercial, and to amend the General Plan designations. The property is developed with two existing buildings and a parking lot. No development is proposed in conjunction with this action. The project is located at 3774 AND 3794 E. Highway 20, CA; APNs: 032-181-02 and 03.

Office Assistant III Jim Feenan– stated that legal notice has been determined on this matter.

Associate Planner Eric Porter - presented the information via Power Point which included the scope, site description, project analysis and recommendations.

Commissioner Hess – asked a question regarding what the Commission was actually going to decide today. He wanted to verify that there would be no decision on future use of the facility mainly a dispensary.

Associate Planner Eric Porter – answered, yes that Commissioner Hess' statement is correct.

9:11 a.m. - Open Public Hearing

Daniel Sosa (Applicant) – wanted to thank the Commissioner for their time regarding this item.

9:14 a.m. – Closed Public Hearing

Commissioner Field – asked about the current use of the building.

Daniel Sosa (Applicant) – he stated it was a market.

Commissioner Field – asked if they sold alcohol.

Daniel Sosa (Applicant) – stated he was not operate the market.

Commissioner Chavez – asked if he was the owner of the property.

Daniel Sosa (Applicant) – stated he was not the owner, but he intends to be the owner.

Commissioner Price – asked if he was in escrow over the property.

Daniel Sosa (Applicant) – stated he was in escrow.

Commissioner Field – asked about the cannabis use of the property.

Daniel Sosa (Applicant) – stated he has not figured out his business plan.

Commissioner Price – restated that the focus of the Planning Commission today was primarily on the rezone.

Commissioner Brown – asked the applicant if he has reached out to the three individuals who wrote letters of opposition.

Daniel Sosa (Applicant) – stated he had not done so.

Commissioner Chavez – asked if the property was rezoned could it have the same use as today. It would just allow for cannabis.

Associate Planner Eric Porter – stated yes to the Commissioner's questions.

Commissioner Field – asked about the age limits on property where cannabis was sold, asking if they needed to be 18 years of age.

Associate Planner Eric Porter – stated that he believed it was 21 years of age. He stated the county would not regulate that, and this is a state regulated law. Discussion occurred regarding the visitation of children on the property.

Commissioner Price – stated that one of the buildings is vacant, and did not want the Commission to get ahead of themselves on the cannabis portion, which is not before the Commission.

Negative Declaration (IS 22-19):

On the motion from **Commissioner Brown** that the Planning Commission find the **Rezone (RZ 22-02)** applied for by **Daniel Sosa** on property located at **3774 and 3794 E. Highway**

20, Nice, CA further described as **APNs: 032-181-02 and 03** recommend the adoption of the Negative Declaration (IS 22-19) by the Board of Supervisors based on the findings set forth in the staff report dated **July 14, 2022**. Seconded by **Commissioner Hess**. The motion was carried by the following vote:

5 Ayes 0 Noes – Motion Carried

Rezone (RZ 22-02):

On the motion from **Commissioner Brown** that the Planning Commission find that the **Rezone (RZ 22-02)** applied for by **Daniel Sosa** on property located at **3774 and 3794 E. Highway 20, Nice, CA** further described as **APNs: 032-181-02 and 03** does meet the requirements of Section 47.22 and Article 19 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance, and that a recommendation of approval be provided to the Board of Supervisors for the Rezone subject to the findings listed in the staff report dated **July 14, 2022**. Seconded by **Commissioner Hess**. The motion was carried by the following vote:

5 Ayes 0 Noes – 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's recommendation, 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.

9:21 a.m. Item #2 –Public Hearing on Consideration of a General Plan of Conformity Report (file no. GPC 22-02) and consider a Categorical Exemption (CE 22-14), per CEQA* section 15301. The applicant, **COUNTY OF LAKE** is proposing verification of compliance of the property with the General Plan designation of PL, Public Lands, which falls under the category of land designated as PF, Public Facilities. The project is located at 1985 Park Drive, Lakeport, CA; APN: 008-011-02.

Office Assistant III Jim Feenan– stated that legal notice has been determined on this matter.

Associate Planner Eric Porter - presented the information via Power Point which included the scope, site description, project analysis and recommendations.

9:25 a.m. Open Public Hearing

No one stepped forward in the chambers and no hands were raised in the Zoom Room.

Commissioner Brown – asked some questions regarding where the work was going to be done and what type of work was going to be done.

Associate Planner Eric Porter – discussed the work in regards to potential conflicts and if a condition of approval that needed to be added regarding the tribal notifications.

Commissioner Hess and Price – stated they would support the added condition regarding the tribal requests.

Associate Planner Eric Porter – asked the Commission if they would like him to add the traditional condition regarding cultural sensitivity and training.

Commissioner Field – addressed the location stated in the planner's presentation and was surprised that it was included in the Lakeport Plan.

9:29 a.m. Closed Public Hearing

Categorical Exemption:

On the motion from **Commissioner Field** that the Planning Commission find and report that, on the minimal site improvements associated with this project, that a Categorical Exemption to CEQA shall be adopted pursuant to CEQA Section 15301, and that this project, located at 1985 Park Drive, Lakeport, CA and known as APN: 008-011-02, will not have a significant effect on the environment with the findings listed in the staff report dated July 14, 2022. Seconded by **Commissioner Hess**. The motion was carried by the following vote:

5 Ayes 0 Noes – Motion Carried

General Plan Conformity:

On the motion from **Commissioner Field** that the Planning Commission find and report that General Plan Conformity GPC 22-02, applied for by the Lake County Public Services Department for the property located at 1985 Park Drive, Lakeport, CA and known as APN: 008-011-02, is in conformity with the Lake County General Plan with the findings listed in the staff report as amended here today dated July 14, 2022. Seconded by **Commissioner Hess**. The motion was carried by the following vote:

5 Ayes 0 Noes – 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's recommendation, 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.

9:32 a.m. Item #3 - Public Hearing on Consideration of a General Plan of Conformity (file no. GPC 22-06 and consider a Categorical Exemption (CE 22-21), per CEQA section 15301. The applicant, COUNTY OF LAKE is proposing Verification of compliance of the property with the General Plan designation of PL, Public Lands, which falls under the category of land designated as PF, Public Facilities. The project is located at 255 N. Main Street, Lakeport, CA; APN: 025-402-01.

Office Assistant III Jim Feenan– stated that legal notice has been determined on this matter.

Associate Planner Eric Porter - presented the information via Power Point which included the scope, site description, project analysis and recommendations.

9:37 a.m. Open Public Hearing

No one stepped forward in the chambers and no hands were raised in the Zoom Room.

9:38 a.m. Closed Public Hearing

Commissioner Chavez – asked if there was a budget for the improvements.

Associate Planner Eric Porter – stated there was no documents regarding the budget.

Commissioner Hess – he stated that it would be nice to see how much land would be disturbed.

Director Darby – stated there was a drawing submitted.

Commissioner Field – there was a discussion regarding the jurisdiction of the item.

Categorical Exemption:

On the motion from **Commissioner Chavez** that the Planning Commission find and report that, on the minimal site improvements associated with this project, that a Categorical Exemption to CEQA shall be adopted pursuant to CEQA Section 15301, and that this project, located at 255 N. Main Street, Lakeport, CA and known as APN: 025-402-01, will not have a significant effect on the environment with the findings listed in the staff report dated July 14, 2022. Seconded by **Commissioner Field**. The motion was carried by the following vote:

5 Ayes 0 Noes – Motion Carried

General Plan Conformity:

On the motion from **Commissioner Chavez** that the Planning Commission find and report that General Plan Conformity GPC 22-02, applied for by the Lake County Public Services Department for the property located at 255 N. Main Street, Lakeport, CA and known as APN: 025-402-01, is in conformity with the Lake County General Plan with the findings listed in the staff report dated July 14, 2022. Seconded by **Commissioner Field**. The motion was carried by the following vote:

5 Ayes 0 Noes – 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's recommendation, 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.

Recess 9:42 a.m. – 9:47 a.m.

9:47 a.m. Item #4 - Public Hearing on Consideration of a General Plan Amendment and Rezone (files no. GPAP 19-03 and RZ 19-03), and a Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS 19-43). The Planning Commission will be asked to make a formal recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The applicant, DENNIS DE LA MONTANYA is requesting a Rezoning and General Plan Amendment to change a 17.4+ acre lot from R1, Low Density Residential, to RR, Rural Residential. No development is proposed in conjunction with this action. The project is located at 8255 Point Drive, Kelseyville, CA; APN: 044-331-24.

Office Assistant III Jim Feenan– stated that legal notice has been determined on this matter.

Associate Planner Eric Porter - presented the information via Power Point which included the scope, site description, project analysis and recommendations.

Commissioner Hess – wanted to know how the planner was defining conflict.

Associate Planner Eric Porter – discussed occurred with the Commission regarding the use of the property.

Commissioner Field – asked a question regarding the rezone classification and agricultural activity.

Associate Planner Eric Porter – stated that this describes the size of the property and the specific classifications and agricultural activity.

10:00 a.m. Open Public Hearing

William Groody – stated his concerns regarding the rezone. He stated the history regarding the land in question. He also discussed the issues with the combination of rural and agricultural land. He discussed the previously denied application.

Barbara Hollenkamp –she discussed the application process in Lake County. She does not think it is a good idea for all the traffic to be passing through the area. She would request the project be denied.

Kevin Odom –stated he was concerned that there were a variety of options that could be done to the property. He stated that once the rezoning is done it stays no matter how many times the land changes hands. He was concerned about all the modifications that could be done to the property. He addressed the wind direction and pesticides. He addressed the water issues that are currently happening in the area.

Mara Eichelmann – stated that Buckingham is one of the most regarded areas in the county. She stated the best use for the land is residential. She stated the well issue and depletion of the water sources. She stated Lake County is rural. She addressed the live animal issue. She stated this was the second rezone request in the last ten years.

Tony Bruito – he discussed the wind direction and where his marina is located adjacent to the property. He stated they have over 300 boats stored at their marina and how they have been there since 1964. He stated that they are opposed to everything except agricultural.

Nancy Barber – she was stunned that this application was filed. She discussed the pesticide issue. She feels that this is the third time this item as come before the Commission.

James Robello – resident of the Buckingham area. He made some comments regarding the map showing the wind direction. He discussed the restrictions regarding the property. He feels there is no need to change the zoning.

Dennis De La Montanya (Applicant) – discussed the description of the property and how it would be developed. He discussed the deed restriction. He explained how he tried to rezone 10 years ago. He was approached by CalFire for use of the land as a staging area. He was approached by neighbors regarding the agricultural use and refuge area. He stated they have no intent of building 60 homes on the property. He stated that are not part of the Buckingham Association. He feels there needs to several items to be addressed regarding future use of the property. He feels that this property is a great piece of land to show the transition from rural residential. He stated this land was approved to be used as a vineyard back in 2000. He addressed the water issue and wells. He stated that Kelseyville & CalFire did not feel comfortable stating anything in writing.

Jeff Drake – he stated he was married to the former owner of the property. He was the one who put the encumbrances on the property. He supports the applicants request to put vineyards on the property. He feels it would add to the peninsula view of the area. He discussed the use of land for building of housing.

Blakely Hull – she recently has purchased an adjacent property. She discussed the safety of the area. She stated she was award of the encumbrances. She wants to stress the use of water in the area. She stated there is extreme drought and any wells being driven would break the law. She discussed the uses of the land and the vineyard issue.

10:31 a.m. Closed Public Hearing

Commissioner Field – she discussed urban/rural interface. She stated she has a lot of experience with the property. She stated her family use to own property in the area. She

stated she sees both sides of the issues. She feels it would be spot zoning. She feels she has to support the staff's decision.

Commissioner Price – stated the zoning stays with the land. There could be impacts for years to come.

Commissioner Chavez – discussed the use of water for the property, traffic issues and pesticides.

Commissioner Price – discussed the fire break proposal and let the community to decide where to use it as a fire break.

Commissioner Brown – stated he is in agreement with staff's recommendation. He stated the Commission has to consider all the impacts now and in the future. He stated that sometimes CEQA fails to fully encompass the project as to land use. He supports the recommendation.

General Plan Amendment (GPAP 19-03)::

On the motion from **Commissioner Field** that the Planning Commission find that the **General Plan Amendment (GPAP 19-03)** applied for by **Dennis De La Montanya** on property located at **8255 Point Drive, Kelseyville** further described as **APN: 044-331-24** does not meet the requirements of the General Plan or the Rivera Area Plan, and that a recommendation of **denial** be provided to the Board of Supervisors for the subject to the findings listed in the staff report dated **July 14, 2022**. Seconded by **Commissioner Chavez**. The motion was carried by the following vote:

4 Ayes 1 Noes (Commissioner Hess) – Motion Carried

Negative Declaration (IS 19-43):

On the motion from **Commissioner Field** that the Planning Commission find the **General Plan Amendment (GPAP 19-03)** and **Rezone (RZ 19-03)** applied for by **Dennis De La Montanya** on property located at **8255 Point Drive, Kelseyville** further described as **APN: 044-331-24** **does not recommend** the adoption of the Negative Declaration (**IS 19-43**) by the Board of Supervisors based on the findings set forth in the staff report dated **July 14, 2022**. Seconded by **Commissioner Chavez**. The motion was carried by the following vote:

4 Ayes 1 Noes (Commissioner Hess) – Motion Carried

Rezone (RZ 19-03):

On the motion from **Commissioner Field** that the Planning Commission find that the **Rezone (RZ 19-03)** applied for by **Dennis De La Montanya** on property located at **8255 Point Drive, Kelseyville** further described as **APN: 044-331-24** does not meet the requirements of the Lake County General Plan or the Rivera Area Plan, and that a recommendation of **denial** be provided to the Board of Supervisors for the Rezone subject to the findings listed in the staff report dated **July 14, 2022**. Seconded by **Commissioner Chavez**. The motion was carried by the following vote:

4 Ayes 1 Noes (Commissioner Hess) – Motion Carried

10:44 a.m. Item #5 - Public Hearing on Consideration General Plan of Conformity Report (file no. GPC 21-03) and consider a Categorical Exemption (CE 21-68), per CEQA* section 15301. The applicant, COUNTY OF LAKE is proposing Verification of compliance of the property with the General Plan designation of PF, Public Facilities, and RC, Resource Conservation. The project is located at 650 E. Highway 20, Upper Lake, CA; APN: 004-010-39.

Office Assistant III Jim Feenan– Legal notice has been determined on this matter.

Associate Planner Eric Porter - presented the information via Power Point which included the scope, site description, project analysis and recommendations.

10:48 a.m. Open Public Hearing

Robert Geary – he discussed his concerns with the study and the water bodies that were near the land. He stated his concerns about consultation regarding this project. He discussed ground disturbances. He discussed the area and possible ground disturbances that have occurred in the area. He stated they have responded and want to be consulted.

Associate Planner Eric Porter – he stated that there was already discussion between the tribes.

Robert Geary & Mr. Porter – discussed the process and how it should be handled in the future.

10:47 a.m. Closed Public Hearing

Commissioner Brown – he discussed the use of CEQA and how there are concerns regarding the process. He has other tribes reach out to him regarding their concerns.

Director Darby – stated they are working on an in house process after meeting with counsel, where all tribes are notified properly.

Categorical Exemption:

On the motion from **Commissioner Brown** that the Planning Commission find and report that, on the minimal site improvements associated with this project, that a Categorical Exemption to CEQA shall be adopted pursuant to CEQA Section 15301, and that this project, located at 650 E. Highway 20, Upper Lake, CA and known as APN: 004-010-39, will not have a significant effect on the environment with the findings **as amended today** listed in the staff report dated July 14, 2022. Seconded by **Commissioner Chavez**. The motion was carried by the following vote:

5 Ayes 0 Noes – Motion Carried

General Plan Conformity:

On the motion from **Commissioner Brown** that the Planning Commission find and report that General Plan Conformity GPC 21-03, applied for by the Lake County Public Services Department for the property located at 650 E. Highway 20, Upper Lake, CA and known as APN: 004-010-39, is in conformity with the Lake County General Plan with the findings **as amended today** listed in the staff report dated July 14, 2022. Seconded by **Commissioner Chavez**. The motion was carried by the following vote:

5 Ayes 0 Noes – 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's recommendation, 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.

10:53 a.m. Item #6 – Public Hearing on Consideration of a twenty-year extension for a mine (file no. UPM 20-01 affecting use permit UP 00-06) and to consider Categorical Exemption (CE22-47) per CEQA section 15301. The applicant, CLEARLAKE LAVA LLC is requesting a Twenty year extension for the continued use of the site as a gravel quarry. The project is located at 13329 Point Lakeview Drive, Lower Lake, CA, and is APNs: 012-066-02, 03, 12 and 71.

Associate Planner Eric Porter – requesting a continuance to August 11, 2022.

10:54 a.m. Open Public Hearing

Richard Knoll – represents Mr. Pelt and stated that he requested a continuance.

Robert Geary – stated his concerns regarding noticing requirements and time line of notice. He discussed different locations where cultural sites were located. He said there needs more time to do his research.

Discussion occurred between staff, Commission and Mr. Geary regarding the EIR and the twenty year extension. They discussed the contracts and the notice of completion from the SMARA department. They discussed the annual report. They also discussed the review process. The Commission suggested that the applicants be notified ahead of time regarding any continuances.

11:04 a.m. Closed Public Hearing

Upon motion by seconded by **Commission Field**, second by **Commissioner Chavez** and carried by a voice vote of (5-0), IT IS ORDERED, that the matter be continued to a date uncertain.

5 Ayes 0 Noes – Motion Carried

Richard Knoll – stated his concerns regarding continuing the matter to a date uncertain.

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's decision, 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 Planning Commission's final determination.

11:10 a.m. Item #7 - Public Hearing on Consideration of a Twenty Year Extension (file no. UPM 22-01) for an existing mine originally approved through Major Use Permit (UP 03-04) and consider Categorical Exemption (CE 22-36), per CEQA* section 15301. The applicant, DNA RIVER ROCK LLC is requesting a twenty year extension for an existing mine. The project is located at 8359 and 8400 S. Highway 29, Lower Lake, CA; APN: 011-069-13 and 12.

Office Assistant III Jim Feenan– Legal notice has been determined on this matter.

Upon motion by **Commission Chavez**, second by **Commissioner Hess** and carried by a voice vote of (5-0), IT IS ORDERED, that the matter be continued to a date uncertain.

5 Ayes 0 Noes – 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's decision, 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 Planning Commission's final determination.

11:13 a.m. Item #8 - Public Hearing on Consideration of a twenty-year extension for a mine (file no. UPX 19-04 affecting use permit UPM 10-01) and consider Categorical Exemption (CE 19-98), per CEQA section 15301. The applicant, CLEARLAKE REDI-MIX is requesting continued use of the site as a gravel quarry. The project is located at 12572 White Rock Canyon Road; Upper Lake, CA, and is APN: 022-009-06.

Planning Commissioner Assistant, Jim Feenan – stated that legal notice has been determined on this matter.

Commissioner Field – requested matter be heard today.

11:14 a.m. Open Public Hearing

Rick Thorne – he stated his project is very small compared to the other projects. Discussion occurred between the applicant, Commission and Mr. Geary regarding meeting with the tribes. He discussed the project and how they were going to proceed. He stated it was not a quarry and was an open pit.

Commissioner Hess - asked Mr. Thorne if he could meet with the tribes before the next hearing. A discussion occurred on how the contact could occur.

Director Darby – stated they she understood from legal that the County is not supposed to reach out to the tribes for consultation. The County can reach out to the tribe and applicant and coordinate a meeting. Discussion occurred between the Commission and staff regarding how the process has been handled in the past. It is her understanding that the County and the Tribe have the consultation, she stated she could check with legal to see how this should be handled.

Discussion occurred between the applicant, Commission and Mr. Geary regarding CEQA requirements. They discussed the notification process. They talked about the consultation and how they will proceed. They talked about how the notification was written. They discussed the four categories that were broken down within in CEQA.

11:28 a.m. Closed Public Hearing

Upon motion by seconded by **Commission Field**, second by **Commissioner Hess** and carried by a voice vote of (5-0), IT IS ORDERED, that the matter be continued to August 25, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting.

5 Ayes 0 Noes – 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

11:31 a.m. Item #9 - Public Hearing on Consideration of a Parcel Map to create three commercially-zoned lots (file no. PM 21-31), and includes a proposed one-year subdivision extension for Valley Oaks subdivision (file no. SDX 22-01) and consider an inclusion under the original FEIR and Addendum, and for a new Categorical Exemption to CEQA per section 15303(c). The applicant, VALLEY OAKS PARTNERS, LLC / KEITH GAPUSAN is requesting a Division of a 47 acre commercially-zoned property to create four parcels (three parcels being ½ to 1 acre in size), a ± 45 remainder lot (parent parcel), and to add a 14 acre lot to the subdivision for use as a secondary vehicle access. The project is located at 18196 and 18426 S. State Highway 29, Middletown, and is known as APNs 014-260-51, 36 and 24.

Office Assistant III Jim Feenan– stated that legal notice has been determined on this matter.

Upon motion by seconded by **Commission Hess** second by **Commissioner Chavez** and carried by a voice vote of (5-0), IT IS ORDERED, case number **PM 21-31** be continued to **August 11, 2022** Planning Commission Meeting.

5 Ayes 0 Noes – Motion Carried

Upon motion by seconded by **Commission Hess** second by **Commissioner Chavez** and carried by a voice vote of (5-0), IT IS ORDERED, case number **SDX 22-01** be continued to **August 25, 2022** Planning Commission Meeting.

5 Ayes 0 Noes – Motion Carried

NOTE: The applicant or any interested person is reminded that the subdivision ordinance provides for a fifteen (15) 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 fifteenth calendar day following the Commission's final determination.

11:39 a.m. Re-opened public hearing

TeMashio Anderson – commented on Line Item #8 ((file no. **UPX 19-04**). Discussed Robinson Rancheria involvement regarding this project. Mr. Porter asked Mr. Anderson if he would like to be notice regarding the next hearing.

11:44 a.m. Closed public comment on Line Item #8.

11:45 p.m. UNTIMED STAFF UPDATE

Director Darby – announced some new appointments to the department. She stated that Mireya Turner will be joining the department as the new Deputy Director. She stated that they have hired a new planning office assistant Amaia Hammack. She stated there also offers out for another Code Enforcement Officer and Assistant Planner.

Director Darby – stated that she had a meeting with Nicole Johnson (County Counsel) regarding the Tribal process and AB52. The process will be put into writing and provided to staff so that the procedure is much clearer.

Director Darby – stated she has submitted her official letter of resignation effective November 4, 2022. She stated she has provided to the Commission her Phase Two reorganization plan, showing where she feels with department should be going. She will be presenting her final plan to the Board of Supervisors. She stated it has been a pleasure working with the Commission.

Commissioner Hess – asked about the cannabis ordinance.

Director Darby – explained to the Commission the status of the cannabis ordinance and where they stood in the process. She stated she would be forwarding the name of the task force members to the Commission sometime this week.

Commissioner Chavez – discussed the CCPA Conference that two of the Commissioners attended. He offered further training to the Commission and where the next training will occur. The conference will occur on October 14th and 15th 2022 in Pleasanton, California. They discussed the benefits of the training. It is noted that Jim Feenan will be assisting the Commissioners with any arrangements that will be needed for travel and accommodations.

Chair Price adjourned the meeting at 11:51 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Christina Price, Chair
Lake County Planning Commission

By: _____

James (Jim) Feenan,
Planning Commission Assistant